

## Questions to be answered by NHC Member States on NCPEG

### 1. What benefits (Pros) can your MS identify of having a Nordic Chart Production Expert Group under NHC?

- *Discuss specific issues related to nautical chart products where it would be beneficial to understand best practice/benchmarking. This could be effects of the implementation of S-100 or sunset of UKHO sunset of paper chart. More specific tasks should be identified such as how temporary and preliminary notices is handled in ENC (raised by DK at the recent NHC meeting). (Confirmed by SE, DK, FI)*
- *Delegate technical issues related to nautical chart products from the NHC level to a more technical level. The expert group should be used to produce proposals or different alternatives for NHC to take decisions on.*
- *Share and learn from challenges in production in various countries. Solving known problems through technical cooperation (NO, IS)*
- *The expert group consist only of the five Nordic MS which have a lot of similarities and it is easy to have more informal discussions and workshops compared to other WGs in other Hydrographic Commissions or IHO WGs. (NO, SE, IS, DK, FI)*

### 2. What are the concerns (Cons) with the NCPEG?

- *Presently the purpose of the expert group from NHC is unclear. It has traditionally been focusing on paper chart production, but it should now need to updated to focus on ENCs and future S-100 products. Though the ToRs are more or less the same. This unclear purpose leads to unclear benefits and inefficient usage and possibly not the most applicable representatives.*
- *Limited concrete results, requires resources to arrange meetings (costs).*
- *There is a possible overlap with this working group and other working groups in other Hydrographic Commissions and IHO WGs. (SE, DK, FI)*
- *Different production systems which may make technical questions difficult to compare*
- *ToR do not represent the current need of HOs.*

**3. What would be needed for your MS to have engagement in the NCPEG?**

- *A more permanent chair of the expert group to achieve continuity. Sweden can consider to chair the expert group on a more permanent basis. (SE, IS, FI)*
- *The groups focus should be directed towards S100 (NO, FI, IS, DK, SE)*
- 
- *Guideline/examination tasks from NHC: A clearer purpose and assignment from the NHC.*
- *New ToR that support the engagement with new standards and the future of paper charts for instance or or matters on compilation of hydrographic and other chart data (bathymetric, terrain, fairways, AtoNs, etc.)*
- *More dedicated tasks which could be dealt with in dedicated workshops. An example could be to arrange a workshop on how to handle temporary and preliminary notices in ENC's.*

**Summary:**

- a) NCPEG consisting only of Nordic MS allows for informal and straightforward discussions. This is a unique setting that all MS value high.**
- b) The current ToR are outdated. To keep the group alive, changing the scope and organizational setting of the group is necessary. All MS came with ideas about what the group may focus on in the future.**
- c) NCPEG should focus on future S-100 products, ENC's and/or the outfacing of paper charts. Other concrete examples have also been named.**
- d) The group should be allowed to select its own – permanent – chair.**
- e) If the above-mentioned points are fulfilled, MS evaluate the group as worth to continue**

**Action Point for NHC66**

- 1) Note the reports of the two NCPEG workshops**
- 2) Note the comments provided by NCPEG workshop participants**
- 3) Approve new ToR NCPEG**