



C3-01.4A v1.2

3rd MEETING OF THE IHO COUNCIL

Monaco, 15 – 17 October 2019

«RED BOOK»

**COMPENDIUM OF COMMENTS
SUBMITTED BY MEMBER STATES ON
PROPOSALS TO BE CONSIDERED BY
THE IHO COUNCIL**

Reference: IHO Resolution 8/1967 as amended – *Procedure for considering proposals submitted by Member States to the Assembly or to the Council.*

Note: Revisions made for v1.1 in red, for v1.2 in green.

PROPOSALS

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 3rd MEETING OF THE IHO COUNCIL

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	References
3.1	Review of the Status of Decisions and Actions from C-2	IHO Secretariat	C3-03.1A
3.2	Draft Proposal to A-2: Revision of Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure of the Council concerning the timing of the election of the Chair and the Vice-Chair, and consequences on Rules 8 and 11.	Council Chair	C3-03.2A
3.3	Draft Proposal to A-2: Medical Fitness of Candidates for Election to the Positions of Secretary-General or Director and Conditions of Service of the Directors	Council Chair	C3-03.3A
3.4	Draft Proposal to A-2: Consideration of the definition of Hydrographic Interests	Secretary-General	C3-03.4A
3.4	Comment by Uruguay supported by Argentina and Brazil on Draft Proposal in Doc. C3-03.4A and Annex: Draft Proposal on the Definition of Hydrographic Interests	Uruguay	C3-03.4B Annex
3.6	Proposal for Consideration by the Council: Roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade (2020 – 2030)	Secretary-General, HSSC and IRCC Chairs	C3-03.6A Rev1
3.7	Draft Proposal to A-2: Confirmation of the interpretation by the Council that there are no discrepancies between the Convention and the Rules of Procedure of the Council, relating to Member States' proposals to the Council	Council Chair	C3-03.7A

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	References
4.1	Report and Proposals from HSSC	HSSC Chair	C3-04.1A
4.1	Annex A: List of Decisions and Actions from C-2 affecting HSSC	HSSC Chair	C3-04.1A Annex A
4.1	Annex B: List of Decisions and Actions of HSSC-11	HSSC Chair	C3-04.1A Annex B
4.1	Annex C: HSSC Comments on the IHO Future Strategic Plan drafted by SPRWG	HSSC Chair	C3-04.1A Annex C
4.2	Report and Proposals from IRCC	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A
4.2	Annex A: Proposal for Amendments to IHO Resolution 2/1997	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex A and its Appendix
4.2	Annex B: Proposal for a Guaranteed Minimum Level of IHO CB Fund Share Appendix to Annex B: - Outreach of the IHO CB Programme During the Period 2016-2018	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex B and its Appendix
4.2	Annex C: Worldwide Electronic Navigation Services Drafting Group Progress Report	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex C
4.2	Annex D: Proposal for Amendments to IHO Resolution 1/2005 Appendix to Annex D - Proposed Amendments to IHO Resolution 1/2005	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex D and its Appendix
5.2	Proposed IHO Work Programme for 2020	Secretary-General	C3-05.2A
5.3	Proposed IHO Budget for 2020	Secretary-General	C3-05.3A
5.4	Preparation of IHO Work Programme and Budget for 2021-2023	Secretary-General	C3-05.4A
5.4	Preparation of IHO Work Programme and Budget for 2021-2023 - Annex A: Proposed 3-year Work Programme	Secretary-General	C3-05.4A Annex A

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	References
5.4	Preparation of IHO Work Programme and Budget for 2021-2023 - Annex B: Proposed 3-year Budget	Secretary-General	C3-05.4A Annex B
6.1	Report and Proposals from the Strategic Plan Review Working Group - Annex A: Draft Revised Strategic Plan 2021 - 2026	SPRWG Chair	C3-06.1A and Annex A
7.2	Proposal to establish an “IHO Innovation and Technology Laboratory’ supported by and situated in Singapore	Singapore	C3-07.2A
7.3	Proposal for the Application of ISO9001:2015 Quality Management Principles to the IHO Structure that entered into force on 6 November 2016	Netherlands	C3-07.3A
7.4	Preparations for the triennium of IHO centenary celebrations (IHO-100)	Secretary-General	C3-07.4A

LIST OF MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

General comments for all the proposals

.../...

Specific comments

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
3.1	Review of the Status of Decisions and Actions from C-2	Council Chair	C3-03.1A

FRANCE:

C2/20 on IHO resol 2/1997

Amendment for the English version is fine for FR (two minors editorial comments: *“Recognized by the Assembly, the RHC shall complement the work of the ~~IHO-Secretariat~~ Organization, establish common regional ~~approach's~~ (approaches?), and balance regional issues with global geospatial needs.”*

Cooperation among all RHCs, including among those not adjacent, is encouraged. RHCs should be aware of the technical maturity level and ~~fiscal~~ (budgetary?) challenges that may influence state involvement. The processes and management of the RHC meetings should be designed to accommodate the broad participation of nations within the region

C2/28 on ENC overlapping

Fr supports WENDWG position that *“Unless bilateral discussions can solve remaining overlaps soon, there was a general agreement that time has come to start applying the different steps identified in IHO Resolution 1/2018, with common sense and on a case-by-case basis, to be in a more robust position for assessing the efficiency of this Resolution in the near future.”*

C2/30;31; 32 on S-100

See below C3-03.6ARev1 and C3-04.2A IRCC

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
3.2	Draft Proposal to A-2: Revision of Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure of the Council concerning the timing of the election of the Chair and the Vice-Chair, and consequences on Rules 8 and 11.	Council Chair	C3-03.2A

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports this proposal.

CANADA:

Canada supports this proposal as presented, with one suggestion.

It is suggested that the rules of procedure in the event of a tie in the election for the position of Vice-Chair Rule 12 (e) be identical to those for the same situation in the election of the Chair (i.e. Rule 12 (d)). In the highly unlikely event that the Chair becomes unable to fulfil their role or the position otherwise becomes vacant before the first Council meeting after the Assembly, the Vice-Chair can then take on that role. This is very important to ensure the best possible preparation for the Council meeting.

JAPAN:

Japan supports this proposal.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands supports this proposal.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
3.3A	Draft Proposal to A-2: Medical Fitness of Candidates for Election to the Positions of Secretary-General or Director and Conditions of Service of the Directors	Council Chair	C3-03.3A

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports this proposal.

CANADA:

Canada endorses this proposal with one suggestion.

For clarity, CA suggests that Article 15 be amended to :

"A Secretary-General or a Director who has been incapacitated for duty for six consecutive months, or otherwise for an aggregate of twelve months, during his/her their term of office shall automatically cease to be Secretary-General or Director, *and the position shall be declared vacant*".

The specific note that the position becomes 'vacant' makes it evident that Article 25 shall then apply.

FRANCE:

Article 25 a) and c) are not coherent. There is no obvious reason why the interim SG should be appointed by "*the Council*" in (25-a, vacancy less than one year before Assembly) versus appointed by "*the Chair of the Council*" (vacancy more than one year before Assembly)

JAPAN:

Japan would suggest that one of two Directors who has elected first should be appointed as an Acting Secretary-General because there is a possible occurrence of vacancy for the post of chair of the Council as well.

In article 14, 15 and 25 the wording "his/her" should not be replaced by "their", unless the whole General Regulation is reviewed and revised accordingly. Otherwise this issue should remain unchanged. The wording "his/ her" and "he /she" could be found in other articles in the regulation.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands supports this proposal with one concern, the insertion in para 25C: “the Chair of the Council shall appoint one of the Directors as Acting Secretary-General until a new Secretary-General elect takes up their duties”. NL suggest this is a responsibility the Council to be managed by the Chair of the Council, not a responsibility of the Chair of the Council in person.

As a matters of order one could debate if making this kind of proposal to the Assembly is within the remit of the Council. Procedures for amendments of the General Regulations are not mentioned in the General Regulations itself. The IHO Convention specifically mentions in ART VI three areas for the Council to make proposal.

- Proposals concerning the overall strategy and the work programme to be adopted by the Assembly.
- Proposals submitted to it by subsidiary organs.
- The establishment of subsidiary organ.

This suggests that proposals for amending the General Regulations do not fit within these three bullets, and thus process is the same as for amending the IHO Convention, ie. by the individual members states.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
3.4A	Draft Proposal to A-2: Consideration of the definition of Hydrographic Interests	Secretary-General	C3-03.4A

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the alternative submitted by Uruguay that combines the demand for hydrography from the maritime community with the offer of hydrography by the Hydrographic Offices, providing a better definition of Hydrographic Interests that is directly connected to the IHO objectives and a fair measurement of the Members States commitment with hydrographic matters.

CANADA:

Canada will comment further after a careful review of the proposal from Uruguay (Doc. C3-03.4B and its Annex refer).

Canada would like to thank Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil for their draft proposal on the definition of hydrographic interests. Canada will be considering this proposals in greater detail and will comment at C-3.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the second option – modifying “second” to “third” of the GR. The first option seems reasonable apparently. But Japan sees the current situation of discussion is not matured yet. Thus Japan would avoid the first option. It would be unavoidable for every Assembly to amend GR regularly even if it is a kind of bureaucratic unless the discussion is matured.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands supports this proposal.

As a matter of order one could debate if making this kind of proposal to the Assembly is within the remit of the Council. Procedures for amendments of the General Regulations are not mentioned in the General Regulations itself. The IHO Convention specifically mentions in ART VI three areas for the Council to make proposal.

- Proposals concerning the overall strategy and the Work Programme to be adopted by the Assembly.
- Proposals submitted to it by subsidiary organs.
- The establishment of subsidiary organ.

This suggests that proposals for amending the General regulations do not fit within these three bullets, and thus process is the same as amending the IHO Convention, ie. by the individual members states.

[With regards to the Comments and proposals by Uruguay supported by Argentina and Brazil (Doc. [C3-03.4B](#) refers)] the Netherlands welcomes in principle discussions on the definition of Hydrographic interest. This proposal attempts to capture this complicated issue from all angles. However, the Netherlands feels that this proposal is very complex and vulnerable to prolonged debate. For instance:

- On the Demand side. Why not use “Fleetownership” to complement Flag tonnage? Which mercantile trade is intended: import, export or the summation of them?
- On the Offer side. Why not use AIS as measure for the actual use of ENCs or use data density as a measure of complexity of the ENCs? Who is going to ‘objectively’ assess the CB values? Why is using a “third party” of lesser value than “a sustainable way”?

So, the Netherlands still favors the approach suggested by the SG. The current situation, though not ideal, works. Moreover, the Netherlands proposes that Council puts only one proposal forward to the Assembly on this issue. This obviously does not preclude individual nations to make their own proposal to the Assembly.

URUGUAY supported by ARGENTINA and BRAZIL:

See comments provided under Doc. [C3-03.4B](#) and its [Annex](#).

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
3.6A	Proposal for Consideration by the Council: Roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade (2020 – 2030)	Secretary-General, HSSC Chair and IRCC Chair	C3-03.6A Rev1

BRAZIL:

Brazil congratulates the work done by the Secretary-General, the HSSC Chair and the IRCC Chair and supports the proposal.

Additionally, Brazil considers that this is also a good opportunity to approach IMO and industry stakeholders to explain the front-of-bridge/back-of-bridge requirements proposed by HSSC.

CANADA:

Canada supports the general timelines of the establishment of the regular provision of S-101 and the dual fuel strategy.

Canada supports the proposed strategy and associated roadmap as input to A2, with the following comments:

1. The link between this roadmap and the [draft] IHO Strategic Plan have to be firmly established. An integrated approach to reporting on the advancements of the roadmap and the strategic plan should also be considered.
2. The roll-out of S-101 should be coordinated to ensure that coverage is not spotty, that is, S-101 coverage is contiguous, particularly along major shipping routes and transboundary areas. RHCs have a major role to play in coordinating the roll-out. This coordination should also be extended to the introduction of other S-1xx products and related services.
3. What other steps can be taken to encourage the IMO and OEMs to adopt new IHO specifications in 2024 when full implementation of S-101 by IHO MS is not before 2030? IMO's interest in Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships (MASS) as noted in IHO CL 36/2019, for example, will be one area for further outreach and collaboration.

FRANCE:

Dual S-101 and S-57. The document set that:

“In order to maintain ECDIS devices already installed on SOLAS vessels which are technically not ready nor required to be upgraded to S-101 ENC process capability and to be in line with the applicable IMO regulations pertaining to existing navigation equipment, identical coverage has to be provided for S-57 ENCs and S-101 ENCs for a transition period until the end of the decade.”

If one can expect that the production will be straight forward from a unique database this will still generate more work for product control (which seems difficult to subcontract). The additional workload associated with dual production is not clearly assessed yet. In case it is heavy, the dual production will have to be shortened by all means.

SENC (cf. §5 of roadmap document on collaboration with industry) :

“ECDIS industry has to be made aware of the start date of S-101 ENC provision service in 2024 to be prepared to read S-101 ENC (including encryption) and maintain consistent performance (Display, Alarms, update etc.) in new ECDIS equipment from 1 January 2024.”

For clarification, FR would make sure that with the S101 turn, there will be no more SENC service, which as a consequence will make it possible for the producers and RENCs to take responsibility of the ENC integrity up to the final customer.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the proposal.

KOREA (Republic of):

Korea (Republic of) would like to thank the IHO Secretary-General and the Chairs of the HSSC and IRCC for their effort in providing the Roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade (2020 – 2030). ROK proposes the following considerations based on our experience with the development of S-100 based Product Specifications and products.

- a) The Council is invited to designate this agenda item as a permanent one during the implementation period so that the Council can continuously monitor the implementation of the Road map.
- b) ROK plans to build the S-100 Infrastructure by 2020. In order to operate it steadily even after the establishment, long-term operation plan needs to be prepared for submission to A-2
- c) For successful implementation of the Roadmap, S-100 capacity building activities should be considered as Phase 1 of Development in the IHO CB Strategy.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands endorses the general timeline for the establishment of regular S-101 ENC provision and the dual fuel strategy.

The Netherlands endorses the proposed strategy and associated roadmap for submission to the 2nd Session Assembly for approval.

The Netherlands offers two editorial comments.

Para 3. S-101 ENC, third hyphen. “In order to maintain ECDIS devices already installed on SOLAS vessels which are technically not ready nor required to be upgraded to S-101 ENC process capability and to be in line with the applicable IMO regulations pertaining to existing navigation equipment, ~~identical~~ **simultaneous** coverage has to be provided for S-57 ENCs and S-101 ENCs for a transition period until the end of the decade”. S101 has a richer data format than S57. So, the quality of the coverage can be better instead of identical.

Para 3. S-101 ENC, fifth hyphen. “This “dual fuel” model is instrumental for the transition period. From the user’s perspective, presentation of cartographic features to meet the IMO mandated content (ENC = official nautical chart) should be seamless and presented under ~~the identical~~ a **congruent** presentation regime.” S101 has a richer data format than S57. This offers complementary portrayal possibilities. This is also mentioned in para 4, S-1-1-ENC fifth bullet: “improve the clarity of portrayal”.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
3.7A	Draft Proposal to A-2: Confirmation of the interpretation by the Council that there are no discrepancies between the Convention and the Rules of Procedure of the Council, relating to Member States' proposals to the Council	Council Chair	C3-03.7A

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports this proposal.

CANADA:

Canada continues to support the C-2 decision related to this matter and supports this submission to the 2nd Meeting of the Assembly.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the proposal.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands supports this proposal.

The Netherlands notes that proposals 1, 2 and 4 are not proposals by members or SG, but by the Council itself. So, the Netherlands suggest to expand the scope of draft Proposal 4 to include the Council itself as a body to make proposals to the Assembly *as the Council sees fit*. See also earlier points of order.

Suggest following amendment to para 3a of proposal 4.

“After having considered Article VI (g)(ii) of the Convention and Rule 8(i) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council in common, the Assembly approves the interpretation that the Council has the authority to request and consider proposals submitted by Member States, the Secretary-General **and the Council itself for referral to the Assembly.**”

Lastly, the Netherlands proposes to make this proposal 1 as it sets percent on the mandate of the Council for later handling of proposals during A2.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
4.1	Report and Proposals from HSSC	HSSC Chair	C3-04.1A

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the progress on development of the S-100 Implementation Strategy.

Brazil agrees with the HSSC Chair that “quantifiable SPI would give precise indication to implement the Strategic Plan, making the strategic vision a tangible reality”.

Brazil agrees with the effort being done for the development of an automated production of paper charts from ENC.

Brazil congratulates the TWCWG for their proposal of a new Resolution on Standard of Digital Tide and Tidal Currents Tables. In response to IHO CL 31/2019, Brazil submitted suggestions for improving this proposal.

Brazil supports the guidance on definition and harmonization of Maritime Services in the context of *e-navigation*.

Brazil supports HSSC’s suggestion to IHO Secretariat to develop an appropriate presentation of *e-navigation* information on the IHO website.

NETHERLANDS:

On the invitation to “Assess the recommendations of the HSSC on the Performance Indicators to be established in accordance with the proposed Revised Strategic Plan”, NL observes that this assessment has already been incorporated in the Draft Revised Strategic Plan 2021 - 2026 - version 20 July, agenda item C3-06.1A, and thus needs no further action under the discussion on the HSSC report.

On the invitation to “Provide initial guidance if any, on the preparation of the final recommendations on the Future of the Paper Nautical Chart, taking into account the preliminary report of the NCWG...”, NL suggest to incorporate SPI 1.1.2 of the Draft Revised Strategic Plan 2021 - 2026 - version 20 July as initial guidance: “By 2026 the revised regulations for International Charts and Chart specifications (S-4) enables production of official paper charts based 100% on the content of ENCs, as provided for in the IHO standards.”

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
4.2	Proposal for Amendments to IHO Resolution 2/1997	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex A and Appendix

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the proposal with the following editorial amendments:

Paragraph 4 – to substitute “Bodies” with “subordinated bodies” (as in paragraph 6); to include “IHO” before “Member States” (as in paragraphs 5 and 12); to substitute “Regional Hydrographic Commissions” with “RHCs” (as in paragraph 2); to include “s” after “RHC”; to substitute “approach's” with “approaches”

It is resolved that the IHO Secretariat and the relevant IHO ~~subordinated~~ ~~B~~bodies shall encourage IHO Member States having common regional interests in data collecting or nautical charting to form ~~Regional Hydrographic Commissions~~ RHCs to cooperate in the undertaking of surveys and other projects. Recognized by the Assembly, the RHCs shall complement the work of the Organization, establish common regional approaches, and balance regional issues with global geospatial needs.

Paragraph 5 – to substitute in the second sentence “coastal” with “Coastal” (initial in capital letter as in paragraph 2)

RHCs, led by IHO Member States, should enable the exchange of information and consultation among the hydrographic services of all ~~e~~Coastal States concerned in the region.

Paragraph 7 – to include in the first sentence “of the IHO” after “General Regulations” RHCs should be properly constituted, follow standard processes where possible, and have activities in line with the objectives of the IHO as described in Article II of the Convention on the IHO, and Article 8 of the General Regulations of the IHO.

Paragraph 16 – to include in the second sentence “-” between “Sub” and “Committee”; to include in the fourth sentence “s” after “HO”

All RHCs are encouraged to appoint a CB Coordinator to ensure that regional capacity building activities are aligned and coordinated in accordance with the IHO CB Strategy and with CB procedures and practices developed by the Capacity Building Sub-Committee (CBSC).

This part-time allocation to assist RHCs should come primarily and ideally from Hydrographic Offices (HOs) within the region.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
4.2	Report and Proposals from IRCC - Proposal for a Guaranteed Minimum Level of IHO CB Fund Share	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex B

IHO SECRETARIAT:

See comments provided under Doc. [C3-04.2B](#)

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the higher prioritization given by the BHI/IHO Secretariat with the allocation of available resources into the Capacity Building Fund during the last decade.

Brazil understands that the budget shall be flexible in order to allow adjustments to be made by the IHO Assembly, the IHO Council and the IHO Secretariat.

Brazil supports actions being carried out by the IHO Secretariat, led by the Secretary-General, to search for continuous reduction of administrative costs and for adjustments to estimates in order to increase resources available to the CB Fund.

FRANCE:

Capacity Building

An increase of MS contribution seems very hard to envisage for France and should be the lowest priority (if even possible) after investigating any possibility to reduce IHO expenses.

From a strict budgetary point of view, the strategy of increasing MS should be assessed with regard to the balance between income and expenses incurred.

JAPAN:

Japan fully realizes the importance of CB But still cannot support any decision which forces the IHO to allocate budget to a specific field. In general, Budget allocation should be utmost free from any restriction or condition. Also it is need to be careful to increase MS contributions.

KOREA (Republic of):

Korea appreciates the effort made by the Chairs of the IRCC and CBSC for providing the proposal and Korea supports it.

There is a discrepancy of approximately 110 k€ to 210 k€ between the budget allocation and the expected expenditure in 2020. It is necessary to review the budget allocation for CB Fund and ways of securing more resources before consideration and approval of the proposal by A-2. The Council is invited to analyze the cases in other international organizations of the status of CB activities and their strategies for securing resources and present the result. In addition, the CBSC is invited to increase the efficiency of implementation of CB activities internally by considering ways of maximizing effectiveness at the minimum cost. There is a lack of feedback on the use of funds from CB activities by RHCs.

NETHERLANDS:

CB is important, needs to be planned and is not free of charge. The Netherlands support in principle that a guaranteed minimum level of IHO Capacity Building Fund is a prerequisite to cover the fundamental activities of the CB work programme and needs to be addressed through direct funding from the IHO budget. The questions is how much is a minimum level? To answer this question it is important to know the effectiveness and efficiency of CB activities conducted so far.

If CB expenditure has proven sufficiently effective and efficient, the Netherlands would support the stepped 1% contribution rise as suggested by the SG under one precondition. There should be a clear link to the Goals and Targets of the new SP.

In light of the new SP the Netherlands does not support a relocation of a share of the Special Project Fund to the CB share

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
4.2	Worldwide Electronic Navigation Services Drafting Group Progress Report	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A Annex C

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the progress report on WENS and suggests to include MSP 15 for “Real-time hydrographic and environmental information Service” for discussion and to include the product S-124 in the scope for WENS.

Brazil recognizes the importance of the products and data issued by Hydrographic Offices to many fields in the marine sciences. But, since the object of the IHO stresses out only hydrographic matters, according to the IHO Convention, Brazil suggests the following “note of caution regarding scope and timing” instead of the third one: “WENS should focus on the S-100 services that support the safety of navigation. As a secondary focus, the S-100 services should highlight non-hydrographic “Maritime Knowledge” as well.”.

FRANCE:

Regarding the sentence *“Some S-100 based services may sit outside the RHC domain, for example weather”*

France has the following comment: such services may not necessarily sit outside some HOs’ remit. Nonetheless such services might take benefit from the S-100 standardization.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the proposal.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
4.2	Proposal for Amendments to IHO Resolution 1/2005 Appendix to Annex D Proposed Amendments to IHO Resolution 1/2005	IRCC Chair	C3-04.2A and its Appendix

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the proposal with the following editorial amendments:

Paragraph 1 – to include in the seventh sentence “(IHO)” after “International Hydrographic Organization” and “(RHCs)” after “Regional Hydrographic Commissions”

The International Hydrographic Organization (IHO), its Member States and the Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs) should ensure adequate preparedness so as to enable an immediate and appropriate response to any future disaster affecting coastal areas of the world.

Paragraph 1 – to delete, to substitute and to include in the last sentence, as follow

As such following activities can be identified with the overarching framework of the IHO Convention on the IHO and General Regulations of the IHO.

Paragraph 2 – to substitute in the first and second sentences “coastal” with “Coastal” (initial in capital letter)

2 Activities

a) By Coastal States:

All Coastal States are encouraged to develop contingency plans in advance in order to be prepared in case a disaster occurs. The specific roles and tasks of the Hydrographic Offices within these Coastal States depend on the individual national governance structures.

Paragraph 3 – to substitute “coastal” with “Coastal” (initial in capital letter); to substitute “secretariat” with “Secretariat” (initial in capital letter as in paragraph 2); to include “s” after “RHC”

Effective disaster response predicates on diplomatic clearance to actually deploy the offered hydrographic assets in theatre. It is the responsibility of affected Coastal States to institute procedures to progress 'hydrographic' requests timely through their Nations' Diplomatic channels. As it is the national responsibility of the Member States offering such support, to use those channels. The IHO Secretariat and Chairs of the RHCs have no means to absorb these national responsibilities.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the proposal.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
5.2	Proposed IHO Work Programme for 2020	Secretary-General	C3-05.2A

NETHERLANDS:

The proposed IHO Work Programmes are not yet available. The Netherlands would like to offer two suggestions for drafting the new IHO Work Programmes with the aim to make them more succinct and directional. Firstly avoid overlap with and repetition of items that are already actioned through General Regulation, ROP, TOR, or the Work Plans of IRCC and HSSC. Secondly, focus the Work Programmes on those items that require involvement, mandating and/or decision-making at Assembly level. This will contribute to an effective PDCA-circle at Assembly and Council level.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
5.3	Proposed IHO Budget for 2020	Secretary-General	C3-05.3A

BRAZIL:

Brazil supports the proposed IHO Budget for 2020.

FRANCE:

The impact of some measures like “organizing meetings in Monaco” should be assessed globally (not only at the IHO level) since travel for example budget is also sensitive for MS.

More comments during the forthcoming discussion at the Council.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the proposal.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands has insufficient insight in the details of the budget to suggest a concrete change. The Netherlands is, however, surprised to note the increase in premiums for medical insurances. Additional background would be appreciated. Are there still variables, for instance an own risk?

This budget has no ‘visible’ link to the Strategic Plan. Something to be considered when harmonizing the budget with the SP before A2.

IHO SECRETARIAT (v1.1):

See comments provided under Doc. [C3-05.3B](#)

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
5.4	Preparation of IHO Work Programme and Budget for 2021-2023	Secretary-General	C3-05.4A and its Annex A

FRANCE (v1.2):

Additional comment received in response to FCCL 02/2019
(Original submission provided in French)

Table 3, costs dependent on Salaries and other costs independent of Salaries:

SHOM notes the approx increase of 100% (+ 150 K euros) in expenditure due to increase in medical cover, compensated by the decrease of an equivalent proportion in current operating costs.

SHOM recommends pursuing with this economical approach, in operating costs in particular, so as to put aside/save the lacking 170K euros to reach the target CB amount. (300 K euros/per year, see Doc. C3-05.3 and comments)

NETHERLANDS:

The proposed IHO Work Programmes are not yet available. The Netherlands would like to offer two suggestions for drafting the new IHO Work Programmes with the aim to make them more succinct and directional. Firstly avoid overlap with and repetition of items that are already actioned through General Regulation, ROP, TOR, or the Work Plans of IRCC and HSSC. Secondly, focus the Work Programmes on those items that require involvement, mandating and/or decision-making at Assembly level. This will contribute to an effective PDCA-circle at Assembly and Council level.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
6.1	Report and Proposals from the Strategic Plan Review Working Group Annex A: Draft Revised Strategic Plan 2021 - 2026	SPRWG Chair	C3-06.1A Annex A

BRAZIL:

Brazil congratulates SPRWG, in special its Chair and Secretary, for the work done in the past two years leading to a comprehensive review of the Strategic Plan.

Brazil supports the proposal for the Draft Revised IHO Strategic Plan for 2021-2026 and would like to make the following comments: items 1.1.2 and 2.2.2 of the “SPI” column are not indicators, but instead they are more like targets. Besides that, it is still under study by IHO the production of official paper charts based 100% on the content of ENC’s, and it is too early to know which “various fields” will be fulfilled by the hydrographic applications.

Therefore, Brazil suggests to delete item 2.2.2 and the following wording for item 1.1.2:

1.1.2 Average of percentage of official paper charts produced by Member States, based 100% on the content of ENC’s, relative to their own portfolio, enabled by regulations for International Charts and Chart specifications. Additionally, the last paragraph of the item “Progress monitoring” needs to be justified also by the right-hand side of the page.

Recommendation 18. Harmonize the draft strategic plan and 3-year work programme and budget submitted to the Assembly, by amending, or providing guidance for amending, the draft strategic plan and WP 2021-2023 submitted to the Council, aiming at an endorsement by the Council, by correspondence, of the amended draft WP 2021-2023, in due time for the distribution of the final draft SP and WP.

Comments:

Brazil supports the adequacy of the draft WP and budget 2021-2023 with the proposal to A-2 for the Draft Revised IHO Strategic Plan for 2021-2026 approved by the Council at C-3. This procedure is to be appreciated by the Council, by correspondence, until February 2020.

At A-2, if the Assembly approves an IHO Strategic Plan for 2021-2026 that would need to amend the 3-year WP 2021-2023, Brazil suggests the Council to request from the Assembly that the Assembly tasks the Council to amend it at C-4, if necessary, for the 3- year WP 2021-2023.

Recommendation 19. Task the SPRWG or an *ad hoc* working group to develop precise formulas for the SPIs, as subordinate to and not part of the strategic plan, with the support of the Secretary-General and the Chairs of HSSC and IRCC.

Comment:

Brazil supports recommendation 19.

Recommendation 20. Considers the offer from the USA to prepare, as an example, a draft simplified/pamphlet transcription of the draft strategic plan that will be submitted to A2.

Comments:

Brazil agrees with the production of a pamphlet of the IHO Strategic Plan 2021-2026 and congratulates the USA for offering to design it.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands supports the Draft Revised Strategic Plan 2021 - 2026 - version 20 July. The Netherlands especially appreciates the additional task of the Council: "The Council determines the method for calculating the performance indicators."

SPIs are now part of the main body documented. Netherlands offers the thought to limit the main body to goals and targets and place the table with targets and SPIs in an Annex. This has the advantage that is easier to maintain the SPIs during the 2021-2016 timeframe with the main body text remaining unchanged.

The Netherlands supports the proposal in paragraph 18 to "Harmonize the draft strategic plan and 3-year work programme and budget submitted to the Assembly...".

The Netherlands supports the task in paragraph 19 "to develop precise formulas for the SPIs, as subordinate to and not part of the strategic plan, with the support of the Secretary General and the chairs of HSSC and IRCC." This task, however, should be limited to calculation methods, not include setting norm values which SPIs have to meet. The latter remains a responsibility of Assembly.

The Netherlands welcomes the offer from the USA in paragraph 20 to prepare a draft simplified/pamphlet transcription of the draft strategic plan that will be submitted to A2.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
7.2	Proposal to establish an “IHO Innovation and Technology Laboratory’ supported by and situated in Singapore	Singapore	C3-07.2A

BRAZIL:

Brazil congratulates Singapore for the initiative and strongly supports the proposal.

CANADA:

Canada would like to acknowledge and thank Singapore for its generous offer to establish an “IHO Innovation and Technology Laboratory”.

Such a facility will play an important part in helping the IHO achieve its vision of becoming the authoritative worldwide hydrographic body by giving it an internal mechanism to develop, test, and implement new standards, technologies, and ideas.

There are obvious links with the proposal on the Roadmap for the S-100 Implementation Decade and IHO capacity building.

As the proposal notes the facility will be situated in one of the more critical shipping regions in the world, and it is appropriate that IHO elevate its presence and activity in that area.

The governance and functioning of the lab and how it fits within the IHO structure will need further reflection. However, the establishment of the Governing Board appears to be a logical first step.

JAPAN:

Japan supports the necessity of catch-up system to new technology. Also supports and appreciates SNG generous intention to establish such no-costal-impact Lab. Still reserve Japan’s position on “IHO flag.”

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands supports in principle the concept of a means that looks at the longer term. Most HO's are likely to have enough challenges at the shorter term as the implementation of S-1XX. So, it is difficult to keep an eye on the longer term developments in the Digital/Artificial age.

An IHO Lab is a means to this end. It helps to create foresight with which we can shape our future. It complements the Strategic Plan that is more geared to build the future from the current situation.

There will be numerous challenges ahead to operationalize such a Lab: virtual vs physical, funding of contributions, relations with other bodies, status (IHO body or), governance etc. This makes it difficult to make a definite decision on establishing an IHO Lab.

The Netherlands proposes therefore to welcome the initiative for a IHO Lab and to task an ad hoc working group to work out further details how this Lab would operate and to report back findings at C4. Moreover, The Netherlands proposes to request from the Assembly that the Assembly mandates the Council to continue the work on an IHO Lab and report back at A3.

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
7.3	Proposal for Application of ISO9001:2015 Quality Management Principles to the IHO Structure that entered into force on 6 November 2016	Netherlands	C3-07.3A

IHO SECRETARIAT:

See comments provided under Doc. [C3-07.3B](#)

BRAZIL:

Brazil agrees that there should be a mechanism to assess the operation of the new IHO Structure, and looks forward to a wider discussion of this proposal at C-3. .

Agenda Item	Object of the Proposal	Submitted by	Reference
7.4	Preparations for the triennium of IHO centenary celebrations (IHO-100)	Secretary-General	C3-07.4A

BRAZIL:

Brazil congratulates the Secretary-General for managing this important initiative and for the IHO Achievements in 2019, and strongly supports the preparations for the IHO-100.

NETHERLANDS:

The Netherlands agrees on proposed activities for the IHO-100 celebrations. However, the Netherlands notes the half day special session on IHO-100 at A2 in April 2020. A2 has already been shortened by a day. This half day event now seems to take up a relative large part of A2. What is the envisioned content of this half day event?