

Seabed 2030 Year 2 Work Plan

Submitted by GEBCO Secretary

SUMMARY

Executive Summary: This document contains the consolidated comments and feedback received from the GGC members, the Secretariats of the IOC and IHO and the Nippon Foundation with respect to the Seabed 2030 Project Year 2 Work Plan

Action to be taken: 3

Related documents: Seabed 2030 Roadmap v10 dated June 2017; Seabed 2030 Business Plan v2.1.6 dated June 2017; GGC35/6/1/1 (*Year 1 report*); GGC35/6/1/2 (*Funding application year 1*); GGC35/6/1/3 (*Year 2 Work Plan*); GGC35/6/1/4 (*Year 2 budget*); Seabed 2030 briefing notes to GGC.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Nippon Foundation-GEBCO Seabed 2030 (Seabed 2030) Project is a Project of the GEBCO Guiding Committee (GGC). The three governing organizations of GEBCO (the Sponsors) – The Nippon Foundation (NF), the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, have given the responsibility of overseeing Seabed 2030 to the GGC.

1.2 Seabed 2030 is managed by the Project Team, which consists of the Seabed 2030 Project Director, the leads of the four Regional Centres and the head of the Global Centre. The Project Team is chaired by the Seabed 2030 Project Director, who is responsible for overseeing of the Regional Centres and the Global Centre as well as the management of the project operations, communications, finance and administration, and outreach and publicity activities.

1.3 As part of the governance of Seabed 2030, the GGC needs to be assured that :

- i. There has been satisfactory progress in the previous year; and
- ii. Proposed direction of work in the following year is in line with the Project mission.

This will be achieved by the GGC considering and endorsing:

- i. The previous year's Annual Report; and
- ii. Next year's Work Plan and Budget.

1.4 Under the Seabed 2030 governance structure, the Seabed 2030 Review Panel is to support the GGC in this assurance process by providing independent reviews of the 2 project documents.

1.5 Seabed 2030 Year 1 ran from 1st February 2018 to 31st July 2018 and Year 2 runs from 1st August 2018 to 31st July 2019. Note: the operational duration of Year 1 was only 6 months as it was preceded by a 6 month Establishment Phase.

1.6 At the Sponsors meeting in London on 10th July 2018, attended by the Sponsors, members of the Establishment team, GGC chair and the Project Director, it was agreed that the GGC should be given the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the 2 project documents before the GGC Meeting 35.

1.7 On 18th September 2018, the GEBCO Secretary circulated to the GGC, the Secretariats of the IOC and IHO, the NF:

- i. Year 1 Annual Report
- ii. Year 2 Work Plan

1.8 In mid-October, the GEBCO Secretary collated the reviews and feedback into 2 GGC documents for discussion and final action at the GGC meeting 35.

1.9 This current document relates to the **Year 2 Work Plan**.

1.10 There is a second document that relates to the Year 1 Annual Report (GGC35/6/1/5)

2. Feedback and Comments

2.1 The collated and consolidated feedback and comments are provided below with a focus on recurrent comments, observations and threads.

2.2 Themes common to the Year 1 Annual Report and Year 2 Work Plan.

The feedback received overwhelmingly contained general themes for both the Year 1 Report and the Work Plan for Year 2:

- i. Recognition that a great deal of progress had been achieved in a relatively short period, particularly in the establishment of the regional centres;
- ii. Both documents were too long and verbose in style with much repeated generalities or superfluous details, which did not add to their understanding or enable an genuine assessment of the project progress to be made;
- iii. The documents need to be more structured and more closely aligned to the stated goals and tasks;
- iv. A overall governance organizational diagram would have aided comprehension of the documents;

- v. A lack of communication outside the small circle of the Project Team was highlighted with some important significant details and information not being provided to a wide enough population;
- vi. Both documents lacked technical, financial and numeric details from which an objective opinion could be formed; and
- vii. The reporting timeline needs to be reviewed to allow proper oversight of activities, future plans and budgets.

2.3 Year 2 Work Plan:

- i. General:
 - a. General view that the GGC does not endorse Year 2 Work Plan in its current format, it is suggested an Addendum is submitted in a briefer format with clear objectives, goals, deliverables and progress milestones to respond to the GGC feedback.
 - b. Proposed Work Plan is considered overambitious, it should be challenging but realistic in relation to goals and deliverables;
 - c. Only one metric is provided (increase coverage from 6% to 9% in 2018 and to 12% in 2019, which is supported) although little detail provided on how this will be achieved;
 - d. Lack of clarity on input from GGC on Year 2 funding application;
 - e. The Work Plan lacks clarity and logical structure with much unrequired detail or too generic proposals;
 - f. Clarification on any predictions or targets for the geographical distribution of the next 6% of data and details on any the plan to spread the processing workload between regional centres if there is a disproportion in data provision;
 - g. It is suggested to increase the focus of fund raising in 2018-2019 with a proper fund raising strategy being developed;
 - h. It is noted that it is extremely important that there is a connection between Seabed 2030 and other global, regional and national ocean policies and programmes, such as the UN Decade of the Ocean, the G7 Charlevoix Blueprint for Healthy Oceans, Seas and Resilient Coastal Communities, the United States, the United States Executive Order on Ocean Policy, and the EU's International Ocean Governance and use these to help justify the need to map world oceans;
 - i. The GEBCO Nippon Foundation Training Programme is important and obviously has a connection to Seabed 2030, particularly through its network of Alumni, but it should not be a key goal in the 2018-2019 Work Plan, this does not seem consistent with road map, business plan and Seabed 2030 priorities;
 - j. Details of the Year 2 budget should be included and explained;
 - k. Suggest that a summary of actions (with time lines and responsible parties) required to support these work goals be included in an appendix;
 - l. Many identified goals were really the tasks or role of the Director and should not I be included; and
 - m. In contrast one reviewed commented that there was good alignment between Work Plan and Seabed 2030 vision, that the plan contained

clear structure with comprehensive coverage of Year 2 intensions, although some tentative concern was expressed on capability to achieve all the targets under interim arrangements, that there may need to be some reassessment.

ii. Data and Management:

- a. 3.1.1 – clarify whether to include new datasets;
- b. 3.1.2 – milestones need to be identified to measure progress and clarify mechanisms to be employed;
- c. 3.1.2 – survey companies will be an important contributor here, they can work on behalf of Seabed 2030 to see if their customers will be willing to share the locations of their data holdings and ultimately contribute those data, even if in the future and at lower resolutions;
- d. 3.1.3 – identify suitable milestones to measure progress towards agreed standards;
- e. 3.1.4 – should be combined with 3.1.2 and clarify processes to be employed, how will these mapping campaigns be funded, hence the reason why fund raising is so important, what happens when all of the existing data is contributed, if no funds have been raised the project will be stalled;
- f. 3.1.5 – questionable whether this should be included and whether it is within the remit of the project;
- g. 3.1.6 – no detail on coordination/cooperation with established initiatives, more focused activity required, it is suggested more focus on partnering with established bodies and initiatives, rather than duplication.
- h. 3.1.8 – lack of detail on actual output and no milestones identified to measure progress;
- i. Strong support for development of data assembly tools, common software and standards across all regional centres; and
- j. Clarification of data flow.

iii. Building Global Community:

- a. 3.2.1 – lack of detail on Master List;
- b. 3.2.2 – remove as this is an identified goal of the GEBCO Project; Need to expand our network outside of mappers and into scientists who use and rely on mapping data.
- c. 3.2.4 – more focused approach required aligned with other developments;
- d. 3.2.5 – communications task which needs more focus and refining;
- e. 3.2.6 – repeat of 3.1.6;
- f. 3.2.7 – similar to 3.2.5 and a communications task, details of potential targets;
- g. 3.2.8 – lacks focus and covered by overall mission, there are some thoughts with respect to communications and partnership strategies, but there is nothing in this or other documents that provides a fundraising strategy and that is a significant omission;

- h. Data contributions are snapshots, it is agreed that significant data contributions should be recognized and a roll of honour on the Seabed 2030 website would be a great way of monitoring and showing progress, however the leading contributor one day may not be the leading contributor the next, therefore communications about contributions should not include rankings, but focus on the contribution and its impact on progress towards the final goal; and
- i. The list of these partners should be included as an appendix to this work plan or the 2017-2018 report; there should be a more challenging and ambitious goal than adding 8 partners in 2018-2019.

iv. Technical and Human Capacity:

- a. 3.3.1 – lack of detail on who and how.
- b. 3.3.2 – technology now available to achieve this, although consideration needs to be given to the legal and regulatory aspects, however Seabed 2030 should not be focused on the development of new technology approaches, but rather create an environment and framework that will naturally support the development of new technology and solutions;
- c. 3.3.3 – lacking detail on who and how, repeat of 3.3.2;
- d. 3.3.5 – lack of detail, overlap with website development, while the website has obviously been expanded and improved, suggest that it needs to be overhauled and refreshed as a priority in 2018-2019; and
- e. Building a Global Community should be a GGC objective as well as Seabed 2030.

v. Corporate Governance:

- a. 3.4.1 – should be standard operational procedure for the functioning of the project;
- b. 3.4.3 – Project Director task on which progress should be included in annual report, promoting fundraising to be a Seabed 2030 priority and developing a fund raising strategy should be done;
- c. 3.4.4 – lack of detail on task or outcome;
- d. 3.4.5 – develop method to measure progress against milestones and deliverables, articulate remedial actions in annual report;
- e. 3.4.6 – should be standard operational procedure for the functioning of the project;
- f. This should go beyond the project team, strongly recommend improved communications with the GGC, the Seabed 2030 project and the Seabed 2030 Director are accountable to the GGC and a once a year meeting is sufficient communications as the GGC can be strong advocates in supporting the goals of the project;
- g. Need for administrative support, this was budgeted and included in the application for Year 1, but never implemented, what is the plan for implementation in Year 2; and
- h. Baselines and targets, what are these and where are they articulated, it is suggested that the work plan includes KPIs with targets.

vi. Risk:

- a. One of the biggest risks is not to focus on raising additional funds, at some point, existing data will be contributed and the project will be stalled because funds have not been raised to map the gaps that remain.

2.4 GGC considerations:

- a. The summary from the collective feedback is that the GGC should endorse the Work Plan once a GGC-approved Addendum that addresses the key issues raised in the feedback is completed and is added to the original Work Plan.
- b. The GGC should consider the feedback summary.
- c. The GGC should consider the submitted Nippon Foundation GEBCO Seabed 2030 Project Year 2 Work Plan Addendum.
- d. The GGC should provide advice to the Project Team on the 5 Changes to be made to the original Work Plan documented in the Work Plan Addendum.

3. Actions

3.1. The GEBCO Guiding Committee is invited to:

- a. **Note** the contents of this report;
- b. **Consider** the items in Section 2.4
- c. **Endorse** the Seabed 2030 Project Year 2 Work Plan on completion of Section 2.4 considerations
- d. **Take** any other Action deemed appropriate.