

## **Nordic Hydrographic Commission Paper Chart Production Meeting** **In Copenhagen the 8th, 9th & 10th September 2004**

**Participants from Norway;** Inger Tellefsen & Gro Johnsen, **Sweden;** Johan Riismark & Patrik Nilsson, **Finland;** Juha Lehtosuo & Matti Olkinoura, **Iceland;** Árni Þór Vésteinsson & Níels Bjarki Finsen, **Denmark;** Berit Holse, Tine Fallemann Jensen, Nina Sahner Hansen & Nina Graasbøl-Schmidt

**We have decided to make a short summary and a detailed report of the meeting.**

The items discussed were:

1. Quality and accuracy of charts
2. Land information (provision of reliable data)
3. Quality control of new charts (Verification of data, validation of the chart)
4. Handling of huge amount of digital survey data
5. Experiences in a combined raster and vector production Publications
7. CSPCWG's activity in general terms
8. Where is the next meeting to be held?
9. New topics for the next meeting!

Further more we briefly discussed:

- The subject "coastline"; updated or old data?
- Speed limits
- How do we tell the users, how updated our charts are?
- Fairways/Edgy contour lines from generated curves
- How could the cliffs be shown properly on land?
- How different are your charts from your ENC?
- What to use on a leading line comma or full stop? - 220,5° or 220.5° or 222.5°?

A detailed report is available.

Item 1:

The countries have different ways of making source diagrams. The reason why some countries have difficulties in showing them like it's described in M4 is that there isn't space enough inside the diagram to show all the information in the charts in satisfactory detail.

Item 2:

All the HO's get land information from the "Land Office". The amount of land information that is shown in charts varies from one HO to the other.

Item 3:

It's preferable to have schemes and some kind of procedures that are common for this subject. Some countries have it because they are ISO certified. Other countries don't but we see the advantages in having it both for routine work and training new people.

Item 4:

Norway has a good system handling huge amount of data and it was interesting to hear about. Iceland and Denmark have Caris, which is able to handle the data, but not without some difficulties. Sometimes we have to divide a multi-beam survey into several files to be able to handle them. Sweden and Finland were very interested in hearing about the programs, because they want a new system, to deal with their troubles.

Item 5:

Denmark explained how they deal with this issue. Norway talked about geo-referenced tiff-files. And we all had a discussion about other ways to combine raster data with vector data.

Item 6:

We all agreed, that the future media for nautical publications will be the Internet, and that we probably should put as much information as possible on the Internet, so that mariners will be able to get it straight a way.

Item 7:

Finland informed us about CSPCWG. We discussed a problem concerning radio-reporting line. A line symbol, including the symbol for radio reporting point, was suggested as a solution to their problem.

Item 8:

It could be an option to go to Sweden or Norway for the next meeting.

Item 9:

The possibility to meet more often was discussed – every year instead of every second year to discuss paper chart related issues. It might be worthwhile to meet more often, so that we can relate with people from the other countries, and have a technical discussion about our work.

Topics that could be discussed at the next meeting:

- \*ISO standards
- \*Experience gained in running tenders
- \*Quality
- \*Procedures
- \*Connection between ENC and charts
- \*Go further into topic database
- \*Education
- \*Each countries production line (Who is doing what?)
- \*Fairways

Best Regards from Denmark

Berit Holse

Nina Graasbøl-Schmidt

Nina Sahrner Hansen

Tine Fallemann Jensen