

2019-07-12

SPRWG Circular letter 04-2019 (by e-mail)

From: Chair, IHO Strategic Plan Review Working Group (c/SPRWG)

To: Members of the IHO Strategic Plan Review Working Group (SPRWG)

Cc: IHO Council's Chair

Subject: Report on draft strategic reviews and preparation for submission to the 3rd meeting of the IHO Council (C-3).

References: a) Council CL 01/2019, dated 28 March 2019

b) SPRWG CL 03-2019, dated 17 June 2019

Enclosure: Annexe – draft IHO strategic plan (version 11th of July 2019) – track change and clean versions

Dear members of the Strategic Plan Review Working Group,

1. This circular letter is to report to you on the changes made to the draft strategic plan (ver. 17-Mar-2019) after taking into account the outcome of the last meetings of HSSC and IRCC, and all your responses to the CL SPRWG 03/2019.

Section “Preamble”

2. No changes have been made to this section, which summarizes what hydrography is, IHO, its vision, mission and object, and the purpose of the strategic plan.

Section “Challenges”

3. This section describes the key elements present in the context of the IHO that are likely to have an impact on its activities. A paragraph has been added, to highlight international initiatives, such as the Decade of Ocean Sciences, as important factors (see § 5 of SPRWG CL 03-2019).

Section “Goals, targets and strategic performance indicators”

General considerations

4. (see § 7 of SPRWG CL 03-2019) – Based on the discussions and contributions, there are 2 options for the choice of SPI in relation to the targets. Basically:

- a) SPIs that are easy to calculate, even if they are not exactly a measure of distance to the target.
- b) SPIs that are more meaningful in relation to the targets, but may require some work to be implemented.

From the experience of the previous strategic plan, option a) is sensible, with however the risk to not reflect adequately IHO progress. The SPRWG Chairman's observation is that the proposed indicators rather follow option b), which is consistent with the ambition of the strategic plan.

For several SPIs, it is proposed that the precise formula of the SPI be not given in the strategic plan, in order to allow some flexibility. It will entail further works to establish these definitions, which could be monitored by the Council.

5. The number of SPIs (15, for 8 strategic targets) is rather high, higher than for the current strategic plan, but this can be considered consistent with the ambition that the strategic plan provides a significant framework for the work programme.

Strategic Goal 1

6. (see §6 of SPRWG CL 03-2019) There is consensus that the wording of the Strategic Goal 1 is ambiguous. To clarify its meaning, which is to point out that, while navigation, as practised by shipping, leisure boats etc. is evolving quite rapidly (draughts, routes, harbours, operating modes etc.), a strategic goal is to evolve, adapt the hydrographic support in depth, for a safe, efficient and environmentally compliant navigation. To keep the wording short, it is proposed to read goal 1 as: **“Evolving the hydrographic support for safety and efficiency of maritime navigation, undergoing profound transformation”**.

7. (see §8 in SPRWG CL 03-2019) – The target 1.1 has been reworded in order to accommodate remark on the absence of a target on coordination for the provision of products and services supporting the safety and efficiency of navigation.

It has been taken into consideration that it is not yet clear how the Coastal States will provide future S-100 “hydrographic information”, as required by the SOLAS convention, and how IHO will play its coordinating role, as provided for by the Convention; this will depend mainly on progress on S-98 and on maturation of the use of S-100. However, it is proposed to include the provision of hydrographic information in target 1.1, to read: **“By 2026, XX% of Member States has operationalized production and distribution of hydrographic products based on S-100 model, under an implementation framework of coordination and agreed timelines”**. Note that XX has yet to be determined.

Outcomes of the on-going work on strategy for S-100, roadmap for S-101 and “WENS” principles, will be key elements of IHO's work programme in this regard.

8. Strategic performance indicators for target 1.1 have been reworded:

- SPI 1.1.1: to be independent from the action of IMO and to take into account HSSC comments;
- SPI 1.1.2: to eliminate any ambiguity and leave the possibility of relying on S-101 ENC's as the source for paper charts;
- SPI 1.1.3: to give a more scope to the role of S-100 in supporting the response to the evolution in shipping needs.

9. The wording of target 1.2 has been slightly modified, to be consistent with the usual classification of IHO documents.

10. Modifications are proposed for SPIs related to the target 1.2:

- SPI 1.2.1: it is proposed to reword this SPI to focus on documentation in support of cyber security, to be more consistent with the target 1.2 by leaving the responsibility for cyber security to HO or organization providing products or services.

- SPI 1.2.2: the level of application of resolution 1/2018 seems to be a reasonable SPI. However as the issue may evolve with the introduction of S-101-based scheming, this PI could be left to the level of the Work Programme.

- SPI 1.2.3: (see § 9.a in SPRWG CL 03-2019). There are mixed views on the limit (50 m or 200 m, with regard to C-55). It was pointed out that a fixed limit, 50 or 200, may be irrelevant as a general criterion to define where to limit the assessment of data quality assessment for safety of surface navigation, and an alternative has been proposed: "For 100 % of charted traffic separation schemes, anchorages, channels and other navigationally significant areas, the adequacy of the hydrographic knowledge is assessed." The "other navigationally significant areas" could encompass ports, areas with unstable seabed ...) This would indeed require some work for the Coastal States, but of the same type as that done to assess the exhaustiveness of ENC coverage through the consideration of a given list of ports.
On the other hand, adopting the fixed depth limit, could be easier for Member States having automated procedures to update C-55. Furthermore, it has been suggested that another SPI could be the percentage of ports, on a selected list, with a complete suite of ENC (approach, costal, etc.).
CATZOC has been proposed as a measure more objective than C-55. I suggest that the strategic plan should not decide how the adequacy is assessed (see above §4).
Finally, it has been suggested that a PI could be the number of MS producing S-101: this could to be left to the level of the work programme.

Strategic Goal 2

- 11.** Slight amendment to the wording of SG 2 has been proposed to eliminate redundancy.

- 12.** (see §9 c. in SPRWG CL 03-2019) – Regarding the target 2.1, the impact of the portal will be difficult to measure. It is proposed to do so on the basis of the amount of data downloaded. It is also suggested that indicators at the level of the Work Programme, could monitor the implementation of the portal, for instance with the number of organizations (MS HO, RHC, others) providing information on MSDI through the IHO GIS.

13. The wording of target 2.2 has been simplified, particularly to avoid naming specific technologies or methods, to handle at the level of the work programme.

14. Regarding the implementation of the related SPI, it was noted that defining “poorly surveyed areas” (at the Work Programme level) would help to focus on those that should be addressed in priority, which could as a consequence help to prioritize the relevant tools and methods. In detail:

- SPI 2.2.1: a different wording of the SPI is proposed “Percentage of adequately surveyed area per coastal state, as reported in C-55”. Using this measure, derived from C-55 addresses several of concerns raised. The C-55 Guidelines (2014) can be used to further assist Member States in breaking down the assessment using maritime activity criteria (e.g. maritime shipping routes, ports and approaches, marine industry) and depth (e.g. <50m, <200m, >200m).

- SPI 2.2.2: the wording proposed by HSSC has been adapted, to capture the fact that the success will also be determined by the variety of applications other than the basic “hydrography for the safety of navigation”.

15. Target 2.3: slight amendment to affirm the purpose of interoperability (means to extend the use of hydrographic data).

16. (see § 9.f in SPRWG CL 03-2019) - The corresponding SPI 2.3.1 has been reworded, to take into account that the shared guiding principles has many dimensions beyond a single class of data or an infrastructure. Restricting the measure to S-1xx data or MSDI may not capture the extent to which these principles can be implemented by an HO.

Two alternates to the initial proposal have been identified:

- a) To assess the level of transposition of the 15 UN-GGIM guiding principles within the IHO system (guidelines, resolutions, etc.);
- b) To count the number of HOs that report success in applying the principles in their national contexts.

The first one would be an indicator on actions undertaken by IHO to support Member States in applying the principles, but may not be sufficient as the application of the principles may depend mainly on national or regional context. It is proposed to adopt the second one¹, probably easier to implement. The measure of actions that IHO could undertake to support Members States in this regard could be left to the level of the Work Programme.

¹ For instance :

- Report the acceptance of principles in practice in the hydrographic community by Member States
- Foster regional/global collaboration based on the principles having been applied
- Develop and adopt standards, resolutions and guidelines when it becomes apparent those are needed
- Develop a library of best practices and success stories that follows from the application of those principles

Strategic Goal 3

17. A rewording is proposed, as “ocean-related” is too general. It could limit to the UN umbrella, which in any case is relevant, but may limit other initiatives. Consequently, proposed rewording: **“Participating actively in international (global or regional) initiatives related to the sustainable use of the Ocean”**.
18. The target 3.1 is devoted to cooperation with other institutions in capacity building. The related SPIs 3.1.1 concerns CB phase 1, seen as the best opportunity for cooperation with other international organizations (e.g. IMO, IALA, regional organizations ...). It is also proposed to use all Coastal States as the basis for the indicator, coherently with the current strategy for capacity building. The proposed rewording is “90% of Coastal States are capable and forward marine safety information (MSI) according to the joint IMO/IHO/WMO manual on MSI”. CBSC has proposed additional PIs, related to CB phase 2 and CB phase 3 which could also be considered at the level of the Work Programme, supporting the CB strategy.
19. The wording of target 3.2 is complex, mixing target and means to achieve it. It is proposed to simplify it to read “Enhance knowledge of the seafloor”, and to leave it to the Work Programme to define ways and means to reach the target.
20. For related SPI (see §9 g. in SPRWG CL 03-2019):
- SPI 3.2.1: increase of data in DCDB seems to be the most consensual and meaningful. The level to be achieved by 2026, or 2023, could be discussed with DCDB, in the framework of Seabed 2030. Please note that depth is not the only parameter required for describing the seafloor.
 - SPI 3.2.2: the results of efforts to engage other communities could be measured by the number of contributions to DCDB from organizations other than hydrographic offices (industry, CSB, SoO, research ...). Actions towards communities like industry, research would be at the level of the Work Programme.
21. The alternative wording proposed for target 3.3 (see §9. H in SPRWG CL 03-2019) raised concern that it would not address the digital as a tool for accessing IHO documents and services. However, I propose to keep a reference to a digital communication strategy, which has already underpinned the on-going refurbishing of the website, but making clear that it covers both IHO notoriety and ease of access to its work. Accordingly, a new wording is proposed, which would leave designation of digital tools to the digital communication strategy mentioned above: **“Implement a comprehensive digital strategy for enhancing IHO visibility and accessibility to its work”**.

22. Regarding the related SPIs:

- SPI 3.3.1: proposed wording has been considered not sufficient to assess the efficiency ... it is proposed to use simple analytics, like the number of followers on the social media implemented by the digital communication strategy.
- SPI 3.3.2: it has been noted that the proposed SPI “IHO web-site gives access to a fully traceable repository of all documents and incorporates GIS services” seems to be already fulfilled. A greater ease of access could be measured by the number of downloads and GIS consultation per year, possibly distinguishing between Member States and others, with a SPI to be read “Gbytes downloaded per year”. In this regard, it is the personal view of the SPRW’s chair that setting up a password system would not facilitate access.

Actions required

23. Chair’s intent is to provide the Secretariat of the IHO with the SPRWG report and the proposal of the draft strategic plan on the **19th of July. These documents will take into account your observations until this date.**

Meanwhile this circular letter and its annexed version of the draft will be posted on the IHO SPRWG webpage, with a link from the C-3 web page.

With my best regards,



Bruno Frachon
c/SPRWG