

# Selected Takeaways from the USCHC IHO SP Gap Analysis

Draft June 2, 2002

Note: This summary benefits greatly from the analysis and distillation conducted by the Arctic Regional Hydrographic Commission (ARHC) and as applied to the USCHC IHO Strategic Gap Analysis ([USCHC45\\_09A](#)). There is considerable parallel in the recommendations or topics identified from the ARHC effort.

The “takeaways” below stem from the “actions” column of the USCHC45\_09A. In an effort to further distinguish the nature of “takeaways” for benefit of USCHC45, the “takeaways” are divided for each goal in terms of “administrative and reporting” and “discussion and decision.” The latter are more worthy of hydrographer attention during the USCHC45 given the time constraints of the meeting. The USCHC Secretariat is planning to select several of the “discussion and decision” points for any discussion at USCHC45.

Please consider sharing any insights you may have with the USCHC45 participants in advance of the USCHC45 meeting in order to support any discussion.

## Goal One

**Evolving the hydrographic support for safety and efficiency of maritime navigation, undergoing profound transformation**

### Administrative and organizational

- Generate and maintain active list on the IHO WGs where US and CA have members.
- Create a dashboard of how USCHC is moving on the IHO SP.
- USCHC determine which routes in Region A might lend themselves to autonomous shipping
- Seek clarification from HSSC on “autonomous shipping and emission reduction.” How should we report out?
- If RHCs are the framework for reporting on HO SPIs, what is the US and CA plan to do so? Once a year? Consistency of US and CA reporting in other RHCs, such as the ARHC? Etc.
- List which products and services in the Roadmap are not under the HO authority? Which S-1## products are outside the authority of the HO?

### Discussion and Decision

- SPI discussion: “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%)”. Define “operational”. What is 100%? Cite the “framework” document.
- List the S-100 roadmap deliverables by 2026 and assess US and CA prospects. Need reference document.
- S-101 alone will not be enough for users to update their systems.
- What is S-128 (“catalog of nautical products”)?
- Cybersecurity discussion:
  - Have the cyber-security specifications been finalized?
  - How is the denominator in this equation calculated?

- What is the difference between SPI 1.1.2 and SPI 1.2.1?
- Does ‘covered’ mean that the data [during transfer] is supposed to be encrypted?
- Do all S-xxx datasets have to be encrypted?
- What if an HO (e.g. US) does not wish to encrypt its products and services? Will this measure for them always be 0%?
- What is the “navigationally significant area” of Region A? Consider the IMO definition, if it exists quote and cite it for reference. Identify a CA-US team to calculate this SPI based on this definition and using any information e.g. CATZOC already captured in INTogIS, if possible. (SPI 1.2.2)
- Update C-55 for Region A for US and CA. What should US do about Aleutian Islands, currently not in Region A C-55 reporting?
- How does INTOGIS fit in the geospatial analysis the RHCs will be doing?
- Discuss a common understanding of SPI 1.3.1 (“*Ability and capability of Member States to meet the requirements and delivery phases of the S-100 implementation plan*”) and/or wait for wait for guidance from the IHO Secretariat, IRCC, or other body.

<b>Goal Two</b>
<b>Increasing the use of hydrographic data for the benefit of society</b>

Administrative and Organizational

- Ask HSSC for clarification on this SPI (“*Number of new applications of the new version of Standards for Hydrographic Surveys (S-44)*”) and work with the HSWG, as required.
- For UN GGIM:
  - Ensure US and CA report on this item and determine the reporting schedule (i.e. report due by what date each year).
  - Follow the work of the MSDI WG and UN GGIM HWG concerning the definition of this measure and engage as required.
  - Create a USCHC web presence including to better communicate its activities and the data available from MS that could be of value to society.

Discussion and Decision

- Does USCHC need a strategy and communications plan to accelerate and increase coverage to support increasing MSDI and/or improved appreciation of value of hydrographic data in the region?
- USCHC to make a concerted effort to develop federated and/or consolidated MSDI(s)/portal(s) for the region.
- Discuss USCHC view on “adequately surveyed.” Should there be a common understanding or should MS define the standards they will use in generating a report? Discuss engagement with relevant IHO Groups, such as CBSC and others to be identified.
- How does C-55 connect to this concept of “adequacy”? What are the efficiencies that can be accomplished vis-à-vis MSDI, C-55 and other geospatial inputs to the IHO?

<b>Goal Three</b>
<b>Participating actively in international initiatives related to the knowledge and the sustainable use of the Ocean</b>

Administrative and Organizational

- Confirm who (agency/nation) provides MSI for US, CA, and for Region A.
- US and CA to complete the evaluation of their bathymetric data coverages vis-à-vis the Seabed 2030 specifications in time to report to C6/A3. Complete their Seabed 2030 data gap analysis, broken down into publicly and non-publicly available data, working with the RDACCs if possible/practical in time to report to C6/A3.

Discussion and Decision

- Consider whether USCHC wants a UN Decade of Ocean Science engagement strategy and what that would look like. This could be related to the previous point and development of a regional MSDI.