

11th IHO CAPACITY BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING  
IHO-CBSC11  
Wollongong, Australia 30 May - 01 June 2013

REPORT

**1. Opening and Welcome to New Members**

Mr. Thomas Dehling, Chair of the Capacity Building Sub-Committee opened the meeting at 1300 on 30 May 2013 at the conference room in the Novotel Wollongong Northbeach Hotel.

**1.1. Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed the CBSC Members and participants to the meeting. He noted Michel le Gouic from SHOM (France), who passed away recently and was very active in CB for many years.

IHB Director Mustafa Iptes thanked the AHS for hosting the meeting and presented the vision for the next 5 years. The new direction is to raise the profile and awareness of the IHO, obtaining capacity building funding from other donors and aid support agencies, and boost membership of the IHB. He stressed the importance of providing technical assistance and support to developing countries in improving hydrographic services and establishing relevant agencies where none exist.

The Chair requested the hosts from Australia to address the Sub-Committee and to provide participants with administrative and local details.

**1.2. Introductions**

The meeting participants were invited to introduce themselves.

**1.3. Administrative Arrangements**

*Docs: CBSC11-01A List of Documents (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-01B List of Participants (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-01C CBSC Membership (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-01D ToR and RoP (IHB)*

The Secretary introduced documents. Thailand updated the list of CBSC Members as Philippines took over the chairmanship [of EAHC](#).

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

*Doc: CBSC11-02 Agenda and Timetable (IHB)*

The agenda was approved with alteration.

### 3. Matters arising from Minutes of CBSC10 Meeting

*Docs: CBSC11-03A Minutes of CBSC10 (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-03B Status of Action List from CBSC10 (IHB)*

The Chair introduced the last meeting minutes that was approved without alteration. He also introduced the list of actions that was updated and accepted by the participants (*doc. CBSC11-03B rev.1*).

### 4. General Issues

#### 4.1. Report by the Chair

The Chair provided a general overview of the activities conducted since the last meeting, with the details to be considered under the appropriate agenda items. He then provided guidance on the objectives and priorities the meeting should address, namely the review of the Strategy, the streamline of the CB operational means and the need for the RHCs to submit their needs regardless of the funds available.

The 12 months since CBSC10 have been very busy with good results and some significant achievements. However there have been delays in achievement of some of the items on the approved work program. Administrative methods need to be improved, including monitoring, general reporting and performance reporting.

The discussions during IRCC4 meeting were very active as capacity building took an important role during this meeting. The Chair presented the development of the Category A program to be funded by ROK at University of Southern Mississippi, and the long term benefits that this initiative will provide to the IHO. He also reported on the Programme Management Board (PMB) held with Republic of Korea and the general objectives.

The Chair noted the meeting held with the CB Coordinators early that morning to widen the task of CB Coordinators in regions where no capacity building funds are directed. These areas still have bilateral cooperation and many donor organizations within the areas. CB coordinators in these areas may be of assistance in channeling CB funds and programs to assist outside their region.

The Chair also highlighted the importance of good management, avoiding [unnecessary](#) details and focusing on the objectives. He stressed the need to concentrate on how to improve procedures and administrative arrangements and how to speed up application and execution of projects.

The IHO/IMO/WMO/IOC/IALA/IAEA/FIG Joint Capacity Building meeting was also reported by the Chair. He highlighted the benefits coming from the coordination among the Capacity Building areas of each organization. The Chair reported that the next meeting will be held either on FIG or IHO headquarters and the CBSC agreed on the following action (in addition to permanent Actions 1 to 12):

**Action 13: Secretary to contact FIG to confirm the joint CB Meeting in October 2013 and the venue (deadline: June 2013).**

IHO Director Mustafa Iptes addressed the meeting and highlighted the importance of managing the CB fund, taking care of the reporting, etc. One area of focus was trying to improve ‘fund hunting’ from donor organizations and other funding streams. He reported about the continuation of the cooperation with Japan and Republic of Korea for CB funding.

Director Iptes highlighted the education in Category A and B and the focus for the next few years. He also reported the great support from IMO for the period 2014-2015 particularly in Africa, South-West Pacific, Meso Americas and the Caribbean Sea.

He stressed that the IHO is somehow victim of the Capacity Building success, and requested the CBSC to consider an increase in manpower support for management to better serve the IHO Member States.

Regarding the strategic issues, Director Iptes invited contributions to IHO CB Strategy to report to the next Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC) in 2014. This is also supported by an industry stakeholder seminar to be held in Monaco at around the same time. Iptes encouraged stakeholders, member states and students of courses in hydrography to participate if possible.

#### **4.2. Industry Stakeholder presentation**

The Chair highlighted industry partnerships on concrete projects and the importance for the CB Programme. He announced the CB Seminar to be held in March 2014 in Monaco and how this will be a good opportunity to foster these relationships and to examine the draft strategy paper. He noted the half-day industry workshop held during CBSC10/IRCC4 and the joint paper from Kongsberg, Caris and Fugro. He then opened the floor to comments regarding cooperation between capacity building coordination and industry.

The Secretary acknowledged in the past there has been great cooperation and used the example of Haiti which involved SHOM and components from industry including equipment, software and training. In 2011 there was a course in Antigua supported by industry. An integral part of renewing the strategy should address industry cooperation.

Jeff Bryant (UK) acknowledged the excellent support received in the past from Kongsberg, Caris and Fugro but reminded the meeting to be careful not to favor those three exclusively and that there are other companies out there who are willing to provide their services to capacity building activities.

Celine Roux (Jeppesen) reported that Jeppesen is ready to help and support, especially in the business of data distribution. Michel Amafo (Suriname) noted the importance of industry participation in the MACHC area. The CBSC agreed on the following action and decision:

**Action 14: Chair to invite Suriname to address the benefits of industry participation to MACHC in IRCC5 (deadline: during IRCC5)**

**Decision 1: CBSC recognizes the industry contribution to Capacity Building and is keen to get further involvement with industry partners.**

#### **5. IHO 2012 CB WP**

*Docs: CBSC11-05A CB Fund Report (IHB)*

CBSC11-05B 2012 CBWP (IHB)

## 5.1. CB Management

### a) Capacity Building Fund (CB Fund)

The Secretary reported on the status of the CB Fund (*Doc. CBSC11-05A*) and experiences gained administering the CB Fund and the CB Projects. He highlighted the need of a CB Management System that will be discussed in Agenda item 7. The CBSC discussed the need to use the 13% administration fee established in the MoU with Republic of Korea.

Jānis Krastiņš (Latvia) suggested allocating resources from CB Fund and from the regular IHO Budget (IHO WP item 3.4.2.1) to develop the Management System.

### b) Coordination of CB activities with Republic of Korea and Japan

Director Iptes and the Chair reported on the status and experiences gained in the co-operation with the Republic of Korea and Japan. The CBSC agreed on the decision:

**Decision 2: CBSC acknowledged the importance of the contributions from Republic of Korea and Japan for the CB Programme.**

### c) IHO/IMO/WMO/IOC/IALA/IAEA/FIG Joint CB Coordination

The Chair reported on the joint meeting of IHO/IMO/WMO/IOC/IALA/IAEA/FIG held in December 2012 in Oostende (Belgium). The meeting brings together the CB officials of the organizations to coordinate joint projects and share experiences in this area.

### d) Updates to the 2012 CBWP

The Secretary presented the 2012 CBWP (*Doc. CBSC11-05B*) and the CB Coordinators updated their projects.

Adam Greenland (New Zealand) requested to have the Inundation [Maps](#) reports to be used in SWPHC. Patricio Carrasco (Chile) will check the costs for translation from Spanish to English. Celine Roux offered to help translating from English to French.

The Chair noted that cooperation between RHCs for sharing of information and translating would be a positive development and suggested that training materials be hosted on the IHO website to allow access to all Member States and RHCs.

Bruno Frachon (France) presented the IMO funded course for Francophone Africa, organized by SHOM. Director Iptes expressed appreciation for SHOM for preparing and delivering the course, the first in French in the region.

The CBSC discussed also the importance of equipment as a tool for CB, since the training alone is not enough for the developing countries to start their work. France suggested the use of portable systems like the ones developed by SHOM. The CBSC agreed [to](#) the following actions and decisions:

Action 15: Chair to include Inundation Maps in the agenda for the joint CB meeting (deadline: before the joint meeting)

Action 16: Australia to provide figures for Vanuatu and Timor Leste placement in the Australia Hydrographic Service (done during the meeting: 6 000 Euros)

Action 17: Secretary to communicate with Portugal and Timor Leste about the letter requesting a technical visit (deadline: June 2013)

Action 18: IHB to approach IMO to try to get to figures of the joint CB Projects in order to illustrate the investment from IMO to the CBWP (deadline: August 2013)

Action 19: France to get the figures for the portable devices (done during the meeting: 50 000 Euros approximate)

Decision 3: The CBSC noted the document and agreed to close the 2012 CBWP (**Annex A**).

Decision 4: CBSC acknowledged the significant contribution of IMO for the development of hydrographic services in the developing countries.

## 5.2. CB Assessment

RHC's representatives and the IHB reported the technical visits carried on since CBSC10. These technical visits are listed in the 2012 CBWP (**Annex A**).

The CBSC Secretary reported on the status of the current C-55 (paper format) and the developments in the Bureau that will lead to a digital publication linked to a GIS system. The target is to have this version ready in the beginning of 2014.

## 5.3. CB Provision

RHC's representatives reported on the CB activities in their regions, making emphasis on the experiences gained. The updated information was incorporated in the 2012 CBWP (**Annex A**).

## 5.4. Analysis and decision on pending activities

The CBSC analyzed the pending activities from 2012 CBWP and decided on cancellation or including in the 2013 CBWP to be discussed under agenda item 8. These decisions are listed in the 2012 CBWP (**Annex A**) for each activity marked as "NOT DONE":

Decision 5: cancel the Assessment activities not executed in 2012 marked as "Cancelled" in the 2012 CBWP (**Annex A**).

Decision 6: include the Assessment activities not executed in 2012 marked as "Postponed to 2013" in the 2012 CBWP (**Annex A**) in the discussions to be held under Agenda item 8.3 (update the 2013 CBWP).

## 6. Strategic Issues of the CBSC

*Docs: CBSC11-06A IHO Capacity Building Strategy (IHB)*

*CBSC11-06B Proceedings of the IHC18, Decision 11 (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-06C Discussion Paper (France, EAtHC CB Coordinator)*  
*CBSC11-06D Discussion Paper (UK)*

## **6.1. Strategy Discussion**

The Chair introduced *docs. CBSC11-06A* and *CBSC11-06B* and invited the CBSC to discuss on the strategic issues of the IHO, including the outcome of the IHC18 and the growing demands on the IHO for Capacity Building. He suggested a review procedure which involves reviewing the current strategy during this CBSC11 to discuss possible changes and to draft a new version.

The draft Strategy should be finalised by the end of the year. In January 2014, Chair will provide the CBSC input to the Extraordinary IHC (EIHC5) in Monaco (6-10 October 2014) along with draft CB Strategy. Stakeholder seminar (Monaco, 11-12 March 2014) will also provide a good opportunity to present the draft strategy and the procedural changes proposed to the stakeholders to seek their input/agreement.

The CBSC12 meeting should be held in early May 2014 so that the draft CB strategy can be formally finalized. It can then be presented to IRCC6 if held back-to-back and then the final version to be presented to the EIHC5.

The Chair reported that the current IHO CB Strategy was approved in 2006 and hasn't been reviewed much since then. He stressed that the idea is to refine the strategy rather than rewrite it, in order to make it more comprehensive and the procedures clearer. He then asked the participants to have an open discussion regarding refinements to the strategy and advised that the entire morning of day 2 would be dedicated to reviewing this document.

Adam Greenland queried whether the attendees at the meeting had sufficient knowledge of the CB strategies of other similar organisations like IMO, IALA, FIG and IOC so that the IHO CB strategy would work alongside with other instruments of a like nature. Suggested that the IHO CB strategy should not be developed in isolation and that other strategies should be reviewed and considered when developing/renewing the IHO CB strategy.

## **6.2. Strategy Revision**

The Strategy revision started with the presentation by Bruno Frachon (France) of the first discussion paper (doc. CBSC11-06C). The paper focused on the use of a global approach like the DOTMLPFI (**D**octrine, **O**rganization, **T**raining, **M**ateriel, **L**eadership and education, **P**ersonnel, **F**acilities and **I**nteroperability).

Bruno Frachon also expressed support to the use of CB Fund to provide lightweight and portable equipment to regions that could not otherwise have access to them, in order to make the CB provision more efficient. He also suggested to keep track of the trainees in order to make the CB Fund more effective and emphasized that many Primary Charting Authorities that have provided support to developing nations may not continue to do so under the current resource constraints. He also suggested the need to consider the main differences among the RHCs when delivering CB activities.

The Chair advised the CBSC of some issues which need to be taken into account when addressing the revised Strategy. These include equipment, funding non-IHO Members States, taking a holistic as well as a regional approach.

Director Iptes spoke of the importance of projects and the importance of providing training to those who will be actively involved in the provision of hydrographic services. Nominations are required to be signed off by national Hydrographer or equivalent and they have to agree to employ these people for the purpose of providing hydrographic services. This is to ensure that training funds are being put to the best use in training those who will use the knowledge for the development of hydrographic capability in-country.

Jeff Bryant (UK) delivered the second discussion paper (*CBSC11-06D Discussion Paper*). The paper largely supports the paper from France. According to him it became apparent at a Blue [Economy](#) Conference that organizations such as the IMO and IALA were doing similar activities as the IHO in terms of technical assessments, providing training etc. He suggested a consolidated approach with IMO and other like agencies to put together a country profile which all agencies would be able to contribute to and would result in a more coherent approach to addressing issues where all agencies have a similar goal.

He also noted an increased demand for more specialist training courses and queried whether the CBSC has the capacity to meet this increased demand. If the CBSC doesn't then there may be a need to contract out to industry which will cost more money. The best value would be for members of the IHO community to continue to conduct the trainings.

The paper also noted that much of the funds for CB have been directed to non-Member States while some Member States who are contributing to the fund don't get much in terms of benefit. Jeff Bryant [also asked the](#) question if the CB fund has a million Euro allocated to it for the year, can all of these funds be reasonably applied to projects within the resources available? There is increased pressure on the IHB and RHCs to administer the projects and on other hydrographic offices who engage in providing the training, technical assessments but consideration hasn't been given to how this will be achieved within the current staff resources.

Director Iptes responded to the concerns raised by the UK and reiterated that the IHO wants to improve CB capabilities for Member States as well as some non-Member States. The key is for the IHO to encourage non-members to become members. He stressed that the Directing Committee (DC) is always engaging in high level contacts, donor fund agencies to support the CB activities.

Adam Greenland (NZ) was invited to present the IMO capacity building strategy. He reported the country profile database developed by IMO that is of great value for efficient delivery of the CB efforts. He also noted the different approach for national versus regional to develop the CB Projects.

According to the IHO President Robert Ward there are a number of principles and factors taken into account when deciding how to allocate training resources. He queried whether the CBSC wanted more formal guidelines dictating who will receive CB funds or just have some general guiding principles or alternatively just leave things as they are? The DC has observed that CB and availability of CB funds can be used as a recruiting tool to raise the profile of Hydrography within a country and eventual membership to the IHO. There needs to be some

scrutiny applied when there is significant sums of money being expended and a review of how much has been directed to a particular country before there can be a reasonable expectation of commitment from the State. One mechanism for commitment would be fund matching by States.

Regardless of the level of training provided (whether it be MSI training or an internationally recognized surveyor or nautical cartographer programme) there is a price to be paid to provide a particular level of capacity building. One issue surrounding the provision of any training opportunities is the value placed on the training by the recipients, particularly if it is provided totally free of charge and requires no commitment whatsoever from the beneficiary State.

President Ward noted that the IMO country profiles are the initiative of the current Secretary-General who has realized that the mandatory audit scheme for IMO Member States is burdened by political sensitivities. It seems unlikely that information gleaned from the mandatory reporting scheme will be available for use elsewhere other than by the country that gets audited. The IHO has contributed information relating to hydrography in the audits but is not allowed to view the outcome of the audits and are not allowed to have a Hydrography expert as part of the audit team, which makes it very difficult if a particular country is in need of hydrographic assistance. It's entirely up to the country that is audited to put their hands up to ask for assistance. For this reason, separate to the audit scheme, the IMO Secretary-General has initiated the country profiles, as such, the IHO and organizations such as IALA are likely to be active contributors. Coordination between IMO, IALA and IHO is getting much better.

President Ward spoke of the administrative resources to run the IHO CB programme and the burden it represents. That puts pressure on the regions, particularly the chair of RHCs as well as the IHB and organizations such as the UKHO who are significant providers of CB services. THE IHB is looking at the potential for bringing in an administrative assistant on a contracted basis to provide assistance with the administration of CB program. Within some of the funding in the CB program, there is provision for some of the funds (a percentage) to be used for administration of CB programs; this is a common practice among other [similar](#) agencies and aid agencies around the world. Historically, the IHO has tended in the past not to use those funds, instead administering the CB fund and programs from within the operating budget of the Bureau and the goodwill of the organizations involved in providing CB support. With the current level of activity and increased funding this is probably not sustainable into the future, so some of the CB funds will need to be directed to funding CB support arrangements and administration.

The discussion led the CBSC to agree on the following decision and action:

**Decision 7: to acknowledge the suggestion from New Zealand to create a country profile, similar to the existing in IMO, to help the decision process in the establishment of the annual CBWP.**

**Action 20: IHB to investigate the use of the Country Database (under development) to create a country profile that can guide the CB efforts (deadline: before CBSC12)**

Adam Greenland (NZ) was also invited to present the risk based assessment developed for the South-West Pacific. In support of improving maritime safety and chart improvement in the SWP region, in late 2011, NZ government agencies LINZ and the NZ Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Program signed an MOU to put in place two projects to improve hydrography



within the region. The aims of the projects were to achieve adequate and accurate nautical charts within the region. Increased cruise liner activity in the region has raised concerns regarding charting in the region.

He noted the two outputs of the projects: to have complete ENC coverage of the SWP charting area; and to produce a chart improvement framework in the region. Of the 60 ENC required in the region, 38 have been published based on paper charts. To achieve this result the project developed a Hydrography risk assessment methodology based on IMO's formal safety assessment (FSA). Adam Greenland also reported the Vanuatu pilot case to test the risk based methodology and the positive results.

The CBSC then agreed on the following decision:

**Decision 8: to recognize the risk assessment developed by New Zealand as a positive tool to establish the priorities for surveys/charting in a region, as well to guide the CB activities and projects.**

Regarding the remarks of President Ward, the Chair asked whether the CBSC is willing to invest 13% of the funds to administrative tasks. Jānis Krastiņš supported the use of 13% of the CB Funds. Bruno Frachon presented the need for a more holistic approach and supports a lower value. Tim Sewell (UK) supported a fixed value during a number of years (subject to review) in order to have continuity. Adam Greenland suggested to have a breakdown of costs before the decision and was supported by Abri Kampfer (South Africa). Latvia was seconded by Savi Narayanan (Canada) and Thani al Mahrouki (Oman).

The CBSC agreed on the following decision and action:

**Decision 9: to approve the investment of up to 13% of the CB Funds to administrative tasks and project management but not to exceed 40 000 Euros.**

**Action 21: IHB to provide the job description for the Assistant to CB in the IHB (done during the meeting, **Annex B**).**

### **6.3 CB Strategy basic decisions**

The Chair proposed a review of the Strategy discussions that have been addressed over the course of the meeting and to come to some decisions and then use this information to draft a new revised Strategy. He suggested approaching the following topics to guide the revision:

#### **a) Equipment purchase:**

First issue discussed was the question of whether to fund purchase of equipment. Historically, CBSC has not funded equipment as it is too expensive to purchase and maintain. Bruno Frachon suggested that the CBSC needed a more holistic approach to CB activities which may include funding for purchase of equipment where appropriate in support of activities such as training, so that the skills learned can be put into practice. Adam Greenland suggested a case by case assessment for purchases of equipment and pointed out that the current strategy allows for this to happen in some compelling cases if funding permits. He pointed out that at the moment there is a ruling that under current capacity building funding there is no

equipment purchases but perhaps there is scope for consideration of equipment purchases on a case by case basis.

Michel Amafo echoed the comments of Bruno Frachon regarding a holistic approach to be taken when considering equipment purchases to support CB activities. He also suggested that equipment should be considered a regional resource, rather than allocated to a particular country so that it is deployable among various countries in a particular region.

President Ward agreed that equipment purchases should be considered if they are to be part of an effective capacity building activity. However, it is important to note that when equipment is provided completely free of charge to a State, there is no sense of ownership, and in too many cases there are no support arrangements in place for that equipment. He suggested that where equipment purchases are considered as part of the package, there needs to be a mechanism which enables some sense of ownership by the State to be put in place. If the equipment is to be provided on a regional basis, this would become even more difficult unless there is a recognized regional organization in charge. Without a proper mechanism quite quickly the equipment will be owned by nobody, maintained by nobody and ultimately used by nobody. He agreed that having equipment as part of a package is good but there needs to be conditions imposed and a sense of ownership and responsibility imparted. He suggested that cost sharing might be one solution.

Many attendees voiced their support of President Ward's comments and observations. Abri Kampfer agreed with President Ward's observations and noted that he had often seen equipment fall into disuse or disrepair due to lack of ownership. He also referred to the Long Term Objectives of the Strategy in paragraph 4.1 to enable all States with navigable waters to achieve Phase 1 of development, so any equipment provided with CB funding should be in support of Phase 1 activities.

The Chair summarized the discussions and the CBSC agreed on the decision:

**Decision 10: equipment purchases and associated maintenance should be included in the draft revised Strategy as part of a holistic approach to CB activities, where there are sufficient resources, a compelling case has been made and there has been comprehensive cooperation between States, RHCs and CBSC.**

#### **b) Financial commitment for CB Fund**

The Chair asked whether the CBSC wanted to have a commitment from Member States to commit to the fund, dependent upon the wealth of the Member State and suggested that they contribute a percentage to the fund if they wish to avail themselves of CB projects. He asked whether this should be included in the strategy or should it just be by arrangement that wealthier countries contribute. Abri Kampfer suggested that there should be in-kind contributions. For example for a Cat B course is fully funded for free, then each State should pay their participants' own travelling costs or something similar. He proposed there was no need to include such provision in the strategy.

President Ward advised that under the current procedures a commitment from participant States is always sought and suggested to have a general statement in the Strategy highlighting that this will be one of the factors which will be taken into account when assessing applicants for CB projects.

The Secretary explained that there is already provision for the commitment in the CB Procedure 4 but agreed that it is worthwhile to have a general statement as suggested by Ward to be contained within the strategy as the guiding principle for the procedure. The CBSC agreed to implement President Ward's proposal:

**Decision 11:** to include in the Strategy revision a general statement highlighting that a financial commitment will be taken into account when assessing the submission of CB projects.

**c) Member States and non-Member States interests**

The Chair raised the question of how to deal with the interests of Member States versus non-Member States in matters relating to CB. Abri Kampfner suggested that non-Member States could be considered for CB Phase 1 activities but Phases 2 and 3 would be reserved for IHO Member States. The Secretary advised the CBSC that in terms of participation in CB activities the ratio of Member States to non-Member States is almost 1:1.

Adam Greenland suggested that examination on a case-by-case basis may be more appropriate with no fixed rule. President Ward advised that in his capacity as President and travelling around visiting a number of non-Member States, it is very hard to sell the benefits of membership to the IHO when these countries seem to enjoy many benefits without the commitment of membership. He suggested that there is good reason to consider limiting access to the higher levels of CB efforts put in place by the IHO. [This proposal was](#) seconded by Tim Sewell. The CBSC then decided:

**Decision 12:** do not close the support to non-Member States but establish some limit. The suggested wording to be considered in the revision is: "In general the IHO CBSC will focus on Member States and will limit the support to non-Member States to Phase 1 only".

**d) Comprehensive (holistic) approach for projects**

The Chair asked the CBSC if it would be worthwhile including something regarding comprehensive projects into the strategy and how could we do this? The CBSC agreed that feasibility studies could be outsourced to establish larger projects and that feasibility studies should be mentioned in the strategy. The CBSC also agreed on the following action:

**Action 22:** France to write the text for the Strategy revision enabling feasibility studies for larger projects (deadline: August 2013).

**e) C-55 issues**

The Chair brought up the issue that the current Strategy mentioned that the CBSC is the body responsible for C-55. However, in the past two years or so, the IHO started to develop C-55 from just a capacity building item to a much broader information tool. The Chair queried how the CBSC thought C-55 would be used in the future and what would be the CBSC involvement in it? The Secretary advised that the IHB uses the current C-55 information to feed into the Country Information System (CIS) and this will be integrated to a GIS system. The Chair proposed that alternative wording be developed to cover the C-55 aspect of the Strategy with a commitment for future use and improvement of C-55. Abri Kampfner

suggested an action on RHCs to provide a report on the status of C-55 within their region. It was so agreed by the CBSC:

Action 23: Chair to invite RHC Chairs to provide a consolidated C-55 update from the National Reports (deadline: during IRCC5).

#### f) Communication plan for CB

Savi Narayanan suggested that in drafting a new Strategy, consideration should be given to whether it is written for the IHO internal use only or can be used as part of a wider communication Strategy to inform States and other stakeholders (i.e. industry) about the plans and procedures. This suggestion was well received by the participants and the CBSC agreed on the decision:

Decision 13: the CBSC will consider a wider communication goal during the process of the Strategy revision.

Celine Roux suggested incorporating a communication plan in the CB Strategy in order to convey the IHB message to all the stakeholders.

The CBSC then agreed on the way forward for the review process:

Decision 14: to create a working group to deal with the draft revised strategy comprising the Chair, France, New Zealand, South Africa, UK, and the Secretary.

Decision 15: to establish the major aspects of the revised strategy as:

- Strict limitations on funding equipment
- Non-Member States generally limited to Phase 1 activities
- The need for comprehensive projects
- Use of consultants
- Use of C-55 as a country profile
- Use of funds for administrative issues on a limited basis
- Co-operation with stakeholders
- MSDI
- Cat B survey

Decision 16: to establish the following revision timetable:

- review of the current strategy at CBSC11
- discuss possible changes at CBSC11
- draft a first version at CBSC11
- work on first version until Dec 2013
- disseminate second version January 2014
- stakeholders seminar 11-12 March 2014
- finalize strategy at CBSC12
- present to IRCC at IRCC6
- present to IHC at EIHC5

Action 24: Drafting Group to draft a revised strategy (rev. 1) to CBSC (deadline: December 2013).

Action 25: Chair to circulate the draft revised strategy (rev. 2) to CBSC (deadline: January 2014).

Action 26: Chair to consider participation at the CB Stakeholders Seminar in Monaco to discuss the draft revised strategy (deadline: 11-12 March 2014).

## **7. Operational Issues of the CBSC**

*Docs: CBSC11-07A Draft Procedure 7 – Application Procedures (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-07B Draft Procedure 8 – Finance Management (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-07C CBWP Workflow (IHB)*  
*CBSC11-07D CB Management System update (IHB)*

### **7.1. CB Procedures**

The Chair provided the current status of the procedures and invited the Secretary to introduce the proposed new CB Procedures 7 (*Doc. CBSC11-07A*) and 8 (*Doc. CBSC11-07B*).

The Secretary explained that Procedure 7 was proposed to set a standard template for the CB applications in order to reduce ambiguity, allow all applications to be assessed on the same criteria, and lead to more efficient processing. He explained also that in the future there will be an online submission process, in a standardized format.

The Secretary presented Procedure 8 in order to improve the project management for the IHB and for the RHC. It requires the nomination of a Project Leader that will manage the CB activity and the submission of the budget plan, to be approved by the IHB. This will avoid expenditures not approved by the CBSC to be charged to the Bureau and the eventual denial of reimbursement. This procedure is also a requirement of the society that audits the IHB according to the Conference Decision.

The CBSC then agreed on the following decision and action:

**Decision 17:** to approve CB Procedure 7 and CB Procedure 8 that will enter into effect immediately.

**Action 27:** Secretary to upload Procedures 7 and 8 to the IHO website and to implement them at the IHB (deadline: June 2013).

### **7.2. CB Workflow**

The Secretary introduced the CB workflow (*Doc. CBSC11-07C*). The workflow showed the lifecycle of a project and how the participants relate to it. This enables better understanding of how projects evolve and what is actually involved in and required for conducting a project.

The CBSC noted the report and agreed to the following action:

**Action 28:** Secretary to upload the CB workflow to the IHO website (deadline: June 2013).

### 7.3. Management System update

The Secretary provided an update on the current status of the development of the CB Management System (*Doc. CBSC11-07D*).

The CBSC noted the development and the efforts from Norway and invited them to continue their support. The following decision and action were agreed by the CBSC:

**Decision 18: to acknowledge the support provided by Norway to the development and specification of the CB Management System.**

**Action 29: Secretary to liaise with Norway for the development of the Management System and its specifications for contract (deadline: August 2013)**

### 7.4. Performance Indicators

The Chair invited the Secretary to present the figures raised in the IHB and the CBSC to review the performance Indicators and suggest improvements if appropriate.

The Secretary then presented the CB related Performance Indicators (4 and 4bis):

Year	2011	2012
Submitted projects	14 (12 + 2)	31 (23 + 5 + 3)
Planned projects	17	30
Delivered projects	13,5	22

The Secretary also presented other figures not related to the current SPIs:

Year	2011	2012
Number of trainees	149	246
Countries with technical visits	10	11

Discussions were held around the value of capacity building projects rather than just the number of projects completed and how to capture this. Several questions were raised:

- Do projects always result in an improvement in hydrographic capability in States?
- Is the program delivering the objectives of the CBSC successfully?
- What does the IHO measure?
- Is it necessary to measure quality as well as quantity?
- Are the figures appropriate measures?

There was a general agreement that performance indicators need improvements to provide useable figures that give an accurate assessment of the success of the CB projects. The Chair also explained that performance monitoring will also be on the agenda for IRCC5. The CBSC then agreed on the following action:

**Action 30: Chair to present the provisional performance indicator figures to IRCC (deadline: during IRCC5)**

## 8. Management Plan

*Doc: CBSC11-08 Draft Management Plan (IHB)*

### 8.1. Inputs received from RHCs, analysis and decision

The Secretary presented the Draft Management Plan (*Doc. CBSC11-08*) and explained that the main difficulty is the way the requests are submitted. According to Procedure 1, the submission will be sent by the RHC to the CBSC. In order to clarify this, the Chair explained that the submissions should be sent by the RHC Chair (or the CB Coordinator on behalf of the Chair) to the CBSC Secretary, copy to the CBSC Chair.

The Chair explained that this year the Management Plan was organized by CB Phase rather than by RHC as done in the past. This was meant to help the CBSC to prioritize the allocation of the resources according to the CB Strategy, focusing Phase 1 and pre-Phase 1 activities.

Savi Narayanan asked whether the CBSC should act when identifying a gap. The CBSC supports this action. This is the case this year where no submission was received from EAthC. Bruno Frachon suggested including a High Level Visit to MOWCA and this was accepted by the CBSC:

**Decision 19: to include the High Level Visits to MOWCA in the 2014 Management Plan and the 2013 CBWP.**

The Secretary presented the job description for the Capacity Building Assistant (**Annex B**) according to Action 8 agreed on agenda item 6.2. The job description is an internal IHB document to guide the work of the staff. The Chair proposed to the CBSC to agree on the allocation of CB Fund resources to allow the IHB to contract a staff to assist the CB management:

**Decision 20: to allocate resources to the IHB to contract the Capacity Building Assistant (CBA) to assist the CB management to be included in the 2013 CBWP, 2014 Management Plan and 2014 CBWP.**

The CBSC also discussed a late submission from NIOHC on "Multi-beam training and Paper Chart/ENC production" and agreed on:

**Decision 21: the late submission NIOHC on "Multi-beam training and Paper Chart/ENC production" has not been taken into account and suggested to resubmit the following year.**

The CBSC discussed the proposed River Survey workshop from SEPHC and agreed that the SWAtHC and MACHC would be invited to participate:

**Decision 22: to include SWAtHC and MACHC to participate in the River Survey workshop proposed by SEPHC.**

**Action 31: SEPHC, SWAtHC and MACHC to develop a new proposal for the River Survey Course to be included in the Agreed 2014 CBWP (done during the meeting).**

Inan Burak (Turkey) proposed to include a Technical Visit to Lebanon due to the favourable situation in the country. The CBSC agreed on the following decision and action:

**Decision 23:** to include the Technical Visit to Lebanon in the Management Plan under condition that it will not exceed 5 000 Euros and be submitted before 7 June 2013.

**Action 32:** Turkey to submit the proposal for the Technical Visit to Lebanon according to the CB Procedures (deadline: done during the meeting).

The Chair also invited the CBSC to discuss other possible projects to be funded by the CB Fund if resources are available. One possibility was to fund participation in a Hydrographic Category B programme. The subcommittee then requested the IHB to investigate it:

**Action 33:** IHB to investigate the costs for funding the participation in a Hydrographic Surveyor Cat B Course (deadline: July 2013).

The other possibility suggested was to fund the participation in the CB Seminar at IHB for some former CB students. This was agreed in principle but subject to availability of funds and to be agreed intersessionally:

**Action 34:** UK to investigate the budget for former CB Students participation in the CB Seminar and submit to the CBSC for intersessional consideration (deadline: December 2013).

## **8.2. Management Plan update**

The 2014 Draft Management Plan incorporated the activities approved by the CBSC Decisions 19 and 20 and adopted as the 2014 Management Plan:

**Decision 24:** to adopt the 2014 Management Plan (**Annex C**).

## **8.3. Review and update the 2013 CBWP**

The CBSC discussed the updates to the 2013 CBWP taking into account the following:

- a) The CBSC Decision 6 to bring the Assessment activities not conducted in 2012 to the 2013 CBWP;
- b) The CBSC Decision 19 to include the High Level Visits to MOWCA in the 2013 CBWP;
- c) The CBSC Decision 20 to allocate resources to the IHB to contract the Capacity Building Assistant (CBA) to assist the CB management to be included in the 2013 CBWP;
- d) The available resources to 2013 increased from 106 000 to 148 000 Euros due to the projects not executed and the differences between the planned and executed budgets of the projects, as discussed in Agenda item 5;
- e) The results of the PMB3 meeting under the MoU with Republic of Korea to fund a Category A Hydrographic Survey Programme in the University of Southern Mississippi.

The CBSC discussed the Tides and Water Level trainings and how to address the courses in the CBWP. Brett Brace (Australia) suggested the use of the IBSC Category A and Category B syllabus to develop a standard course. Australia developed its own course using this approach. The CBSC then agreed on the following actions:

**Action 35:** Chair to invite HSSC to task TWLWG to develop a basic one-week training course on tides and water levels to be delivered to the RHCs (deadline: before HSSC5).



Action 36: Australia to provide details of the Tidal and Water Level Course developed in Australia (deadline: June 2013).

Action 37: Secretary to check with the TWLWG the existence of a basic course on tides (deadline: June 2013).

The CBSC also discussed the CB project on "Print on demand" proposed by SWAtHC (with seats for other 4 Latin American countries) submitted in the 2013 Management Plan. The course was not approved and the Chair will address this issue with IRCC and HSSC:

Decision 25: not approve the funding of a "Print on demand" course in the 2013 CBWP.

Action 38: Chair to address Print on Demand with IRCC and HSSC and report back to CBSC12 (deadline: during IRCC5 and HSSC5).

The way forward regarding MSDI was also tackled by the CBSC. The Chair reminded the participants that the MSDI WG was tasked by HSSC to develop a standard course. The CBSC considered suggestions to hold the funding of such courses and discussed the relevance of it. Director Iptes noted that MSDI is raising value in the IHO and is the basis for hydrographic services, even for those countries in phase 1.

MSDI was also considered as an issue for the Strategy revision. Lysandros Tsoulos (IBSC Chair) acknowledged the importance of MSDI and that he will address the subject within the IBSC. Michel Amafo recalled the experience of the MEIP ([Marine Economic Infrastructure Programme – essentially an MSDI for the MACHC](#)) in the MACHC and the importance of MSDI.

The Chair recognized MSDI as an important component in a Hydrographic Service but argued whether the CB Fund has to fund such courses. Bruno Frachon suggested investigating in the RHCs what the requirements are for a MSDI course. This may help the MSDI WG to further develop the standard courses. The CBSC agreed on the following decision and action:

Decision 26: to keep the MSDI courses and finance the instructors' participation (fees, air tickets, local transportation, accommodation and meals) and the students pay for their participation.

Action 39: MACHC, NIOHC and RSAHC CB Coordinators to get back to their regions and assess whether the countries are willing to participate in the 2014 MSDI Courses funding their own attendees (deadline: July 2012).

The CBSC discussed the importance of Boundary Courses and agreed that has significant impact and importance in numerous countries that can benefit for such courses. It was agreed to continue to support the course:

Decision 27: continue to support the Boundary Courses using CB Fund.

The CBSC concluded discussions regarding this agenda item and agreed on the following decision:

Decision 28: to adopt the Updated 2013 CBWP (**Annex D**)

#### 8.4. Adoption of the 2014 CBWP

The Chair presented the 2014 Management Plan (**Annex C**) and invited the CBSC to discuss it in the light of the IHO 5-year WP approved by the IHC18.

The CBSC discussed the CB Projects proposed in the Management Plan taking into consideration the resources used in the Updated 2013 CBWP (**Annex D**), the Decisions taken under Agenda items 8.1 to 8.3:

**Decision 29: to adopt the Agreed 2014 CBWP (Annex E)**

#### 9. Any other business

The Chair suggested and the CBSC accepted to invert Agenda items 9 and 10 in order to discuss all the important matters before discussing the Chair Report to IRCC5. The CBSC discussed two subjects:

- a) CB Coordinators meeting held on the morning of Day 1: the CBSC discussed the possibility of having a CB Coordinator in every RHC, even in those regions not in need of CB support. The Chair proposed that he will address this participation in direct contact with RHC members. The CBSC also discussed the development of terms of reference (ToR) for the CB Coordinators and the following actions were agreed:

**Decision 30: to establish a Task Group to develop the ToR for the CB Coordinators in coordination with the CBSC Chair. Composition: Jeff Bryant (UK/Chair), Adam Greenland (NZ), Inan Burak (Turkey) and the Secretary.**

**Action 40: Task Group (UK/Chair, NZ, Turkey and Secretary) to develop the ToR for the CB Coordinators (deadline: June 2013).**

- b) IC-ENC CB support: Nick Ligacs (IC-ENC) reported that the last IC-ENC Steering Committee meeting decided to participate in CB activities. The information obtained in the CBSC11 meeting will allow the report to the next steering committee in September 2013 in support of the decision making process.

#### 10. Report from the CBSC to the IRCC5 Meeting

The Chair invited the CBSC to provide guidance regarding the items to be included in the report to IRCC5, besides the list of activities since CBSC10 and report on actions put on CBSC by the IRCC4.

The main topics to be reported to IRCC5 were then decided as: actions from IRCC4, Capacity Building Strategy, CB Management, CB Work Programme, and the next meeting.

**Action 41: Chair to present the CBSC11 report to IRCC5 (deadline: during IRCC5).**

## 11. Date and place of the 12<sup>th</sup> CBSC Meeting

The Chair invited the CBSC to identify the venue and dates for the 12<sup>th</sup> CBSC Meeting considering that in order to contribute to the IHO WP preparation and the EIHC5 the meeting should take place in the first half of May. Also, whenever possible, the meeting should be organized in conjunction with IRCC6.

The CBSC discussed whether CBSC should continue to meet back-to-back with IRCC. Pros and cons were considered and the agreement is that it should continue to be as currently done:

**Decision 31: to continue the CBSC meetings back-to-back with IRCC whenever feasible.**

France offered to host the CBSC/IRCC meetings in Brest (CBSC, TBC) and Paris (IRCC). The CBSC thanked France for offering to host and agreed the decision:

**Decision 32: to hold the CBSC12 meeting in Brest (TBC) on 14 – 16 May 2014.**

## 12. List of Actions with deadlines and assigned lead

The CBSC reviewed the List of Actions and the Decisions taken during the meeting (**Annex F**).

## 13. Closure

The Chair thanked the participants for the fruitful meeting and the hosts for organizing such a nice event. He closed the meeting 1700 on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2013.

### List of Annexes:

- A – Updated 2012 CBWP
- B – Job Description for the Capacity Building Assistant
- C – 2014 Management Plan
- D – Updated 2013 CBWP
- E – Agreed 2014 CBWP
- F – List of Actions