

## PROCEDURE 4

### EVALUATION PROCEDURE OF SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BY RHC CHAIRMEN TO THE CBC

This procedure aims at assessing from a global perspective each project submitted to the CBC by RHC Chairmen.

Requests are ranked upon their merit according to the 4 following criteria:

Criterion	Consideration	Weight
B	Benefit with reference to the SOLAS convention	15 %
A	Applicant neediness	25 %
S	Status of Applicant with regards to hydrographic surveying, nautical charting and MSI	40 %
IHO	IHO internal appreciation	20 %
Final score	PROC 4 submission score = B + A + S + IHO	≤ 100 %

These criteria are detailed as follows:

1. **“B” criterion, for Benefit with reference to the SOLAS convention**  
 This criterion aims at evaluating the improvements brought by the project to the safety of navigation.  
 It is made of 3 sub-components, reflecting the project significance to international Maritime traffic “T” (6%) and to national users “N” (4%). It also includes a co-operation factor “C” (5%) introduced to encourage multinational projects.
2. **“A” criterion, for Applicant neediness**  
 This criterion focuses on the Applicant himself.  
 It consists of 4 sub-components reflecting the Applicant’s wealth “W” (10%), the local cost of living based on *Per Diem* “P” (5%), a Geography factor “G” (5%) and factors that cannot be measured directly “AOB” (5%).
3. **“S” criterion, for Status of Applicant with regards to hydrographic surveying, nautical charting, MSI and willingness to enter a SOLAS-type bilateral arrangement**  
 This criterion can be estimated mostly by consulting the IHO publication S 55.  
 It consists mainly of 3 sub-components, representing the Applicant status “H” (10%) of hydrographic surveys, “Nc” (10%) of nautical charting, and “MSI” (10%) of maritime safety information.  
 A 4<sup>th</sup> “MOU” (10%) sub-component has been added to reflect the Applicant willingness to enter a SOLAS-type bilateral arrangement with another developed Member State, as recommended by the IHO Publication M3, updated July 2007, p 194, § K4.1.2. f).
4. **“IHO” criterion, for IHO/CBC internal appreciation**  
 This criterion covers those issues of concern to the IHO that CBC cannot apprehend objectively.  
 It consists of 2 sub-components, “R” (10%) for risk assessment and “£” (10%) for cost considerations.

Proceed now to the automated Excel Evaluation Grid

## PROCEDURE 5

## PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Procedure 5 provides guidelines and rules to assess the performance of all CB efforts funded by CBC.

The assessment has to be divided into the different kinds of projects, as for example evaluating the success of sponsoring a training course is different to the result of a technical visit.

The sponsored person or body has to provide a report. This report should have a certain form, giving an impression of the result and hints for further comparable projects.

There should be an evaluation by the CBC as well, whether the money spent was worthwhile. This is important (in combination with the report) to assist further funding decisions from the same applicant and to improve similar projects.

Procedure 5 is subdivided into four steps:

1. Monitoring of the project
2. Report
3. Assessment
4. Analysis

The performance assessment has to be related to the application and has to be as concrete as the objectives have been formulated.

### **1. Monitoring of the project**

Monitoring is carried out by the relevant Regional Representative (internal body of each RHC and focal point, see Administrative Resolution T1.3) or another person appointed by CBC under supervision of the Chair/Vice-Chair of the CBC.

The Monitoring starts after the CBC informed the RHC about the funding and ends, when the project leader reported to the CBC. The report on project realisation itself lies within the responsibility of the leader of the project.

For complex projects a subdivision into milestones is necessary and should be done in the application phase. These pre-defined milestones have to be surveyed by the Representative.

### **2. Report on the project carried out:**

The leader of the project has to provide a report after completion, interruption or cancellation of the project, including an assessment of the project by all participants (i.e. participants of training courses). After finalisation it is sent to the CBC with a copy to the relevant RHC. The RHC, preferably through its regional co-ordinator or a CBC member from this region should assess the results achieved, may add remarks and send them to the CBC.

All reports shall have the same "Identification" and shall be provided according to the form below.

Report:

<b>Identification</b>	<b>Project Number :</b> (as assigned by CBC)
Project Name:	
Submitting RHC/Country:	
Date:	
Institution executing the project:	
Name of responsible:	
Address:	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
e-mail:	

[similar to the application form]

<b>Financial report</b>	Resources			Comments
	requested	allocated	spent	
Contribution by countries involved				
Contribution by other parties				
Contribution expected from CBC Fund				
Total Cost (Euros)				
Breakdown of costs				
From CBC Fund (item and amount)				
From other parties (item and amount)				

<b>Results</b>	
	Assessment and Comments
Date of start	
Date of finish	
Changes in scope or focus	
Results achieved (output, product, etc.)	
Comparison with the Achievements and benefits awaited	
Problems experienced	
Suggestion for improvement for similar projects	
Suggestion for follow-up projects	
Information on the long term effect for Hydrography and the sustainable use	
Valuation	% According to the assessment criteria a) results achieved b) further perspective
General remarks	

For technical visits this form may not be valid. In this case the “Conduct of Advisory Visits by Study Teams drawn from Member States of Regional Hydrographic Commissions” can be used, including the following subsections:

- INTRODUCTION
- DESCRIPTION OF MARITIME ACTIVITIES
- OUTLINE S-55 ANALYSIS
- PROPOSALS FOR CO-ORDINATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING
- PROPOSALS FOR ASSISTANCE
- FOLLOW UP ACTION

**3. Assessment (by the project leaders/organisers):**

The project leader is requested to assess the project itself and future perspectives. Assessment should be carried out according to the table provided by rating each performance indicator on a scale from 0 to 5. Additional comments for more detailed explanation can be added in the table. The Project leader is invited to collect feedback from all other participants of the project if applicable.

Each of the performance indicators indicated in the table is rated according to the scale provided:

a. main evaluation

- 0 = 0-20%      no goals achieved, no result,
- 1 = 20-40%    only some goals achieved or goals only achieved in minor parts
- 2 = 40-60%    about half of the goals achieved, result is only partially satisfying
- 3 = 60-80%    nearly all major goals achieved, result is almost satisfying
- 4 = 80-90%    all major goals achieved, result is satisfying
- 5 = 90-100%   all goals completely achieved, result is absolutely satisfying, more than expected,

b. rating value to estimate the possible perspective for further projects

- 0 = 0-20%      almost no basis for further projects, a general readjustment of co-operation is necessary before starting other projects
- 1 = 20-40%    quite poor basis for further projects, readjustment of co-operation seems to be helpful before starting other projects
- 2 = 40-60%    reasonable basis for further projects, but major adjustments are necessary
- 3 = 60-80%    good basis for further projects, but some adjustments may be helpful
- 4 = 80-90%    good basis for further projects
- 5 = 90-100%   very good basis for further projects

	<i>Performance indicator</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Comments</i>
-	Arrangements		
	Organisation of the project		
	Involvement(contribution) of		
	National partners		
	Regional partners		
	RHC		
	IHB		
-	Efficiency of the project		

	Goals achieved		
	Planned timing		
-	Future perspectives		
	Need of similar project (locally, regionally)		
	Impact on future development		
-	Procedure of CBC		
	Application form		
	Support received		
	Follow up and reporting		

#### 4. Analysis by CBC:

The project should be analysed or evaluated by the CBC in order to create a "history of previous funded projects" and a "performance history; precedence in this type of demand".

A table of performance with indicators according to the percentage of the results achieved should be maintained by Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary.

Each of the performance indicators indicated in the table is rated according to the scale provided:

##### a. main evaluation

0 = 0-20%	no goals achieved, no result,
1 = 20-40%	only some goals achieved or goals only achieved in minor parts
2 = 40-60%	about half of the goals achieved, result is only partially satisfying
3 = 60-80%	nearly all major goals achieved, result is almost satisfying
4 = 80-90%	all major goals achieved, result is satisfying
5 = 90-100%	all goals completely achieved, result is absolutely satisfying, more than expected,

##### b. rating value to estimate the possible perspective for further projects

0 = 0-20%	almost no basis for further projects, a general readjustment of co-operation is necessary before starting other projects
1 = 20-40%	quite poor basis for further projects, readjustment of co-operation seems to be helpful before starting other projects
2 = 40-60%	reasonable basis for further projects, but major adjustments are necessary
3 = 60-80%	good basis for further projects, but some adjustments may be helpful
4 = 80-90%	good basis for further projects
5 = 90-100%	very good basis for further projects

	<i>Performance indicator</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Comments</i>
-	Arrangements		
	Organisation of the project		
	Involvement(contribution) of		
	National partners		
	Regional partners		
	RHC		

-	Efficiency of the project		
	Improved National Capability		
	Achieved goals		
	Deviation from initial program		
-	Cooperation		
	Involvement of National authorities, Partners etc.		
	Regional Cooperation (Countries, RHC)		
-	Future perspectives		
	Need of similar project (locally, regionally)		
	Impact on future development		
	Interest from National Authorities to improve Hydrographic Capability		
-	Procedure of CBC		
	Application form		
	Support received		
	Follow up and reporting		
-	Quality of the project overall		