

SESSION ON SYMBOLS AND TERMINOLOGY

Chairman: Prof. H. Kato

Symbols and Terminology Group Memberships: B. Johnson (Chairman)– C. Podenzana–Bonvino (Secretary) – D. Clarke – N. Matsumoto – M. Schmiechen.

Discussion of the Report and the Draft Recommendations of the Symbols and Terminology Group (cf. Proceedings, Volume 1, pp. 41–54).

I. DISCUSSIONS

ST-1

G.E. HEARN

Marine Technology, Newcastle University, U.K.

conditional upon adherence to such standards which would have become part of the notes for would-be authors.

ADOPTION OF ITTC CONSISTENT NOMENCLATURE

My comment is in response to the statement made in the report presentation concerning the lack of adoption of ITTC consistent symbols and definitions. Is it not possible for ITTC to persuade the publication committees of professional societies such as SNAME, RINA, etc. to adopt the ITTC standards? Subsequent acceptance of papers for publication by such societies, or conference sponsored by them, might then be

ST-2

R.C. MCGREGOR

University of Glasgow, U.K.

DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT

In view of the reference by the Chairman of the Committee to the difficulties associated with the interface between hydrodynamic symbolism and those for structures as represented by the ISSC, I would

appreciate the committee's comments on interface with the hydraulic community. At the IAHR Congress in Lausanne, they produced a document which overlapped in the field of wave characteristics. Is there an attempt to achieve consistency with them?

Secondly, these are clear difficulties in searching a stable standardised position that all practitioners can sensibly aim to adopt. In view of the further changes that are envisaged is it the Committee's view that a steady state is ever likely to be attained.

ST-3

B. MULLER-GRAF

Berlin Model Basin, VWS, Berlin, Germany

**COMMENTS ON THE REPORT OF THE
SYMBOLS AND TERMINOLOGY GROUP**

I like to congratulate the Symbols and Terminology Group for preparing and updating the List of Standard Symbols. The new 1990 draft is clearly arranged and allows a more practicable use than the 1989 one. The Symbols can now be found easily.

Despite the fact:

- that the symbols are representing the common language of the towing tank community,
- that the computer compatible symbols will be used more and more for the written text because the symbols with indices are not very suitable for text processors,

- that the former Presentation and Information Committees undertook extensive efforts for nearly 25 years to encourage the use of standard symbols.

I have the impression that the standard symbols in general are not accepted by the ITTC members. The reasons for this statement are:

1. The old fashioned symbols can still be found in the present proceedings;
2. The draft for special craft of 1984 has not been taken into account by the relevant committees;
3. The Universities, also those which are members of the ITTC do not use the standard symbols.

Therefore I like to ask the SAT Group:

Do you plan additional activities to change this situation besides your permanent recommendation, that the members should be encouraged to use the Standard Symbols?

Furthermore the SAT Group reported under item 3.7 that work is in progress on Symbols for catamarans. Because catamarans are at present the vessel type with the largest number of deliveries of unconventional craft, their symbols are urgently needed. Catamarans will be tested more and more in the near future. Therefore it would be very helpful if these new symbols which are mainly related to the geometrics of the hull, would be prepared by members who are involved in practical tank testing of catamarans.

Finally, it is difficult to understand that for the presentation of diagrams and figures, as well in the proceedings as during the discussions, the appropriate ISO Rules have not been taken into account. By a consequent use of the Internal Standard ISO 5966-1982 (E) (Documentation - Presentation of scientific

and technical report) legible and clearly arranged figures would have been presented. The SAT Group should take into consideration to recommend the use of these ISO Rules by the ITTC.

II. REPLIES BY THE SYMBOLS AND TERMINOLOGY GROUP

Reply to Dr. HEARN

Dr. Hearn makes a valid point concerning the need to encourage professional societies in the marine field to adopt the ITTC Standard Symbols, list as a guide for authors writing for their publications. The S & T Group will explore ways in which this excellent suggestion can be implemented in the societies mentioned. Following the 19th ITTC, Professor Johnson volunteered to serve on the publication committee of SNAME to help formulate such a policy and to work on the development of standard formats for submitting technical papers on diskettes for publication.

Instructions to authors need to be updated to include the use of standard symbols. However, until the current ITTC Standard Symbols List (possibly in condensed form) becomes readily available to authors, they cannot adhere to standards which are little known outside the ITTC community. The S & T List, as it stands, is too large a document to be distributed with instructions to authors. This problem must be resolved in order to implement Dr. Hearn's suggestion.

Reply to Prof. McGREGOR

In response to the discussion of Professor McGregor concerning the interface with the hydraulic community, the following is offered. In 1986, Professor Johnson attended a two day workshop on Wave Generation and Analysis sponsored by the Ocean Engineering Committee of the 18th ITTC and the IAHR Working Group on Wave Generation and Analysis. At that meeting, the IAHR/PIANC List of Sea State Parameters was presented and discussed. The Ocean Engineering Committee agreed to adopt a common list of symbols with the IAHR insofar as possible.

The IAHR List of Sea State Parameters is more comprehensive than the ITTC Symbols List. The IAHR List includes a section on supplementary and research symbols used for wave research as well as a number of useful sketches (which the S & T Group intends to add to Section 1.4.1 of the ITTC 1990 List.) Section 1.4.1 (Waves) of our list represents a subset of the IAHR list which contains the symbols of primary interest to our Ocean Engineering and Seakeeping

Committees. The principal change to the IAHR list is the addition of the Greek zeta (ζ) to indicate wave elevation for the ITTC Seakeeping Committee's z-positive downward convention. The Ocean Engineering Committee, like the IAHR, uses eta (η) to indicate wave elevation in a z-positive upward convention.

In response to Professor McGregor's second point, the S & T Group doubts if a steady state list of symbols will ever be attained, since the list must necessarily be updated to keep pace with developments in marine technology and in the development of standard formats for the exchange of marine dynamics data.

Reply to Dr. MULLER-GRAF

The comments of Dr. Müller-Graf are greatly appreciated by the Symbols and Terminology Group and it is appropriate at this point to acknowledge the continuous, active support the work of the SAT Group has received from Dr. Müller-Graf.

The SAT Group fully agrees that more missionary work is necessary to encourage the use of the Standard Symbols. Especially the colleagues from the universities are asked to assist the SAT Group in this on-going task. In doing so they might even come up with substantial contributions of their own to the list of Standard Symbols.

Concerning the symbols for catamarans the SAT Group notes that since Dr. Müller-Graf left the High Speed Vehicles Committee the work of up-dating and extending the symbols has been disrupted. It is recommended that one of the new members of that committee is charged with that task.

The point Dr. Müller-Graf raises concerning the presentation of diagrams sadly enough is true. The SAT Group will take up this problem and urge the Organizing Committee of the 20th ITTC to include the appropriate ISO Rules into the guidelines for the preparation of the Committee Reports and Written Discussions.
