

SWPHC Response to Action Item IRCC5/19

SWPHC input to IHO Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs)

No PI	Designation	IRCC Contribution	Comments	SWPHC
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.		Coastal States: Australia, Fiji, France, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, UK, USA. Australia, France, New Zealand, UK and US provide 100% ENC coverage
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.		State-2008/2013 Aus -544/848 France -243/381 UK -1566/1834 NZ – unknown / 66 US -
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.		State - MSI service / surveying capability/charting capability Aus – yes/yes/yes France - yes/yes/yes UK – yes/yes/yes NZ – yes/yes/yes US – yes/yes/yes Fiji – yes PNG – yes (Aus)/yes(Aus)/yes(Aus) Tonga - yes

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.		
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).		Aus – 0 France - UK – NZ – 0 US – Fiji – PNG – Tonga -
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.		
SPI8	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.	Navigation Purpose 1 & 2 ENC schemes agreed for SWP; Navigation Purpose 3-6 are managed by individual countries

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

No PI	Designation	IRCC Contribution	Comments	SWPHC
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.	See SPI 2
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.	nil
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.	See SPI 3
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.		unknown

WPI 19	Status of hydrographic surveys in each region.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.	Metrics to be defined.	
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.	100%
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.	100% Navigation Purpose 1 & 2 Navigation Purpose 3-6 State – agreed scheme / available in 2013 / =% Aus – 849/849 / 100% France – 104 / 99 / 95% UK - 105 / 103 / 98% NZ – 74 / 66 / 89% US - unknown
WPI 22	Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		
WPI 23	Percentage of Coastal States which are IHO Member States.	Source: collated by the IHB.		Aus – yes France - UK – NZ – yes US – Fiji – PNG – Tonga - yes
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.		See SPI 1
WPI 29	Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial infrastructure.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		<p>Aus – yes managed by Geoscience Australia</p> <p>France – yes via INFRAGEOS-H and ENTREPOT projects</p> <p>UK – no though may be covered by INSPIRE project in Europe</p> <p>NZ – yes, managed by LINZ (NZ Geospatial Office)</p> <p>US – unknown</p> <p>Fiji – unknown</p> <p>PNG – unknown</p> <p>Tonga - unknown</p>

WPI 40	Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilaterals and RENC membership, etc.	Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs.		Agreements in place Aus – 6 in 2008 and 6 in 2013 France – 9 in 2008 and 14 in 2013 UK – 71 in 2008 and 85 in 2013 NZ – Nil US – Fiji – PNG – Tonga -
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.		