

# TIDAL WATER LEVEL CURRENT WORKING GROUP (TWCWG)

[Working Group of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)]

## Paper for Consideration by HSSC CG

### TWCWG Input into the IHO Strategic Plan

**References:** HSSC 7/05

Document version 1.0

HSSC7 invited the HSSC working groups to submit ideas for the IHO Strategic Plan and the IHO 3-year Program of Work. The TWCWG input is provided below.

#### **§ 4. Strategic directions:**

##### **“1. Strengthen the role and effectiveness of the IHO”**

To achieve § 1.3 “engaging the various stakeholders”, an action could be devoted to one person or one WG, in order to interact, convince non-governmental international organizations, government industry, academia.

##### **“2. Facilitate global coverage and use of official hydrographic data, products and services”**

This point could be clarified. For standards, guidelines, recommendations, and some other informations that are important to be known and shared in hydrography, points 2.1 to 2.6 fit well. To strive to achieve a global coverage and availability of official hydrographical data and services is probably unfeasible. Mainly due

- to state missions that are the base of operation for some organizations implying legal aspects and cooperation,
- to data policies and data properties laws,
- to ability to host IT servers to access to the data storage units in different countries, providing redundancy, backup,
- to define the scope of responsibilities of delivery (frequency and functional structure to deliver data and services).

Data and services would be validated by providers, production centres. If yes, this last point could be defined.

##### **“3. Raise global awareness of the importance of hydrography”**

§ 3.1: From capacity building experience in TWCWG, the first feedbacks highlight the usefulness of asking for a prerequisite level of understanding in hydrography and in English.

**Strategic assumptions and directions**, following the point on the necessary investment to provide and maintain a good quality of infrastructure in hydrography:

##### **“3. Strategic assumptions”**

§“3. Economic and market related trends” raises, deservedly, the long term investment required (§ 3.3). This point would benefit to be completed by a 5 years funding commitment and a 10 years funding commitment projection of funders (from funders to appropriate IHO service). Budget should be at least partially known by Chairmen, Vice-Chairs and Secretary of working groups, when it impacts actions of working group (WG). This would permit to better define the scope for action and to assign directly relevant priorities among the actions, when

necessary. This point could echo to 1.1 of § strategic directions. Ex: § 5.1 Ways and means, Planning and review cycles, could be an opportunity to synthesize the multi-annual budget, only the usable one for strengthen the role of the IHO, provide and maintain hydrography infrastructure and encourage publications means, training materials, capacity building.

## **“5. Ways and means”**

§ “5.2 Risk analysis and mitigation” I would add a point (d) Identify a contact and an action to achieve it (this echoes to §1.3).

Last section of §“5.3 Work programme”: Suggestion: Provide annually a calendar of scheduled reports, reviews. In one document, all the useful information from IHO would be visible and should encourage interactions between MS, Chairmen of WG and IHO, at least to prepare milestones.

## **“6. Progress monitoring”**

§6.1 Performance indicators (PI): At this level in the text, possibly write the required frequency of definition of PI. It could be annually.

§6.2: Review of progress. Same comment as above.

I'd add a fifth point § 6.5: Monitoring of the available budget for the work program. From manager of this section Progress monitoring to WG chairmen vice-chairs and secretaries.

§ Working level: PIs: This is more the responsibility of WG. But it could be written that PIs review and PIs definition and calculation would be provided to IHB. This would promote a good balance between the PIs definition, update and the real actual activity.

## **“Annex A -Risk management framework”**

### **“1. Risk Management Policy”**

§1.2: General Methodology”: Strategic level by the IHB: And communicate it towards WG chairmen, vice-chairs and secretaries.

### **“2. Risk management process”**

§ “2.2 Risk identification”:

(1) Face to internal risk identified a ranking by priorities could be added. And addition of a qualifier. Ex: Strong, low, blocking point.

(2) External risk: Same as for internal risk (1).

### **“SD1 Strengthen the role and effectiveness of the IHO”**

§ External: Face to the risk of “technological developments too fast to cope”, one strong point of IHO is that the organization can anticipate sometime and make recommendations regarding the production of high technology developments. If the risk is too strong, would it be possible to create a WG in the frame of IHO? A WG that would look products and services from new technologies (PSNTWG)

### **“SD3 Raise global awareness of the importance of hydrography”**

§ External : The “ lack of interest” raised in the text maybe highlights the need to identify a contact who will be in charge to promote inter organizations relations and help to search funds for work program, relations and provide information to IHO organization.

### **“2.3 Risk assessment”**

Column Risk can sometimes dilute the risk analysis. Man understands however that this number provides a global estimation of risk. Is a percentage of risk could qualify the risk in complement?

### **“2.5 Implementation of the risk management plan”**

Also validate the risk treatment with Chairmen to the top management team.

## **Others**

As highlighted NIPWG comments:

Expand the use of S-100

S-100 should be provided in a way that it could be used globally and not only for ECDIS

S-100 should support facets of the e-Navigation MSPs

Chair of TWCWG,

Gwenaële Jan