Comments from Norway:

No specific comments from Norway about landforms or contour lines.

In the suggested ISOM201X the difference in width between 201 and 202 is too small, especially if impassable cliff (201) is to be forbidden to pass. 201 should be close to double the size of 202.

The question about forbidden to pass 201 is controversial in Norway. Some believe that it is strange to have a natural detail like this as forbidden. There is a big difference between a natural detail like a cliff and a fence. A fence is more clearly defined.

In addition it could be difficult for organizers to keep track of who is breaking the rule (cross 201), so this could lead to randomness rather than fairness.

If 201 is to be classified as forbidden to cross, the length of the feature in the terrain should be at least 50 meters.

Positive in this category are the clarifications on runnability (stony ground / dense boulder field - 209-212) and the focus on that stony ground and boulder field are area symbols (208-212).

Should there be minimum dimensions for passable water (302) when represented using light blue.

307 – impassable marsh. The same issues as for 201, and in addition marshes may have seasonal variations

Is it necessary to introduce 314? This symbol is less applicable than the blue cross. Our suggestion is to get rid of 313 or 314, and then we would prefer to get rid of 314.

Allowing less than 100% yellow for 401 and 402 will make it more likely that they are misinterpreted as 403/404. We do not see the need, and would suggest to only allow 100% yellow for 401 and 402 (skip the suggested possibility of using 75%).

The vertical green stripes disturb the reading of other map detail. Some believe that the changes to 407 and 409 will make the map less readable, but the intention of adjusting the density of the green stripe symbols to fit with the densities of 406 and 408 is logical.

Some find it useful to be able to use both the vegetation boundary alternatives (black dots and green line) on the same map.

Do we need so many special vegetation feature symbols? To help the color deficient, it would be useful to get rid of one of the non-black cross symbols (blue, green or brown).

503 – why should we change this? It is quite a big change from 3 – 5 meters. Should keep this as it is. If it has to be changed; try to have not so definite specification of the width classes, as this would let the mapmaker adapt depending on the surroundings to enhance readability.

508 - some scepticism to shorter dashes as confusion with 505 footpath is more likely, in particular in combination with outline colour - testing is necessary.

ISOM2000, 512 (footbridge) is missing from ISOM201X, but it is needed!

511 change (thicker - 0.2mm - line for pylons) could make it difficult to read the map with powerlines that cross paths and cliffs. By cutting the powerline lines in areas with many black details this would not be a big problem. It should therefore be stated that the lines may be cut - "... may be broken to improve the legibility of the map"

518 – consider to make it a bit thinner than suggested.

521 – the grey fill option. There is disagreement about if this. Is it useful, and if it is useful - how thick should the black line be. Should there be a minimum size? We could not agree on this.

532 – do we need so many symbols for prominent man-made features? Is the difference between this and the asterisk big enough to justify two symbols? Is this needed?

Changing the green from 30%, 60%, 100% to 20%, 50%, 100%: There may be good perceptual reasons for changing the percentages, but the ISOM2000 system seems to have worked well. Test prints are necessary, and there is scepticism when it comes how this would render with non-spot colour offset printing.

For the main change to the course setting symbols (strict enlargements) there is not agreement in Norway, especially when it comes to the sizes of the control circles. The majority of feedback is that the change in ISOM201X will result in too big control circles on the map. Especially with enlargements to larger scales than 1:10000. This may lead to course setters deviating from the rule. Is it necessary to make this change. We could not conclude on this, as there are disagreements within the group. It is the size of the control circles that causes the greatest concern.