



# PROPOSALS

## PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 2<sup>nd</sup> SESSION OF THE IHO ASSEMBLY

### LIST OF PROPOSALS (AS 20 DECEMBER 2019)

PROPOSAL No.	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	WORK PROGRAMME
1.1	Interpretation of some articles in Basic Documents of the IHO	IHO Council	1
1.2	Revision of Articles 14, 15, 20 and 25 of the General Regulations of the IHO	IHO Council	1
1.3	Revision of Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO – Hydrographic Interest	IHO Council	1
1.4	Revision of Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO – Hydrographic Interest (Bis) – [Original title: Reconsideration of the definition of what constitutes “an interest in hydrographic matters” or “hydrographic interests”]	Uruguay	1
1.5	Consideration on the Definition of Hydrographic Interests (Ter)	India	1
1.6	Revision of Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council and consequence on Rules 8 and 11 - Timing of Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair	IHO Council	1
1.7	3-year Work Programme and Budget 2021-2023	IHO Council	1
1.8	Revised Strategic Plan	IHO Council	1
1.9	Report on the informal consultation process for the future of S-23	Secretary-General	1
1.10	Establishing an IHO strategy and resolution for gender-inclusive language	Canada & Japan	1
2.1	S-100 Implementation Strategy	IHO Council	2
2.2	Conducting a Risk Assessment on the “Dual Fuel” Mode of ECDIS for S-57 ENC and S-101 ENC, Providing More Specific Guidance on its Implementation	China	2
2.3	Revision of IHO Resolutions following the Introduction of S-100	Republic of Korea	2

2.4	Establishing a joint IHO-Singapore Innovation and Technology Laboratory	Singapore & United States of America	2
3.1	Revision of the IHO Resolution 2/1997 - Establishment of Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHC)	IHO Council	3
3.2	Revision of the IHO Resolution 1/2005 - IHO Response to Disasters	IHO Council	3
3.3	Establishing an IHO e-Learning Center	Republic of Korea	3

## LIST OF MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

The Secretary-General thanks Member States who have shared their respective comments on the Assembly Proposals in advance. In accordance with Resolution 8/1967 as amended the Secretary-General has placed his comments on the technical, administrative and financial implications on relevant Proposals.

In deviation from the previous practice, this Red Book issue does not contain the proposals since this would unnecessarily duplicate the Assembly Proposals coming as separate documents. Instead, links are provided under the respective headline of each proposal.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.1</a>	Interpretation of some articles in Basic Documents of the IHO	IHO Council	1

### **BRAZIL**

Brazil supports this proposal.

### **CANADA**

Canada endorsed the interpretation approved by the IHO Council.

### **DENMARK**

Denmark supports this proposal.

### **FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

### **JAPAN**

Japan supports this proposal.

### **NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports both elements of this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports this proposal

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK supports Council's interpretation on the matter and fully supports the amendments to the General Regulations.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. supports the proposal. This interpretation empowers the Council to streamline basic decision-making of the IHO. This will greatly enhance the Council's effectiveness and ability to respond to operational, practical, and general considerations in a timely manner.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.2</a>	Revision of Articles 14, 15, 20 and 25 of the General Regulations of the IHO	IHO Council	1

**BRAZIL**

Brazil supports this proposal

**CANADA**

Canada endorses the proposed revisions as endorsed by the IHO Council.

**DENMARK**

Denmark supports this proposal

**FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

**JAPAN**

Japan endorses this proposal, with one suggestion for the article 25. Japan would suggest that one of two Directors, who has elected first, should be appointed as Acting Secretary-General for the vacancy of the post.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports this proposal

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports the amendments to Articles 14, 15 and 25 but has reservations with the suitability of certain words in Article 20. The terminology (particularly 'defect' and 'disease') is somewhat archaic but that aside, this particular term would likely infringe the Disability Discrimination Act were the Convention subject to UK law, as there is no provision to make reasonable adjustment(s), in the event someone has a disability. Substituting 'defect or disease' for 'condition' may make it more palatable but it still remains somewhat discriminatory in nature.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE OF MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

In order to address Japan's proposal

*that one of two Directors, who has elected first, should be appointed as Acting Secretary-General for the vacancy of the post.*

As a result of the variation of terms of six or three years of service for Directors under the revised convention, the ascertainment of the Director "who was elected first" is not unambiguous.

In order to address United Kingdom's comment

*on the discriminatory attitude of the wording;*

The Secretariat proposes a revised wording for ARTICLE 20, Clause (c):

Each nomination shall include a medical certificate issued by a duly qualified medical practitioner stating that the candidate presents no apparent symptom likely to interfere with the proper discharge of their duties. In the event that such a certificate cannot be provided the nomination will not be accepted.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.3</a>	Revision of Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO – Hydrographic Interest	IHO Council	1

**CANADA**

Notwithstanding its comments regarding PRO 1.4 and PRO 1.5, Canada concurs with this proposal.

**CHILE**

We would support keeping actual criteria.

**DENMARK**

Denmark supports the proposed revision of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO as presented in Annex A

**FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

**FRANCE**

Revision of Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO - Hydrographic interests

See comments on proposals N° 1.4 and 1.5.

Article 16 of the IHO's General Regulations will have to be revised in line with potential new guidelines to be agreed at the second IHO Assembly, and in particular the follow-up to proposals 1.4 and 1.5 made by Uruguay and India respectively.

**GERMANY**

Germany supports this proposal.

There are many other possible factors to be considered applicable to measure Hydrographic Interest, but it seems to be extremely difficult if not impossible to elaborate an overarching and completely fair formula for that. Taking into account that the tonnage is linked to the financial contributions to the IHO, the proposal provides the best practicable solution.

**ITALY**

Italy generally supports a revision of the definition of “Hydrographic Interest”. A structured analysis should be conducted by the Council appropriately, appointed by the Assembly. A dedicated working group by correspondence could be created with the aim to provide the MSs with a comprehensive analysis of the present criteria and proposals to be presented at A-3.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports the proposed revision of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO as presented in Annex A (red-line version) and B (clean version).

**NORWAY**

Norway agrees to revise the clause of article 16 of the GR as proposed. Norway realizes that the present definition of hydrographic interest is not optimal. Even though Norway will probably drop out of the top 10 on the tonnage list by the next cycle, we assess that a thorough process to come up with a revised definition of hydrographic interest will be challenging and time consuming. Norway would like to reiterate its statement made during C-3 that IHO MS not being a Council member, can attend Council meetings as observers and that their comments and proposals are taken into account as shown during earlier Council meetings. Norway proposes to not pursue the discussion about a revised definition of hydrographic interest any further and in particular does not support to assign additional resources to the development of alternative definitions.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports the proposal from the IHO Council to retain the existing definition of Hydrographic Interests and to amend Clause (c) of Article 16 of General Regulations accordingly.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK notes the significant interest by some IHO Member States to improve the definition of ‘Hydrographic Interest’ away from measurement by national flag state tonnage to a more effective measuring mechanism. Proposals 1.4 and 1.5 both have merits with their proposed systems of measurements and calculations for the definition of ‘Hydrographic Interest’.

The UK believes that Council should be tasked to establish a Working Group to fully assess the proposals and to prepare a draft submission and recommendations to A-3.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE OF MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

Proposal 1.3 aims to remove a specific task from the General Regulations since this document is not considered as the proper document nor the right mechanism to address the Assembly with this item. Since the sentence itself points specifically to the second Assembly, editorial action is required in any case. The proposed removal of this sentence, however, does not preclude the Assembly to consider the subject of the definition of hydrographic interest if Member States wish so (PRO 1.4 and PRO 1.5 refer).

The Secretary-General takes note on the wide range of views expressed by Member States of the appropriateness to revive the discussion about the definition of hydrographic interest undertaken by Strategic Planning Working Group from 2005 to 2006 and recommends to study Chapter 6 /Annex K of the report of the Working Group as well as the related Council document C1-6.3 (both annexed to this document for ease of reading) in preparation of the discussion at the Assembly.

The Secretary-General recommends the installation of an informal Working Group formed by the interested Member States for the draft and submission of a joint proposal to the Council.

The Secretary-General t wishes to highlight that the regular acquisition of information as required for calculation methods such as those proposed by Uruguay and India will place a significant additional administrative burden on all Member States and the Secretariat.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
1.4	Revision of Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO – Hydrographic Interest (Bis) – [Original title: <i>Reconsideration of the definition of what constitutes “an interest in hydrographic matters” or “hydrographic interests”</i> ]	Uruguay	1

## ARGENTINA

ARGENTINA fully supports the proposal made by URUGUAY, with the full conviction that the concept presently in force of hydrographic interest is extremely biased towards the merely nautical or commercial aspect which, in the philosophy of this proposal is a constitutive part of the «DEMAND» of hydrography, and does not consider the efforts of the countries in the «OFFER» of hydrography, which is not limited only to national flag vessels, but also to all international maritime traffic in the waters in which each State has the obligation to provide the public service of nautical safety.

Thus, if a State that does not have a high national fleet tonnage, it does not necessarily have a low «hydrographic interest», since it will also serve the needs of other flags' vessels operating in its jurisdiction.

That is why ARGENTINA considers that it is appropriate to include the concepts of «DEMAND» and «OFFER» in hydrography and that, although the concept of tonnage must be considered, other factors defining the hydrographic effort in relation to the service provided and its benefits must also be considered.

ARGENTINA is aware that many other measuring factors could be used for the «DEMAND» and mainly the hydrographic «OFFER», which is ultimately the main reason for the existence of the Hydrographic Services and, therefore the IHO.

All the factors presented here are easily measurable by international bodies or through official and reliable information. Member States are therefore encouraged to analyze and approve this proposal, or eventually to propose other factors to make the «hydrographic interest» measurement more accurate.

## CANADA

Canada believes that the proposed methodology has some merit but further analysis is required to establish the impact of the new approach on the composition of the Council and any other consequences. As a result, Canada favours no change to Article 16 (beyond the change in PRO 1.3) at this time.

Notes:

1. Canada would like to thank Uruguay for the time and effort in analyzing this complex topic.
2. The analysis does raise some interesting points. For example, the alignment of a hydrographic interest based solely on the criterion of tonnage with the overall objects, mission, and vision of the organization. The nature of this relationship may need further discussion.
3. The methodology explained in Annex B does have some distinct advantages. The data required for the measurement of the “demand” is objective, transparent, and easy to collect. Similarly, the calculations of ENC areas for the “supply” are straightforward. The “assessment” is slightly more subjective.

4. It is suggested that an exercise be undertaken to apply this methodology to all MS and compare the outcome to the current hydrographic interest and assess the impact on the composition of the Council.

## CHILE

We would support keeping actual criteria.

## FRANCE

Revision of Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations of the IHO – Hydrographic Interest (Bis) – [Original title: Reconsideration of the definition of what constitutes “an interest in hydrographic matters” or “hydrographic interests”] - Uruguay

France supports Uruguay's proposal to reconsider the definition of what constitutes "an interest in hydrographic matters" or "hydrographic interests".

This proposal is a continuation of the current definition using the criterion of tonnage, supplemented by the volume of maritime trade of the Member States in order to provide a refined assessment of the "demand" for hydrographic services. The consideration of the "offer" in hydrographic services through published ENCs as well as the stages of development of hydrographic capacity (as assessed through CBSC procedure 11) rightly complement the measurement of "demand" to provide a finer and more accurate measure of "hydrographic interests". ».

The proposed calculation method appears sufficiently simple and is based on quantified and easily accessible elements, which might allow an operational and unambiguous implementation of this new definition.

This proposal, which would constitute a significant improvement in comparison with the current definition based solely on fleet tonnage, could possibly be improved by taking into account the contribution of Member States to capacity building, along the lines of item 7 "Capacity building" of proposal 1.5 submitted by India, through a simplified assessment of this contribution.

## ITALY

Italy generally supports a revision of definition of “Hydrographic Interest”.

## JAPAN

Japan considers not to spend too much time for discussing the definition of the election of the Council members themselves, as the important thing is how to facilitate and stimulate discussion in the Council. Japan believes that we should focus on creating structure to facilitate decision-making, such as encouraging participation of the Member States as observers in the Council.

**NORWAY**

Norway recognizes the proposal as a serious attempt to improve the current definition of hydrographic interest but does not support it for further consideration. Since flag tonnage defines IHO member state annual contribution, flag tonnage is not only a measurement for the demand of hydrography but also a measurement for the amount of the respective fiscal support of international cooperation in hydrography by means of the functioning of the IHO. Norway refers to our comments made to proposal 1.3

**SPAIN**

Spain supports this proposal.

There is an error in the "Measurement of the OFFER of Hydrography" section: Where it says (4 plus 4 plus 4 equals 64) it should read (4 times 4 times 4 equals 64)

**SWEDEN**

Sweden would like to thank Uruguay, Argentina and Brazil for the proposal on the definition of Hydrographic Interests. However, Sweden is of the opinion that the proposal is too complex and would lead to prolonged debate without any prospects of reaching consensus. Sweden therefore supports the proposal PRO-1.3 from the IHO Council, to retain the existing definition of Hydrographic Interests.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK notes the significant interest by some IHO Member States to improve the definition of 'Hydrographic Interest' away from measurement by national flag state tonnage to a more effective measuring mechanism. Proposals 1.4 and 1.5 both have merits with their proposed systems of measurements and calculations for the definition of 'Hydrographic Interest'.

The UK believes that Council should be tasked to establish a Working Group to fully assess the proposals and to prepare a draft submission and recommendations to A-3.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. believes improvements in the definition of Hydrographic Interest, as applied to Council membership would be beneficial. Both proposals have merit and have not yet been reconciled. We acknowledge resolving this definition will take some effort, but the long term balance of Council representation will improve IHO operations into the foreseeable future. We are willing to participate should the MS feel progress can be made to resolve the challenge.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.5</a>	Consideration on the Definition of Hydrographic Interests (Ter)	India	1

### ARGENTINA

ARGENTINA welcomes the proposal of «hydrographic interest» submitted by INDIA. Such proposal is consistent with the philosophy of hydrographic «DEMAND» and «OFFER» of Proposal 1.4, although it does not express it in those terms, materializing the «DEMAND» in terms of cartographic sales and enabling the other factors to be assigned to the hydrographic «OFFER».

Although many of the values apparently can be obtained based on a YES/NO option (example item 1. HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES, or 3. NAUTICAL SAFETY), the others (2. 4. and 5.) are presented as proportions in which the denominators are not defined, that is why it is not easy to test their implementation.

It definitely brings new perspectives that could help in generating an improved (though more complex) definition of «hydrographic interest».

### CANADA

Notes:

1. CA would like to thank India, as well, for examining the topic of hydrographic interest and presenting its original ideas.
2. As with the previous proposal, CA would like to see more analysis of the proposed methodology to understand its impacts.
3. A side-by-side comparison of the outcomes two approaches would be useful.

### CHILE

We would support keeping actual criteria.

### FRANCE

While pursuing an objective similar to the Uruguayan proposal (PRO 1.4) for a more accurate definition of "hydrographic interests", the Indian proposal appears, however, more complex to implement, with some criteria that are more complex to quantify.

The inclusion of the contribution of Member States to capacity building (item 7 of the proposal) would provide a further refinement to the assessment of interest in hydrographic issues. Subject to a sufficiently simple and objective method of calculation, this approach could be used to complement proposal 1.4.

**ITALY**

Italy generally supports a revision of definition of “Hydrographic Interest”.

**JAPAN**

Japan considers not to spend too much time discussing the definition of the election of the Council members themselves, as the important thing is how to facilitate and stimulate discussion in the Council. Japan believes that we should focus on creating structure to facilitate decision-making, such as encouraging participation of the Member States as observers in the Council

**NORWAY**

Norway recognizes the proposal as a serious attempt to improve the current definition of hydrographic interest but does not support it for further consideration. Norway refers to our comments made at proposal 1.4 and 1.3.

**SPAIN**

Proposal too complex, especially in the evaluation of the weight of each concept that is part of the Hydrographic Interest. Such a detailed distribution of weights in each concept would introduce a lot of controversy among Member States. Spain is committed to a simpler solution.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden would like to thank India for the proposal on the definition of Hydrographic Interests. However, Sweden is of the opinion that the proposal is too complex and would lead to prolonged debate without any prospects of reaching consensus. Sweden therefor supports the proposal PRO-1.3 from the IHO Council, to retain the existing definition of Hydrographic Interests.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK notes the significant interest by some IHO Member States to improve the definition of ‘Hydrographic Interest’ away from measurement by national flag state tonnage to a more effective measuring mechanism. Proposals 1.4 and 1.5 both have merits with their proposed systems of measurements and calculations for the definition of ‘Hydrographic Interest’.

The UK believes that Council should be tasked to establish a Working Group to fully assess the proposals and to prepare a draft submission and recommendations to A-3.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. believes improvements in the definition of Hydrographic Interest, as applied to Council membership would be beneficial. Both proposals have merit and have not yet been reconciled. We acknowledge resolving this definition will take some effort, but the long term balance of Council representation will improve IHO operations into the foreseeable future. We are willing to participate should the MS feel progress can be made to resolve the challenge.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.6</a>	Revision of Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council and consequence on Rules 8 and 11 - Timing of Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair	IHO Council	1

**BRAZIL**

Brazil supports this proposal

**CANADA**

Canada supports the proposed revisions to the Rules of Procedure for the IHO Council (Articles 8, 11, and 12) as endorsed by the Council.

**DENMARK**

Denmark supports this proposal.

**FRANCE**

Rule 12 could be supplemented in this way in order to emphasize the importance of electing the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council before the first meeting of the Council:

Proposed wording for consideration by the Member States:

« REGLE 12

- (a) Members shall elect the Chair and Vice-Chair ~~during their first meeting~~ by correspondence as soon as is practicable after each ordinary session of the Assembly.

Drafting proposal submitted by France (addition in blue & bold):

« RULE 12

- (a) Members shall elect the Chair and Vice-Chair ~~during their first meeting~~ by correspondence as soon as is practicable after each ordinary session of the Assembly, **and before the first meeting of the Council newly established by the Assembly**".

**JAPAN**

Japan generally supports this proposal, with two suggestions of the amendments.

- Although actions in the case of a vacancy arising in the position of Vice-Chair are stated in the proposed Rule12 (f), those for the Chair are not stated.
- The Rule 8(b) does not need to be deleted as the Vice-Chair may be elected in the meeting of the Council according to the proposed Rule12 (f).

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports this proposal

**SPAIN**

Item (e) of the Annexes is repeated

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports the proposed revision of Articles 8, 11 and 12 of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. supports this change. Establishing leadership positions prior to the meeting will enhance the preparations and allow the Council to function efficiently.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE TO MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

In order to address Japan`s comments the Secretary-General proposes to retain RULE 8, Clause (b) with a minor amendment:

- (b) election of the Chair and Vice-Chair, when necessary in accordance with RULE 12 (f) of these Rules of Procedure;

and, consequently, amend RULE 12, Clause (f) as follows:

- (f) In the case of a vacancy arising in the position of the **Chair or** Vice-Chair during the inter-sessional period, an election shall take place during the next meeting of the Council. The nominations for the position shall be closed ten weeks before the opening day of the meeting of the Council and the Secretary-General shall submit the list of nominees to the Council Members together with the supporting documents for the meeting at least two months prior to the opening day of the meeting.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.7</a>	3-year Work Programme and Budget 2021-2023	IHO Council	1

### ARGENTINA

Regarding the three-year budget presented, ARGENTINA is concerned about the impact of the proposed abrupt and progressive reduction of the Capacity Building Fund (125K/ 85K/65K) on the CBSC activities.

More specifically, how will this reduction affect the achievement of objectives 1.3 and 3.1 presented in the Strategic Plan of Proposal 1.8, and in item 6 of Annex A of Proposal 2.1) Capacity Building of the Hydrographic Services. Transition in ENC production in S-101 and S-1xx services).

In accordance with item 6 of this proposal, the possibility of implementing an increase higher than 1% suggested by the Council would be, in our opinion, an acceptable alternative in order to avoid the decrease of the Capacity Building Fund and to enable the achievement of the aforementioned objectives, which we consider fundamental for the next three years.

### BRAZIL

Brazil supports this proposal

### CANADA

Canada generally supports the endorsement by the Council, however, it will take more time to thoroughly review the Work Programme and Budget and bring any subsequent comments to the Assembly.

### CHILE

We do not support the initiative to increase by 1% the annual contribution. We are of the idea that operational cost should be lowered by adopting actions as for example;

- a) Why to consider attending annual ATCM if there is no reciprocity. Secretary General did not agree to invite this organization as an Observer to the IHO Assembly, why to attend their meetings? (TASK 1.1.2)
- b) What's the IHO benefit in attending GEO annual meetings? (TASK 1.1.5)
- c) Why the attendance of the HSSC Chair is paid by the IHO to attend the Council meetings? (TASK 2.1.3)
- d) Why the attendance of the IRCC Chair is paid by the IHO to attend the Council meetings? (TASK 3.1.2)
- e) Is it necessary that a Director attends each and all RHCs meetings and occasionally accompanied by an Assistant Director?

- f) Support of 10.000 euros annually is anticipated for reviewing and updating S-5 and S-8 publications  
Why this support is not being considered for other publications as well?
- g) Payments made by MSs with recognized courses to IHO are not reflected in the budget. Is there any special reason for this?
- h) Contribution by Monaco Government to the GEBCO Programme is not reflected in the budget. Is there any special reason for this? Or is no longer provided?

**FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

Finland support the proposed IHO Work Programme and Budget for 2021-2023 and agree that Assembly mandate Council to increase value of IHO share annually by 1% from 2021 to 2023, if necessary.

**ITALY**

IT agrees on the 3-year Work Programme.

On the Budget 2021-2023, as possible result of the Action C3/45 and desirable enlargement of the IHO MS, thanks to the "CONVENTION on the IHO as amended by the PROTOCOL dated 14 April 2005 that entered into force on 8 November 2016", IT suggests to devote any surplus of budget coming from the general increase of x% per year of MS' contribution share from 2021 until 2023 and from the join of new MS, to increase the following two Budget Chapters:

- Special Project Fund
- Capacity Building.

**JAPAN**

On the Income side, Japan expects that the financial contribution to the IHO will be increased by increasing number of Member States.

On the Expenditure side, Japan understands the increasing personnel expense mainly caused by a significant increase in staff health insurance costs is unavoidable, however, Japan expects IHO to make continuous efforts for saving expenses by improving work efficiency and so on.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands support all three elements of this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway approves the 3-year work program based on the Strategic Plan in force. Norway approves the 3-year budget estimates. Norway approves the option of a consecutive annual increase of 1% of the Member States contribution share from 2021 to 2023 subject to the annual approval by C-4, C-5 and C-6 as part of the approval process of the annual budget

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK supports the endorsement of the 3-year work programme and 3-year budget estimates but has reservations about the Council's ability to complete all elements under work programme 3.3 in light of the decreasing budget allocation to Capacity Building. Any increase in Member States contributions should be allocated for specific purposes e.g. Capacity Building.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. supports the work program and commends the IHO Secretariat for thorough program preparation. The U.S. looks forward to further alignment of the work programme, performance measures, and communications with the Strategic Plan.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S RESPONSE TO MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

In order to address Chile's comments the Secretary-General provides the following clarification:

- a) *Why to consider attending annual ATCM if there is no reciprocity. Secretary General did not agree to invite this organization as an Observer to the IHO Assembly, why to attend their meetings? (TASK 1.1.2)*

The specific resources for travel costs as provided under the respective column of the three-years work programme can indeed be misinterpreted since they suggest regular participation on all events listed. Attendance of Secretariat's staff at events outside Monaco enjoy a special focus in the Secretariat's operations in terms of their consumption of time, personnel and budget resources. The Secretary-General considers direct participation very carefully and always in view of the needs derived from the strategic work plan and the concrete tasks at hand. The annual list of IHO Secretariat Travel (Annex C of the Annual Report) indicates that the Secretariat did not participate in all meetings listed in the Work Programme. This is in particular true for those listed by Chile. The exemption was the annual Meeting of ATCM 2019 in Prague, Czech Republic. The annual meeting of the Hydrographic Commission of Antarctica was purposely planned back to back with this Conference since the IHO was invited to give a seminar on the status of hydrographic activities in Antarctic waters. Thanks to the contributions of the National Hydrographers of Chile and United Kingdom this Seminar was regarded as very informative by the Conference participants and helped to renew liaison with various research and commercial bodies acting in the region.

- b) *What's the IHO benefit in attending GEO annual meetings? (TASK 1.1.5)*

GEO is coordinating efforts to build a Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) in order to exploit the growing potential of Earth observations to support decision making in an increasingly complex and environmentally stressed world. In that respect, it is considered that maintained relationships with the Group on Earth Observation (GEO) could be beneficial for global IHO activities in particular for GEBCO and MSDI. However, the attendance by the Secretariat or representation of the IHO by a Member State at the GEO meetings has always been decided on a case by case basis, considering the relevance of GEO's agenda. There was no attendance from

the Secretariat to GEO annual meetings in 2018 and 2019. So far no attendance is planned for 2020.

- c) *Why the attendance of the HSSC Chair is paid by the IHO to attend the Council meetings? (TASK 2.1.3)*

The potential coverage of costs for the participation of the HSSC and IRCC Chairs is made as preservation for a situation that one of those Chairs might not be part of the respective Member State's delegation of the Council. So far this has not been the case and no payment has been made. The potential of reimbursement of travel costs was regarded as minor compensation of the enormous in kind contribution of the respective Member State made through appointment of the Chairs for continued involvement in IHO issues during their tenure as Chair in parallel to their domestic duties.

- d) *Why the attendance of the IRCC Chair is paid by the IHO to attend the Council meetings? (TASK 3.1.2)*

See comments for c) above.

- e) *Is it necessary that a Director attends each and all RHCs meetings and occasionally accompanied by an Assistant Director?*

It is the view of the Secretary-General that personal attendance at RHC meetings is well received by the various Commissions and Member States since it supports numerous aspects of IHO's strategic work plan and helps to keep the Members and Associate Members of the Commissions well informed about the ongoing activities in all three IHO Work Programmes.

Participation of an accompanying Assistant Director happened in selected cases only to serve in additional functions (e.g. Secretary for HCA), to help for Council preparations (ARHC 8) or to facilitate back to back Capacity Building Workshops in particular for the RHC meetings which have high level of participation (e.g. EAthC, MACHC, SWPHC).

- f) *Support of 10.000 euros annually is anticipated for reviewing and updating S-5 and S-8 publications. Why is this support not being considered for other publications as well?*

The Standards of Competence for Surveyors and Cartographers (S-5 and S-8) are jointly maintained with experts nominated by FIG and ICA. Since both Organizations cannot provide in kind contribution for genuine IHO Standards, coverage of travel expenses for the Chairs of the affected working groups is the established practice.

- g) *Payments made by MSs with recognized courses to IHO are not reflected in the budget. Is there any special reason for this?*

National education and training institutions accredited for the conduct of recognized courses on the basis of S-5 and S-8 are obliged to pay a fee to maintain the functioning of the International Board Standards of Competence for Surveyors and Cartographers (IBSC) to allow the board members to conduct on-site visits to ensure the quality of the program. The IHO Secretariat manages the account on behalf of the three parent organizations but has no authority about the earning and spending which solely lies with the IBSC. This account is therefore not considered as part of the IHO budget.

- h) *Contribution by Monaco Government to the GEBCO Programme is not reflected in the budget. Is there any special reason for this? Or is no longer provided?*

The contribution by Monaco Government to the GEBCO Programme is reflected in Chapter V of the 3-Years Budget under Allocation to Funds – GEBCO Fund = 8.200 Euro. It should be noted that this voluntary contribution of the Monaco Government is not guaranteed and is subject to annual confirmation by the benefactor.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.8</a>	Revised Strategic Plan	IHO Council	1

### ARGENTINA

The Strategic Plan presented by the Council is clear, concise and has clear objectives and goals. In turn, the Strategic Performance Indicators are generally simple and easily calculable.

We do not see the consistency between SPI 1.1.1, which requires that 100% of the MS must have operationalized products and services S-100 by 2026 and 1.3.1, which requires a 50% capacity of MS to meet the requirements and implementation stages of the S-100 implementation plan.

On another hand, the use of capacity building and training to achieve targets 1.3 and 3.1 is made difficult by the fact that the CBF will be reduced so dramatically over the next 3 years.

### BRAZIL

Brazil supports this proposal.

Brazil would like to emphasize that SPIs should follow ISO 9001 Key Performance Indicators principles and, therefore, always be measurable

### CANADA

Canada supports the recommendations of the Council to the Assembly with respect to the Revised Strategic Plan.

Notes:

1. Suggest removing "STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE INDICATORS" from the heading of Section III of the draft Strategic Plan document. It is noted later in that section that the SPIs are listed in the Annex of the document.
2. Is it correct to assume that some of the SPIs listed in the Annex may change slightly subject to the proposed further work of the SPRWG?
3. Canada wishes to acknowledge and thank Mr. Bruno Frachon (FR) for his diligence, hard work, and leadership of the SPRWG.

### DENMARK

Denmark acknowledge the work of the SPRWG to develop the new Strategic Plan for 2021-2026.

The strategic plan will be an important tool to enable IHO and the MS to priorities their efforts in a forward looking perspective.

**FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

**FRANCE**

France questions the formulation of the Strategic Performance Indicator (SPI) 2.1.1 «Number of hits downloading data/information from the portal" which might suggest that Target 2.1 aims to develop a data access portal, whereas it refers to the building of a "portal to support and promote regional and international cooperation in marine spatial data infrastructures (MSDI)". The portal should be limited to a promotional function in MSDI, with access to data/information being provided in a privileged manner through a distributed architecture based on national maritime spatial data infrastructures, such as the EMODNET portal.

**ITALY**

Italy actively participated in the drafting of the RSP and fully supports the structure and content.

**JAPAN**

Japan continues to support this proposal.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands support all four elements of this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway (member of Council and SPRWG) approves the revised strategic plan and approves the amended ToRs and RoPs for the SPRWG.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports the revised strategic plan proposal. In support of the IHO Secretariat, the UK has volunteered its assistance to help align Work Plan 2021-2023 to the Strategic Plan.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. commends the leadership of France, Japan, and Canada and the work of the SPRWG team in developing revisions to the IHO Strategic Plan. The resulting Council-endorsed plan is concise, action-oriented, and inclusive of the stakeholder interests. The plan orients the IHO with global, regional, national and local needs as we begin the important decade of the 2020s.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.9</a>	Report on the informal consultation process for the future of S-23	Secretary-General	1

## CANADA

Canada supports all of the recommendations put forth by the Secretary-General as positive and rational steps forward.

## FRANCE

France notes that no consensus has been reached on the revision of S-23, and recalls\* its wish to have an updated version of this technical publication on the limits of the seas and oceans.

\* See XVIIIth International Hydrographic Conference, Proceedings / Volume 1, p. 128.

France thus supports PRO 1.9.1 aimed at providing the digital coordinates of the limits of the oceans and seas, thus meeting the requirements of modern geographical information systems, both to meet the internal needs of Hydrographic Offices and more generally for the benefit of all.

Such a provision will thus fill the gap left by the fact that S-23 has not been updated for almost 70 years, a gap filled by various initiatives (such as marineregions.org), which has adversely affected the Organization's visibility.

France will support the development of a dataset entitled "Polygonal demarcation of Global Sea Areas" to designate geographical sea areas through a system of unique numerical identifiers (first paragraph of PRO 1.9.2).

The new S-130 dataset (2nd paragraph of PRO 1.9.2) should be established in the most pragmatic way possible in relation to the objectives pursued in order not to further delay the provision of the "Polygonal demarcation of Global Sea Areas".

The basic guidelines for the allocation and display of sea area attributes to be applied to geographic information systems (PRO 1.9.3) should be developed in a consensual and pragmatic manner, based on technical considerations.

## ITALY

Italy generally considers the opportunity of modernization of the provision of geographic limits to the global seabed.

## JAPAN

Japan appreciates the Secretary-General's efforts to advance the Informal Consultation Process for the Future of S-23. Japan understands the intention of the Secretary-General's proposal to provide digital coordinates for limits of oceans and seas in order to make hydrographic contents fit for purpose in light of modern digitalized information needs.

On such basic understanding, we are prepared to work cooperatively and constructively with the IHO Secretariat and Member States and focus our work on IHO's core objectives and technical missions in the digital era.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports the proposal in general and would like to highlight the appropriateness of establishing a digital technical solution of polygonal demarcations of global sea areas.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

The Republic of Korea supports, in principle, the proposals submitted by the Secretary-General, which are the outcome of the informal consultation process for the future of S-23 drawn up under the stewardship of the Secretary-General. The Republic of Korea also notes that S-23 is outdated that it is no longer suitable to serve as a valid standard for modern hydrography both in terms of substance and form, as elaborated within Annex A of the report. The dataset proposed by the Secretary-General, S-130, will likely foster the provision of standardized coordinates of the limits of oceans and seas in a digital format. This new IHO standard will be much more effective in meeting user requirements in the increasingly digitalized geospatial information environment of the 21st century. Such an IHO standard is anticipated to ensure that hydrographic information is universally accessible and compatible with other global geospatial data.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. supports the proposal and the development of the dataset of "Polygonal demarcations of global sea areas." Updating and establishing common locations, boundaries and regions that can be utilized within modern navigation and Geographic Information Systems will benefit the global community. We look forward to assisting on this effort should Member States reach consensus on the way forward.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">1.10</a>	Establishing an IHO strategy and resolution for gender-inclusive language	Canada & Japan	1

## BRAZIL

Brazil congratulates Canada and Japan for submitting this proposal, supports a new IHO Resolution regarding gender-inclusive language and would like to present some suggestions to the proposed IHO Resolution as showed below.

Observation: In red to remove and in blue to add.

GENDER-INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE TO BE USED IN IHO DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS	x/2020	IHO A-2	
--	--------	---------	--

1) Given that language plays an important role in shaping cultural and social attitudes, it is resolved that **the Secretariat of the all IHO and the organs of the IHO** must ensure that the language used in IHO documents and communications issued or amended **after the 2nd Meeting Session of the IHO Assembly** will be gender inclusive **as per the UN Guidelines on Gender-inclusive Language** (<https://www.un.org/en/gender-inclusive-language/>).

2) Documents produced prior to the approval of this resolution will be updated at the earliest possible opportunity and, preferably, in conjunction with other content editing or revision.

**3) The approval of documents amended solely to address gender language issues is delegated to the IHO Council by the IHO Assembly.**

**4) Documents amended for any other reason will follow the approval process that is appropriate for that particular document.**

Brazil suggests the following requests for decision of the Assembly, instead of the second element of this proposal:

- to task HSSC and IRCC to include the revision of Publications under its remit in its Work Plan, adopting the UN Guidelines on Gender-inclusive Language.

- to task the Council to conduct a comprehensive review of the IHO Basic Documents, adopting the UN Guidelines on Gender-inclusive Language, and to provide draft revised IHO Basic Documents for the consideration of the Assembly at the next ordinary session (A-3).

- to task the Secretary-General to draft revised IHO Resolutions 2/2004 and 6/2009 as amended and to submit it to the forth meeting of the Council (C-4).

- to task the Council to monitor the IHO's progress towards the implementation of the UN Guidelines on Gender-inclusive Language to all IHO documentation and communications and report to the Assembly at the next ordinary session (A-3).

## CANADA

Canada supports this proposal.

**CHILE**

We support proposal in a) but we do not support text in letter b) of the Proposal, as this new activity which is not associated to the mission nor the objectives of the IHO will generate a new workload for the development and monitoring of what might be developed.

**DENMARK**

Denmark supports this proposal

**FINLAND**

Finland is in favor of the proposal.

**FRANCE**

France supports the general objective of gender-neutral IHO documentation and communication.

As the French language does not have a gender-neutral grammar, the extent of the task of updating existing documentation in accordance with the United Nations guidelines on inclusive language should not be overlooked.

In accordance with the United Nations Guidelines on Inclusive Language (<https://www.un.org/fr/gender-inclusive-language/guidelines.shtml>, Point 2.4), the typographical strategies of using slashes, parentheses, or the middle point to combine the use of the feminine and masculine, complicating the reading and understanding of texts, should be avoided.

**GERMANY**

Germany supports this proposal.

**ITALY**

Italy supports the proposal as a sign of non-discrimination against a particular sex, social gender or gender identity, and to promote gender equality and eradicate gender bias.

Italy also supports the proposed draft Resolution annexed to PRO 1.10, in order to underline the IHO's commitment to ensuring that gender- inclusive language is used in all its documentation and communication.

**JAPAN**

Japan expects that the Assembly approves this proposal.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands support both elements of this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports the proposal

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports the proposal

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports the Proposal for a new IHO Resolution regarding gender-inclusive language and to task Council to develop an implementation strategy.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. commends the delegations from Canada and Japan for making their joint proposal to establish an IHO Strategy and Resolution for Gender-inclusive language. The U.S. endorses the IHO resolution that requires gender-neutral language in IHO documentation and communication. The U.S. is prepared to assist the Council with efforts to develop an implementation strategy.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE TO MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

The Secretary-General seeks for advice how bilingual countries such as Canada deal with this transition to Gender-inclusive language in French language. On this basis the Secretary-General would be in the position to monitor the implementation of the Resolution for those documents listed in Annex B of PRO 1.10.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">2.1</a>	S-100 Implementation Strategy	IHO Council	2

**ARGENTINA**

Once again, there is a need, in accordance with item 6 of this proposal, to seek ways to increase the CBF in order to meet the training needs of the Member States so that they can meet in a timely manner the proposed timetable for the S-100 implementation strategy.

**BRAZIL**

Brazil supports this proposal in order to ensure the engagement of stakeholders.

**CANADA**

Canada supports this proposal as endorsed by the Council.

Notes:

1. Within the context of Section 3 *Coordinated implementation of services*, CA believes that RHCs have a major role to play in the coordinated roll-out of S-100 products and services. If there is agreement regarding the role of the RHCs, it is suggested that a statement to that effect be added to this section.

*Suggested text: RHCs should consider taking a coordinated approach to the roll-out of S-100 products and services to ensure that there continuous coverage within their region. This is particularly critical for the introduction of S-101 ENC.*

**DENMARK**

Denmark supports this proposal.

**FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

**FRANCE**

France recalls its comments made at the 3rd Council meeting ( item 3.6A of C3) and calls for a transitional period during which the double availability of ENCs in S-57 and S-101 formats must be ensured, as short as possible, in order to limit the burden on producer services.

For clarification, France wishes to ensure that with the S-101 switch, there will no longer be a SENC service, which will allow producers and RENCs to take responsibility for the integrity of the ENC up to the final customer.

**ITALY**

Italy supports the proposal, underlining the importance of establishing a solid cooperation with all the Stakeholders involved in the Implementation Strategy. This will allow a smooth, phased and coordinated transition to S-100 and its Product Specifications, first of all from S57 ENC's to S-101 ENC's.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands support both elements of this Proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway approves the "S-100 roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade" endorsed by the Council as presented in Annex A of PRO 2.1.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The principles of S-100 strategy are supported but the technical challenges of implementation for hydrographic offices, industry and vendors should not be underestimated. The UK would be grateful for reassurance of testing of "Dual Fuel" system standards.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. supports the proposal and looks forward to establishing the 2020's as an "implementation decade" for progressing the S-100 framework. The success of this effort will depend on broad capacity building and technology development.

The U.S. supports tasking the Council to maintain the roadmap with annual updates, with the Chairs of the Council, IRCC, HSSC and the IHO SG. The proposal ensures all aspects of the roadmap will be managed at the IHO's highest levels and in line with the strategic objectives of the organization. The approach offered by the Council tackles the important but ambitious goals of realizing the S-100 hydrographic model that will underpin the future relevance and value of the IHO in a new digital age.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE TO MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

The Secretary-General is pleased to share the following observations:

To address Argentina's comments regarding the desired

*increase the CBF in order to meet the training needs of the Member States:*

The portion of the IHO Budget designated to Capacity Building is not of an amount and never has been to cover costs of training. The allocated resources are limited to cover costs for visits to undertake technical assessments of existing capacity and resulting needs of prospective or new IHO Member States as well as to fund the participation of IHO Member States and Non-Member States on regional workshops. Once costs of training courses have been covered with IHO money in previous years this has been paid from the surplus generated with savings from other IHO Budget allocations.

To address comments on the “Dual Fuel” arrangements:

The operation of an ECDIS in a multi fuel environment is not a completely new challenge. Throughout the full first decade of the 2000nds many ECDIS maintained the mixed presentation of a combination of S-57 ENC, Raster Charts (ARCS) and private vector charts in various formats.

To report the newest developments on S-100 implementation issues:

At its 7<sup>th</sup> Session in January 2020 the IMO Sub-Committee NCSR considered the report from IHO (NCSR 7/22/5) presenting a status of IHO's ECDIS-related standards and a roadmap for the introduction of the next generation of S-101 Electronic navigational charts (ENC); explaining the resulting implications for existing and new ECDIS installations; and proposing consideration of amendments to resolution MSC.232(82) on Revised Performance Standards for Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems (ECDIS) to include references to the S-100 framework and the Product Specification S-101 based on, with regard to ECDIS equipment installed on or after 1 January 2024. The Sub-Committee acknowledged the ongoing efforts of IHO to develop and test S-100 based data product specifications, as well as the proposed introduction of IHO's S-101 ENCs as a transfer standard for official charts in ECDIS. NCSR 7 agreed that the amendments to resolution MSC.232(82) should be considered at the 8<sup>th</sup> session of NCSR in 2021 under the existing output on the Committee's post-biennial agenda on "Revision of ECDIS Guidance for good practice (MSC.1/Circ.1503/Rev.1)" and, in this respect will invite MSC at its next session (MSC 102) to expand this output to include consideration of amendments to resolution MSC.232(82). MSC 102 will take place at London Headquarters from 13<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2020.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">2.2</a>	Conducting a Risk Assessment on the “Dual Fuel” Mode of ECDIS for S-57 ENCs and S-101 ENCs, Providing More Specific Guidance on its Implementation	China	2

## CANADA

### Notes:

1. Canada agrees that the IHO should continue its S-100 development work with all stakeholders to ensure a smooth and viable transition to S-101 ENCs.
2. Continuous evaluations of new developments is required to identify potential issues (or risks).
3. The IHO Innovation and Technology Laboratory proposed by Singapore could be an important resource for testing and evaluating new developments, both individually and within the system environment.

## DENMARK

Denmark supports this proposal.

## ITALY

Italy considers CHINA’s proposal useful for a smooth and fluid transition from S-57 ENCs to S-101 ENCs, in line with the S-100 Implementation Decade.

## NORWAY

Many HO's understandably worry about S-100 implementation and the implications of the parallel provision of S-57 and S-101 ENC as well as additional S-100 based data service provision. Any activity that can shed more clarity on S-100 implementation timelines, the synchronization with IMO’s ECDIS Performance Standards and ECDIS carriage requirements should be embraced. Strong liaison with affected partners including but not limited to IEC and CIRM as well as thorough testing before regular provision of services should be established. Therefore Norway is supportive of this proposal and hopes that the proposed Joint IHO-Singapore Innovation and Technology Lab can pave the way here.

## UNITED KINGDOM

The UK supports the principle of the Proposal but would like more clarity on how the IHO proposes to conduct the risk assessment, however, the UK stands ready to assist with implementation of the “Dual Fuel” mode and would wish to assist with the development of risk mitigation strategies. Furthermore, the UK believes that industry should be engaged as early as possible to ensure the standards and requirements for display equipment are met.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. shares China's concern about putting the burden of transition from S-57 to S-101 ENC's onto the user by requiring "dual fuel" ECDIS. The "dual fuel" requirement would introduce additional complexities such as type approval, data display and how ENC overlaps would be managed between S-57 and S-101 data. The U.S. would like the IHO to consider other approaches to "dual fuel" such as data conversion (S-57 → S-101 and S-101 → S-57) so that a seamless suite of ENC's will be available in both formats during the transition period.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">2.3</a>	Revision of IHO Resolutions following the Introduction of S-100	Republic of Korea	2

## BRAZIL

Brazil congratulates Republic of Korea for submitting this proposal.

Brazil supports the undergoing revision of IHO Resolutions 1/1997 and 1/2018 by WENDWG, considering S-100 series, agrees with the revisions of IHO Resolutions 1/1987, 4/2002 and 1/2007 and would like to suggest some modifications as showed below.

Observation: In green ROK proposal, in red to remove and in blue to add.

IHO TRANSFER STANDARD FOR DIGITAL HYDROGRAPHIC DATA	1/1987 as amended	IHO A-21	A3.7
---	-------------------	----------	------

1 It is resolved that the IHO Transfer Standard described in S-57 and S-100 shall be adopted by the IHO for the exchange of digital hydrographic and cartographic data.

2 It is further resolved that the IHO Secretariat, through the HSSC (Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee), keep the contents of the Standard under review in response to changing requirements and practical experience. Changes to S-57 (~~the Standard~~) are coordinated on behalf of the HSSC by ~~the~~ ENC Standards Maintenance Working Group (ENCWG), changes to S-100 are coordinated on behalf of the HSSC by the S-100 Working Group (S-100WG), and changes to S-100 series are coordinated on behalf of the HSSC/IRCC by their subordinate Sub-committees/ Working Groups. National Hydrographic Offices which wish to propose changes to the Standard should address their comments to the IHO Secretariat. Other users of the Standard, for example equipment manufacturers, should be advised to address their comments to their national Hydrographic Office.

ENC/SENC DISTRIBUTION OPTION	4/2002 as amended	43/2003 IHO A-2	A3.11
------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------

It is resolved that SENC distribution can be accepted as an option, in addition to direct ENC distribution, providing that the following principles be adhered to:

- According to the Roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade (2020 –2030), The HO should ensure that the IHO data (ENC) is always available to any user in the S-57 or S-101 ENC format.
- As an option Hydrographic Offices may allow the distribution of their HO data (ENC) in a SENC format.
- Distributors who are to supply the SENC service must operate under the regulations of the issuing authority. The onshore ENC to SENC conversion must be performed using type approved software.
- The SENC update mechanism should not be inferior to the ENC - ECDIS update mechanism.
- The distributor of SENC data should maintain a registry of its users.
- The copyright of the ENC data should be maintained.

**CANADA**

Canada support the proposal by the Republic of Korea to revise the IHO Resolutions 1/1989, 4/2002, and 1/2007. It is suggested that decisions related to Resolutions 1/1997 and 1/2018 be deferred until the WENDWG has completed its work.

**FRANCE**

The proposed revision of Resolution 4/2002 should take into account the discontinuation of the SENC service with the phase-out of ENC's in the S-53 format at the end of the transition period and the switch to ENC's exclusively in the S-101 format.

**ITALY**

Italy agrees that an IHO Resolutions revision process should start in order to assure consistency and to facilitate the development of the S-100 series and to implement the Roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade (2020 – 2030).

**JAPAN**

Japan supports this proposal, with a suggestion of the following editorial amendment.

The phrase "in S-100" in 1/2007 as amended should be replaced with "in Publication S-100" to harmonize with the previous sentence.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports the revision of IHO Resolutions 1/1987, 4/2002 and 1/2007, with the understanding that the proposed text for Resolution 4/2002 as amended should read "the S-57 and/or S-101 ENC data format" (paragraph a). Regarding the IHO Resolutions 1/1997 and 1/2018, the Netherlands supports that the WENDWG takes into account S-100 in all its work items, and the Assembly does not need to do additional revisions at this time.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports the revision of IHO Resolutions to ensure consistency.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE TO MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

For the suggested revision of Resolutions 1/1987 the Secretary-General proposes to use the correct terminology of the stressed IHO Standards. The first paragraph of Resolution 1/1987 should then read as follows:

It is resolved that the IHO S-57 Transfer Standard for Hydrographic Data including the S-57 based Product Specifications and the IHO S-100 Universal Hydrographic Data Model including the S-100 based Product Specifications shall be adopted by the IHO for the exchange of digital hydrographic and cartographic data.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">2.4</a>	Establishing a joint IHO-Singapore Innovation and Technology Laboratory	Singapore & United States of America	2

**CANADA**

Canada supports this proposal and would like to thank Singapore for its generous offer.

**FINLAND**

Finland is in favor of the proposal.

**FRANCE**

No comment, France's support to this creation has already been identified.

**ITALY**

Italy fully supports the proposal: the Laboratory would efficiently help the transition to a full implementation of the S-100 Universal Data Model and its descending Product Specifications.

**JAPAN**

Japan supports this proposal. Japan evaluates the fixed duration of 10 years for the laboratory operation and no IHO financial resource spent for its operation.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports this proposal.

**SPAIN**

Spain supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK supports the proposed establishment of an IHO innovation and technology laboratory in Singapore.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. is pleased to co-sponsor the establishment of a joint IHO-Singapore innovation and technology laboratory. We appreciate the Government of Singapore's generous offer to fund the office. The laboratory's objectives to advancing hydrographic technologies, products and services for navigation, sustainable ocean development, and other IHO priorities aligns well with the future maritime transportation needs. The proposed structure supports partnerships with existing technology centers, academic institutions, governments, and private interests engaged in hydrographic/maritime transportation issues. We anticipate some more work to be done regarding IHO brand management and believe that the joint IHO-Singapore innovation and technology laboratory is an ideal initiative to begin with.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">3.1</a>	Revision of the IHO Resolution 2/1997 - <i>Establishment of Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHC)</i>	IHO Council	3

**ARGENTINA**

Item 12 of the proposed amendment to Resolution 2/1997 eliminates the possibility that other active States in the region (non IHO members) could be invited to attend as Observers to the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. This is not in accordance with Article 8(g) of the General Regulations.

While we understand that this amendment is intended to encourage non-Member States to join the IHO, in the particular case of the SWAtHC, this amendment would directly affect BOLIVIA's status as observer in that commission.

**BRAZIL**

Brazil supports this proposal

**CANADA**

Canada endorses the proposed revisions as endorsed by the IHO Council

**CHILE**

We would appreciate to receive the text "ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REGIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSION CHAIRS", a document that it seems it has not circulated.

**DENMARK**

Denmark supports this proposal.

**FINLAND**

Finland supports the proposal.

**JAPAN**

Japan supports the proposal both as a Member State and a Chair of the EAHC

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports this proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports this proposal.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports this Proposal.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. supports the Proposal to modernize and harmonize, the relationships between the IHO and the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. The changes articulate the relationship, establishing minimum management criteria expectations, and define national involvement levels that are consistent across the globe.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL`S RESPONSE TO MEMBER STATES COMMENTS**

In response to Chile`s request for an IRCC document titled "ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REGIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSION CHAIRS" the Secretary-General wishes to clarify that this document is to be drafted in result of the approval of Proposal 3.1.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">3.2</a>	Revision of the IHO Resolution 1/2005 - <i>IHO Response to Disasters</i>	IHO Council	3

**BRAZIL**

Brazil supports this proposal

**CANADA**

Canada supports this proposal as endorsed by the IHO Council.

**FRANCE**

IHO resolution 1/2005 deals with IHO's response to natural disasters: "earthquakes, tsunamis, hurricanes and other natural disasters" as mentioned in the introduction to the resolution.

It would be interesting to obtain the views of the Member States on the appropriateness of extending the framework of the Resolution to human-caused disasters for which a response from the IHO might be necessary, for example in response to air or maritime transport accidents.

In this respect, the International Civil Defence Organization (ICDO) proposes a categorization of the various disasters that could be usefully cited in the resolution (<http://icdo.org/fr/catastropes.html>).

**JAPAN**

Japan thoroughly supports the proposal. Japan would like to express our appreciation for the great support and help from Australia and other Member States since A-1.

Thanks to their cooperation, the IHO Resolution 1/2005 could cover the necessary requirements.

**NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands supports this proposal.

**NORWAY**

Norway supports this proposal.

**SWEDEN**

Sweden supports this proposal.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The UK fully supports this Proposal.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. recognizes and thanks Japan for their work in revising Resolution 1/2005 – IHO Response to Disasters, and supports this revision.

PROPOSAL N°	OBJECT OF THE PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	REFERENCE
<a href="#">3.3</a>	Establishing an IHO e-Learning Center	Republic of Korea	3

### ARGENTINA

ARGENTINA welcomes and appreciates the offer of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA to use its resources and expertise for the implementation of an IHO e-Learning Center.

The production of e-Learning guidelines could be entrusted to the CBSC, with the help of Member States wishing to collaborate, as well as academia and industry. In this way, the impact of the CBF decrease could be sought by trying to reduce the unmet demand for training.

### BRAZIL

Brazil supports the proposal and congratulates ROK for this proposal considering that will bring a new dimension for the delivery of capacity building activities.

### CANADA

Notes:

1. CA thanks the ROK for its proposal to establish an IHO e-learning center and to develop corresponding e-learning guidelines.
2. The offer host the center is most appreciated.
3. With regards to the developing of e-learning guidelines, which group or organization would take on this task? Related, what foreseen as the role of the CBSC/IRCC in this work?

### FINLAND

In general, Finland is in favor of the idea of the IHO e-Learning Center and is ready to support the proposal if IHO can allocate required resources for the Service.

### FRANCE

France supports this proposal, which is in line with the French proposal for the development of IHO's e-learning capacity submitted to the first session of the IHO Assembly (PRO 2).

The creation of an IHO online training centre, which would thus rely on the web hosting service and the LMS (Learning Management System) platform of the Korean Hydrographic and Oceanographic Agency, would multiply the effects of the different training initiatives of the Member States, while avoiding the

sometimes redundant development of training modules within the different regional hydrographic commissions. The gains thus obtained would make it possible to focus more on the beneficiary countries and to offer a harmonized training offer, while highlighting the role of the IHO in the field of training.

The online training module on maritime safety information, developed by France as part of the capacity building programme for EAthC, would naturally find its place in this future online training centre, thus increasing its visibility to reach the maximum number of beneficiaries.

France thanks the Republic of Korea for this proposal and its investment in hydrographic capacity building.

## ITALY

Italy supports the initiative, as the e-Learning infrastructure at KHOA could represent a useful tool to promote the diffusion of Hydrography world-wide, in line with the IHO Capacity Building Strategy. In drafting the guideline, with reference to the guideline amongst others, the following two aspects need to be taken into careful consideration:

1. The establishment of clear and simple procedures to access the e-Learning center;
2. E-Learning contents and programs.

## JAPAN

Japan understands the importance of e-learning. However, Japan sees that its operation period, resources of cost, administration method of the data server and network securities etc. are still remain uncertain, and that this proposal needs review and discussion under an adequate subordinate body of the IHO before consideration in the Assembly.

## NORWAY

Norway welcomes and supports this important and generous proposal by South-Korea.

## SPAIN

Spain agrees with the proposal

## UNITED KINGDOM

The UK fully supports both the establishment of an IHO e-Learning Centre and the development of e-Learning Guidelines and would like to be fully engaged in the development of these initiatives. The views and recommendations of IBSC should also be taken into account.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The U.S. thanks Republic of Korea for their initiative and agrees that there is potential for e-learning to support capacity building in the broadly-dispersed hydrographic community. It should be discussed in the context of IBSC and CBSC, and better integrated into IHO structures.

## **Annexes addressed by the Secretary-General's comments in response to Member States comments on PRO 1.3**

**Chapter 6** of the report of the Strategic Planning Working Group to the International Hydrographic Conference 2007

### **6. DEFINITION OF HYDROGRAPHIC INTEREST**

The amendments to the IHO Convention state that Member States shall take one third of the seats on Council on the basis of hydrographic interest, and that the definition of hydrographic interest, and hence the Council composition, should be set out in the General Regulations.

To focus the debate on the definitions, the SPWG addressed the following questions:

- a. what is the purpose of defining "hydrographic interest"?
- b. what are the basic elements of hydrographic interests?
- c. how can statistical analysis of possible criteria inform the debate?

In examining the purpose of defining the term "hydrographic interest", consideration was given to whether it was to be the basis for monetary contributions to IHO, or a seat on Council, or both of these, or for additional purposes not yet defined. The principle agreed by the SPWG was that the concept of "hydrographic interests" is only to be used for the selection of Council members.

In clarifying the importance of the criteria which may be used to identify "hydrographic interest" it was agreed that the criteria must be:

- relevant to the intended purpose;
- measurable and unambiguous;
- applicable to all Member States;
- mutually compatible if multiple criteria are to be used in combination;
- revisited/recalculated at regular intervals (eg at each Assembly).

The list of parameters considered by the SPWG is provided at Annex K. Many models were examined, which contained different definitions of the criteria, used singly or in combination, and different combinations of the criteria.

A clear statistical analysis was produced by Finland, which demonstrated the impact of various criteria and combinations of criteria, on potential Council membership and illustrated the degree to which Council composition might be affected by the use of different criteria.

The analysis is available on the IHO website. It concluded that Tonnage was as effective a criterion as any other and much the simplest to operate.

After many days of debate, over several meetings, the SPWG concluded that the single criterion to be used for defining hydrographic interest for Council membership should, in the first instance, be Tonnage. This confirms the proposal put to the 3<sup>rd</sup> EIHC and its decision N° 4. When the new structure is implemented, experience will be gained and the subject may be revisited. Each Assembly after the creation of the first Council could review all the possible definitions to see if a better one emerged. At the latest, this should be done at the second Assembly, in accordance with Article 17 (c) of the amended General Regulations.

**Annex K** of the report of the Strategic Planning Working Group to the International Hydrographic Conference 2007

### CRITERIA FOR DEFINITION OF HYDROGRAPHIC INTERESTS

Parameter	Debated Issues
Tonnage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does the list vary too slowly?</li> <li>• is there a link with hydrographic capability?</li> </ul>
Continental shelf and/or EEZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has it been defined?</li> <li>• has it been approved by the UN?,</li> <li>• does it cover remote areas or only mainland areas?</li> </ul>
Number of charts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• national charts only?</li> <li>• in territorial waters only?</li> <li>• covering other areas like continental shelf?</li> <li>• if continental shelf, does this mean defined and approved by UN?</li> <li>• if outside national waters, only charts produced under a bilateral agreement?</li> <li>• based on a uniform (i.e. generic) scale? or charts actually produced?</li> <li>• charts produced for purposes other than SOLAS/ UNCLOS?</li> <li>• types of charts               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International Charts</li> <li>- national paper charts</li> <li>- ENCs</li> <li>- RNCs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Hydrographic Surveying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of surveying ships</li> <li>• Ships owned by HO only? By the State? By industries? What about international contractors?</li> <li>• Number of surveying platforms rather than ships (i.e. including LIDAR etc)?</li> <li>• Number of surveying hydrographic systems               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- multi beam echo-sounders</li> <li>- single beam echo-sounders</li> <li>- side scan sonars</li> <li>- Lidar systems</li> <li>- Others</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Scale of investments into surveying</li> <li>• Types of areas surveyed</li> <li>• in national waters only?</li> <li>• areas beyond national waters? Open sea?</li> <li>• joint survey programs (e.g. under bilateral or multi-lateral agreements)</li> <li>• complexity of water (e.g. shallow versus deep water, according to S44 definitions?)</li> <li>• Size of areas surveyed</li> <li>• Percentage of total of national responsible area?</li> <li>• Area surveyed last year? Average last 3 years?</li> <li>• Other?</li> </ul>

Parameter	Debated Issues
Length of coastline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mainland only?</li> <li>• including islands?</li> <li>• remote areas?</li> <li>• complexity of coastline?</li> </ul>
IHO commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in committees, working groups, boards and RHCs</li> <li>• implementation of and support to IHO instruments, e.g. RENCs</li> </ul>
Involvement in Capacity Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in Developing Projects</li> <li>• annual financial contribution to developing countries</li> </ul>
Size of merchant fleet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• under national flag only</li> <li>• under foreign flag</li> </ul>
Volume/value of seaborne trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imports/exports</li> <li>• through territorial waters</li> <li>• through international waters/straits</li> </ul>

## Council document C1-6.3

## Consideration of the definition of Hydrographic Interests

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Secretary-General
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	This paper invites the Council to incorporate in its work programme the consideration of the use of the terms <i>hydrographic interests</i> and <i>interest in hydrographic matters</i> in relation to the composition of the Council, in order to report to the second session of the Assembly in 2020

**Background**

1. The IHO, through a Strategic Planning Working Group, undertook an extensive review of the Organization from 1997 to 2007. As a result, in 2005 the 3<sup>rd</sup> Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC-3) agreed a range of amendments to the Convention on the IHO, and in 2007 the 17<sup>th</sup> International Hydrographic Conference (IHC-17) adopted the supporting Basic Documents, and several organizational and administrative changes.

2. The amendments and changes included the establishment of a Council. The establishment of the Council is covered in Article VI of the Convention on the IHO. It is further described in Article 16 of the General Regulations.

3. In describing the composition of the Council, clause (a) of Article VI of the Convention on the IHO states:

*One fourth of, but not less than thirty, Member states shall take seats on the Council, the first two thirds of whom shall take up their seats on a regional basis and the remaining one third on the basis of hydrographic interests, which shall be defined in the General Regulations.*

4. Clause (c) of Article 16 of the General Regulations then states, among other things:

*The remaining one-third of the Council seats shall be held by Member States that have the greatest interest in hydrographic matters and have not been selected under the procedure described in sub-paragraph (b) above. The definition of what constitutes an interest in hydrographic matters shall be reconsidered at the latest at the second Assembly meeting. Meanwhile, the scale by which an interest in hydrographic matters is measured shall be national flag tonnage. ...*

**Discussion**

5. The SPWG spent a significant amount of time in considering how to measure “hydrographic interest” as reported in document CONF.17/DOC.1. The size of the area of national waters, the size of the Exclusive Economic Zones, the length of national coastlines, the portfolio of nautical charts and several other possible measures were all considered. All were rejected on the basis that there were no indisputable, authoritative reference values that could be used.

6. In the absence of other options, the SPWG proposed to rely on the long-established IHO formula for calculating the national flag tonnage from which the number of financial shares and votes allocated to Member states are calculated.

7. In proposing to use flag tonnage as the measure to determine *hydrographic interests* or *interest in hydrographic matters*, the SPWG kept the option open to identify other measures in the future. For this reason, a requirement for the second session of the Assembly to reconsider what constitutes *an interest in hydrographic matters* was included in the proposed clause (c) of

Article 16 of the General Regulations that was subsequently agreed by the Member States at IHC-17.

**Proposal**

8. The Council has now been established. It is the primary organ that reports to and advises the Assembly and the Member States. The roles of the Council are set out in Article VI of the Convention on the IHO. As stated in sub clause (g)(v), this includes:

*Prepare, with the support of the Secretary-General, proposals concerning the overall strategy and the work programme adopted by the Assembly*

9. It therefore follows that the Council, as part of its strategic overview role, is best placed to consider whether alternatives exist as a suitable measure of *hydrographic interests* or *interest in hydrographic matters* and whether or how any changes might be made to existing arrangements in the Organization.

**Action Required of the Council**

10. The Council is invited to:

- a. **agree** that the Council include in its work programme the consideration of the definition and use of the terms *hydrographic interests* and *interest in hydrographic matters* in relation to the composition of the Council, with a view to reporting to the second session of the Assembly in 2020; and to
- b. **take any other actions** that may be appropriate.