

## Paper for Consideration by WENDWG

--

## Performance Indicators related to the WENDWG

<b>Submitted by:</b>	IHB
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	This paper invites the WENDWG to consider initial proposals on the evolution of the Performance Indicators related to the IHO Programme of Work supported by the WENDWG. If agreed, these proposals should be submitted to IRCC-8 for the preparation of the next IH Conference/IHO Assembly.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	WENDWG5-04A - <i>Decisions, outcomes and actions from IRCC-6, EIHC-5 and HSSC-6 affecting WENDWG activities.</i> Final minutes of WENDWG-5 (Section 4A). Annual Report of the IHO for 2014 – Annex B - <i>Status Report on Performance Monitoring.</i> IHO Resolution 12/2002 as amended - <i>Planning cycle.</i> Final minutes of HSSC-7 (Section 4.1).
<b>Related Projects:</b>	N/A

## Introduction / Background

- Following the decision of the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC-4) in 2009 to introduce IHO performance indicators and the review of the relevant monitoring system by the 18th International Hydrographic Conference (IHC-18) in 2012, the Annual Report of the IHO for 2012 included Performance Indicators (PIs) for the first time.
- Seven Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs) and Working Level Performance Indicators (WPIs) are related to WENDWG activities. They are reported in the IHO Annual Reports (P-7) and summarized in the Table 1 below:

Table 1

PI No.	Designation	Source
SPI 1, WPI 21	Number and percentage of Coastal States providing ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party.¶	WENDWG 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 <sup>1</sup> ) from the benchmark 01 Aug. 2008.	WENDWG
SPI 8, WPI 21	Percentage of available / agreed ENC schemes, and percentage of ENC available.¶	WENDWG through RHCs or International Charting Coordination Working Groups (ICCWG)
WPI 5	Number of ENCs distributed annually under license (equivalent annual licences)¶	WENDWG
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

<sup>1</sup> IMO/NCSR since 2014.

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.	<b>WEND WG through RHCs</b>
--------	---	-----------------------------

3. At its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting in 2013, the HSSC agreed to retain its current working level (operational) performance indicators (WPI) until sufficient historical data is available to assess their usefulness. HSSC-5 also tasked the IHB to invite the WENDWG, via the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC), to assess how representative is the ENC usage indicator (WPI5) based solely on the inputs from Primar and IC-ENC, and to propose alternatives if appropriate.

4. At its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting in 2015, the WEND Working Group (WENDWG) reviewed the PIs that are related to WENDWG activities and agreed to retain the current SPIs and WPIs until the next IH Conference/IHO Assembly in 2017. For the future, the WENDWG also suggested that the targets of the SPIs and WPIs should be estimated.

5. In order to facilitate the assessment of the relevance of current PIs during the review of the IHO Strategic Plan at the next IH Conference/IHO Assembly in 2017, the WENDWG is invited to consider the following proposals for two new Working Level Performance Indicators and to make subsequent recommendations in its report to IRCC-8. The new Working Level Performance Indicators fall under the remit of the IRCC and are supposed to be provided by the WENDWG as a Source like at present. Then, IHO Member States might choose one of the two to become a Strategic Performance Indicator.

#### **Analysis/Discussion**

6. Current PIs related to WENDWG activities fall basically into two categories: one intends to assess the capability of the IHO, as a whole, to meet IMO requirements (availability of adequate ENC coverage), the second one intends to reflect the mariners' level of ENC usage.

7. Based on the experience gained since 2012, it is deemed important to retain two equivalent categories, one being "producer-driven" (HOs), the second being "customer-driven" (ECDIS users). For efficiency purposes, it seems also important to tentatively simplify the indicators, and make possible the quasi-automated production of their values at the WENDWG level only, without being obliged to request inputs from various entities (IHO Member States, RHCs, etc.) which have proved to be unrealistic.

8. As in the past, it is likely that the IHO Member States will consider at the next IH Conference/IHO Assembly that ENC production (in S-57 and tomorrow in S-101) remains the top priority of the IHO as part of its core foundation and strategic objectives. However, considering the new potential IHO high-speed tempo for the planning cycle (which will be three years) and the new responsibilities given to the IHO Council in the near future, the steering of the future 3-year IHO Programme of Work and its monitoring on an annual basis should therefore rely on a limited number of indicators, in general, for the sake of efficiency.

9. For WEND, based on the above considerations, one single indicator for each category, directly derived from databases, risk assessment and user reports, is considered appropriate enough and realistic. Suggestions are made in Table 2 below:

**Table 2**

<b>PI No.</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Note</b>
WEND WPI New 01	Percentage of available ENC's / agreed ENC's schemed.	See section 10
WEND WPI New 02	Percentage of relevant reports/cases from "end users" (mariners, shipshandlers, maritime safety agencies,...) reported to the IHO Secretariat, complaining about ENC's (coverage, gaps, overlapping inconsistencies, quality, availability, ...) / Number of ENC users	See section 11

10. The WEND WPI New 01 is an evolution of the former SPI 8 / WPI 21 for a better assessment of the IHO global capacity in ENC production for adequate ENC coverage. This indicator summarized as well the activities of ENC Producers (numerator) and of the RHCs when establishing ENC schemes based on risk assessment methodologies (denominator). It seems very easy to get it. As an example, per default, the initial value of this indicator at the date of the IH Conference/IHO Assembly can be deducted from the current ENC coverage, plus the ENC production projections by HOs (if and when available). An extension of the new INTtoGIS web services (IHO CL 89/2015 refers) can certainly be considered and used, by the HOs and ENC Coordinators, to add the additional “agreed” schemed ENCs in a database, equivalent to the S-11 Part B INT Chart Database. Then, the evaluation of this indicator becomes purely automatic. .
11. The WEND WPI New 02 is an evolution and combination of the former SPI 2, WPI 5 and WPI 15, for a better assessment of the “customer” point of view. Certainly, it implies the implementation of a simple mechanism managed by the Secretariat of the IHO to record customer reports in order to populate a new collaborative IHO database. The development of an optional basic reporting online form, for end users (and HOs, stakeholders, RENCs, etc.), could be considered to facilitate, even automate, the setting up of the file records. The other figures (number of ENC users) can easily be provided by the RENCs as a dataflow process like at present. For this new proposed indicator, no factual report reaching the Secretariat of the IHO in a year, despite the possible increase of ENC usage, would be interpreted as very good outcome for the IHO with respects to the IMO requirements.
12. Former SPI 1, WP 21 and WPI 16, which are not proposed here to be retained for WENDWG activities, could eventually be considered by the Capacity Building Sub-Committee for monitoring Phase 3 developments (nautical charting capability).

### **Conclusions**

13. The seven current SPIs and WPIs, depending on the WENDWG activities in general, have had some good merit to reflect the “ENC” factor in the IHO Work Programme for about five years. Data collection for getting them every year has proven quite difficult though and it is considered that, in the absence of achievable targets, they have not been exploited that much by Coastal States, IHO Member States and RHCs to steer up priorities. Two new compact and basic indicators are proposed to supersede the former ones. It is the view of the IHB that these WPIs should be sufficient and relevant enough, for the consideration of the IHO Council, the IHO Member States and the RHCs to monitor carefully the “ENC” factor at the IHO Work Programme level. Declinations of these IHO performance indicators can be decided easily at regional levels as well and might provide useful information.

### **Recommendations**

14. In his report to the IRCC, it is suggested that the Chair of the WENDWG recommends the implementation of the new indicators, as described in sections 9, 10 and 11, from 2017 as an outcome of the next IH Conference/IHO Assembly, as far as the IHO Strategic Plan is concerned.
15. If agreed at IRCC-8, the WENDWG will provide the IRCC, prior to the next IH Conference/IHO Assembly, with the initial values (in 2017) and possible targets (for 2020) of the two new indicators.

### **Justification and Impacts**

16. Lessons learned from the use of SPI 1 / WPI 21, WPI 5, WPI 15, WPI 16 for five years: need for simplification, efficiency, automatic process.

### **Action Required of WENDWG**

17. The WENDWG is invited to:
  - a. consider the proposals in sections 9, 10, 11, 12,14 and 15;
  - b. take any action as appropriate.