



PART 2

Identification	Project Number : 3.1.5g
Project Name:	Regional Workshop in Hydrographic Production Database (HPD) combine with SWAtHC.

Financial report				
Contributions by countries involved	Resources			Comments
	Requested	allocated	Spent	
	None	None	None	
Contribution by other parties	None	None	None	
Contribution expected from CBC Fund	E29,000	E32,651.00		Air Tickets US\$ 15,840.80 CARIS Training 8,120.00 PCs Rental 2,655.00 Hotel 16,518.00 Lunch 490.00 Transfer 1,340.00 <u>US\$44,963.80</u>
Total Cost (Euros)	E29,000	E32,651.00	E32,651.00	
From other parties (item and amount)	None	None	None	

Results	Just one text, possible topics listed
	Assessment and Comments
Date of start	September 2nd, 2013
Date of finish	Septemeber 6th, 2013
Changes in scope or focus	None

Results achieved (output, product, etc.)	<p>There were 19 participants from the SEPHC and SWAtHC:</p> <p>02 of SHNA of Argentina 02 of DHN of Brazil 01 of SNHN of Bolivia 01 of DHN of Paraguay 01 of SOHMA of Uruguay 01 of Canal de Panamá of Panama 02 of CIOH of Colombia 02 of INOCAR of Ecuador 02 of SHOA of Chile 04 of DHN of Perú</p> <p>Regional Workshop in Hydrographic Production Database (HPD) was carried out in accordance with the Agenda.</p> <p>It started at 9.00 am to 5.00 pm</p> <p>There were two specialists from Caris who were in charge of developing the subjects of the Agenda according to their capacities and experience.</p> <p>At the end of the first day of the Seminar, the authorities of this DHN took the opportunity to show participants the work of the technical areas (Oceanography, Geomatics, Cartography departments) and its direct implications in the development and maritime safety of our country. History Hall was also visited.</p> <p>There was a very profitable knowledge-sharing among the Hydrographic Services.</p>
Comparison with the Achievements and benefits awaited	<p>The HPD Workshop allowed us to assess the technical knowledge of the Hydrographic Services and their cartography production level using the CARIS HPD software and update some databases.</p> <p>On the other hand, Participants got more knowledge, experience and advice about the creation or implementation of this tool.</p>
Problems experienced	<p>Some of the participating countries have not yet implemented their cartography data base with CARIS HPD.</p>
Suggestion for improvement for similar projects	<p>Some of the participating countries considered that HPD workshop lasts more days to explain and try to solve the problem of the different participating countries.</p>
Suggestion for follow-up projects	<p>With the purpose of exchange experiences, knowledge, problems and solutions; internships among countries with most knowledge in the different modules of CARIS HPD software would be desirable.</p>
Information on the long term effect for Hydrography and the sustainable use	<p>We hope to have a regional hydrographic database that allows access to information to the countries that produce international navigational charts as well as a better quality control of cartographic products to be made.</p>
Valuation	<p>% According to the assessment criteria a) results achieved b) further perspective</p>
General remarks	

For technical visits this form may not be valid. In this case the “THE CONDUCT OF ADVISORY VISITS BY STUDY TEAMS DRAWN FROM MEMBER STATES OF

REGIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSIONS“

can be used, including the following subsections:

- INTRODUCTION
- DESCRIPTION OF MARITIME ACTIVITIES
- OUTLINE S-55 ANALYSIS
- PROPOSALS FOR CO-ORDINATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING
- PROPOSALS FOR ASSISTANCE
- FOLLOW UP ACTION

1. Assessment (by the project leaders/organisers):

The project leader is requested to assess the project itself and future perspectives. Assessment should be carried out according to the table provided by rating each performance indicator on a scale from 0 to 5. Additional comments for more detailed explanation can be added in the table. The Project leader is invited to collect feedback from all other participants of the project if applicable.

Each of the performance indicators indicated in the table is rated according to the scale provided:

a. mainevaluation

- 0 = 0-20% no goals achieved, no result,
- 1 = 20-40% only some goals achieved or goals only achieved in minor parts
- 2 = 40-60% about half of the goals achieved, result is only partially satisfying
- 3 = 60-80% nearly all major goals achieved, result is almost satisfying
- 4 = 80-90% all major goals achieved, result is satisfying
- 5 = 90-100% all goals completely achieved, result is absolutely satisfying, more than expected,

b. rating value to estimate the possible perspective for further projects

- 0 = 0-20% almost no basis for further projects, a general readjustment of co-operation is necessary before starting other projects
- 1 = 20-40% quite poor basis for further projects, readjustment of co-operation seems to be helpful before starting other projects

2 = 40-60% reasonable basis for further projects, but major adjustments are necessary

3 = 60-80% good basis for further projects, but some adjustments may be helpful

4 = 80-90% good basis for further projects

5 = 90-100% very good basis for further projects

	Performance indicator	Mark	Comments
-	Arrangements		
	Organisation of the project	5	
	Involvement(contribution) of		
	National partners	-	
	Regional partners	-	
	RHC	-	
	IHB	5	The CBSC financing was a very important support to join both regional commissions (SEPHC an SWAtHC to carry out and train the members, associate members and observer of both RHC
-	Efficiency of the project		
	Goals achieved	5	
	Planned timing	5	
-	Future perspectives		
	Need of similar project (locally, regionally)	5	
	Impact in future development	5	
-	Procedure of CBC		
	Application form	5	
	Support received	5	
	Follow up and reporting	5	