4de th

SUID-AFRIKAANSE REKENAARSIMPOSIUM
SOUTH AFRICAN COMPUTER SYMPOSIUM

HOLIDAY INN PRETORIA
JULIE 1 – 3 JULY 1987

Proceedings

of the

4th South African Computer Symposium

Holiday Inn, Pretoria

1 – 3 July 1987

edited by

Pieter Kritzinger

Computer Science Department
University of Cape Town

PREFACE

Computer science is an emerging discipline which is having difficulty in being recognised as a worthy member of the sciences. I will paraphrase John Hopcroft, co-winner of the 1986 Turing Award, when, during a recent interview, he said that the primary reason for the lack of recognition, is the age of our researchers. Probably not one of the researchers who presented their work at this symposium is older than 45. I know of no computer scientist in South Africa who is in a position where (s)he can affect funding priorities. As far as I know we have no representation on any of the committees of the Foundation for Research Development and for our Afrikaans speaking fraternity, none who is a member of the *Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns*. It will take time and conscious effort to establish our presence. The same is true of course for our universities. Again, with one exception, I know of no dean of a science faculty, vice-principal or principal who is a computer scientist. We consequently spend an enormous amount of time trying to explain the needs of computer science and its difficulties. I believe this symposium is a further step towards accreditation by our peers and superiors from the other sciences.

The total number of papers submitted to the Programme Committee for consideration was 34. Each paper was reviewed by three persons knowledgeable in the field it represents. Of those submitted, 23 were finally selected for inclusion in the symposium. As a result the overall quality of the papers is high and as a computer science community in Africa we can be justly proud of the final programme.

This is the fourth in the series of South African computer symposia. This year the symposium is sponsored by the Computer Society of South Africa (CSSA), the South African Institute for Computer Scientists and the local IFIP Committee. The executive director of the CSSA and his staff deserve warm thanks for handling the organisation as well as they have, while the Organising Committee provided Derrick and I with very valuable advice.

Finally I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the authors, to the members of the Programme Committee and particularly the reviewers. Without the kind cooperation of everyone, this symposium would not have taken place.

Pieter Kritzinger
July 1987.

SYMPOSIUM CHAIRMAN: PS Kritzinger, University of Cape Town.

SYMPOSIUM CO-CHAIRMAN: D Kourie, University of Pretoria.

MEMBERS OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Judy Bishop, Witwatersrand University

Chris Bornman, UNISA

Hannes de Beer, Potchefstroom University

Gideon de Kock, Port Elizabeth University

Jaap Kies, Western Cape University

Derrick Kourie, Pretoria University

Pieter Kritzinger, Cape Town University

Tony Krzesinski, Stellenbosch University

Michael Laidlaw, Durban Westville University

Peter Lay, Cape Town University

Ken MacGregor, Cape Town University

Theo McDonald, Orange Free State University

Jan Oosthuizen, University of the North

Dennis Riordan, Rhodes University

Alan Sartori-Angus, Natal University

John Shochot, Witwatersrand University

Theuns Smith, Rand Afrikaans University

Trevor Turton, ISM (Pty) Ltd

Gerrit Wiechers, Infoplan.

LIST OF REVIEWERS

BERMAN Sonia
BISHOP Judy
BORNMAN Chris
CAREY Chris
CHERENACK Paul
DE BEER Hannes
DE VILLIERS Pieter
GORRINGE Pen
KIES Jaap
KOURIE Derrick
KRITZINGER Pieter
KRZESINSKI Tony
LAIDLAW Michael
LAY Peter
MacGREGOR Ken
MATTISON Keith
McDONALD Theo
RENNHACKKAMP Martin
RIORDAN Denis
SATORI-ANGUS Alan
SCHOCHOT John
SMITH Theuns
TURTON Trevor
VAN DEN HEEVER Roelf
VAN ROOYEN Hester
VON SOLMS Basie
VOS Koos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Keynote Address

"An Extensible System and Programming Tool for Workstation Computers." 1
Niklaus Wirth, ETH, Zurich

Invited Lectures

"The Relationship of Natural and Artificial Intelligence." .....not included in Proceedings.
G Lasker, University of Windsor, Ontario.

"Software Engineering: What Can We Expect in the Future?" .....not included in Proceedings.
D Teichrow, University of Michigan, U.S.A.

Computer Languages I

"SPS-Algol: Semantic Constructs for a Persistent Programming Language." 13
S Berman, University of Cape Town.

"Petri Net Topologies for a Specification Language." 25
R Watson, University of the Witwatersrand.

"Towards a Programming Environment Standard in LISP." ... 45
R Mori, University of Cape Town

"ADA for Multiprocessors: Some Problems and Solutions.".. 63
J Bishop, University of the Witwatersrand.

Computer Graphics

"Polygon Shading on Vector Type Devices." 75
C F Scheepers, CSIR.

"Hidden Surface Elimination in Raster Graphics Using Visigrams." 97
P Gorringe, CSIR.

Database Systems I

"On Syntax and Semantics Related to Incomplete Information Databases." 109
M E Orlowska, UNISA.

"Modelling Distributed Database Concurrency Control Overheads." 131
M H Rennhackkamp, University of Stellenbosch.

Operating Systems

"The Development of a Fault Tolerant System for a Real-time Environment." 149
M Morris, CSIR.

"A New General-purpose Operating System." 161
B H Venter, CSIR.

Computer Languages II

"The Representation of Chemical Structures by Random Context Structure Grammars." 175
E M Ehlers and B von Solms, RAU.

"A Generalised Expression Structure." 189
W van Biljon, CSIR.

Computer Networks and Protocols I

"An Approximate Solution Method for Multiclass Queueing Networks with State Dependent Routing and Window Row Control." 203
A E Krzesinski, University of Stellenbosch.

"A Protocol Validation System." 227
J Punt, University of Cape Town.

Computer Networks and Protocols II

"Protocol Performance Using Image Protocols." 251
P S Kritzinger, University of Cape Town.

Artificial Intelligence

"A Data Structure for Exchanging Geographic Information." 267
A Cooper, CSIR.

"The Design and Use of a Prolog Trace Generator for CSP." 279
D G Kourie, University of Pretoria.

Database Systems II

"An Approach to Direct End-user Usage of Multiple Databases." 297
M J Phillips, CSIR.

"A Semantic Data Model Approach to Logical Data Independence." 329

S Berman, University of Cape Town.

Information Systems

"The ELSIM Language: an FSM-based Language for the ELSIM SEE." 343
L du Plessis and C Bornman, UNISA.

"Three Packaging Rules for Information System Design." . 363
J Mende, University of the Witwatersrand.

Computer Languages III

"Experience with a Pattern-matching Code Generator." ... 371
M A Mulders, D A Sewry and W R van Biljon, CSIR.

"Set-oriented Functional Style of Programming." 385
C Mueller, University of the Witwatersrand.

Tutorial

The use of Modula-2 in Software Engineering." 399
N Wirth, ETH, Zurich.

DAY 1

07h30	Registration and Coffee.
08h45	Welcoming address, President of the South African Institute of Computer Scientists, Dr. G. Wiechers.
09h00	Invited Lecture. Professor D. Teichrow, University of Michigan. *Software Engineering, ... What Can We Expect in the Future.*
10h00	COFFEE
	Computer Languages I. Chairman: G. Wiechers.
10h15	S. Berman, University of Cape Town. *SPS-Algol: Semantic Constructs for a Persistent Programming Language.*
10h50	A. Watson, University of the Witwatersrand. *Petri Net Topologies for a Specification Language.*
11h25	R. Mori, University of Cape Town. *Towards a Programming Environment Standard in USP.*
11h50	J. Bishop, University of the Witwatersrand. *ADA for Multiprocessors: Some Problems and Solutions.*
12h30	LUNCH

	Computer Graphics. Chairman: D. Kourie	**Operating Systems.** Chairman: K. MacGregor.
14h00	C. F. Scheepers, CSIR. *Polygon Shading on Vector Type Devices.*	M. Morris, UNISA. *The Development of a Fault Tolerant System for a Real-time Environment.*
14h35	P. Gorringe, CSIR. *Hidden Surface Elimination in Raster Graphics Using Visigrams.*	B. H. Venter, CSIR. *A New General-purpose Operating System.*
15h15	COFFEE	COFFEE
	Database Systems I. Chairman: B. von Solms.	**Computer Languages II.** Chairman: J. Bishop.
15h30	M.E. Orlowska, UNISA. *On Syntax and Semantics Related to Incomplete Information Databases.*	E.M. Ehlers and B. von Solms, Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit. *The Representation of Chemical Structures by Random Context Structure Grammars.*
16h05	M.H. Rennhackkamp, Stellenbosch University. *Modelling Distributed Database Concurrency Control Overheads*	W. van Biljon, CSIR. *A Generalised Expression Structure.*

18h00	Cocktail Party in Cullinan Room A.

DAY 2

08h30 Keynote Address by Profesor Niklaus Wirth, Swiss Federal Institute for Technology, Zurich.
An Extensible System and a Programming Tool for Workstation Computers.

Computer Networks and Protocols I. Chairman: P.S. Kritzinger.

09h30 A.E. Krzesinski, University of Stellenbosch.
An Approximate Solution Method for Multiclass Queueing Networks with State Dependent Routing and Window Flow Control.

10h05 J. Punt, University of Cape Town.
A Protocol Validation System.

10h30 COFFEE

Computer Networks and Protocols II. Chairman: R. van der Heever.

11h00 P.S. Kritzinger, University of Cape Town.
Protocol Performance using Image Protocols.

11h35 Invited Lecture by Professor G. Lasker, University of Windsor, Ontario.
The Relationship of Natural and Artificial Intelligence.

12h30 LUNCH

	Artificial Intelligence. Chairman: G. Lasker.	**Information Systems.** Chairman: D. Teichrow.
14h00	A. Cooper, CSIR *A Data Structure for Exchanging Geographic Information.*	L. du Plessis and C. Bornman, UNISA. *The ELSIM Language: an FSM-based Language for the ELSIM SEE.*
14h35	A. I. Newcombe, University of Cape Town and R. Rada, National Library of Medicine, Maryland. *Strategies for Automatic Indexing and Thesaurus Building.*	J. Mende, University of the Witwatersrand. *Three Packaging Rules for Information System Design.*
15h15	COFFEE	COFFEE
	Database Systems II. Chairman: C. Bornman.	**Computer Languages III.** Chairman: N. Wirth.
15h30	M.J. Philips, CSIR. *An Approach to Direct End-user Usage of Mutiple Databases.*	W. van Biljon, CSIR. *Experience with a Pattern-matching Code Generator.*
16h05	S. Berman, University of Cape Town. *A Semantic Data Model Approach to Logical Data Independence.*	C. Mueller, University of the Witwatersrand. *Set-oriented Functional Style of Programming.*

16h45 Open Forum with professors G. Lasker, D. Teichrow and N. Wirth.
Moderator: Dr. D. Jacobson.

19h30 Symposium Banquet in Cullinan Room.
Guest speaker, Dr. D. Jacobson, Group Executive: Technology, Allied Technologies Limited.

DAY 3

08h00 Registration (Tutorial only).

08h30 Tutorial.
The Tutorial will be given by professor Niklaus Wirth, Division of Computer Science, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich.

The use of Modula-2 in Software Engineering.
Topics to be covererd include:

What is Software Engineering?
Data types and structures.
Modularization and information hiding.
Definition and implementation parts.
Separate compilation with type checking.
Facilities to express concurrency.
Pompous programming style.
What could be excluded?

12h15 **Close of Symposium.**

12h30 LUNCH

A DATA STRUCTURE FOR EXCHANGING GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

by

A K Cooper
National Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, CSIR

ABSTRACT

Geographical information consists of non-spatial information (alphanumeric) and spatial information (vector and raster), the relationships between the non-spatial information and the spatial information, as well as the spatial relationships inherent in the spatial information, known as topology. It is undesirable for any exchange standard to lose, reduce or alter any information exchanged through the standard. For this reason, current alphanumeric and graphic exchange standards are insufficient for geographical information.

The project team drawing up a proposed South African standard for the exchange of geographical information has studied the proposals and standards of other countries and has held discussions with the users and potential users of computerized geographical information in this country. The project team feels that the best model for use with the data structures of the exchange standard is the relational one. This paper describes the nature of geographical information and the advantages of the relational model.

KEYWORDS

Geographical Information, Exchange Standard, Topology, Feature, Attribute, Relational Model.

1. INTRODUCTION

Geographical information consists of all information that refers to the man-environment system and that can be localized in space and time. Computerization of geographical information started with the statistical processing of thematic data and with automated cartography. This has now developed to Geographical Information Systems (GIS). A GIS consists of a data base of spatially (geographically) referenced data and a collection of utilities for efficiently inputting, storing, retrieving, maintaining, manipulating, analysing and displaying the data.

A true GIS is a system that is orientated to the analysis of geographically referenced data to produce useful information [COOP86b]. To do this, the GIS's data base must cater for the different types of geographical information (vector, raster and alphanumeric) and provide a topological structure for the spatial data - that is, a structure that explicitly encodes the spatial relationships inherent in the data.

A major problem with geographical information, and one that has delayed its computerization, is the enormous volumes involved. Donald Light of the US Geological Survey (USGS) estimates that to digitize the approximately 54000 7.5-minute standard topographical quadrangle maps (at a scale of 1:24000) that cover the lower 49 American states, the USGS will require a storage capacity of about 11 terabytes [LIGH86]. The scale of 1:24000 would be acceptably large for most rural applications, but for urban applications, scales of 1:1000 or even larger become necessary. The enormous volumes are not restricted to topographical data - consider the amount of data captured in a population census.

It is not feasible to expect users of geographical information to capture all their own raw data because the time and costs involved are prohibitive. Users must be able to acquire data from other users. There are a number of different suppliers whose hardware and software are used for processing geographical information. Unfortunately, very few are compatible with each other to the extent that they can exchange geographical information. Generally, users have a great deal of freedom in structuring their systems, and consequently, there could even be significant problems in exchanging information between systems from the same supplier. Thus there is a need for a software- and hardware-independent exchange standard for geographical information. The data structures of the exchange standard should be a superset of the structures of the systems that might use the exchange - they must not lose, reduce or alter the information or its topology.

In April 1986 a joint project between the National Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences (NRIMS) of the CSIR and the Chief Directorate of Surveys and Mapping (CDSM) was initiated to draw up a South African exchange standard for geographical information. The project team has studied the standards and proposals of a number of countries, including Australia [STAN81], the United States [USGS84], [MOEL85], [MOEL86], [TESE86] and [MOEL87] and the United Kingdom [HAYW86] and [HAYW87], as well as proposals submitted to the International Hydrographic

Organisation, [NAWG85], [CHS85] and [YEAG86]. The project team distributed a questionnaire on GIS to over 130 organisations in South Africa and has also organized a number of workshops on GIS. This has enabled the GIS community to provide the project team with valuable inputs concerning the proposed exchange standard. A draft exchange standard was released in March 1987 for public comment [CLAR87], and in September 1987 the final report will be presented to the National Programme for Remote Sensing, the project's sponsors.

2. THE CONTENTS OF A GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM

The following definitions are from [COOP87], [CLAR86b] and [CLAR87]:

A simple **feature** is a set of one or more uniquely identifiable objects in the real world where the defined characteristics of the objects are consistent throughout all the objects.

An **attribute** is a defined characteristic of any feature about which information is stored.

Non-spatial attributes are attributes that are independent of position - often termed the desciptive data of the feature.

A **spatial attribute** is an attribute whose value is a subset of any n-dimensional space. Most current GIS's work in two dimensions, and some work in three dimensions. There is no reason why future GIS's might not work in more dimensions. The three fundamental types of two-dimensional vector spatial attributes are nodes, chains and regions. The fundamental raster spatial attribute is the matrix.

A **node** is a 0-dimensional object with an n-tuple of coordinates specifing its position in n-dimensional space.

A **chain** is an ordered sequence of n-tuples of coordinates with a node at each end. The direction of the chain is defined when the chain is used in a specific feature.

An **arc** is any continuous part of the circumference of a circle with a node at each end. The arc is defined by giving the start and end nodes of the arc and either the centre of the circle or any other point on the circumference of the arc.

A **region** is the interior of a continuous and closed sequence of one or more chains, known as the region's outer boundary.

Examples of vector spatial attributes are:



Figure 1

A **matrix** consists of an n-tuple of coordinates (its origin) and an m-dimensional tesselation of data values encoded in a pre-defined format.

Three-dimensional vector spatial attributes are not yet well understood, and no exchange standard has attempted to cater for them. [COOPS87] refers to **solids** as the fundamental three-dimensional vector spatial attribute. As and when solids are formally defined and used in geographical information, they can easily be added to the proposed exchange standard. The advantage of the relational model for the exchange standard is that to add new types of data, all one has to do is formally define, and add to the standard, the relationships that should exist between the new data types and existing data types.

In a geographical data base, features are grouped on the basis of the nature of their spatial attributes. The three types of vector features are point, line and area, and the raster type of a feature is a grid.

A **point** feature is one whose position is described by a node.

A **line** feature is one whose position is described by a set of chains and/or arcs. These chains and arcs do not necessarily form a continuous object.

An **area** feature is one whose position is described by a set of regions. These regions do not necessarily form a continuous object.

A **grid** feature is one whose position is described by a set of matrices. These matrices do not necessarily form a continuous object.

Owing to the complex nature of geographical information, it is desirable to be able to combine a number of different features to form one feature. The proposed exchange standard allows **compound** features, which are collections of other features.

Classification is the arrangement of features into classes or groups and must be done on the basis of the qualitative characteristics of the objects, such as their function, and not on the basis of their quantitative characteristics.

There is a grey area between the classification and the non-spatial attributes of a feature, and different criteria apply for different users [COOP86a]. In fact, classification itself could be considered to be a non-spatial attribute.

For example, a tall office building could be classified as a building, as an area zoned for commercial use, or even as an aeronautical obstruction. Whichever classification is used, the other characteristics of the feature could be recorded as non-spatial attributes of the feature.

A feature's classification should be done on the basis of its characteristics that are least likely to change. In our example, it would be better to classify the feature as a building because if the building were destroyed then the feature would be as well, while the building could quite easily be rezoned. Conceptually, there is no reason why an object or event in the real world could not be represented by more than one feature, especially if the classifications of the different features are not closely connected. However, this could lead to problems such as redundant data and is not recommended. For details on how to set up a classification see [SCHE86].

4. TOPOLOGY

Four types of topology are incidence, containment, intersection and adjacency.

Incidence means that more than one feature share the same spatial attributes. If this topology is not explicitly captured with the spatial data, it is difficult to generate. In older GIS's, the same spatial data were often captured more than once, for example, the common boundary of two neighbouring regions would be captured twice, once for each region. As these data would be captured by hand digitization, the two versions of the same boundary would not necessarily be the same. This would result in slivers in the data base - narrow areas of overlap (the intersection of two regions in the data base that do not intersect in the real world) and underlap (the area between two regions in the data base that in the real world are adjacent). The solution to the problem of slivers is to share spatial data so that when data are captured, the spatial data that are already captured can be used.

Incidence topology includes point features sharing the same node, line features and area boundaries sharing the same chains, area features sharing the same regions and grid features sharing the same matrices. An example follows:



Figure 2

Thus, the chain between nodes A and B is shared by the line feature River Z and the boundaries of the area features Farm X and Farm Y.

Containment means that a spatial attribute lies entirely within the outer boundary of a region. The two containment topologies are **exclusion** and **inclusion**. If a region is completely contained within another region and does not form a part of the containing region, then the outer boundary of the contained region is an inner boundary of the containing region. We say that the containing region excludes the contained region. A region may exclude zero or more other regions which are within its interior. Inclusion means that the contained spatial attribute forms a part of the containing region. Inclusion can be determined from the coordinates of the spatial attributes. However, a user might wish to encode the relationship explicitly as transformations between different projections can alter the apparent relationships. Encoded inclusion relationships can speed up access to the data. Owing to the number of these relationships normally present in the data, it is unlikely that a user will explicitly encode all the inclusion relationships.

Intersection means that there is one coordinate common to more than one spatial attribute. In topologically structured data one would expect a node at that point and that all chains passing through that point would be broken at that point into two chains, each of which has its start or end node at that point. To determine the intersections of line features, one would determine which of their constituent chains had terminal nodes in common.

Adjacency of regions can be determined through the chains which form boundaries common to more than one region.

Thus, topological connections on spatial attributes exist between a chain and its terminal nodes, a region and the chains that form its outer and inner boundaries, and a region and its excluded regions and included nodes, chains, regions and matrices.

In addition, between the features and the spatial attributes are the relations that take care of networks of chains that form a line feature, disjoint regions that form an area feature and different matrices that form a grid feature.

In the example below, chains A, B, C, D and E together form River X.



Figure 3

Topological information is implicit in the real world and is explicitly captured to reduce data redundancy, enhance data consistency and completeness, and speed up access to the data. The topology of geographical information is not yet well understood, and while the proposed exchange standard [CLAR87] has attempted to cater for topology that is known and used, it might be necessary to revise the topological relationships catered for in the standard as the use of topology in geographical information matures.

5. ADVANTAGES OF A RELATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR EXCHANGING GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

There are three common models for data structures, namely the hierarchical, the network and the relational. Current exchange standards use hierarchical (for example, the Australian standard [STAN81]) network or hybrid models (for example, the British standard [HAYW87] uses a combination of network and relational models) for their data structures. Two major disadvantages of these models are firstly, that users have to enter data into a number of fields that they do not wish to use, and secondly, that the structures are rigid and can only be changed with difficulty to cater for new types of data, such as the third dimension.

With a relational structure, users merely omit those relations for which they have no data, and it is almost trivial to add new relations to an existing exchange standard. In fact, data that can be exchanged through a relational exchange structure can always be exchanged through the structure, no matter how many new relations are added to cater for new types of data.

Normalization of geographical data in relations minimizes the redundancy and removes anomolies in updating the data [VANR87]. All the relations in the proposed exchange standard [CLAR87] are in at least the second normal form. Once the contents have been finalised, further normalization will be investigated, bearing in mind the danger that over normalization of geographical information could slow down the retrieval of the information [VANR87].

The project team drawing up the proposed exchange standard has studied the hierarchical, network and relational data models in the context of geographical information and believes that the relational model is the only one that provides the power and flexibility required.

The following are a few examples of the relations provided in the exchange standard. The relations are given in the boxes with rounded corners, and the attributes of the relations are given in the boxes with square corners. The keys of the relations are given above the relations.



Figure 4

This is a ~~one to many~~ many-to-one relation - each feature may have only one classification, while there may be any number of features with the same classification.



Figure 5

Because a feature can have more than one non-spatial attribute, a sequence number has to be added to the key to ensure that the key is unique.



Figure 6

A line feature consists of a set of chains. In the relation, the node ID indicates which of the chain's two terminal nodes is the start node. The relationships in geographical information are complex, and it is not possible to define all the relations so that they might easily be inverted. For example, the inverse of the previous relation is the following (note that the node ID is not in the relation):



Figure 7

6. CONCLUSION

To be useful, an exchange standard should be a superset of any system that might use the exchange. It should also be expandible to cater for any advances that might take place. Thus, while the standard should cater for the topology required by GIS's, a user should be able to use it in a stripped down form if he does not require any topology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank the other members of the project team, Derek Clarke, Hester van Rooyen and Elri Liebenberg, as well as my colleagues at NRIMS and the GIS community in South Africa for all their help. I should like to thank the anonymous referees for their helpful comments.

REFERENCES

CHS85 Canadian Hydrographic Service, 1985, 'Evolving Communications Standards in the Mapping and Charting World: a Report and a Proposal', submitted to the IHO's Committee on the Exchange of Digital Data.

CLAR86a Clarke DG, Cooper AK, Liebenberg EC & Van Rooyen MH, May 1986, 'Questionnaire on GIS Exchange Format Proposals', National Standards for GIS Exchange, 24 pp.

CLAR86b Clarke DG, Cooper AK, Liebenberg EC & Van Rooyen MH, May 1986, 'Glossary of GIS terms and English/Afrikaans Translations', National Standards for GIS Exchange, 28 pp.

CLAR87 Clarke DG, Cooper AK, Liebenberg EC & Van Rooyen MH, March 1987, 'A proposed national standard for the exchange of digital geo-referneced information: Draft', NRIMS CSIR Technical Report TWISK 517, 151 pp.

COOP86a Cooper AK, January 1986, 'Report on the GIS project planning discussions', NRIMS CSIR Internal Report I668, 13pp.

COOP86b Cooper AK, September 1986, 'An Introduction to Geographical Information Systems', NRIMS CSIR Internal Report I718, 7pp.

COOP87 Cooper AK, December 1986, 'Thoughts on exchanging geographical information', Proceedings 1987 ASPRS-ACSM Annual Convention, Vol 5, pp 1-9.

HAYW86 Haywood P, chair, September 1986, 'The National Transfer Format Final Draft (Issue 1.3)', Ordnance Survey, 158 pp.

HAYW87 Haywood P, chair, January 1987, 'The National Transfer Format Release 1.0', Ordnance Survey.

LIGH86 Light DL, March 1986, 'Mass Storage Estimates for the Digital Mapping Era', in Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing Vol 52 No 3, pp 419-425.

MOEL85 Moellering H, ed, January 1985, 'Digital Cartographic Data Standards: An Interim Proposed Standard', Report No 6, National Committee for Digital Cartographic Data Standards, 164 pp.

MOEL86 Moellering H, ed, April 1986, 'Digital Cartographic Data Standards: A Report on Evaluation and Empirical Testing', Report No 7, National Committee for Digital Cartographic Data Standards, 219 pp.

MOEL87 Moellering H, ed, January 1987, 'A Draft Proposed Standard for Digital Cartographic Data', Report No 8, National Committee for Digital Cartographic Data Standards.

NAWG85 North American Work Group Committee on the Exchange of Digital Data, 1985, 'Proposed Format for the Exchange of Digital Hydrographic Data', submitted to the IHO's Committee on the Exchange of Digital Data.

SCHE86 Scheepers CF, Van Biljon WR & Cooper AK, September 1986, 'Guidelines to Set Up a Classification for Geographical Information', NRIMS CSIR Internal Report I723, 12 pp.

STAN81 Standards Association of Australia, August 1981, 'Interchange of Feature Coded Digital Mapping Data', Australian Standard 2482-1981, 24 pp.

TESE86 TeSelle G, chair, August 1986, 'Federal Geographic Exchange Format - A Uniform Format for the Exchange of Spatial Data Among Federal Agencies', Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee on Digital Cartography, 69pp.

USGS84 U S Geological Survey, 1984, 'USGS Digital Cartographic Data Standards', Geological Survey Circulars 895-A to 895-G.

VANR87 Van Roessel JW, 1987, 'Design of a spatial data structure using the relational normal forms', International Journal of Geographical Information Systems, Vol 1, No 1, pp 33-50.

YEAG86 Yeager JA, chair, November 1986, 'Format for the Exchange of Digital Hydrographic Data', IHO Committee on the Exchange of Digital Data.