

**THIRD MEETING OF THE IHO INTER REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE  
IHO-IRCC3  
Niteroi, Brazil, 26-27 May 2011**

**IRCC INPUT TO IHO STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS**

**Submitted by the Chair of IRCC**

## **1. Background**

In 2009 the 4<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC) approved the revised IHO Strategic Plan and the revised version of IHO resolution 2/2002 on the IHO planning cycle (annex A) based on the recommendations of the IHO Strategic Plan Working Group (ISPWG). The implementation of the processes dealing with the maintenance, monitoring and execution of the Strategic Plan was outlined by three additional decisions:

Decision No. 5: Approval of transition arrangements to the new IHO structure.

*The 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC approved the arrangements for the transition to the new structure of the IHO Work Programme described in section 8 of the ISPWG Report and to task the IHB Directing Committee accordingly.*

Decision No. 6: Reviewing of the possible needs for assistance in preparing the annual cycles of the new strategic mechanism.

*The 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC agreed to request the IHB Directing Committee to review possible needs for assistance in preparing the annual cycles of the new strategic mechanism, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC chairs, and to report to Member States before the end of 2010. This proposal was approved in the hope that the IHO Member States will join Norway in helping the IHB to fulfil its task.*

Decision No. 7: Reviewing of the implementation of the new planning mechanism.

*The 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC agreed to request the IHB Directing Committee to review the implementation of the new planning mechanism, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC chairs, at the end of each annual cycle in early 2011 and 2012 and report back to the next ordinary IHC (or to the first Assembly) in 2012.*

The ISPWG report had proposed the following arrangements for the transition to the new system:

- retain the contents of the current Work Programme until the next ordinary session of the IHC / Assembly (i.e. 2012),
- re-arrange the tasks according to the new three programme structure starting with the 2010 Work Programme edition,
- compute new budget aggregates starting with the 2010 budget, within the limits of the approved five year budget,
- present to the IHC / Assembly in 2012 a new Work Programme and budget for the period 2013-2017 based on the new Strategic Plan as approved by the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC. This Work Programme and budget will be prepared under the aegis of the IHB in close cooperation with the two new Committees and they shall have their endorsement.

Recognizing that the IHB might be confronted with some difficulties in implementing the additional tasks associated with the new mechanism (risk management and performance monitoring), the ISPWG suggested that the issue be monitored annually by the IHB as further experience is gained with the new committee structure and that the implementation of the new planning mechanism be reviewed by the Conference / Assembly in 2012.

## **2. Status of implementation**

In accordance with the decisions of the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC, the IHO Work Programme for 2010 was broken down into the three new IHO programmes: Corporate affairs, Hydrographic services and standards, Interregional coordination and support (IHO CL 64/2009 of 25 September 2009).

The IHO Work Programme for 2011 was supplemented with a reference to the most relevant strategic directions and performance indicators from the Strategic Plan for each element. The draft was submitted to the chairs of HSSC and IRCC for comments before review and approval by IHO Member States (IHO CL 62/2010 of 6 October 2010). In August 2010, the IHB Directing Committee forwarded a paper, inviting the chairs of HSSC and IRCC to consider the impact of the strategic planning process on the work of their Committees and to decide how the two Committees can best fulfil their reporting and monitoring obligations under the strategic planning process. The paper was examined by the HSSC during its 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting in October 2010 in Rostock, Germany, and input was provided to the Bureau. This is reported in the minutes of the HSSC meeting (IRCC3-04.1A - section 4 A). The chair of the IRCC presented his preliminary views on the paper and suggested further clarifications before consulting IRCC members.

In accordance with decision 7 of the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC, a report on the implementation of the new strategic mechanism was provided to IHO Member States through CL 8/2011 of 24 January 2011. The IHB Directing Committee informed MS of the limited progress in implementing decision 6 due to the discontinuation of the external support initially provided by Norway.

At this stage the performance indicators have not yet been implemented.

The Directing Committee indicates in CL 8/2011 that a report will be drafted, to be circulated to Member States towards the end of 2011 for consideration by the XVIII<sup>th</sup> International Hydrographic Conference in 2012, and requests input from the two Committees.

## **3. Issues to be considered by IRCC**

The IHB paper of 2010 identifies four principal activities under the strategic planning process that involve both HSSC and IRCC:

- input for the update of the IHO Strategic Plan,
- input for the annual update of the IHO Work Programme,
- input and involvement with performance monitoring,
- input and involvement with risk management.

### ***3.1 Update of the IHO Strategic Plan***

IHO Resolution 12/2002 indicates that the IRCC will be invited 12 months **before each ordinary Conference** to provide input to update the IHO Strategic Plan:

*“Y-12 (Apr): IHB invites MS, HSSC and IRCC to submit proposals to update the Strategic Plan.”*

This implies that the IRCC will review the extant Strategic Plan prior to submitting any input for

consideration by the Conference.

***It is proposed that the IRCC Chair and Secretary prepare the review and submit a working paper for consideration by the IRCC at its annual meeting in the year preceding the IHC, under item 6 of its standing agenda.***

***For the first time line of 2012, noting that the strategic directions of the 2009 edition remain highly relevant and considering that the implementation of the 2009 Strategic Plan is still in its initial stage it is recommended to postpone any revision to the next Conference / Assembly and to concentrate on the implementation issues.***

### ***3.2 Input to the IHO Work Plan***

IHO Resolution 12/2002 requires that in April of each year:

*“IHB evaluates the accomplishment of the preceding year’s Programme, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, and reports to MS, through the “IHO Annual Report”, reviews the Work Programme upcoming years in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, proposing changes (if needed) to the Programme in force and budgetary adjustments issuing from those changes, within the limits of the 5-year Budget.”*

This implies that the IRCC will review the forthcoming annual IHO Work Plan and provide comment and feedback to the Directing Committee by the end of June of each year.

***It is proposed that:***

***(i) At the beginning of each year, the IRCC Chair and Secretary prepare an assessment of the implementation of the preceding year’s Programme, submit it to IRCC members for approval by correspondence and report to the IHB;***

***(ii) The IRCC Chair and Secretary prepare the review of the Work Programme upcoming years and submit a working paper for consideration by the IRCC at its annual meeting under item 6 of its standing agenda;***

***(iii) Additionally, the HSSC and IRCC Chairs could be consulted on the draft Programme in parallel with the consultation of the Finance Committee (as it was done in 2010 for the IHO Work Programme for 2011).***

The IRCC annual report for 2010 (IRCC3-02.1) was the first attempt at implementing (i) above.

The framework for implementing (ii) above for the IHO 2012 Work Programme is provided in annex B. It is suggested to foster the appropriation of the new Strategic Plan through a result-oriented approach with the identification by the relevant organs of quantitative objectives and/or specific deliverables for each task.

### ***3.3 Performance monitoring***

Annex 7 of the ISPWG Report lists recommended Performance Indicators (PI’s). There are nine strategic PI’s intended to monitor the seven Objectives of the IHO. In addition, there are 43 working level PI’s intended to measure the 19 Strategic Initiatives that support the four Goals of the IHO.

The Directing Committee has compared the IHO performance monitoring regime agreed at the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC with the arrangements adopted by other intergovernmental and national institutions. It reports that the International Maritime Organization (IMO) monitors its very extensive program of inter-governmental work under eight Goals monitored through 18 PI’s; the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) has identified five Strategic Thrusts that it monitors with 11 PI’s; the Australian Hydrographic Service has identified six Goals, that it measures with 13 PI’s, and the Chilean HO

measures its performance using 21 PI's in total. Informal inquiries indicate that these levels of monitoring are typical. The International Standards Organization (ISO) has identified seven Key Objectives and seven measurable results in its Strategic Plan, but does not employ any PI's.

After examining the proposed PI's in relation to their usefulness and how easy it would be to collect and collate the underlying data required, the Directing Committee reports that in many cases, the data will be difficult or impossible to collect and its usefulness seems difficult to identify; it recommends considering revised or alternative arrangements.

According to the ISPWG report, a clear distinction should be made between strategic PIs (SPIs) and working level PIs (WPIs). Performance monitoring at the IHO level is based on the SPIs only. As indicated in the IHO Strategic Plan and in accordance with the recommendations of the ISPWG and decisions of the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC, the SPIs are to be agreed by the Conference. A **small** number (9) of SPIs has been proposed and agreed and should now be implemented. Comments on the collection, collation and assessment of the information required for the SPIs are provided in annex C.

As indicated in the ISPWG report, it is up to the subsidiary organs to agree on WPIs which are useful for monitoring their own Work Programme and for feeding SPIs. This should be done progressively and pragmatically with the priority put on WPIs which feed directly into the SPIs. A preliminary assessment of possible WPIs relevant to IRCC is provided in annex D with a proposed classification in two categories :

- priority 1: WPIs to be considered for implementation in 2012;
- priority 2: WPIs to be considered at a later stage.

***It is proposed:***

- (i) to invite the IHB Directing Committee to start implementing the SPIs as agreed by the 4<sup>th</sup> EIHC;***
- (ii) to identify a first set of WPIs for monitoring the IRCC Work Programme and feeding into the SPIs.***

### ***3.4 Risk assessment***

The risk management framework is described in annex A of the Strategic Plan; risk analysis is an integral part of the annual update of the Work Programme. It involves principally a "top down" approach, with input coming from the Directing Committee in consultation with the Chairs of IRCC and HSSC. The methodology relies in large part on the performance monitoring system to determine if identified risks are increasing or being mitigated. It is also advised that the IHO should: "... *decide on possible risks from a bottom-up perspective; this could be executed by subordinate bodies of the IHO in line with this framework*".

***It is recommended that the IRCC and its subordinate bodies handle the "bottom-up" component of risk assessment when preparing their own Work Programmes and when discussing the update of the IHO Work Programme coming years at the IRCC annual meeting.***

***Noting that the risk analysis is intertwined with monitoring the progress on the Strategic Directions through the agreed PIs, it is suggested to start the annual revision of the risk assessment once the PI's are in place.***

## **4. Action required of IRCC**

**The Committee is invited to consider the above comments and recommendations and to implement the following measures:**

- approve the inputs to the IHO Work Programme for 2012;**

- **approve a set of working level performance indicators (WPIs) for monitoring the IRCC Work Programme and feeding into the strategic performance indicators (SPIs);**
- **report its recommendations to the IHB Directing Committee.**

**Annex A to IRCC3-06.2**  
**IHO Resolution 12/2002 as amended**

**PLANNING CYCLE**  
**(Interim regime)<sup>1</sup>**

The Organization shall prepare two plans to guide its work:

- 1) The Strategic Plan shall be for an indefinite period, and shall be reviewed at each Conference.
- 2) The 5-year Work Programme shall look five years ahead, and shall be reviewed annually.

**Planning Cycle for the Strategic Plan**

Y-12 (Apr): IHB invites MS, HSSC and IRCC to submit proposals to update the Strategic Plan.

Y-08 (Aug): IHB circulates the proposals on strategic issues to all MS.

Y-05 (Nov): MS provide comments to IHB in relation to the proposals.

Y (Apr): At the IHC, the revised Strategic Plan is discussed, amended and decided upon in Plenary.

Y+02 (Jun): IHB circulates the updated Strategic Plan to MS.

*Notes:*

1) *Rules of Procedure of IHC n° 14 and n° 15 apply.*

2) *"Y" means the year of the Ordinary Conference, and the numbers are months before (-) or after (+).*

**Planning Cycle for the 5-year Work Programme**

The 5-year Work Programme will be reviewed on a yearly basis.

Y (Jan): The corresponding Annual Programme enters in force.

Y+04 (Apr): IHB evaluates the accomplishment of the preceding year's Programme, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, and reports to MS, through the "IHO Annual Report", reviews the Work Programme upcoming years in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, proposing changes (if needed) to the Programme in force and budgetary adjustments issuing from those changes, within the limits of the 5-year Budget.

Y+06 (Jun): MS provide IHB with comments and proposals, if any, for changes to the Programme in force.

Y+08 (Aug): IHB submits to the Finance Committee (FC) for approval the draft Programme and Budget for the upcoming year.

Y+09 (Sep): FC members provide comments and IHB issues CL submitting the draft Programme and Budget to MS for approval.

Y+11 (Nov): MS approve the draft Programme and Budget and IHB issues CL with the final version of the Programme and Budget.

Y+12 (Jan): The corresponding Annual Programme enters into force, and the Cycle is repeated.

During Conference years, Article 23 of the General Regulations will apply and the IHB will submit the new Work Programme and associated 5-year Budget for the intersessional period 4 months before the Conference. The Work Programme and proposed 5-year Budget will be discussed and approved by the Conference and will enter into force on 1st January of the year following the Conference. Then the Planning Cycle as described above will apply.

*Note: "Y" means years.*

---

<sup>1</sup> This version is applicable until the amendments to the IHO Convention approved by the IHC in 2005 enter into force. The version applicable in the future regime (three-year cycle) was also approved by the 4<sup>th</sup> IEHC.

**Annex B to IRCC3-06.2**  
**Framework for IRCC input to the review of the IHO Work Programme for 2012**

| Task  | Title  | Activities / Deliverables  | Comments |
|---|--|--|----------|
| <b>Element 3.1 Cooperation with Member States and attendance at relevant meetings</b> |  |  |          |
| 3.1.0   | IRCC – Inter Regional Coordination Committee                 | Produce IRCC Annual Report for 2011<br>Prepare and conduct IRCC4<br>Update and implement the IRCC Work Programme |          |
| 3.1.1   | ARHC - Arctic Region Hydrographic Commission                 | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.2   | BSHC - Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission                    | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.3   | EAHC - East Asia Hydrographic Commission                     | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.4   | EAtHC Eastern Atlantic Hydrographic Commission               | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.5   | MACHC - Meso American and Caribbean Hydrographic Commission  | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.6   | MBSHC - Mediterranean and Black Seas Hydrographic Commission | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.7   | NHC - Nordic Hydrographic Commission                         | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.8   | NIOHC - North Indian Ocean Hydrographic Commission           | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.9   | NSHC - North Sea Hydrographic Commission                     | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.10  | RSAHC - ROPME Sea Area Hydrographic Commission               | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.11  | SAIHC - Southern Africa and Islands Hydrographic Commission  | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.12  | SEPHC - South East Pacific Hydrographic Commission           | To be discussed (1)  |          |
| 3.1.13  | SWAtHC - South West Atlantic Hydrographic Commission         | To be discussed (1)  |          |

| <b>Task</b>  | <b>Title</b>   | <b>Activities / Deliverables</b>   | <b>Comments</b> |
|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 3.1.14   | SWPHC - South West Pacific Hydrographic Commission   | To be discussed (1)  |                 |
| 3.1.15   | USCHC - USA and Canada Hydrographic Commission   | To be discussed (1)  |                 |
| 3.1.16   | HCA – Hydrographic Commission on Antarctica  | Prepare and conduct HCA12<br>Status of INT chart scheme and production<br>Status of ENC scheme and production<br>Status of surveys |                 |
| <b>Element 3.2 Increase Participation by non-Member States</b> |  |  |                 |
| 3.2.1  | RHCs to encourage the approval of pending applications for IHO membership.                                   | Notification of approval within 12 months of the application   |                 |
| 3.2.x  | Specific activities of RHCs  | To be discussed (2)  |                 |
| <b>Element 3.3 Capacity Building Management</b>                |  |  |                 |
| 3.3.1  | CBSC - Capacity Building Sub-Committee   | Prepare and conduct CBSC10<br>Update and implement the CBSC Work Programme   |                 |
| 3.3.2  | Capacity Building Fund (CBFund) Management.  | Set and implement goal for 2012 Budget   |                 |
| 3.3.3  | Meetings with other organizations, funding agencies, private sector and academia.                            |  | As required.    |
| 3.3.4  | Capacity Building Strategy. Development of submission, implementation and assessment procedures.             |  | As required.    |
| 3.3.5  | Follow-up of CB activities and initiatives.  |  | As required     |
| 3.3.6  | IBSC - International Board on Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors and Nautical Cartographers. | Prepare and conduct IBSC35<br>Update and implement the IBSC Work Programme   |                 |
| 3.3.7  | Provide guidance to training institutions  |  | As required     |
| <b>Element 3.4 Capacity Building Assessment</b>                |  |  |                 |
| 3.4.1  | Review and maintain existing CB procedures and develop new ones.   |  | As required     |
| 3.4.2  | Technical and Advisory Visits  | According to CBSC Work Programme   |                 |
| <b>Element 3.5 Capacity Building Provision</b>                 |  |  |                 |



| <b>Task</b>  | <b>Title</b>   | <b>Activities / Deliverables</b>                | <b>Comments</b>  |
|--|--|---|--|
| 3.5.1  | Raise Awareness on the Importance of Hydrography.  | According to CBSC Work Programme                |  |
| 3.5.2  | Technical Workshops, Seminars, Short Courses.  | According to CBSC Work Programme                |  |
| 3.5.3  | Hydrographic and Nautical Cartography Courses.   | According to CBSC Work Programme                |  |
| 3.5.4  | On the Job Training (ashore / on board).   | According to CBSC Work Programme                |  |
| 3.5.5  | Marine/Maritime Projects.  | According to CBSC Work Programme                |  |
| 3.5.5a   | <i>Marine Electronic Highway Project (Malacca Strait)</i>                                |   |  |
| 3.5.5b   | <i>Marine Highway Development (Western Indian Ocean).</i>                                |   |  |
| 3.5.5c   | <i>Safety of Navigation on Lake Victoria.</i>  |   |  |
| 3.5.5d   | <i>Marine Highway Development (Western Mediterranean Sea)</i>                            |   |  |
| 3.5.6  | CBC to foster bilateral agreements in order to help satisfy SOLAS V/9                    | According to CBSC Work Programme                |  |
| <b>Element 3.6 Coordination of Global Surveying and Charting</b> |  |   |  |
| 3.6.1  | WEND WG.   | Update and implement the WEND WG Work Programme |  |
| 3.6.2  | RHCs to coordinate ENC schemes, consistency and quality                                  |   | In accordance with Element 3.1   |
| 3.6.3  | C-55 Status of Hydrographic Surveying and Nautical Charting Worldwide                    | IHO Member States to provide annual update.     | Consider the need to investigate ways and means to improve the overall status of surveys in non IHO Member States and set priorities in line with existing surveying assets. |
| 3.6.4  | Maintenance of INT Chart Schemes and improvement of availability of the INT Chart Series |   | In accordance with Element 3.1   |
| <b>Element 3.7 Maritime Safety Information</b>                   |  |   |  |

| <b>Task</b>                      | <b>Title</b>  | <b>Activities / Deliverables</b>  | <b>Comments</b> |
|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 3.7.1                            | WWNWS - World-Wide Navigational Warning Service Sub-Committee                       | Prepare and conduct WWNWS4<br>Update and implement the WWNWS Work Programme |                 |
| 3.7.2                            | WWNWS Expansion and Coverage.   |   | As required     |
| 3.7.3                            | NAVAREA Coordinators.   | Provide annual self-assessment  |                 |
| 3.7.4 -                          | WWNWS Publications S-53, S-53 App.1.  |   | As required     |
| <b>Element 3.8 Ocean Mapping</b> |   |   |                 |
| 3.8.1                            | GEBCO Guiding Committee.  | Prepare and conduct GGCXXIX   |                 |
| 3.8.2                            | TSCOM - Technical Sub-Committee on Ocean Mapping.                                   | Prepare and conduct TSCOMXXVIII   |                 |
| 3.8.3                            | SCUFN – Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names.                                    | Prepare and conduct SCUFNXXV  |                 |
| 3.8.4                            | Shallow Water Bathymetry.   | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.5                            | Bathymetric Data Integration.   | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.6                            | Maps and Digital Grids.   | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.7                            | New GEBCO Products.   | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.8                            | Global Awareness.   | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.9                            | IHO Digital Bathymetry Data Center.   | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.10                           | IBC Projects, consistency, regional mapping series coordinated by SCRUM (ex-ISCRUM) | To be discussed   |                 |
| 3.8.11                           | GEBCO publications: B1, B4, B6, B7, B8, B9,B10.                                     |   | As required     |

Notes:

(1) Each RHC is invited to identify its relevant activities/deliverables in 2012 from the following generic list:

- plenary meetings
- meetings of subordinate bodies
- status of INT chart scheme
- status of INT chart production
- status of ENC scheme
- status of ENC production
- status of hydrographic surveys

(2) Specific activities if any to be identified by RHCs.

**Annex C to IRCC3-06.2**  
**IRCC Review of Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs)**

| Objective  | Strategic PIs<br>(... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)  | Comments of the IHB Directing Committee   | IRCC Comments  |
|--|---|---|--|
| (a) To promote the use of hydrography for the safety of navigation and all other marine purposes and to raise global awareness of the importance of hydrography.                             | <b>SPI 1</b> Number and percentage of Coastal States providing ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.<br>(Previous year figures in brackets)   | This does not measure the success of Objective (a), which is about raising awareness.   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPI agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The rationale is that the existence of organisational measures intended to provide ENC coverage (with the associated update mechanisms) either directly or through a third party is a good aggregate indicator of an appropriate level of awareness of the importance of hydrography.</li> <li>3. Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs.</li> </ol>   |
| (b) To improve global coverage, availability and quality of hydrographic data, information, products and services and to facilitate access to such data, information, products and services. | <b>SPI 2</b> Growth in ENC coverage worldwide, as reported in the IHO on-line catalogue, relative to the existing gap in adequate coverage (as defined by IMO/NAV) from the benchmark 01 Aug. 2008.             | This should not be linked only to chart coverage for international voyages.<br>Is it the best measure to use?   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPI agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The intention is too start with something based on existing mechanisms and relevant with the IHO commitment to IMO, in accordance with the risk analysis.</li> <li>3. Source: collated by WEND WG from the IHO on-line catalogue.</li> </ol>   |
|  | <b>SPI 3</b> Percentage of Coastal States which provide hydrographic services, directly or through an agreement with a third party, categorized by CB phases, as defined by the IHO Capacity Building Strategy. | Will States accept being placed in a “category”?<br>How does this measure accessibility of data, etc.?<br>How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (b)? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPI agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The assessment should be made collectively not by individual States (mainly non IHO MS);</li> <li>3. The rationale is that the main leverage to improve global coverage, availability, etc. and ACCESS to etc. is through the implementation of the Capacity Building Strategy. When the indicator approaches 100% then it will be time to consider a new indicator more directly connected with the availability and quality of data.</li> <li>4. Source: CBSC through RHCs.</li> </ol> |

| Objective  | Strategic PIs<br>(... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)  | Comments of the IHB<br>Directing Committee   | IRCC Comments  |
|--|---|--|--|
| (c) To improve global hydrographic capability, capacity, training, science and techniques.   | <p><b>SPI 4</b> Percentage of “acceptable” CB requests which are planned.</p> <p><b>SPI 4bis</b> Percentage of planned CB requests which are subsequently delivered.</p>  | <p>What is the 100% baseline for this?<br/>How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (c)?</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPIs agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The rationale is again that the main leverage to reach objective (c) is through the implementation of the Capacity Building Strategy.</li> <li>3. The 100% baseline for SPI 4 is that all “acceptable” CB requests (“acceptable” to be defined by CBSC) are planned. When both SPI4 and 4bis are closed to 100% then it will be time to consider a more refined indicator.</li> <li>4. Source: CBSC.</li> </ol> |
| (d) To establish and enhance the development of international standards for hydrographic data, information, products, services and techniques and to achieve the greatest possible uniformity in the use of these standards. | <p><b>SPI 5</b> Number of standards issued (including new editions), per category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- hydrographic standards to enhance safety of navigation at sea,</li> <li>- protection of the marine environment,</li> <li>- maritime security,</li> <li>- economic development.</li> </ul> | <p>This measure appears to encourage the issue or revision of standards just to satisfy the figures.<br/>How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (d)?</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPIs agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The indicator is to be associated with the targeted number of standards which need to be issued or revised.</li> <li>3. Source: HSSC.</li> </ol>  |
| (e) To give authoritative and timely guidance on all hydrographic matters to States and international organizations.   | <p><b>SPI 6</b> Number of potential new IHO MS (indicated by the start of the application process) relative to the number of “non-IHO” IMO MS.</p>  | <p>This does not measure the success of Objective (e).</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPIs agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The indicator is adapted to the present situation where the success in providing “authoritative and timely guidance” is measured in first instance by the growth in IHO membership. When the percentage of “non-IHO” IMO MS will be closed to 0 (we are now around 50%) then it will be time to look for a more refined indicator.</li> <li>3. Source: IHB through the government of Monaco.</li> </ol>         |

| Objective   | Strategic PIs<br>(... to measure success in achieving specific objectives) | Comments of the IHB<br>Directing Committee  | IRCC Comments   |
|---|--|---|---|
| (f) To facilitate coordination of hydrographic activities among the Member States.      | <b>SPI 7</b> Increase in participation / membership in RHCs.               | Attendance or membership does not necessarily mean participation or coordination. Will this measure the success or failure of Objective (f)?      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPIs agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. Again, the indicator is based on what was identified by the ISPWG as the priority of to-day. The main tools to facilitate the coordination of hydrographic activities are RHCs and in many RHCs effective participation / membership in Conferences is still the basic issue.</li> <li>3. Source: IRCC through RHCs.</li> </ol>  |
| (g) To enhance cooperation on hydrographic activities among States on a regional basis. | <b>SPI 8</b> Percentage of available / agreed ENC schemes.                 | How/who measures this?<br>Is this a good indicator of cooperation?<br>How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (g)? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SPIs agreed by the Conference;</li> <li>2. The indicator is adapted to the present situation where the production of agreed ENC schemes was identified by ISPWG as the top priority related with objective (g). The objective is to have all INT regions covered with an agreed scheme for each navigational purpose (NP) or groups of NPs depending on regional conditions.</li> <li>3. Source: WEND WG through RHCs or International Charting Coordination Working Groups (ICCWG).</li> </ol> |

**Annex D to IRCC3-06.2**  
**IRCC Review of Working Level Performance Indicators (WPIs)**

| Strategic directions  | Responsible organ              | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------------|----------|
| <p>1.1 implementing proactive, efficient and dynamic procedures and mechanisms that respond effectively to emerging trends, developments and challenges.</p>                      | <p>IHB / Secretary General</p> | <p><b>WPI 1 -</b> Percentage of IHO MS participation in the main IHO organs during the reporting period.</p> <p><b>WPI 2 -</b> Response ratio to IHO CL during the reporting period.</p> <p><b>WPI 3 -</b> Specific examples of changes made (e.g. implementation of S100) in the reporting period.</p> <p><b>WPI 4 -</b> Number of times the IHB is required to respond to external demands without notice (or without opportunity to consult with MS).</p> <p><b>WPI 5 -</b> Number of reactive circular letters published each year (the fewer the better).</p> | <p>(e)</p>         |          |
| <p>1.2 closer and more effective cooperation with other international organizations, in order to respond to cross-agency issues and thereby promote coherence and efficiency.</p> | <p>IHB / Secretary General</p> | <p><b>WPI 6 -</b> Number and names of relevant international organizations with which agreements are established.</p> <p><b>WPI 7 -</b> Qualitative assessment of progress with such agreements including any noteworthy successes that promote the partners' positions.</p>   | <p>(e)</p>         |          |

| Strategic directions  | Responsible organ       | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments |
|---|-------------------------|--|--------------------|----------|
| 1.3 engaging the various stakeholders, including non-governmental international organizations, government, industry, academia and others, in the technical work of its bodies, in order to ensure a more inclusive approach to decision-making and the optimum use of high fidelity data. | IHB / Secretary General | <b>WPI 8 -</b> Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the attendance by stakeholders in key IHO meetings and a short qualitative statement of any noteworthy benefits/outcomes delivered as a result.  | (c) and (d)        |          |
| 1.4 developing, improving, promulgating and promoting clear, uniform global hydrographic standards to enhance safety of navigation at sea, protection of the marine environment, maritime security and economic development.  | HSSC                    | <b>WPI 9 -</b> Percentage of standards considered up to date.<br><b>WPI 10 -</b> Number of standards issued (including new editions), per category (safety of navigation at sea, protection of the marine environment, maritime security and economic development) in the reporting period.<br><b>WPI 11 -</b> Percentage of standards considered adequately implemented / enforced. | (d)                |          |



| Strategic directions   | Responsible organ | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments |
|--|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------|
| 1.5 promoting the role of hydrography in supporting relevant related ocean sciences. | HSSC              | <p><b>WPI 12 -</b> Number of events (including letters, meetings, seminars, publications, Web actions for this purpose) during the reporting period.</p> <p><b>WPI 13 -</b> Assessment of the effectiveness of the events based on specific feedback.</p> <p><b>WPI 14 -</b> Increase in proportion of IHO web-site hits and enquiries to IHO for advice / assistance.</p> | (a)                |          |

| Strategic directions  | Responsible organ | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments   |
|---|-------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| <p>2.1 coordinating effectively Member State activities for the provision of coherent, standardized and well coordinated hydrographic services, in accordance with regulation 9 of Chapter V of the SOLAS Convention.</p> | <p>IRCC</p>       | <p><b>WPI 15 -</b> Growth in ENC coverage worldwide, as reported in the IHO on-line catalogue, relative to the existing gap in adequate coverage (as defined by IMO/NAV) from the benchmark 01 Aug. 2008.</p> <p><b>WPI 16 -</b> Number of additional IHO MS starting to produce &amp; maintain (with/without support) relevant ENCs (contributing to 'adequate coverage') in the reporting period relative to those already producing at 01 Aug. 2008.</p> <p><b>WPI 17 -</b> Percentage of Coastal States delivering hydrographic services - categorized by CB phases (MSI services, surveying capabilities, charting capabilities), directly or through an agreement with a third party, at the end of the reporting period.</p> <p><b>WPI 18 -</b> Percentage of IHO MS updating their C-55 entry data regarding hydrography survey, INT charts, ENC, and MSI in the reporting period.</p> | <p>(b) and (f)</p> | <p>Priority 1<br/>WPI 15 and 16 associated with SPI 1.</p> <p>WPI 17 associated with SPI 3.</p> <p>WPI 18 connected to task 3.6.3.</p> |

| Strategic directions   | Responsible organ | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments   |
|--|-------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 2.2 enhancing and supporting cooperation on hydrographic activities among States on a regional basis under the aegis of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. | IRCC              | <b>WPI 19 -</b> Status of hydrographic surveys in each region.<br><b>WPI 20 -</b> Percentage of agreed INT chart schemes, percentage of INT charts available.<br><b>WPI 21 -</b> Percentage of agreed ENC schemes, percentage of ENC available.<br><b>WPI 22 -</b> Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities. | (g)                | Priority 1<br>WPIs directly connected to deliverables expected from RHCs.        |
| 2.3 expanding membership of the IHO.   | IRCC              | <b>WPI 23 -</b> Percentage of Coastal States which are IHO Member States;<br><b>WPI 24 -</b> Number of new Coastal States joining the IHO during the reporting period.<br><b>WPI 25 -</b> Number of potential new IHO MS (indicated by the start of the application process) relative to the number of “non-IHO” IMO MS.     | (c) and (g)        | Priority 1   |
| 2.4 encouraging and supporting the establishment of new Hydrographic Offices.  | IRCC              | <b>WPI 26 -</b> Percentage of Coastal States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office.<br><b>WPI 27 -</b> Number of States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office in the reporting period.   | (c)                | Priority 1<br>WPIs directly connected to the aggregate assessment of CB results. |

| Strategic directions  | Responsible organ | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments                                     |
|---|-------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 2.5 encouraging and supporting the development and promotion of integrated navigation systems and geospatial data infrastructures.                          | HSSC              | <b>WPI 28 -</b> Percentage of Coastal States which provide ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.<br><b>WPI 29 -</b> Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial infrastructure.   | (a)                | Priority 1<br>WPI 28 associated with WPI 16. |
| 2.6 promoting the use of new technologies and the opportunities offered by globalization and international cooperation.                                     | IHB / Council     | <b>WPI 30 -</b> To be determined in relation with the relevant items in the Work Programme.  | (e)                | Priority 2                                   |
| 3.1 ensuring that the role and responsibilities of national Hydrographic Offices are clearly understood at all levels in the marine and public communities. | IRCC              | <b>WPI 31 -</b> Number of promotion actions in the reporting period along with feedback indicators of notable impact.<br><b>WPI 32 -</b> Number of invitations received and taken up to participate in engagement with other government agencies / maritime interest groups in the reporting period. | (a)                | Priority 2                                   |
| 3.2 supporting and promoting the benefits of national Hydrographic Offices and hydrographic programmes.   | IRCC              | <b>WPI 33 -</b> Number of promotional events or activities conducted in the reporting period - including letters, meetings, and seminars for this purpose.   | (a)                | Priority 2                                   |

| Strategic directions  | Responsible organ | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments   |
|---|-------------------|--|--------------------|------------|
| 3.3 bringing the importance of hydrography on issues affecting safety of navigation at sea, protection of the marine environment, maritime security and economic development to the attention of International Organizations, funding agencies, national governments, maritime stakeholders and others. | IRCC              | <b>WPI 34 -</b> Number of participations in national and international events in the reporting period year and specific examples of resultant successes. | (a)                | Priority 2 |
| 3.4 preparing and promoting education and outreach programmes which involve fostering a well informed citizenry and creation of a public awareness of the importance of hydrography and its role in daily life.   | IRCC              | <b>WPI 35 -</b> Number of initiatives in the reporting period.   | (a) and (c)        | Priority 2 |
| 4.1 acting as a focal point and forum for all hydrographic matters.   | IHB / Council     | <b>WPI 36 -</b> Number of events dealing with hydrographic matters without any IHO participation in the reporting period.                                | (e)                |            |

| Strategic directions   | Responsible organ | Working level PIs  | Related Objectives | Comments  |
|--|-------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| 4.2 supporting national initiatives aimed at developing and enhancing hydrographic infrastructure.   | IRCC              | <b>WPI 37 -</b> Number of initiatives in the reporting period.<br><b>WPI 38 -</b> Number of requests for support met in the reporting period.<br><b>WPI 39 -</b> Number of proactive measures taken during the reporting period to engage national hydrographic authorities. | (b)                | Priority 2  |
| 4.3 encouraging bilateral and regional cooperation on hydrographic and related matters.  | IRCC              | <b>WPI 40 -</b> Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilaterals and RENC membership, etc.  | (f) and (g)        | Priority 1<br>WPI connected to task 3.5.6.                |
| 4.4 strengthening the IHO capacity-building programme in order to better support the needs of Member States especially those developing their capabilities from maritime safety information through surveying to nautical charting and marine spatial data infrastructure. | IRCC              | <b>WPI 41 -</b> Percentage of planned CB events that are achieved<br><b>WPI 42 -</b> Number of acceptable CB requests received<br><b>WPI 43 -</b> Percentage of “acceptable” CB requests which are planned.  | (c)                | Priority 1<br>WPIs directly connected to CB deliverables. |