

**6th CSPCWG MEETING
IHB, Monaco, 1-3 December 2009**

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

Use of INT1 numbers, e.g. in databases

Submitted by:	UK
Executive Summary:	Changes to INT1 symbol numbering and names may cause difficulties to the naming convention used for symbols in a database environment
Related Documents:	INT1.
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background

Changes to INT1 symbol numbering and names may cause difficulties to the naming convention used for symbols in a database environment.

Analysis / Discussion

UKHO is basing the naming convention for symbols in its database environment on the numbers and names listed in GB Chart 5011 (which is based on INT1), e.g. C2_UNSUR_COS to signify unsurveyed coastline. This aids users of the database to select the correct symbols through the symbol browser when required.

Recent changes to INT1 have caused some difficulty to our naming convention, resulting in adjustments to the database symbol names. There is a need to maintain symbols relating to the different names, because older products will be based on the previous names, while new products will relate to the new names. There is concern that the work required to make such changes could be considerable.

Particular difficulties would arise from changes if the same number were to be used to represent a different symbol. There is a risk that the database user will inadvertently choose the incorrect symbol if numbers are reused for different symbols.

Other changes have resulted:

- from symbols changing sections e.g. F40 (canal distance mark) has been moved to B25,
- from changes in terminology e.g. our symbol Q90_STAKE has been renamed to Q90_POLE and N63_DREDGING to N63_EXTRACT (CARIS software is limited to a maximum of 12 characters for each symbol name, so the full name cannot always be included).

Conclusions

UK would prefer that numbers are not reused for different symbols.

UK would be interested to know what sort of naming conventions other countries working in database environments are using and are they affected by such changes?

Recommendations

To consider the implications of name and number changes in INT1

Justification and Impacts

Improve efficiency by reducing the effort spent replicating changes to naming convention in INT1 within the symbol set used in the database environment.

Action required of CSPCWG

The CSPCWG is invited to:

- a. exchange views and experience
- b. consider whether a policy is required to take account of the implications of name and number changes in INT1.