USCHC IHO Strategic Plan Gap Analysis – The Way Forward (Part 2)

Report to USCHC46

Mobile, Alabama, USA

16-17 March 2023



Part 1 Review

- At USCHC45 the USCHC IHO SP Gap Analysis document was introduced (<u>USCHC45 09A</u>)
 - Results based largely on the analysis and distillation conducted by ARHC
 - Many common elements
- USCHC45 discussed some 'takeaways' from the analysis
 - Focused on a few key elements
 - Clearer definitions required
 - Need for common and consistent reporting methodologies by MS and RHCs
- As a RHC of 2 MS, USCHC should be in a better position than others to address items
 - Not many answers from USCHC45
 - Time for demonstratable progress vis-à-vis SP implementation (Part 2)



Part 2 – Suggested Actions (a)

- General SP Updating and Reporting
 - Create single USCHC SPI Report Card that both countries would keep upto-date Action 1
 - This would be a subset of Annex A of the SP which contains only those elements applicable to MS and RHC.
 - USCHC MS to adopt identical definitions and methodologies for the SPIs in the Report Card Action 2
 - Makes for a consistent approach and easy "roll-up" of figures to the RHC level
 - IMPORTANT This must include C-55 (see next slide)
 - Develop a reporting cycle for the SPIs which fits with requirements for IRCC and particularly for Council Action 3
 - Designate a USCHC IHO SP Secretariat to oversee updating and adherence to the reporting cycle Action 4
 - Recommend representatives from each hydrographic office
 - One person designated as lead



Part 2 – Special Note on C-55

- C-55 has an important role to play
 - It is implicated in SPIs 1.2.2, 2.2.1, 3.1.1
 - 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 using appropriate quality indicators.
 - 2.2.1 Percentage of adequately surveyed area per coastal state
 - 3.1.1 Percentage of Coastal States that are capable to provide marine safety information (MSI)
 - Advantageous for US and CA to adopt identical methodologies for C-55 submissions for reporting
 - Information for SPIs could be 'automatically' drawn from C-55
 - Support possible future C-55 developments including integrations with INToGIS and/or GEBCO/Seabed 2030?
 - USCHC C-55 submissions will need to be included in the planning cycle.



Part 2 – Suggested Actions (a)

- Goal 1 Evolving the hydrographic support for safety and efficiency of maritime navigation
 - IMO has placed a timestamp on S-100 implementation (1 January 2026)
 - Create a cross-walk, to the greatest extent possible, between Goal 1
 Targets/SPIs and the Status on Implementation of the S-100 Roadmap
 document (as presented in Agenda Item <u>USCHC46-10C</u>) Action 5
 - These are related and this may streamline and economize reporting, and help clarify the similarities and differences between the Roadmap and SP
 - Particularly pertinent for 1.3.1 "Ability and capability of Member States to meet the requirements and delivery phases of the S-100 implementation plan".

Part 2 – Suggested Actions (b)

- Goal 2 Increasing the use of hydrographic data for the benefit of society.
 - Explore the possibility to develop federated and/or consolidated MSDIs for nav and non-nav information. Action 6
 - Is there a need to sort out "whose services where" e.g. S-111?
 - Engage MSDI WG and UN GGIM HWG concerning the definition of SPI 2.3.1
 "Number of HOs reporting success applying the principles [i.e. UN shared guiding principles for geospatial information management] in their national contexts"
 Action 7
 - Clarify the link with, or the role of, the USCHC IGIF-H matrix
 - Related to the above two items, evaluate the costs and benefits of a USCHC web presence for outreach and communications, especially for S-100 Roadmap implementation. See MACHC example here. Action 8
 - SPI 2.2.1 previously discussed in the context of C-55



Part 2 – Suggested Actions (c)

- Goal 3 Participating actively in international initiatives related to the knowledge and the sustainable use of the Ocean
 - Complete any further work required for the USCHC Seabed 2030 bathymetric data analysis for SPI 3.2.3 Percentage of total sea area that is Seabed 2030 compliant for incorporation into the GEBCO dataset and services. Action 9
 - Record in the USCHC SP Report Card and update on a set schedule
 - SPI 3.1.1 previously discussed in the context of C-55
 - EXTRA EXTRA High Seas Treaty breakthrough!
 - Perhaps for future discussion: Will there be a role for MS, RHCs and the IHO?
 e.g. S-122 as part of the tool box to establish and manage marine protected areas (MPAs)
 - Consideration for the next version of the IHO SP?



USCHC is invited to:

- a. Note this report.
- b. Consider the set of 9 actions proposed as part of MS and the USCHC commitment to the implementation of the IHO Strategic Plan.
- c. Take any other actions it feels may enhance the implementation of the IHO Strategic Plan.

Thank you

