

**14<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE IHO INTER-REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
IHO-IRCC14  
Denpasar - Bali, Indonesia, 6-8 June 2022**

**IRCC Chair proposal regarding SPI allocated to IRCC**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	IRCC Chair
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	This proposal is a result of the discussions on SPI, taking into account the various contributions and describes the best way forward.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	IHO Strategic Plan 2021-2026 IRCC workshop April 2022 IRCC Circular Letter 1/2021
<b>Related Projects:</b>	None

### **1. Introduction / Background**

In 2020, A-2 approved the revised IHO Strategic Plan (Decision 19) and tasked the Council (Decision 20) to monitor closely the appropriateness and applicability of the proposed SPI and amend them if deemed necessary.

After the A-2 approval of the 3 year (2021-2023) IHO Work Programme, the IHO Work Programmes for 2021 and 2022 aligned with the Revised IHO Strategic Plan's Goals and Targets, were respectively approved by C-4 and C-5.

With Action C4/39, the Council agreed on the proposed allocation of the new SPIs to the Secretary-General, HSSC and IRCC (Work Programmes 1, 2 and 3 respectively). With Actions C5/15 and C5/42a-b the Council, noting the report and commending the IRCC, the RHCs and IRCC Subordinate Bodies for their achievements as well as the outcome of the IRCC October 2021 Workshop on the Strategic Plan, invited the IRCC to provide recommendations to the RHCs as a matter of priority, recognizing the need for further IRCC workshops to support the realization of the IHO Strategic Plan (deadline: by April 2022/IRCC14/C-6).

In April 2022 the second IRCC workshop concentrated on these SPI and inputs from IHO Secretariat, IRCC members and Member States have been discussed.

This proposal has been drafted by IRCC Chair in liaison with Vice-Chair and IHO Secretariat. It forms a compromise for the best way forward.

### **2. Analysis/Discussion**

This proposal is providing important and urgent strategic input to the realization of the IHO Strategic Plan 2021-2026. A decision has to be taken at IRCC 14, to be in line with the tasks from Assembly and Council assigned to IRCC on this topic.

The proposal is based on the discussions and inputs so far, especially at the IRCC Workshop in April and on the following assumptions and driving factors:

- a) Keep it simple.
- b) Derive figures that are measuring the success.
- c) These figures don't have to be perfect.
- d) They can evolve over time, but for the period of the Strategic Plan they have to be comparable for each year.
- e) use of existing digital tools available at the IHO Secretariat as far as possible.
- f) No need (and no time in view of A 3 in 2023) to wait for the development of fully new tools based on information not available yet.
- g) Core aim is to find worldwide indicators that doesn't leave any MS behind.

- h) Recognition of additional national and regional approaches to the IHO Strategic Plan and possibility of additional, tailored, probably more sophisticated measures in certain regions.
- i) Main focus on quality rather than quantity in defining the metrics to apply to the SPI assigned to IRCC.
- j) MSDI portal will not be ready before 2024.

### **3. Conclusions**

The IRCC Chair proposes the following way forward on the measurement of SPI allocated to the IRCC:

#### **SPI 1.2.2**

Percentage of navigationally significant areas (e.g. charted traffic separation schemes, anchorages, channels) for which the adequacy of the hydrographic knowledge is assessed through the use of appropriate quality indicators.

Navigationally significant areas: **areas covered by Usage Bands 3 to 5**

Appropriate quality indicator: **Percentage of the area, where CATZOC is other than U (Unassessed).**

Note 1: UB 3-6 are generally considered to be produced, when the respective area is navigationally significant. A depth contour isn't needed at this stage. UB 6 will have no statistical effect due to the limited area covered.

Note 2: Areas covered by several UB ENC to be counted from the higher UB only.

Note 3: Assessing the adequacy is not the same as being adequate.

Note 4: This can be developed further at a later stage. HSSC to be asked for support.

The calculation is being done by IHO Secretariat regularly.

Target for 2026: 100%

#### **SPI 1.3.1**

**Ability and capability of Member States to meet the requirements and delivery phases of the S100 implementation plan**

Filled IGIF template provided by WEND WG. Figures are "yes/partially/no" per each RHC.

Target: 50% yes

Note 1: The SPI measures the ability and capability to meet the requirements, not the production itself.

Note 2: WEND WG to provide the template.

#### **SPI 2.1.1**

**Number of hits downloading data/information from the portal**

IHO Secretariat to extract the number of accesses to the Map of National Geo-portals per year using the GIS tools.

The figure is a number, there is no concrete target other than an increase over time.

#### **SPI 2.2.1**

**Percentage of adequately surveyed area per coastal state**

**Use C-55 and additional GEBCO/Seabed2030 information,**

**IHO Secretariat to derive figures from C-55 for “adequately surveyed”, per coastal state regularly. For the coastal state with more than one region in C-55, the value will be defined by the weighted average of the regions based on the areas.**

**The results are in % per coastal state.**

**To report the figures, a strategic overview based on percentage intervals will be applied.**

**Task GEBCO GC to provide an additional figure for each RHC on the Seabed2030 information.**

Note 1: C-55 is considered as reference by the Strategic Plan WG.

Note 2: The definition of “adequately surveyed area” is for the time being done by MS and shall be developed by DQWG at a later stage (ask HSSC to task DQWG to do so).

Note 3: The categories “resurvey required” and “never systematically surveyed” in C-55 will not be used.

Note 4: Goal 2 isn't directly related to safety of navigation, but it can be assumed, that C-55 can be used for the time being, until better data is available. A broader view is provided by the additional Seabed 2030/GEBCO information.

Note 5: The weighted average is seen as a sufficient figure for the global perspective. RHCs might develop additional measurements of their developments (i.e. BSHC resurvey monitoring DB)

Note 6: There is no need at this stage to derive a depth contour line.

Note 7: A future extension of C-55 especially with regard to Goal 2 is being considered at CBSC. A new CBSC PT was tasked at CBSC20 "to focus on the content of C-55 to better reflect both the requirements for safety of navigations and the use of hydrographic data for non-navigational purposes”.

Note 8: Coastal States are not only Member States, this is covered in C-55.

Note 9: A strategic overview may consist of “number of states in certain intervals of % values” (i.e. 0-25-50-75-100%).

### **2.3.1**

**Number of HOs reporting success applying the UN shared guiding principles for geospatial information management in order to ensure in their national contexts.**

The guiding principles are very generic. A questionnaire will be quite simple to be provided and to be answered. It will be asking MS whether they applied the principles fully, partially or not yet.

**IHO Secretariat to send a CL and compute the results for 2022.**

RHC to include an update for their respective region in their report to IRCC.

Target: 70% of MS

Note 1: CL to be sent by the IHO Secretariat in June. Table of results to be provided to RHC by IHO Secretariat by December.

### **3.1.1**

**Percentage of Coastal States that are capable to provide marine safety information (MSI) according to the joint IMO/IHO/WMO manual on MSI**

**Task of WWNWS**

Target: 90% of Coastal States

**3.2.1**

**Amount of data received per year by the IHO Data Centre for Digital Bathymetry (DCDB)**

**3.2.2**

**Number of contributors to DCDB who are not hydrographic offices.**

**Comment SPRWG: Monitoring will be based on the increase of the value of the indicators, and assessment of its significance.**

**Task of DCDB**

**3.2.3**

**Percentage of total sea area that is Seabed2030 compliant for incorporation into the GEBCO dataset and services**

**Task of GEBCO GC**

**4. Recommendations**

IRCC to endorse the proposal.

Formalization of the proposal for SPI 2.3.1 via IHO CL by June 2022.

IHO MS, RHCs and IRCC subordinate bodies contributions' gathering and communication to IHO Secretariat via IRCC by October 2022.

Provision of metrics by IHO Secretariat through IHO Annual Report by December 2022.

To present the results at A-3.

In parallel, IRCC Chair to present the proposal at C-6.

**5. Justification and Impacts**

The proposed priority is high, as it is directly related to the Strategic Plan.

This proposal is providing a solution for the tasks given to IRCC at A-2 and by the Council. It is based on the assumptions and driving factors described in chapter 2. It is therefore combining a minimum of resources while providing results for the SPI allocated to IRCC sufficiently.

**6. Action Required of IRCC**

The IRCC is invited to:

- a. endorse the proposal
- b. recognize the contributions of IRCC members, IHO Secretariat and MS
- c. agree on the proposed way forward
- d. task IRCC Chair to report at C-6 accordingly
- e. task WEND WG to provide the template for SPI 1.3.1
- f. confirm the tasks allocated to WWNWS, DCDB and GEBCO GC
- g. ask IHO Secretariat to take the actions allocated to the Secretariat, especially to derive figures and overviews according to the proposal as well as sending a CL and the questionnaire to MS.