

**8th MEETING OF THE IHO-INTER REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
IHO IRCC-8**

ABU DHABI, UAE, 29-31 MAY 2016

RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION, AND THE PROGRESS MONITORING PROCESS IN RELATION TO IRCC

Submitted by:	IHB
Executive Summary:	This document seeks input from the Committee as part of the process to review the IHO Strategic Plan, particularly in relation to the monitoring and reporting of the execution of the IHO Work Programme in relation to the IRCC.
Related Documents:	IHO Resolution 12/2002, as amended – <i>Planning Cycle</i> IHO CL 17/2016 dated 31 March - <i>Call for submissions to update the IHO Strategic Plan</i>
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background

1. The current version of the IHO Strategic Plan came in to force in 2009. The Plan includes comprehensive guidance on progress monitoring and risk management in relation to the execution of the IHO Work Programme.
2. IHO Resolution 12/2002 as amended sets out the timetable for the review of the IHO Strategic Plan and the Inter-Conference / Assembly Work Programme. According to the Resolution, twelve months prior to the next Ordinary International Hydrographic Conference (which is anticipated to be held as the first session of the Assembly subject to the entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention on the IHO), Member States and the two programme committees – the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) and the Hydrographic Standards and Services Committee (HSSC), should be invited to submit any proposals to update the Strategic Plan and the Work Programme.
3. In accordance with the Resolution, IHO CL 17/2016 invited Member States and the Chairs of IRCC and HSSC to submit to the Directing Committee any proposals to update the Strategic Plan no later than 1 July 2016, so that any such proposals can be compiled and circulated in accordance with the review timetable.
4. A copy of the current Strategic Plan (2009) is available from the IHO website at: www.iho.int > Letters & Documents > Basic Documents.

Analysis/Discussion

5. In accordance with Decision No. 1 of IHC-18 and as reported in IHO CL 62/2012, progress monitoring and risk management, following the guidance in the Strategic Plan, was implemented in 2012, at the beginning of the Conference inter-sessional period.
6. **Risk Management.** The risk management element comprises primarily of the identification of significant risks to the completion of tasks in the IHO Work Programme by the designated leader of each task. Significant risks are shown in the Work Programme - if they are provided. Despite the comprehensive guidance on the methodology for the identification and treatment of risk provided in Annex A to the Strategic Plan, experience to date has shown that relatively few task leaders provide any input, and those that do provide a predominantly subjective assessment of any identified risks. These mainly relate to a lack of confidence that sufficient volunteers will come forward to take on tasks identified in the Work Programme.

7. **IRCC Progress Monitoring.** The progress monitoring element comprises the use of Performance Indicators (PIs) against which the progress in implementing the Strategic Directions can be assessed. The PIs are arranged in two categories: Strategic PIs (SPIs) associated with the Objectives of the IHO, to be agreed by the Conference/Assembly and Working Level PIs (WPIs) associated with the Strategic Directions of the IHO, to be agreed by the appropriate subsidiary organs. A list of **agreed** SPIs and a list of **suggested** WPIs is provided in Annex C of the Strategic Plan. The 2009 Strategic Plan indicates that the PIs should be measured and considered on an annual basis.

8. The IRCC reviewed the WPIs related to its activities at its 3rd and 4th meetings, in 2011 and 2012 respectively. IRCC4 agreed to monitor the WPIs listed in Annex A and invited the RHCs and the relevant subsidiary organs to provide annually, to the IRCC Chair, their estimated values as of 31 December of the preceding year and target values for 31 December 2017. As indicated in the subsequent IHO Annual Reports, obtaining the necessary input from IRCC bodies has been problematic, although the situation has improved over time. Annex A shows the results for 2012-2015.

9. As directed by Decision 3 of EIHC-5 in 2014, performance monitoring was supplemented by a biannual reporting mechanism that request the chairs of committees, sub-committees and working groups to report at year-end and mid-year on the overall status of their respective work programmes by completing a template listing current goals and priorities and current or expected gaps and needs. The outcome of the first three bi-annual assessments was submitted to Member States through IHO CL 17/2015, 66/2015 and 14/2016. Annex B indicates the responses received from RHCs and IRCC subsidiary organs.

Conclusion

10. Obtaining the appropriate annual data and information for the PIs currently in use and the additional six-monthly progress reports is problematic in a number of cases. It may be that in some instances, the chosen PI is not a good indicator or that it is simply too difficult to measure or to report. For these reasons, and as required by EIHC-5 Decision 3, the progress monitoring and risk management framework should be considered again at the next Conference/Assembly in 2017.

Action Required of IRCC

11. The IRCC is invited to consider the existing progress monitoring and risk management framework in relation to the IRCC, and to identify any adjustments, if they are required.

Annex A
IRCC Working Level Performance Indicators

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2012	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	Status 31 Dec. 2015
WPI 15 => <u>SPI 2</u>	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	<u>See SPI 2</u> <u>Small scale: ~ 100%</u> <u>Medium scale: 88%</u> <u>Large scale: 95%</u>	<u>Small scale: ~ 100%</u> <u>Medium scale: 90%</u> <u>Large scale: 96%</u>	<u>Small scale: ~ 100%</u> <u>Medium scale: 91%</u> <u>Large scale: 97%</u>	<u>Small scale: ~ 100%</u> <u>Medium scale: 92%</u> <u>Large scale: 97%</u>
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.	WEND WG through RHCs	No suitable information was available at the IHB	2 (No suitable information provided by 8 out of 15 RHCs)	0	1
WPI 17 => <u>SPI 3</u>	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 was provided by most RHCs <u>See SPI 3</u>			

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2012	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	Status 31 Dec. 2015
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	17% (14/81)	21% (17/82)	24% (20/82)	21% (20/85)
WPI 19	<i>Status of hydrographic surveys in each region.</i>	IRCC through RHCs	Metrics yet to be defined by IRCC			
WPI 20	Percentage of agreed INT chart schemes, percentage of INT charts available. ¹	IRCC through RHCs or ICCWGs	88% (14 schemes out of 16) 72% (1,429 charts published out of 1,988 planned)	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)	88% (14 schemes out of 16) 79% (1,588 charts published out of 2,009 planned)
WPI 21 => SPI 8	Percentage of agreed ENC schemes, percentage of ENC available.	WEND WG through RHCs or ICCWGs	<u>No suitable information was available at the IHB See SPI 8</u>	<u>No suitable information provided by most RHCs (input only from SEPRHC and SWAtHC)</u>	<u>IHB estimate for UB1, 2 and 3 based on existing coverage: ~80%</u>	<u>IHB estimate for UB1, 2 and 3 based on existing coverage: ~82%</u>
WPI 22	Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities.	IRCC through RHCs.	No suitable information was available at the IHB	No suitable information provided by 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% (80 / 151)	54% (81 / 151)	54% (81 / 151)	55% (84 / 152)
WPI 24	Number of new Coastal States joining the IHO during the reporting period.	IHB	1	1	0	3 ⁹

¹ Regions A and N, for which no scheme is available yet, are excluded

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2012	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	Status 31 Dec. 2015
WPI 25 => 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	<u>See SPI 68 / 89 (2011: 7 / 90)</u> <u>Number of IMO MS: 170</u> <u>Number of IHO MS: 81</u>	<u>7 / 88</u> <u>Number of IMO MS: 170</u> <u>Number of IHO MS: 82</u>	<u>7 / 88</u> <u>Number of IMO MS: 170</u> <u>Number of IHO MS: 82</u>	<u>8 / 86</u> <u>Number of IMO MS: 171</u> <u>Number of IHO MS: 85</u>
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			
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			
WPI 28 => SPI 1	Percentage of Coastal States which provide ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.	WEND WG through RHCs	<u>See SPI 4 No suitable information was available at IHB</u>	<u>No suitable information provided by RHCs</u> <u>IHB estimate:</u> <u>~60%</u>	<u>No suitable information provided by RHCs</u> <u>IHB estimate:</u> <u>~64%</u>	<u>No suitable information provided by RHCs</u> <u>IHB estimate:</u> <u>~66%²</u>
WPI 29	Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial infrastructure.	IRCC through RHCs	No suitable information was 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 information available at the IHB to make an estimate

² Information is difficult to obtain from Primary Charting authorities acting on behalf of coastal States. Thanks to the information kindly provided by Australia, France, New Zealand, South Africa and UK in 2015, the estimate is likely to be better this year.

No PI	Designation	Source	Status 31 Dec. 2012	Status 31 Dec. 2013	Status 31 Dec. 2014	Status 31 Dec. 2015
WPI 40	Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilateral agreements and RENC membership, etc.	IRCC through RHCs	Limited information available at IHB IHB estimate: 2	No suitable information was available at IHB	Limited information available at IHB IHB estimate: 2	Limited information available at IHB IHB estimate: 4
WPI 41 => <u>SPI 4bis</u>	Percentage of planned CB events that are achieved.	CBSC	<u>See SPI 4bis 73%</u>	<u>86%</u>	<u>82%</u>	<u>79%</u>
WPI 42	Number of acceptable CB requests received.	CBSC	31	28	29	30
WPI 43 => <u>SPI 4</u>	Percentage of "acceptable" CB requests which are planned.	CBSC	<u>See SPI 4 97%</u>	<u>75%³</u>	<u>97%</u>	<u>93%</u>

³ Reduction due to reduction in CB funds available in 2013

Annex B

Inventory of the responses from RHCs and IRCC subsidiary organs to the three bi-annual surveys

IHO bodies and inter-organizational bodies	Reports at end of 2014	Reports at mid-2015	Reports at end of 2015	Comments
IRCC	Yes	Yes	No report	
HCA	Yes	Yes	No report	
WWNWS-SC	Yes	Yes	Yes	
CBSC	Yes	No report	No report	
WEND-WG	Yes	Yes	Yes	
IENWG	Yes	Yes	Yes	
MSDIWG	Yes	No report	No report	
CSBWG	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	No report	CSBWG established by IRCC7 (June 2015)
IBSC	No report	No report	No report	
GEBCO-GC	Yes	Yes	No report	
TSCOM	Yes	Yes	Yes	Joint reports
SCRUM				
SCUFN	Yes	Yes	Yes	
DCDB	No report	No report	No report	
NHC	No report	Yes ⁴	Yes ⁴	
NSHC	Yes	Yes	Yes	
MBSHC	No report	No report	No report	
BSHC	No report	No report	No report	
USCHC	No report	No report	No report	
EAHC	No report	No report	No report	
EAtHC	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SEPRHC	No report	No report	No report	
SWPHC	No report	No report	No report	
MACHC	Yes	Yes	Yes	
SAIHC	Yes	Yes	Yes	
NIOHC	Yes	No report	Yes	
RSAHC	No report	No report	No report	
SWAtHC	No report	No report	No report	
ARHC	No report	No report	No report	
FC	Yes	Yes	No report	
SRWG	Yes	Yes	Yes	

⁴ Report provided but not recorded in the assessment issued by the IHB.