

NHC NSEG Workshop 12-01-2023 – Minutes

Round of Introduction

Participants:

- Elizabeth Hagemann (DK)
- Yvonne Petersen (DK)
- Hendrik Stang (DK)
- Magnus Wallhagen (SE) – National Hydrographer Sweden
- Magnus Hovberg (SE) – Production Manager
- Maarit Mikkelsen (FI) – Team Leader Hydrographic Services and Bathymetric Data Team
- John Helge Herland (NO) – Operator Multibeam Data
- Niels Finsen (IS) – Project Manager Chart & ENC Production
- Andri Leifsson (IS) – Cat B Hydrographer

Introduction and Background

DK: Explaining why have invited to this meeting. During NHC meetings, they have been repeatedly discussions on working groups, their need and efficiency. More and more challenging to define what NSEG should work with. Deliverables are for instance difficult to define. Following several reasons, among others Covid and maybe the lack of tasks, NSEG has not been very active in the last couple of years. Following the NHC65 meeting in Stavanger, DK was tasked to invite to this workshop to discuss the purpose and future of NSEG.

We have thus invited to this workshop and have send out an agenda.

The purpose is to find a way forward, and draft a suggestion to the NHC. DK therefore invites to an open discussion on the usefulness of this group.

Discussion

DK (Yvonne): From a Danish point of view, the topics of the group are of course very relevant, but it is difficult justify spending resources on this group if there is not something very special that is not being discussed in other contexts.

NO (John): Has participated serval times. Group has been very useful, particularly focusing on data management. There is no similar group as such that focuses exclusively on hydrographic data. Useful for connections across different HO's. Discussing the use of software and the use of software can be a useful element to discuss in this group context.

DK (Yvonne): The way DK is working and using processing software differently by now and relying no longer on in-house developed software.

SE (Magnus Hovberg): Sweden supports Norway and the need of this group. It is useful to meet and discuss besides not having the same software packages. Differences and similarities in software products can be discussed about – both in the area of data acquisition and post-processing. AI information and the use of AI can also be an element to be discussed.

SE (Magnus Wallhagen): The Nordic context allows a very unique way of discussing – both on a political, as well as on an operational level. When new techniques, and new routines are implemented, discussing and engaging with fellow Nordic countries can be very useful. NSEG provides such platform.

IS (Niels): Iceland also supports the existence of this group and the points made by Sweden and Norway.

IS (Andri): Especially as Iceland is a small HO, this WG is of big importance. It provides a platform to address questions, and profit from the knowledge and experience of fellow Nordic HOs.

FI (Maarit): FI believes that the work of this group is very important. IHOs WGs do not provide a similar thematical setting. NSEG is an important forum to exchange ideas, and practical discussions.

Future:

DK (Elizabeth): In order to continue with this group, there is a need for a more permanent organization. Right now, the ToR say that NHC is deciding on chairmanship, and meeting location. This may though be easier when the group itself agrees on a chair and maybe consider a permanent chair.

DK has the challenge of being member state in many different RHC and thus also WGs. Therefore, DK has to reconsider its resources. DK thus wants to make sure that this group does not become a platform for simply repetition of IHO information.

FI (Maarit): Confident, that meetings may be organized again in the future.

SE (Magnus Wallhagen): Sweden confirms the point of Denmark. The group should have a mandate to decide on its chairmanship and meeting location.

NO (John): This is not a group for making big decisions – that is made on an IHO level. Yet, it could work as a platform to discuss questions, and elements that are then brought up on another IHO level. Generally, NO believes though that this group should be seen as a practical forum where questions are being discussed. Also, this group is much more informal than all other IHO WGs. This is a big advantage.

SE (Magnus Wallhagen): If we, as MS, want to have influence on an IHO level – this group can very well be used to draft and create common Nordic papers to IHO WG or even to the higher IHO level. This group creates such platform.

Outcome:

DK (Elizabeth): Thank you for all your comments. To summarize, 4/5 MS see this group as very useful, stressing it as a platform to discuss specific and practical questions. Particularly also, as NHC presents a very informal setting. To continue this group, it has to be asked: Is there anyone who is willing to invest the resources to restart this group?

IS (Niels): Maybe this should be brought up at NHC66?

SE (Magnus): Every MS should consider whether they can chair this group, and this should then be decided at the NHC66.

Actions NHC66:

- **Note the report of the NSEG workshop**
- **Approve the revised NSEG ToR**