

NAVAREA Coordinators' Self-Assessment Quality Management Analysis

Submitted by IHO Secretariat

SUMMARY

Executive Summary: This document provides details of the analysis of the NAVAREA Coordinators' Self-Assessment Reports to WWNWS10.

Action to be taken: Paragraph 8.

Related documents: NAVAREA Coordinators' Self-Assessment Reports

1. See attached Quality Management analysis table.
2. A notable number of the Self-Assessment reports were received well after the deadline; this caused significant additional work and delayed the publication of the documents on the website. NAVAREA Coordinators are requested to ensure the published deadline for submission of Self-Assessment reports is observed and not treated as a target. It was pleasing to note that all but two were received in Word format, which greatly assisted in the final preparation of the documents.
3. Some of the quoted average elapsed times are a bit too uniform across the reported years. Although all reports were received on the current template, a number did not submit the additional Annex A Excel spreadsheet provided for each relevant NAVAREA and for use by the CBSC, chairs of RHCs and Regional CB Coordinators. Details of MSI information received from coastal states within individual NAVAREAs and typical topics/subjects; i.e. mainly aids to navigation, military exercises, port construction activities, etc., helps to identify coastal states that are not providing information or the information that is provided is limited to particular topics/subjects and therefore they are likely not to be fulfilling their entire remit. The coastal states listed in each version were harmonized with the standard United Nations names, unless unavailable; the objective is to generate a comprehensive list of coastal states across all IHO activities, hence the need to use harmonized names to ensure all elements are referring to the same state. In addition it is intended to generate a master list for each NAVAREA to ensure the CB Coordinators are approaching the correct NAVAREA Coordinator and RHC Chair.
4. NAVAREA Coordinators are strongly encouraged to confirm/check the contents of their Self Assessment reports with the National coordinators within their individual NAVAREAs. It is recommended that draft documents are circulated to National coordinators for their input and checking, this will also ensure communication between the NAVAREA Coordinator and the National coordinators.
5. Specific comments on submitted Self Assessment report are contained in the table below:

NAVAREA	Remarks
I	Contribution to MSI training gratefully acknowledged.
Ib	Noted the successful action to avoid the inference for NAVTEX broadcasts. Noted the proposal to make the Baltico a MSI WG under the BSHC.
II	Noted the success with Nigeria and the on-going difficulties with other coastal states. Is 10 minutes a set standard or just quick work? Any further progress with bringing the non-operational NAVTEXT transmitters back into service? Clarification of statement in 3.3 regarding Nigeria? CB assessment details for NAVAREA should be used as the example format in all reports, where appropriate; identified need to continue to highlight situation in all for a (IMO, RHC and Technical visits). Noted next EAHC meeting is October 2018 in Lagos, Nigeria.
III	GMDSS Master Plan update date two years old, confirmation been sent to IMO that Plan is correct? Have the provided contact details been confirmed and checked? Elapsed times appear a bit uniform; Any progress on bringing the non-operational NAVTEX stations in Syria and Tunisia back online? Note the minimal output from Albania, Israel and Morocco, any known reasons? Clarification of Contingency Plan, is there an arrangement with an adjacent NAVAREA? No CB required yet course funded for MBSHC in September 2018? Good to note progress on provision of MSI in eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea areas.
IV-XII	Rapid elapsed time noted, any particular reason for such significant change? Good to note Dominican Republic success; note progress on receipt of MSI from coastal states with NAVAREA and need to monitor the ongoing contact and provision of MSI post course.
V	Is the detail in Table 2.2 correct, all MSI received by text? The elapsed times appear a bit uniform; as highlighted at WWNWS9, the table on equipment in use has not been included; when was the most recent contingency exercise? No CB activities, what about the planned MSI course in Niterói in September?
VI	Is 20 minutes a standard? Concern over the lack of progress at bringing La Paloma NAVTEX station back into service; good to note contingency plan with V is exercised periodically; concern expressed on out-of-area transmission of MSI is noted, clarification may be needed.
VII	Received in pdf format. Average elapsed time for transmission of immediate priority warnings appear somewhat uniform; successful contingency exercise with NAVAREA II noted; efforts to improve MSI provision in region noted and appreciated, although lack of impact after MSI course remains a concern; attendance at future WWNWS-SC meetings vital for regional development.
VIII	Has contingency plan been exercised? For which RHCs is the course in 2019?
IX	Note that Ethiopia is no longer a coastal state, even if they are considering acquiring a navy; Need to try and obtain details of points of contact for all national coordinators, Iraq and Sudan in particular after visits made by technical teams; Equipment details should be provided; concern that immediate priority warnings appear to have an elapsed time of greater than 30 minutes? When was GMDSS Master Plan updated? Concern over MENAS status, is MENAS acting officially on behalf of Bahrain or is there a separate national organization? Good to note progress on development of external contingency plans, may need to consider an alternative NAVAREA

	to ensure complete coverage; need to identify priority coastal states for MSI training and pass information to Regional CB Coordinator (Oman) so application for training course can be submitted to CBSC.
X	Details/reasons for reduced availability Mar 18? Comments on broadcast monitoring noted; relying on access to the AMSA MSI website could create challenges for some of the maritime community, have any comments/feedback been received? any consideration for contingency plan with neighbouring NAVAREA? PNG progress encouraging, any indication on the time frame? What impact resulting from significant CB investment, has MSI provision improved? Details on regional technical developments are encouraging.
XI	Note realistic average elapse times; monitor progress to bring manila NAVTEX station back into operation; may wish to consider contingency plan with adjacent NAVAREA; note plan for MSI training in Indonesia and to visit other national coordinators, need to consider multiple national authorities have overlapping responsibilities in some states; note comment on wider distribution of MSI beyond own national authorities; previous concerns no MSI received from some coastal states remain.
XIII	No warnings qualified as immediate priority?
XIV	What success with communications checks? Note that warning transmission time has reduced; what impact resulting from significant CB investment, has MSI provision improved? Have Maritime NZ personnel delivered course? Close liaison required with LINZ for CB issues through SWPHC and initiative to training a local instructor; noted comments on broadcast monitoring, see separate submission. Constructive collaboration with Iridium noted.
XV	No information on average time to transmit 'immediate priority' messages; Encouraging to note various contingency initiatives, recommend they are completed and exercised at least annually; good to note smooth migration of Inmarsat satellites.
XVI	Good to see two of three NAVTEX stations became operational since WWNWS9, any update on when Mollendo NAVTEX station will be operational? Noting the vulnerability of the region to natural disasters, contingency agreement with adjacent NAVAREA needs to be completed as a matter of priority, progressing discussions with NAVAREAXV should be a priority. Good to see ISO certification is being progressed
XVII-XVIII	What initiatives are in place to try to reduce the broadcast elapsed times? Contingency plan activity noted.
XIX	When change from rectangular to NAVAREA XIX anticipated?
XX-XXI	What are contingency plans and have they been exercised?

6. The relationship between NAVAREA Coordinators and National coordinators is the foundation for the successful provision of MSI to the wider maritime community, this is only achievable if there is open and regular communication. NAVAREA Coordinators have a vital role as the link between the information providers and the maritime customers. It is evident that time and effort invested in developing the skills and capabilities of National coordinators, after the concentrated Capacity Building MSI course, consolidates and reinforces the knowledge and confidence of the individuals as well as their organizations.

7. It is suggested a short survey/questionnaire could be developed to assess the performance/interaction between NAVAREA and National Coordinators. It would seek to

highlight where improvements could be made by NAVAREA Coordinators to better engage and develop the knowledge and skills of National coordinators, as well identify areas on which National coordinators could focus to improve the provision of information back to their respective NAVAREA Coordinators. The information would assist chairs of Regional Hydrographic Commissions and Capacity Building Regional Coordinators to identify states in need of additional training effort as well as those not gaining from training already provided. This would allow RHC chairs' to remind National administrations of their responsibilities under SOLAS as well as to maximize the benefits of any CB training provided.

8. The Sub-Committee is invited to:

- a. **note** the information provided;
- b. **consider** amending the title to 'NAVAREA Assessment' to better reflect the objectives and sources of the information provided;
- c. **develop** a short questionnaire/survey to be sent to National coordinators;
- d. **encourage** NAVAREA Coordinators and participants to continue to submit reports in a timely fashion well ahead of the meeting dates; and
- e. **take** any other action as appropriate.

MSI Quality Management Survey

NAVAREA	ISO 9001-2008	Promulgate “In-Force” Bulletins	Promulgate “No-Warning” Messages	Monitor Broadcast in almost real time	Promulgate Immediate Messages within maximum delay period	24/7 contact information provided	Promulgate two scheduled broadcasts	IMO Master Plan updated
I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
I Baltic Sub-area	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes ¹ (Navtex)	Yes
II	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
III	No ²	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
V	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VI	No ³	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VII	No ⁴	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VIII	No ⁵	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IX	No ⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
X	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
XI	No ⁷	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
XII	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
XIII	No ⁸	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
XIV	No ⁹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
XV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ¹⁰	Yes	Yes	Yes
XVI	Yes ¹¹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

¹ See paragraphs 4 & 5 of NAVAREA Ib Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/Ib)

² See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA III Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/III)

³ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA VI Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/VI)

⁴ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA VII Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/VII)

⁵ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA VIII Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/VIII)

⁶ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA IX Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/IX)

⁷ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XI Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/XI)

⁸ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XIII Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/XIII)

⁹ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XIV Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/XIV)

¹⁰ See paragraph 2 of NAVAREA XV Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/XV)

¹¹ See paragraph 13 of NAVARERA XVI Self Assessment (WWNWS10/2/1/XVI)

XVII	No ¹²	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ¹³	Yes	Yes	Yes
XVIII	No ¹⁴	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ¹⁵	Yes	Yes	Yes
XIX	No ¹⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ¹⁷
XX	No ¹⁸	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
XXI	No ¹⁹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

¹² See paragraph 2 of NAVAREA XVII Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XVII)

¹³ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XVII Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XVII)

¹⁴ See paragraph 2 of NAVAREA XVIII Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XVIII)

¹⁵ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XVIII Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XVIII)

¹⁶ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XIX Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XIX)

¹⁷ See paragraph 2 of NAVAREA XIX Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XIX)

¹⁸ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XX Self Assessment (WVNWS10/2/1/XX)

¹⁹ See paragraph 5 of NAVAREA XXI Self Assessment (WVNWS10/1/2/XXI)