Annex A - Axis of Evolution of the IHO Strategic Plan

The IRCC is requested to provide feedback to be taken into consideration by the SPRWG during their review of the IHO Strategic Plan. This feedback has been contributed in two ways:

1. Within the reports of several RHCs to IRCC
2. During a live brainstorming session at IRCC 16

The information provided is captured below.

RHC Contributions to IRCC16

The following contributions to 'Input to the IHO Strategic Plan" were provided within the reports of the RHCs listed below:

NHC Input to the IHO Strategic Plan review
NSHC Report - Annex A: NSHC Input to the IHO Strategic Plan
EAHC Report - Input by Japan

A summary of the content provided by members of the above-listed RHCs was collated by the IHO Director:

1. Maintain the 3 main goals but update and refine targets to better align with strategic objectives
2. Rename Goal 1 into "Precise Marine Navigation"
3. Streamline Goals 2 and 3
4. Targets to be measurable and identifiable with clear responsibilities assigned
5. SPIs to be objectively reviewable and applicable for all Member States
6. Enhance discoverability and governance for SPIs for external stakeholders, tracking and newcomers
7. Consider on how to conduct the maintenance of S-100 product specifications and the GI registry
8. Conduct capacity building by IHO and RHCs for technical training and examination on how to develop the S-100 products
9. Increasing attention on workforce development in 2027-2033

IRCC16 Brainstorming Exercise

On day three, IRCC opened a discussion on the "Axis of Evolution of the IHO Strategic Plan". After a review of the 'Input to the IHO Strategic Plan" included in some RHC reports, three groups were created to brainstorm on the:

1. Strategic Plan Structure;

2. Governance and Role of IRCC;
3. Measurement system (SPI), and
4. Aspects concerning RHCs and IRCC bodies

While input from the three groups, in its entirety, is provided below, the IRCC Chair team did attempt to summarize the suggestions, based on the bullets above, especially where overlap was identified.

Individual Group Contributions

Group 1:

The group suggests keeping VISION and MISSION unchanged.

GOAL 1:

- Include "PRECISE" is desirable
- To be clear that it is still the PRIORITY
- Headline with longer description of goal
- Support (Should connect to) IMO e-Navigation Strategy
- Include capacity building
- What is our main priority?
- (We should not have goal that "only" support other parties goals)
- To provide the hydrographic services (Electronic navigational data service (ENDS)???) for safe,
- efficient (& precise) navigation

GOAL 2 and 3:
- Goal 2 is about the use of GOOD hydro DATA, to COLLECT ONCE and USE for MULTIPLE
- purposes
- Goal 3 is about focusing on cooperation/collaboration both in terms of goal 1+2
- Goal 3: Strengthen IHO's role as a global player by integrating navigational safety, depth data, and other marine data, emphasizing collaboration, data alignment, and a broader narrative on the benefits of hydrography.

TARGETS (Need to define targets before defining SPIs and also consider re-use of most important SPIs) FOR

GOAL 1
- Phase out plan for S-57
- Capacity building

GOAL 2
- Capacity building

GOAL 3

- MSDI
- Capacity building

SPIs
- should be easy to measure and compare
- should be provided by secretariat or other reporting

Group 2:

A. New Strategic Plan Structure – off the table, however something that multiple RHCs had identified. In the current strategic plan, there is a target for an MSDI Portal – other SPI were not well thought out – these are examples of areas where these should be tweaked.

Goal One:

Challenge the drafting group to develop language in a way that is more transparent and accessible to ourselves and our broader stakeholder group (industry, ports, maritime regulators).

More plain language description of what we are trying to do with Goal One.

We need to adapt the language of our goals to our direct stakeholders, like the IMO, ports maritime authority.

Content of the high level goals is not changed – but refining the language adds value. Clarify the implications.

Goals that are more understandable for the outside community. Improve our language, serve as a better tool to get the outside world engaged and perhaps successfully obtain funding partners.

Are we focusing too much on bathymetry – there are many other themes that are relevant to us and our community. Broadening the scope of what we are talking about with our Strategy.

Navigation is more than just bathymetry.

Backscatter – we do not need this for our navigational charts, but this adds immense value to Goals 2 and 3. Considering efficiency, bathymetry is not enough, needs sea level, weather forecasts, we are planning for this with S100.
Perspective – the way this is worded is open to other data sources – BUT, the SPIs only focus on bathymetry. The SPIs need to include more than bathymetry.

Goal Two – use of our data for other purposes, to the betterment of our society.

Task for the drafting group – addressing the crossovers between Goals Two and Three make more concrete the connection between hydrography and other purposes, social, economic and environment. Goal Two – good statement, however how and why – it needs to be more specific

Climate change is missing. Ideas like – hydrography as an underpinning data layer for climate modeling.

Instead of focusing on non-navigation – goal two is about what connects us to the outside world. Goal two focus on hydrography supporting – digital twins, climate change, inundation modeling,

needs to be more concrete in Goal Two and link this to the biggest challenges of our planet.

Social, economic and environmental – non navigational uses, these are actually top priority for our governments.

Realizing the benefits of data beyond navigation.

We need to understand the limitations of SPIs – measuring what we can measure, not necessarily what we need to measure. When we want to measure benefits we need to be specific, words that mean something to our stakeholders.

C-55 additional question – do you serve your data in other places (not for navigation) – this could be a simple measure to demonstrate hydrographic offices contributing their data to these other purposes of economy, social, climate etc. Link our data to other important global needs.

Ocean models depending on good bathymetry – need to preserve the value of that data through our workflow. We also need to be prepared for higher requirements for things like digital twins. How we are successful in addressing the wider community benefits – how we help other parts of society to do their job better.

Making other government stakeholders understand how vital our data is. Cross over between Goals 1 and 2 – green shipping – reduced carbon – these are required and are fundamental navigation requirements for some European countries. Including the concept of sustainability into Goal One.

Goal Three
We do not need to have an exhaustive list of international organizations. In order to achieve goals one and two we need engagement with navigation and non-navigation partners to enable success.

This is a foundational goal – an infrastructure goal. Capacity Building is one of our strategic pillars –capacity building should be in Goal 1 to improve and prepare and build our capacity. In Goal one we need to engage with other producers and other data themes – cooperation with other organizations is required – IMO, IALA, WMO.

What is new, we are going into the S100 era and we want IMO involved. Task for the drafting group– Goal one requires others to engage with us.
Goal 1 is our heavy hitter – our core business. Recast Goal three as an underlying support to Goal 1.

Goal three is currently focused on the ancillary uses of hydrography - strengthen goal three.

Goal Three - Provide hydrographic data in support of safety of efficient maritime use (suggestion)

Where does the IHO want to be? How are we recognized in a broad community as a key asset, that we are engaged in the Ocean community. Recognition and engagement is the goal but it enables Goals 1 and 2.

B. Governance and Role of IRCC – this comes after we have decided how to evolve the Strategic Plan – this is not the time to question the current role and governance of the IRCC.

Group 3:

A. New Strategic Plan Structure
      a. Goals 2 and 3 as potentially being able to be streamlined
            i. Would that be considered by IRCC?
            ii. Is SPI 1.3 important enough to make it its own goal in the void created by merging goals 2 & 3
            iii. Capacity building, technology, workforce, should be considered in the new strategic plan
            iv. Is Capacity Building itself not a goal, but a method to support the other goals?
            v. Workforce and IT investment, and technology supports all of the goals
      b. Largely keep the current strategy but reduce the workload
            i. Do we maintain the 3 main goals but refine the targets?
                ii. Observe that climate change is absent from the current SP even it can be inferred.
      c. Goal 2: Include climate change and coastal resiliency maybe as a textual Change?
      d. Goal 3: There's a need to build public awareness about ocean governance and activities and why they are important

B. Role of IRCC
      a. The breadth is broad

C. Measurement systems and SPI
      a. A homepage explanation of how these indicators are being calculated, where they reside, who calculated and when. Place them in a prominent location on the website. Will inform MS and build accountability. Right now they are buried in the yearly report and meeting reports. Place it in the IHO SP page
      b. Can we make it dynamic and automatic? Can we structure national reports to extract that data directly from them?
      c. Changing metrics is always a risk, old statistics get tossed
      d. SPI 2.1.1: Build a portal? MSDI is not supposed to develop this anymore. Must update this SPI
      e. SPI 2.3.1: Shared guiding principles: If you're thinking about data - follow a standard. Should we refine this?

D. Aspects concerning IRCC bodies
      a. Making sure all of the RHCs are operating somewhat similarly
      b. A lot of concerns from RHCs about capacity building are just noted
      c. Review the IRCC permanent actions to have more of the subordinate bodies report out statistics across regional commissions
      d. Review IRCC actions to incorporate a global metric for SPIs
      e. Some RHCs are doing a great job being inclusive to coastal states that are not IHO members