

**Subject:** SPRWG circular mail 3/2018 - outcomes of 1st step - preparation of 2nd step - meeting in GOA 5th June

**From:** Bruno Frachon <bruno.frachon@shom.fr>

**Date:** 5/2/2018 12:56 PM

**To:** Douglas.Brunton@dfm-mpo.gc.ca, akrostami@pmo.ir, direccion@inocar.mil.ec, evert.flier@kartverket.no, handwionoy@gmail.com, hgorziglia@shoa.cl, hilary.thompson@defence.gov.au, hydrographic@mpa.gov.sg, infokhoa@korea.kr, jbuscal@fn.mde.es, jepha@gst.dk, john.e.lowell@nga.mil, mamafo@mas.sr, marco.grassi@marina.difesa.it, mcj.vd.donck@mindef.nl, palmer@marinha.mil.br, shigeru.nakabayashi@jodc.go.jp, sunbing@msa.gov.cn, sut0412@yahoo.com.br, tim.lowe@UKHO.gov.uk, zeljko.bradaric@hhi.hr, jefcioh@dimar.mil.co

**CC:** LL.Dorst@mindef.nl, Shep <shep.smith@noaa.gov>, abreneol@shom.fr, adcs@iho.int, ddavid@dimar.mil.co, ddavidviteri@gmail.com, hgorziglia.hydro@gmail.com, ico@jodc.go.jp, ihmesp@fn.mde.es, info@mas.sr, infohid <infohid@pushidrosal.id>, internationalrelations.ukho@ukho.gov.uk, jonathan.Justi@noaa.gov, oche42 <oche42@yahoo.com>, sg@iho.int, sparizi@pmo.ir, stanley.b.harvey@navy.mil, lfpalmerfonseca@gmail.com, shigeru.nakabayashi@jodc.go.jp, ihmesp@fn.mde.es, info@mas.sr

Dear members of the SPRWG,

You will find below, for your consideration, some information on work in progress, and some requests, in **bold type**, for future work and meeting.

### **A. General status of progress**

#### A.1. Step 1

You will find on the collaborative space a comprehensive view, prepared by Doug Brunt, of the WG members' contributions for the 1st step as described in my circular email 1/2018 dated 2018/03/01. They raise several questions that need some discussion, and I propose that **you could react to my general summary and comments, hereafter (§B)**, inspired by your inputs. These points could be also discussed in the meeting in GOA on Tuesday the 5th of June (see below § A.3), in order to strive to find a common view on the major outputs of this first step, including alternatives which may have to be submitted to the Council for its next meeting.

#### A.2. Step 2

Nevertheless, it would be useful that we start to think to "which goals, ways and means that could address identified deficiencies" (according to §1.2.4 of the ToRs of the SPRWG). I propose that it will be a second item of the agenda of the GOA meeting, and I invite you to provide **contributions by e-mail before the meeting, which would be useful to start to focus the discussion and further correspondence work on this matter** (see also hereafter § B.1).

#### A.3 Meeting in Goa

A side-meeting to the IRCC-10 will be organized in Goa on the 5th of June (from 16:00 to 18:00, see circular e-mail 1/2018).

I have received very few explicit confirmations of participation (Yes: FR, NL - No: CL). I guess that following members representing an IHO MS chairing a regional hydrographic commission or subordinate bodies to the IRCC will attend the IRCC meeting and will be willing to participate to the SPRWG meeting : AU, CA, CO, DK, IT, ES, GB, NO, SG, US. For other SPRWG members (BR, CN, HR, EC, ID, IR, JP, KR, MO, SU) could you consider:

1) to **confirm your intention to participate or not:**

2) if you intend to participate, to register to the IRCC meeting (open to all IHO member States), using the registration documents provided at the IRCC page on the IHO web site, at [http://iho.int/mtg\\_docs/com\\_wg/CBC/CBSC16/CBSC16-IRCC10-registration.htm](http://iho.int/mtg_docs/com_wg/CBC/CBSC16/CBSC16-IRCC10-registration.htm)

Please, take into consideration that **you may need a visa to travel to India.**

## B. Comments / Synthesis from the SPRWG members' contribution

From your various inputs, I have captured the following (omissions or misunderstandings are my own responsibility). As they express the views of several members of the SPRWG, they may be not allways consistent:

1. There is no explicit comment on the general structure of the strategic plan, but, acknowledging that the current Strategic Plan is the result of a consensus, it could be desirable to have a more precise focus of certain parts, and a stricter articulation on one hand between assumptions and directions, and between directions and ways and means on the other hand. Especially:
  - Clarify what is the scope of "Strategic assumptions". Taking them as "hypothesis" may be ambiguous (they could be understood as questionable), in particular when it comes to fixing goals or directions. I suggest that they should be understood and reviewed as relevant elements of context, to be taken as given (assessment of the "external world" and of the IHO situation), and requiring strategic actions / directions for fulfilling the mission of the IHO. We could review the relevance and usefulness of a SWOT analysis of these elements.
  - There is a shared view on the necessity to measure achievement of goals. The current strategic plan includes (in its annexe B) Strategic Performance Indicators, referring to strategic directions and objectives of the IHO (from the Convention on the IHO); however the question raised could be on giving some precise goals to the strategic directions, against which performance indicators should be compared, which is an evolution from the current strategic plan. **If agreed, identifying such goals should be an important outcome of the second step of our work.**
2. Contents / Wording of the Strategic Assumption:
  - Some of them are felt as too general, and sometimes obvious. Some proposals have been made to make them more specific. For all of them, as well for other that have been proposed by members, I suggest that we check that they are precise enough to refer to an important aspect of the IHO mission that they may impact, and from which strategic directions or goals should be identified.
  - Some additional context elements have been proposed (for instance to capture the E-Navigation matter).
  - The contents could be enriched from the analysis of shortfalls of the IHO, including factors impeding the completion of IHO objects.
  - Current technical "strategic assumptions", paradoxally for a technical organization, are not very developed.
  - Some current wording may be more related to strategic directions than to context elements. For instance, for the "Crowd sourcing" and the increasing role of "other" data producers, there is a need to be more explicit on the context elements that induce this trend.
  - This context analysis could be segmented in fewer categories (see proposal from Brazil : technological context, legal context, customers, to which we could add elements stemming from national HO's perspective, which is indeed an important context for the IHO).
  - Regarding stakeholders' expectations, it is felt that we need first to define more precidely what are stakeholders, partners and customers. US and CL contributions are useful in this perspective.
3. Shortfall of the organization:
  - Poor participation of many member States.
  - Lack of capability of some MS to comply with IHO resolution and standards.
  - Poor progress on capacity building in some regions, as measured by coastal States' capacity to deliver hydrographic services.
  - Leisure market, ore more generally, non-ECDIS market not in the focus of the organization;
  - Role of IHO not recognized when it comes to Ocean data & sciences (I suggest to have a look to the IOC Executive Secretary's 2017-2018 report to the IOC Executive Council : [http://ioc-unesco.org/index.php?option=com\\_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=21626](http://ioc-unesco.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=21626) ).
4. The most desired improvements of these shortfalls:
  - Fix an objective of provision of actual hydrographic services by all member States (chair's comment: see current Strategic Performance Indicator SPI-3)
  - IHO needs to focus on methodology, such as: standardization, facilitation of cooperation, advice on governance, cost-benefit analysis, quality assessment, certification, leaving to HO's and regional structures the definition of new roles they need to have with regard to the expanding use of hydrographic and marine data.

- IHO should take a leadership in marine geospatial data (sometimes more precisely defined as "seabed data").
- 5. Measure of success by 2026 (few inputs).
  - In general: meeting priorities, measured by SPIs, while maintaining a standardization and resolution environment helping HO's to fulfill their role.
  - Specifically:
    - ENC coverage (chair's comment: refer to current SPI-2)
    - Increased number of IHO Member States providing hydrographic services and implementing IHO standards and resolutions.
    - Increased participation of IHO MS to IHO's decisions

On this last theme, I add a personal comment, to be considered especially by those members who will have representatives to the next HSSC meeting: having a good view of what could be electronic navigation using S-101 and other S-10X products, could be necessary to define the general architecture of these products and priorities in their developments and organization in their provision (see for instance documents HSSC10-05.3D and HSSC10-05.3F on the HSSC-10 page on the IHO web site).

Finally, I find useful to make a clarification regarding the question 3 in my circular 2/2018 "reflection topics" date 20th of March : the simplicity and agility question was not concerning the way that Hydrographic Offices are operating, but the way we are running the IHO processes.

Best regards

BF