
2nd IRCC Workshop on the Strategic Plan

SAIHC
Regional experiences of measuring SPI

Peter Sparkes, SAIHC Chair

SPI 1.2.2

'Percentage of navigationally significant areas for which the adequacy of the hydrographic knowledge is assessed through the use of appropriate quality indicators'

We actively encourage Member States to complete C55 but the above is problematic...

- Navigationally significant areas are not defined and agreed upon.
- Currently extracting this information from C-55 is not possible.
- To amplify and address the issue, Annex to SPRWG CL01-2020, brings out the difference in approach between navigationally significant areas in SPI 1.2.2, and additionally consider non “navigationally significant” areas in SPI 2.2.1. However, the navigationally significant area will vary according to the development activities of a nation. New ports and allied structures will be continuously added as per the requirements of various stakeholders, which will have to be updated in data projected in C-55 and hence the SPI percentage being shown will be ever varying and unachievable.
- Hence, if a defined SPI percentage has to be achieved, the present number of ports, harbours, anchorage and other navigational significant areas of each member state will have to be frozen for hydrographic accounting.

SPI 1.3.1

'Ability and capability of MS to meet the requirements and delivery phases of the S-100 implementation plan'

- Can be achieved via a questionnaire in conjunction with IHO S100WG and disseminated by CB Coordinators to RHCs
- If S-101/S-102 data is to be included, a realistic audit of MS abilities to undertake surveys independently or through bilateral collaboration must be carried out to establish a baseline

SPI 2.1.1

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

- MSDI of various MS is developed by different organisations – HOs, Ports, Government Orgs
- MSDI Portals often contain other data types than hydrographic data, so 'number of hits' could be mis-leading

SPI 2.2.1

'Percentage of adequately surveyed area per coastal state'

- C-55 limitation – need to define 'adequately surveyed'
- For effective clarity of SPI objective, the following needs to be highlighted without ambiguity:-
 - i. Order of Survey as per S-44 edition 6 required to be met during hydrographic data collection. (Defining adequacy and quality)
 - ii. Methods of data collection which can be accepted for different navigationally significant/ non-significant areas. (Defining quality)
 - iii. What density of data collected can be defined as 'adequately surveyed'. (Defining data coverage)

SPI 2.3.1

'Number of HOs reporting success applying the principles in their national contexts'

- RHCs can distribute and coordinate MS response annually and utilise the CB coordinators to disseminate information or requests for data.
- Additionally, clearer guidelines and benefits that can be derived for hydrographic products from the UN shared guiding principle for Geospatial information management needs to be defined.

In conclusion..

- SPIs must be clearly defined, measurable and accessible to all Member States
- SAIHC Region Limitations:
 - Missing membership may make it difficult to gather meaningful information to apply to region as a whole (but good news is this is improving – new members Angola, Kenya, Seychelles in recent years)
 - COVID-19 has severely limited face-to-face communication and engagement however SAIHC18 10-12 May, Maputo, Mozambique will enable greater engagement
 - SAIHC development could additionally be measured through regional initiatives e.g. MSI Audit by AGLWG, access to CSB
- SAIHC Next Steps – SAIHC18 Seminar 9th May SPI regional engagement