

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

**Member State Reporting on Strategic Performance Indicators:
Guidance Sought on Baseline Definitions, Reference Documents,
and Scope for Certain SPIs**

Submitted by:	United States of America
Executive Summary:	Many RHCs are currently assessing implementation of the IHO Strategic Plan (SP) from a regional perspective, including member state status. This paper identifies Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs) for which the submitting country seeks broader discussion, definition, and common understanding of six SPIs which are anchored in member state self-reporting. Clarification of assumptions will be helpful building consistent standardized reporting process and global /regional/member state status reports.
Related Documents:	IHO SP
Related Projects:	Implementation of the IHO SP and SPI Reporting (ongoing)

1. Introduction / Background

The IHO Strategic Plan (IHO SP) was adopted in 2020. Reporting on status of Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs) and IHO SP implementation has in part been tasked to the Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs). Of 15 SPIs, six are specific to the status and reporting by coastal states individually (see Annex 1).

Over the course of conducting gap analysis and SPI reporting as a member state, uncertainties have arisen in regards to interpreting how to report a status against certain indicators. This paper identifies some of those SPIs (those that are member state based in the SPI terminology) for which further clarity would be warranted to ensure a consistent and meaningful reporting is conducted at the member state level. This is fundamental to further reporting at the regional and global level.

This paper focuses on six of the SPIs. The SPIs not included will likely also benefit from further discussion among the member states at an appropriate venue, such as the IRCC and/or Council.

2. Analysis/Discussion

In undertaking its contributions to several RHCs, the U.S. has come across certain questions related to the SPIs, and specifically the context to which member states input is provided.

Member states should have a common understanding of the context within which to provide status on the selected SPIs.

Assumptions the U.S. has made and guidance currently sought are in the following regards:

A) SPI terms

- (1) The SPI use of the terms “HO,” “member state,” and “coastal state” are synonymous. Is this correct?
- (2) Optimally, for the six SPIs identified in Annex 1, the total number of responses in any year is assumed to be equivalent to the total number of member states. In 2021, for example, there would be 97 responses. The denominator of the metric would be equal to the total number of member states? Is this correct?

- (3) A member state would not respond more than one time with differing metrics in a given reporting period, i.e. yearly. For example, the responses of any member state should be the same in each RHC in which it may be reporting. The member state reporting on its metric should report as a “member state” not as “a member state providing services within a particular regional commission.” Is this correct?

B) Clarifying and referencing benchmarks, standards, criteria within the five highlighted SPIs

- (4) Five of six selected SPIs contain terms for which documented citations would likely be helpful. This would assist member states reporting in a consistent fashion for “summary assessments.”

SPI #	SPI
1.1.1	Percentage of Member States having operationalized production and distribution of hydrographic data products and services based on IHO Universal Hydrographic Data Model (S-100), under an implementation framework of coordination and agreed timelines (2026: 100%)
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 (2026: 100%)
1.3.1	Ability and capability of Member States to meet the requirements and delivery phases of the S-100 implementation plan (2026: 50%)
2.2.1	Percentage of adequately surveyed area per coastal state
2.3.1	Number of HOs reporting success applying the GGIM principles in their national contexts (2026: 70%)
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 (2026 90%)

For example, what criteria are to be considered when characterizing products and services as “operationalized?” When referring to the S-100 implementation plan, it would be helpful to include the document number and web address for directed consideration. What does a metric of 50% mean- does it mean 50% success realizing the goals of the implementation plan for the specific year 2026?

C) International waters

- (5) Member states should or should not report on status of international waters. Should responses to the six highlighted SPIs be based on national jurisdiction or should member states be reporting on international waters? If the latter, how should that be coordinated?
- (6) How should international waters be reported, if at all, by member states for those SPIs identified and especially where RHCs are reporting regionally? For example, is 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”) limited to member state waters (including EEZ) or international waters?

(D) Overall management and awareness

- (7) Key reference documents in the SPIs should be maintained and clearly tied (for example by document number and reference location) to the SPIs. They should be readily discernable and discoverable on the IHO.INT website:
- a. S-100 implementation plan
 - b. Implementation framework

- c. S-100 Roadmap¹
- d. IMO/IHO/WMO manual on MSI
- e. Metrics Status

(8) The IHO Secretariat should consider the feasibility of establishing a “*management presence*” on the IHO Webpage for The SP. The term “management presence” in this paper is intended to convey the need for prominent focal point location on the IHO.INT webpage where a viewer may easily notice and discover the status of the metrics of the overall IHO SP (including governance documents and any relevant guidance).²

3. Conclusions

Clarification of assumptions underlying member state reporting on selected SPIs will improve reliability and utility of regional and global assessments of the progress of the IHOs implementation of the IHO SP.

4. Recommendations

- a. Consider this report and address the points raised, including issuing documented guidance for all member states and RHCs on reporting on SPIs and governance of the implementation of the IHO SP.
- b. Consider developing guidance or articulating assumptions that RHCs and member states should adopt with regard to RHC reporting on gap analysis for international waters and member states reporting on those SPIs identified here.

5. Justification and Impacts

It is considered a requirement by the member state submitting this paper that reporting on the SPIs by member states must be consistently understood by the member states. The benefit includes useful and reliable metrics at the member state to global level.

There should be no net added requirement on the part of the member states, as they are already considering how to report on metrics in the IHO SP as part of their membership in the IHO.

6. Action Required of IRCC

The IRCC is invited to:

- a. Endorse the underlying assumption that member states should report on SPIs highlighted here in a consistent manner with commonly understood assumptions, caveats, understanding, and interpretations.
- b. (If the above) Document any assumptions and interpretations for ease of reference by member states in their completing tasks to report on SPIs
- c. Agree this is required for useful reporting and understanding on the progress of the IHO to meet its SP implementation.
- d. Report any outcomes and decisions to the HSSC for awareness and in support of overall implementation of the IHO SP which necessarily involves all three Programs of the IHO.
- e. Request the IHO Secretariat provide a report on creating a management presence on the IHO.INT website as proposed in item 2 D. (7) and (8) above.

¹ Are A, B, and C the same?

² The same may also be warranted for progressing the implementation of the IHO showcase deliverable for the current decade, the S-100 Model and its Roadmap for realization.

Annex 1

IHO SP SPIs that are member state reported

Goal 1 Evolving the hydrographic support for safety and efficiency of maritime navigation, undergoing profound transformation	
1.1.1	Percentage of Member States having operationalized production and distribution of hydrographic data products and services based on IHO Universal Hydrographic Data Model (S-100), under an implementation framework of coordination and agreed timelines (2026: 100%).
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 (2026: 100%) ³
1.3.1	Ability and capability of Member States to meet the requirements and delivery phases of the S100 implementation plan (2026: 50%).
Goal 2 Increasing the use of hydrographic data for the benefit of society	
2.2.1	Percentage of adequately surveyed area per coastal state .
2.3.1	Number of HOs reporting success applying the principles in their national contexts (2026: 70%).
Goal 3 Participating actively in international initiatives related to the knowledge and the sustainable use of the Ocean	
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 (2026 90%)

³ For purposes of this paper and to seek clarification, this SPI is considered to be member-state based.