

Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission

BSHC input to IHO Strategic Performance Indicators and IRCC Working Level Indicators

[Ref. IRCC5/19 Action]

IRCC contribution to monitoring Strategic Performance Indicators (in document IRCC5 Annex C)

| No PI | Designation | IRCC Contribution | Comments | BSHC input 2013 | BSHC 2017 |
|-------|--|--|----------|--|-----------|
| SPI 1 | Number and percentage of Coastal States providing ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party. (Previous year figures in brackets) | Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs. | | 9 / 100% (All Baltic Sea Coastal states.) | 9 / 100% |
| SPI 2 | Growth in ENC coverage worldwide, as reported in the IHO on-line catalogue, relative to the existing gap in adequate coverage (as defined by IMO/NAV) from the benchmark 01 Aug. 2008. | Source: collated by WEND WG from the IHO on-line catalogue. | | [to be reported by the WEND-WG] | |
| SPI 3 | Percentage of Coastal States which provide hydrographic services, directly or through an agreement with a third party, categorized by CB phases, as defined by the IHO Capacity Building Strategy. | Source: collated by CBSC through RHCs. | | 100% | 100% |
| SPI 4 | Percentage of "acceptable" CB requests which are planned. SPI 4bis Percentage of planned CB requests which are subsequently delivered. | Source: collated by CBSC. | | None | |
| SPI 5 | Number of standards issued (including new editions), per category: - hydrographic standards to enhance safety of navigation at sea, - protection of the marine environment, - maritime security, - economic development. | No IRCC contribution (Source: collated by HSSC). | | N/A | |
| SPI 6 | Number of potential new IHO MS (indicated by the start of the application process) relative to the number of "non-IHO" IMO MS. | No IRCC contribution (Source: collated by IHB through the government of Monaco). | | 1 Lithuania (in the discussion phase at Lithuania's Govern- ment) | 0 |



| SPI 7 | Increase in participation / membership in RHCs. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs. | | All 9 Baltic Sea countries are actively participating (Lithuania as associated member) to the work of the BSHC. | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|------|
| SPI 8 | Percentage of available / agreed ENC schemes. | Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs or International Charting Coordination Working Groups (ICCWG). | See table in IRCC An- nual Report for 2011. | 100% | 100% |

Selection of IRCC Working Level Indicators (in document IRCC5 Annex C)

| No PI | Designation | IRCC Contribution | Comments | BSHC input 2013 | BSHC 2017 |
|--------|---|---|--|---|---|
| WPI 15 | Growth in ENC coverage worldwide, as reported in the IHO on-line catalogue, relative to the existing gap in adequate coverage (as defined by IMO/NAV) from the benchmark 01 Aug. 2008. | Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs. | Associated with SPI 1. | Adequate coverage achieved. Some extensions planned. | |
| WPI 16 | Number of additional IHO MS starting to produce & maintain (with/without support) relevant ENCs (contributing to 'adequate coverage') in the reporting period relative to those already producing at 01 Aug. 2008. | Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs. | Associated with SPI 1. | All Baltic Sea countries have been producing ENCs. | 0 |
| WPI 17 | Percentage of Coastal States delivering Hydro- graphic services - catego- rized by CB phases (MSI services, surveying capa- bilities, charting capabili- ties), directly or through an agreement with a third party, at the end of the reporting period. | Source: collated by the CBSC through RHCs. | Y/N as- sessment for each Coastal State and each CB phase. | 100% | 100% |
| WPI 18 | Percentage of IHO MS updating their C-55 entry data regarding Hydrography survey, INT charts, ENC, and MSI in the reporting period. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs. | | Updated regularly 100% | 100% |
| WPI 19 | Status of hydrographic surveys in each region. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs. | Metrics to be defined. | Described in document BSHC18_C1 | In progress according to HELCOM re- survey |



| | | | | | scheme |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--------|
| WPI 20 | Percentage of agreed INT chart schemes, percentage of INT charts available. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs or IC-CWGs. | See table in IRCC Annual Report | [Not analysed] | |
| WPI 21 | Percentage of agreed ENC schemes, percent- age of ENC available. | Source: collated by WEND WG through RHCs or IC-CWGs. | Associated with SPI 8. See table in IRCC Annual Report | [Not analysed] | |
| WPI 22 | Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs. | | All are already active. | N/A |
| WPI 23 | Percentage of Coastal States which are IHO Member States. | Source: collated by the IHB. | | 88% (8 of 9 coastal states) | 100% |
| WPI 24 | Number of new Coastal States joining the IHO during the reporting period. | Source: collated by the IHB. | | 0 | 1 |
| WPI 25 | Number of potential new IHO MS (indicated by the start of the application process) relative to the number of "non-IHO" IMO MS. | Source: collated by the IHB. | | Lithuania (in the discussion phase at Lithuania's Government) | 0 |
| WPI 26 | Percentage of Coastal States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a Nation- al Hydrographic Office. | Source: collated by CBSC through RHCs. | | 100% | 100% |
| WPI 27 | Number of States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office in the reporting period. | Source: collated by CSBC through RHCs. | | 0 | 0 |
| WPI 28 | Percentage of Coastal States which provide ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party. | Source: collated by the WEND WG through RHCs. | | 100% | 100% |
| WPI 29 | Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial in- frastructure. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs. | | No reply from all. Status shown below: DEN: Yes EST: Yes FIN: Yes (Inspire) GER: Yes LAT: in progress LIT: Yes (through state owned company) POL: RUS: SWE: in progress | |



BSHC input to IHO Strategic Performance Indicators and IRCC Working Level Indicators

| WPI 40 | Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilaterals and RENC membership, etc. | Source: collated by IRCC through RHCs. | No reply from all. Status shown below: DEN: EST: 0 FIN: 0 GER: 0 LAT: LIT: POL: RUS: SWE: 8 |
|--------|---|--|---|
| WPI 41 | Percentage of planned CB events that are achieved. | Source: collated by CBSC. | N/A |
| WPI 42 | Number of acceptable CB requests received. | Source: collated by CBSC. | 0 |
| WPI 43 | Percentage of "accepta- ble" CB requests which are planned. | Source: collated by CBSC. | N/A |