

**7TH MEETING OF THE IHO-INTER REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
IHO IRCC7**

MEXICO CITY, 01-03 JUNE 2015

Status Report on Performance Monitoring (2014)

Submitted by:	IHB
Executive Summary:	This paper provides a summary report of Performance Monitoring for 2014.

Background

The introduction of IHO performance indicators was decided in 2009 by the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC-4), together with the adoption of the IHO Strategic Plan.

The implementation of performance indicators is described in the IHO Strategic Plan as follows:

The implementation of performance indicators is based on a two level approach:

- strategic level: a small number of PIs associated with the objectives of the IHO (1 or 2 PIs per objective), to be agreed by the Conference (the Conference to be replaced by the Assembly when the revised IHO Convention enters into force) and managed by the IHB (the IHB to be replaced by the Secretary General and the Council when the revised IHO Convention enters into force);

- working level: PIs associated with the strategic directions and managed by the appropriate subsidiary organs;

In this perspective cross-references between the objectives, the strategic directions and the PIs are arranged in the following way:

Objectives => strategic PIs => strategic directions => responsible organs => working level PIs

Accordingly, the assessment of the working level PIs and the review of progress with the strategic directions are considered in two phases: an initial review by the leading organ and an overall review by the IHB (the IHB to be replaced by the Secretary General and the Council when the revised IHO Convention enters into force). Together with the assessment of the strategic PIs, these results are then submitted for consideration by the Conference (the Conference to be replaced by the Assembly when the revised IHO Convention enters into force). The submission should include a qualitative and, where practicable, a quantitative assessment of progress based on the value of the PIs. It should also include recommendations on management actions to be considered where trends indicate either a lack of progress or a change to an underlying assumption/direction is required. In this way the aim can be maintained and evidence of progress monitored/presented.

The EIHC-4 adopted nine strategic performance indicators (SPIs) associated to the seven objectives of the IHO and invited the IHB Directing Committee to consider, in liaison with the HSSC and the IRCC, the implementation of working level performance indicators based on list of potential indicators associated with the strategic directions.

In 2012, the XVIIIth IHC welcomed the monitoring system to be put in place by the IHB Directing Committee based on the Strategic Performance Indicators (SPI) of the Strategic Plan (see CONF.18/WP.1/Add.2) and invited them to take action. Moreover, the HSSC and the IRCC were invited to review the working level performance indicators relevant to them.

The Annual Report of the IHO for 2012 included Performance Indicators for the first time.

Strategic Performance Indicators

Table 1 provides values for the Strategic Performance Indicators for 2014. The values for 2013 are included to enable trends and comparisons to be made.

Table 1

Strategic Performance Indicators (SPI)

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec 2013	Status 31 Dec 2014	General Trend
SPI 1	Number and percentage of Coastal States providing ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.	WEND WG through RHCs	No suitable information was provided by RHCs. IHB estimate ~60%	No suitable information provided by RHCs IHB estimate ¹ :~64%	↑
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.	WEND WG and IHO on-line catalogue of coverage	Small scale: ~ 100% Medium scale: 90% Large scale: 96%	Small scale: ~ 100% Medium scale: 91% Large scale: 97%	↔ ↑ ↑
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.	CBSC through RHCs	No suitable information was available at IHB	Proposal on how to obtain suitable information will be proposed to IRCC-7 (June 2015)	
SPI 4	Percentage of “acceptable” CB requests which are planned. <i>(Percentage of submitted CB requests that were approved)</i>	CBSC	75%	97%	↑

¹ Information is difficult to obtain from Primary Charting authorities acting on behalf of coastal States

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec 2013	Status 31 Dec 2014	General Trend
SPI 4 bis	Percentage of planned CB requests which are subsequently delivered.	CBSC	86%	82%	↔
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.	HSSC	4 (See Appendix I) <i>Safety of navigation: 2</i> <i>Protection of the marine environment: 2</i> <i>Maritime security: 0</i> <i>Economic development: 0</i>	5 (See Appendix I) <i>Safety of navigation: 4</i> <i>Protection of the marine environment: 0</i> <i>Maritime security: 0</i> <i>Economic development: 1</i>	↑ ↑ ↓ ↔ ↑
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.	IHB through the Government of Monaco	7 / 88 (2012: 8 / 89) <i>Number of IMO MS: 170</i> <i>Number of IHO MS: 82</i>	7 / 88 <i>Number of IMO MS: 170</i> <i>Number of IHO MS: 82</i>	↔ ↔ ↔

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec 2013	Status 31 Dec 2014	General Trend
SPI 7	Increase in participation / membership in RHCs.	IRCC through RHCs	No suitable information provided by RHCs IHB estimate: MS participation: 83% Non MS participation: 25%	No suitable information provided by RHCs IHB estimate ² : MS participation: 75% Non MS participation: 29%	↔ ↔
SPI 8	Percentage of available / agreed ENC [production] schemes.	WEND WG through RHCs or International Charting Coordination Working Groups (ICCWG)	No suitable information provided by most RHCs ³	IHB estimate for UB1, 2 and 3 based on existing coverage: ~80%	

² Based on

- Number of RHC meetings: 11
- Participation of IHO MS: MS represented 56 times out of 75 possible attendances
- Participation of non IHO MS: Non-MS represented 16 times out of 56 possible attendances

³ The status of ENC Schemes was provided by 2 RHC: SEPRHC and SWAtHC.

HSSC Working Level Performance Indicators

HSSC4 agreed to implement the WPIs listed in table 2.

Table 2 provides values for the Working Level Performance Indicators for 2014 associated with Work Programme 2.

Values for 2013 are included to enable trends and comparisons to be made.

Table 2
HSSC WPIs

Metric	Source	Rationale	Status 31 Dec 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	General Trend
Number of S-100 based product specifications approved	IHB	Relative indicator of uptake of IHO standards including for purposes other than SOLAS navigation	0	0	↔
Percentage of annual work programme achieved	HSSC WGs (all)	Progress against objectives in the strategic plan	19%	52%	↑
Total number of participants at meetings (MS and Expert Contributors)	HSSC WGs (all)	Indicates participation of MS and wider community in execution of the plan	258 <i>MS: 172</i> <i>Expert Contributors.: 86</i>	171 <i>MS: 128</i> <i>Expert Contributors: 43</i>	↓ ↓ ↓
Number of technical revisions and clarifications approved	IHB	Indicative of ability to provide comprehensive, safe and effective standards	3	2	↓
Number of ENCs distributed annually under license (equivalent annual licences)	WEND WG	Relative indicator of ENC usage throughout SOLAS market	2,202,487	2,272,923 ⁴	↑

⁴ Total of Primar and IC-ENC distribution only - does not include local distribution or other distribution mechanisms

IRCC Working Level Performance Indicators

Table 3 provides values for the Working Performance Indicators for 2014 associated with Work Programme 3.

Values for 2013 are included to enable trends and comparisons to be made.

Table 3
IRCC WPIs

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	General Trend
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.	WEND WG through RHCs	No suitable information was available at IHB	See SPI 2	
WPI 16	Number of additional IHO MS starting to produce & maintain (with/without support) relevant ENC's (contributing to 'adequate coverage') in the reporting period relative to those already producing at 01 Aug. 2008.	WEND WG through RHCs	2 (no suitable information provided by 8 out of 15 RHCs)	0	↓
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.	CBSC through RHCs	No suitable information provided by most RHCs WPI 17 is the same as SPI 3		

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	General Trend
WPI 18	Percentage of IHO MS updating their C-55 entry data regarding hydrography survey, INT charts, ENC, and MSI in the reporting period.	IRCC through RHCs	21% (17/82)	24% (20/82)	↑
WPI 19	<i>Status of hydrographic surveys in each region.</i>	IRCC through RHCs	Metrics yet to be defined by IRCC	Metrics yet to be defined by IRCC	
WPI 20	Percentage of agreed INT chart schemes, percentage of INT charts available. ⁵	RCC through RHCs or ICCWGs	88% (14 schemes out of 16) 75% (1,491 charts published out of 1,980 planned)	88% (14 schemes out of 16) 77% (1,558 charts published out of 2,013 planned)	↔ ↑
WPI 21	Percentage of agreed ENC schemes, percentage of ENC available.	WEND WG through RHCs or ICCWGs	No suitable information provided by RHCs	See SPI 8	
WPI 22	Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities.	IRCC through RHCs.	No suitable information provided by RHCs	No suitable information provided by RHCs	
WPI 23	Percentage of Coastal States which are IHO Member States.	IHB	54% (81⁶ /151)	54% (81⁶ /152)	↔
WPI 24	Number of new Coastal States joining the IHO during the reporting period.	IHB	1⁷	0	↓

⁵ Regions A and N, for which no scheme is available yet, are excluded

⁶ Serbia is not considered as a Coastal State

⁷ Montenegro.

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	General Trend
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.	IHB	WPI 26 is the same as SPI 6		
WPI 26	Percentage of Coastal States which have achieved CB phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office.	CBSC through RHCs	No suitable information was available at IHB	Proposal on how to obtain suitable information will be proposed to IRCC-7 (June 2015)	
WPI 27	Number of States which have achieved CB phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office in the reporting period.	CBSC through RHCs	No suitable information was available at IHB	Proposal on how to obtain suitable information will be proposed to IRCC-7 (June 2015)	
WPI 28	Percentage of Coastal States which provide ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.	WEND WG through RHCs	WPI 28 is same as SPI 1		
WPI 29	Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial infrastructure.	IRCC through RHCs	Limited information available at IHB IHB estimate: 18% (28/151) (based on limited information provided by some RHCs and MSDIWG)	No information available at the IHB to make an estimate	

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	General Trend
WPI 40	Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilateral agreements and RENC membership, etc.	IRCC through RHCs	No suitable information available at IHB	Limited information available at IHB IHB estimate: 2 ⁸	
WPI 41	Percentage of planned CB events that are achieved.	CBSC	WPI 41 is the same as SPI 4bis		
WPI 42	Number of acceptable CB requests received.	CBSC	28	29	↔
WPI 43	Percentage of "acceptable" CB requests which are planned.	CBSC	WPI 43 is the same as SPI 4		

⁸ Comoros with France and Montenegro with PRIMAR