

Response to Action Item IRCC5/19

From: North Sea Hydrographic Commission

NSHC input to IHO Strategic Performance Indicators and IRCC Working Level Indicators

No PI	Designation	IRCC Contribution	Comments	NSHC input
SPI 1	Number and percentage of Coastal States providing ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party. (Previous year figures in brackets)	Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs.		
SPI 2	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.	Source: collated by WEND WG from the IHO on-line catalogue.		
SPI 3	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.	Source: collated by CBSC through RHCs.		
SPI 4	Percentage of "acceptable" CB requests which are planned. SPI 4bis Percentage of planned CB requests which are subsequently delivered.	Source: collated by CBSC.		None
SPI 5	Number of standards issued (including new editions), per category: - hydrographic standards to enhance safety of navigation at sea, - protection of the marine environment, - maritime security, - economic development.	No IRCC contribution (Source: collated by HSSC).		

SPI 6	Number of potential new IHO MS (indicated by the start of the application process) relative to the number of “non-IHO” IMO MS.	No IRCC contribution (Source: collated by IHB through the government of Monaco).		
SPI 7	Increase in participation / membership in RHCs.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		All countries in the region are members of NSHC. There is no risk of any degradation of participation and therefore no additional work items have been identified
SPI 8	Percentage of available / agreed ENC schemes.	Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs or International Charting Coordination Working Groups (ICCWG).	See table in IRCC Annual Report for 2011.	

Selection of IRCC Working Level Indicators (document IRCC4-06.2)

No PI	Designation	IRCC Contribution	Comments	NSHC input
WPI 15	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.	Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs.	Associated with SPI 1.	
WPI 16	Number of additional IHO MS starting to produce & maintain (with/without support) relevant ENCs (contributing to 'adequate coverage') in the reporting period relative to those already producing at 01 Aug. 2008.	Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs.	Associated with SPI 1.	
WPI 17	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.	Source: collated by the CBSC through RHCs.	Y/N assessment for each Coastal State and each CB phase.	
WPI 18	Percentage of IHO MS updating their C-55 entry data regarding hydrography survey, INT charts, ENC, and MSI in the reporting period.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		Only 3 out of 10 members have confirmed updating in the reporting period.
WPI 19	Status of hydrographic surveys in each region.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.	Metrics to be defined.	NSHC has tasked the Re-survey Working Group to present and monitor the surveys. Irish waters to be completed by 2025. Sweden completed 45% to S44 standard by January 2014. Norway developed a 5 years survey plan.
WPI 20	Percentage of agreed INT chart schemes, percentage of INT charts available.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs or ICCWGs.	See table in IRCC Annual Report for 2011.	Three countries reported 95-100%. Lacking input from other members

WPI 21	Percentage of agreed ENC schemes, percentage of ENC available.	Source: collated by WEND WG through RHCs or ICCWGs.	Associated with SPI 8. See table in IRCC Annual Report for 2011.	
WPI 22	Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		Active participation of all is at a sufficient level. No action needed
WPI 23	Percentage of Coastal States which are IHO Member States.	Source: collated by the IHB.		
WPI 24	Number of new Coastal States joining the IHO during the reporting period.	Source: collated by the IHB.		
WPI 25	Number of potential new IHO MS (indicated by the start of the application process) relative to the number of "non-IHO" IMO MS.	Source: collated by the IHB.		
WPI 26	Percentage of Coastal States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office.	Source: collated by CBSC through RHCs.		
WPI 27	Number of States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office in the reporting period.	Source: collated by CBSC through RHCs.		
WPI 28	Percentage of Coastal States which provide ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.	Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs.		
WPI 29	Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial infrastructure.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		Only 3 out of 10 members have confirmed that a SDI is in place or in process
WPI 40	Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilaterals and RENC membership, etc.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		Sweden 8 licensing agreements, Norway 1 bilateral and 3 RENC membership
WPI 41	Percentage of planned CB events that are achieved.	Source: collated by CBSC.		
WPI 42	Number of acceptable CB requests received.	Source: collated by CBSC.		
WPI 43	Percentage of "acceptable" CB requests which are planned.	Source: collated by CBSC.		