

2nd IHO-HSSC Meeting
Rostock, Germany, 26-29 October 2010

Paper for Consideration by HSSC

HSSC Input to IHO Strategic Planning Process

Submitted by:	Directing Committee
Executive Summary:	This paper invites the HSSC to consider the impact of the IHO Strategic Planning Process on the HSSC and to decide how the Committee can best fulfil its obligations.
Related Documents:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4EIHC Paper EX4/Rep.01 - <i>Report of the IHO Strategic Plan Working Group</i> 2. IHO Resolution 12/2002 (as amended) – <i>Planning Cycle</i> 3. 4EIHC Decision No. 7 – <i>Reviewing of the implementation of the new planning mechanism</i>

Introduction / Background

1. The Terms of Reference of the HSSC includes:
 6. *Prepare a Committee Work Program and propose it to each ordinary session of the International Hydrographic Conference ("each ordinary session of the International Hydrographic Conference" to be replaced by "the Assembly" via the Council when the Assembly and the Council are established). Consider and decide upon proposals for new work items under the Committee Work Program, taking into account the financial, administrative and wider stakeholder consequences and the IHO Strategic Plan and Work Program.*
 7. *Monitor the execution of the Committee Work Program and report to each ordinary session of the International Hydrographic Conference ("ordinary session of the International Hydrographic Conference" to be replaced by "meeting of the Council" when the Council and Assembly are established), including an evaluation of the performance achieved.*
2. In 2009, the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (4EIHC) adopted the recommendations of its IHO Strategic Plan Working Group (ISPWG) This included a revised IHO Strategic Plan and an outline description of various processes for the maintenance, monitoring and execution of the Strategic Plan. These are described in the ISPWG Report: 4EIHC Paper EX4/Rep.01 - *Report of the IHO Strategic Plan Working Group*. The Conference also adopted a revised IHO Resolution 12/2002 - *Planning Cycle*. (A copy is provided at Annex A)
3. The IHO strategic planning process agreed by the 4EIHC includes risk management and performance indicators. These are addressed at two levels:
 - strategic level by the IHB and processed top down
 - working level by subordinate bodies under HSSC/IRCC and processed bottom up
4. The 4EIHC took note of the comments of the Directing Committee that the requirements of the strategic planning process could have organisational and resource implications, and requested the IHB Directing Committee:
 - ... to review the implementation of the new planning mechanism, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC chairs ... and report back to the next ordinary IHC (or to the first Assembly) in 2012.*

Analysis

5. Under the IHO Strategic Planning Process there are four principal activities that will involve the HSSC:
- Input to the IHO Strategic Plan
 - Input to the IHO Work Plan
 - Performance monitoring
 - Risk management

Input to the IHO Strategic Plan

- 5.1 IHO Resolution 12/2002 indicates that the HSSC can provide input annually to update the IHO Strategic Plan:

“IHB invites MS, HSSC and IRCC to submit proposals to update the Strategic Plan”

This implies that the HSSC will review the extant Strategic Plan annually at its meetings prior to submitting any input.

5.2 **Questions:**

How will this be achieved in practical terms by the HSSC?

Is this a task for the HSSC Chair Group, or the Chairman, or both?

Input to the IHO Work Plan

- 5.3 IHO Resolution 12/2002 requires that the ...

“IHB evaluates the accomplishment of the preceding year’s Programme, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, and reports to MS, through the “IHO Annual Report”, reviews the Work Programme upcoming years in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, proposing changes (if needed) to the Programme in force and budgetary adjustments issuing from those changes, within the limits of the 5-year Budget.”

This implies that the HSSC will review the forthcoming annual IHO Work Plan at its meetings and provide comment and feedback to the Directing Committee.

5.4 **Questions:**

Will the HSSC provide input to the Directing Committee both before and after the proposed Work Plan has been finalised?

Given the constraints of a one-year planning cycle, how will this be achieved in practical terms by the HSSC?

Should the HSSC Chair Group do this? If so, should this be by correspondence prior to each meeting of the HSSC or immediately before each meeting?

Performance Indicators

- 5.5 Annex 7 of the ISPWG Report lists recommended Performance Indicators (PI’s). There are nine PI’s intended to monitor the seven Objectives of the IHO. In addition, there are 43 PI’s intended to measure the 19 Strategic Initiatives that support the four Goals of the IHO. The proposed PI’s and their relationship to the Objective, the Goals and the Strategic Initiatives of the IHO is shown in the tables in Annex B.

- 5.6 The Directing Committee has compared the IHO performance monitoring regime agreed at the 4EIHC with the arrangements adopted by other intergovernmental and national institutions. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) monitors its very extensive program of inter-governmental work under eight Goals monitored through 18 PI’s, the World Meteorological Organization has identified five Strategic Thrusts that it monitors with 11 PI’s, the Australian Hydrographic Service has identified six Goals, that it measures with 13 PI’s, and the Chilean HO measures its performance using 21 PI’s in total. Informal inquiries indicate that these levels of monitoring are typical. The International Standards Organization (ISO) has identified seven Key Objectives and seven measurable results in its Strategic Plan, but does not employ any PI’s.

5.7 Paragraph 7 of the ISPWG report indicates that the PI's are proposals and open to "... *refinement by the appropriate organs*". This indicates that revised or alternative arrangements can be considered.

5.8 The PI's identified in the ISPWG Report s relating specifically to the HSSC are highlighted in Annex B.

5.9 While the ISPWG Report (in paragraph 7) suggests that PI's should be measurable, practical and achievable, the Directing Committee has examined the proposed PI's in relation to their usefulness and how easy it would be to collect and collate the underlying data required. In many cases, the data will be difficult or impossible to collect and its usefulness seems difficult to identify. Brief comments by the Directing Committee on these aspects are included in the tables in Annex B.

5.10 Questions:

How would the HSSC collect, collate and assess the information required for the PI's that relate to the Committee?

Are the 52 proposed PI's realistic and useful?

Risk Management

5.11 The risk management methodology is principally a "top down" approach, with input coming from the Directing Committee in consultation with the Chairs of IRCC and HSSC. The methodology relies in large part on the performance monitoring system to determine if identified risks are increasing or being mitigated.

5.12 The ISPWG report (Report annex A, paragraph 2.5) also advises that the IHO should: "... *decide on possible risks from a bottom-up perspective; this could be executed by subordinate bodies of the IHO in line with this framework*".

5.13 Questions:

Does a "*bottom-up perspective*" mean the involvement of HSSC or its subordinate WGs or both?

How will this be achieved in practical terms?

Discussion and Conclusions

6. The Directing Committee pointed out to the 4EIHC that the Strategic Planning Process appears to involve a number of potentially complex and time consuming processes. As a result, the 4EIHC invited the Directing Committee to review the implementation of the new planning mechanism, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC chairs and to report back to the next ordinary IHC in 2012.

7. The Directing Committee considers that the number and detail of many of the proposed PI's is excessive and well beyond the existing capability of MS, the organs of the IHO and the IHB to support in a meaningful way. There are no staff members (PA's or administrative staff) in the IHB with either the capacity or the experience to manage performance reporting and analysis at the scale envisaged in the ISPWG Report. As a result, the DC proposes that it would be more manageable and practical to reduce the PI's to about 12 Key Performance Indicators that will monitor the overall achievement of the IHO Goals rather than through the more direct monitoring of the 19 Strategic Initiatives so far identified to achieve those Goals.

Recommendations

8. The HSSC is invited to consider the issues and how it can best ensure that the purpose of the strategic planning process is achieved in a pragmatic and efficient manner. This may mean suggesting revisions to the Directing Committee on the methodology proposed, the measurement metrics (PI's), or the levels of responsibility that have been assigned. Practical business rules may also need to be established.

9. In any case, and in accordance with its current Terms of Reference and IHO Resolution 12/2002, the HSSC should provide input to the 2013-2017 Work Programme by 1 September 2011.

Action required of HSSC

10. HSSC is requested to:

consider the matters raised in this paper,

agree that the proposed IHO strategic planning and performance monitoring mechanism requires simplification,

agree that the Directing Committee develop a simplified reporting and monitoring structure focussed on the IHO Goals, rather than the IHO Strategic Initiatives, for subsequent consideration by Member States,

provide feedback to the chair of HSSC and the Directing Committee concerning the strategic planning process in general, and in particular:

- HSSC input to the Strategic Plan
- HSSC input to the IHO Work Plan
- HSSC input and involvement with Performance Monitoring
- HSSC input and involvement with Risk Management

provide input to the Directing Committee for the 2013-2017 Work Programme by 1 September 2011, and take any other action as appropriate.

Copy of IHO Resolution 12/2002

PLANNING CYCLE	12/2002 as amended	EIHC 4	T5.1
-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------	-------------

The Organization shall prepare two plans to guide its work:

- 1) The Strategic Plan shall be for an indefinite period, and shall be reviewed at each Conference.
- 2) The 5-year Work Programme shall look five years ahead, and shall be reviewed annually.

Planning Cycle for the Strategic Plan

Y-12 (Apr): IHB invites MS, HSSC and IRCC to submit proposals to update the Strategic Plan.

Y-08 (Aug): IHB circulates the proposals on strategic issues to all MS.

Y-05 (Nov): MS provide comments to IHB in relation to the proposals.

Y (Apr): At the IHC, the revised Strategic Plan is discussed, amended and decided upon in Plenary.

Y+02 (Jun): IHB circulates the updated Strategic Plan to MS.

Notes: 1) *Rules of Procedure of IHC n° 14 and n° 15 apply.*

- 2) *"Y" means the year of the Ordinary Conference, and the numbers are months before (-) or after (+).*

Planning Cycle for the 5-year Work Programme

The 5-year Work Programme will be reviewed on a yearly basis.

Y (Jan): The corresponding Annual Programme enters in force.

Y+04 (Apr): IHB evaluates the accomplishment of the preceding year's Programme, in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, and reports to MS, through the "IHO Annual Report", reviews the Work Programme upcoming years in consultation with the HSSC and IRCC, proposing changes (if needed) to the Programme in force and budgetary adjustments issuing from those changes, within the limits of the 5-year Budget.

Y+06 (Jun): MS provide IHB with comments and proposals, if any, for changes to the Programme in force.

Y+08 (Aug): IHB submits to the Finance Committee (FC) for approval the draft Programme and Budget for the upcoming year.

Y+09 (Sep): FC members provide comments and IHB issues CL submitting the draft Programme and Budget to MS for approval.

Y+11 (Nov): MS approve the draft Programme and Budget and IHB issues CL with the final version of the Programme and Budget.

Y+12 (Jan): The corresponding Annual Programme enters into force, and the Cycle is repeated.

During Conference years, Article 23 of the General Regulations will apply and the IHB will submit the new Work Programme and associated 5-year Budget for the intersessional period 4 months before the Conference. The Work Programme and proposed 5-year Budget will be discussed and approved by the Conference and will enter into force on 1st January of the year following the Conference. Then the Planning Cycle as described above will apply.

Note: "Y" means years.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Table 1

Strategic Performance Indicators
(intended to monitor/measure the IHO Objectives)

PI's that may require direct HSSC input or consideration have been highlighted: 

IHB Comments in **RED**

Objective	Strategic PIs (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
(a) To promote the use of hydrography for the safety of navigation and all other marine purposes and to raise global awareness of the importance of hydrography. This is about improving "community awareness", not about chart or data availability	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) This does not measure the success of Objective (a), which is about raising awareness.

Objective	Strategic PIs (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
<p>(b) To improve global coverage, availability and quality of hydrographic data, information, products and services and to facilitate access to such data, information, products and services.</p>	<p>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. <i>This should not be linked only to chart coverage for international voyages. Is it the best measure to use?</i></p> <p>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. <i>Will States accept being placed in a "category"?</i> <i>How does this measure accessibility of data, etc?</i> <i>How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (b)?</i></p>
<p>(c) To improve global hydrographic capability, capacity, training, science and techniques.</p>	<p>SPI 4 Percentage of "acceptable" CB requests which are planned. <i>What is the 100% baseline for this?</i> <i>How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (c)?</i></p> <p>SPI 4bis Percentage of planned CB requests which are subsequently delivered.</p>

Objective	Strategic PIs (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
<p>(d) To establish and enhance the development of international standards for hydrographic data, information, products, services and techniques and to achieve the greatest possible uniformity in the use of these standards.</p>	<p>SPI 5 Number of standards issued (including new editions), per category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - hydrographic standards to enhance safety of navigation at sea, - protection of the marine environment, - maritime security, - economic development. <p style="color: red;">This measure appears to encourage the issue or revision of standards just to satisfy the figures How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (d)?</p>
<p>(e) To give authoritative and timely guidance on all hydrographic matters to States and international organizations.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p style="color: red;">This does not measure the success of Objective (e)</p>
<p>(f) To facilitate coordination of hydrographic activities among the Member States.</p>	<p>SPI 7 Increase in participation / membership in RHCs.</p> <p style="color: red;">Attendance or membership does not necessarily mean participation or coordination. Will this measure the success or failure of Objective (f)?</p>

Objective	Strategic PIs (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
(g) To enhance cooperation on hydrographic activities among States on a regional basis.	<p>SPI 8 Percentage of available / agreed ENC schemes.</p> <p>How/who measures this? Is this a good indicator of cooperation? How will this measurement indicate the success or failure of Objective (g)?</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Table 2

**Working Level Performance Indicators
(intended to monitor/measure the IHO Goals)**

PI's that may require direct HSSC input or consideration have been highlighted: 

IHB Comments in RED

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
<p>1. Strengthen the role and effectiveness of the IHO</p> <p>The IHO will continue its leading role as the competent international organization on all hydrographic matters by responding more efficiently and effectively to the needs of the maritime community, government, science and industry for hydrographic data, products and information through:</p>	<p>1.1 implementing proactive, efficient and dynamic procedures and mechanisms that respond effectively to emerging trends, developments and challenges.</p>	<p>WPI 1 - Percentage of IHO MS participation in the main IHO organs during the reporting period. <i>How does this monitor SD 1.1?</i></p> <p>WPI 2 - Response ratio to IHO CL during the reporting period. <i>How does this monitor SD 1.1?</i></p> <div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>WPI 3 - Specific examples of changes made (e.g. implementation of S100) in the reporting period. <i>This seems to encourage changes for the sake of the figures.</i> <i>Will this measurement indicate the success or failure of SD 1.1?</i></p> </div>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
		<p>WPI 4 - Number of times the IHB is required to respond to external demands without notice (or without opportunity to consult with MS). <i>How will the IHB record and collate these figures? What is an external demand?</i></p> <p>WPI 5 - Number of reactive circular letters published each year (the fewer the better). <i>This measure is fairly subjective.</i></p>
	<p>1.2 closer and more effective cooperation with other international organizations, in order to respond to cross-agency issues and thereby promote coherence and efficiency.</p>	<p>WPI 6 - Number and names of relevant international organizations with which agreements are established. <i>Will increasing the total numbers be a measure of success?</i></p> <p>WPI 7 - Qualitative assessment of progress with such agreements including any noteworthy successes that promote the partners' positions. <i>How will this be measured?</i></p>
	<p>1.3 engaging the various stakeholders, including non-governmental international organizations, government, industry, academia and others, in the technical work of its bodies, in order to ensure a more inclusive approach to decision-making and the optimum use of high fidelity data.</p>	<p>WPI 8 - Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the attendance by stakeholders in key IHO meetings and a short qualitative statement of any noteworthy benefits/outcomes delivered as a result. <i>How will this be measured? - %? - total? - What is a key meeting? Will this measurement indicate the success or failure of SD 1.3?</i></p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
	<p>1.4 developing, improving, promulgating and promoting clear, uniform, global hydrographic standards to enhance safety of navigation at sea, protection of the marine environment, maritime security and economic development.</p>	<p>WPI 9 - Percentage of standards considered up to date. <i>Who/how will "up to date" be decided?</i></p> <p>WPI 10 - Number of standards issued (including new editions), per category (safety of navigation at sea, protection of the marine environment, maritime security and economic development) in the reporting period. <i>This seems to encourage revisions for the sake of the figures.</i></p> <p>WPI 11 - Percentage of standards considered adequately implemented / enforced. <i>How will this be measured? Where will the figures come from? Is there a difference between standards and guidelines? In any case, IHO "standards" are not binding/enforceable on HO's. Will this measurement indicate the success or failure of SD 1.4?</i></p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
	1.5 promoting the role of hydrography in supporting relevant related ocean sciences.	<p>WPI 12 - Number of events (including letters, meetings, seminars, publications, Web actions for this purpose) during the reporting period. <i>How and by whom will these figures be compiled?</i></p> <p>WPI 13 - Assessment of the effectiveness of the events based on specific feedback. <i>How and by whom will these figures be obtained?</i></p> <p>WPI 14 - Increase in proportion of IHO web-site hits and enquiries to IHO for advice / assistance. <i>Stats other than website hits will be difficult to collect and collate.</i></p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
<p>2. Facilitate global coverage and use of official hydrographic data, products and services</p> <p>The IHO will strive to achieve global coverage and availability of high quality official hydrographic data, information, products and services necessary for safety of navigation at sea and for non-navigational uses, e.g. by means of the developing spatial data infrastructure, through:</p>	<p>2.1 coordinating effectively Member State activities for the provision of coherent, standardized and well coordinated hydrographic services, in accordance with regulation 9, of Chapter V of the SOLAS Convention.</p>	<p>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. <i>This is also SPI 2.</i></p> <p>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. <i>Does this measurement indicate success or failure of SD 2.1?</i></p> <p>WPI 17 - Percentage of Coastal States delivering hydrographic services - categorized by CB phases (MSI services, surveying capabilities, charting capabilities), directly or through an agreement with a third party, at the end of the reporting period. <i>Experience shows that this info will be very difficult to obtain from many developing States. How does this measurement monitor effective coordination in the delivery of hydrographic services?</i></p> <p>WPI 18 - Percentage of IHO MS updating their S-55 entry data regarding hydrography survey, INT charts, ENC, and MSI in the reporting period. <i>How does this measurement monitor effective coordination in the delivery of hydrographic services?</i></p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
	<p>2.2 enhancing and supporting cooperation on hydrographic activities among States on a regional basis under the aegis of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions.</p>	<p>WPI 19 - Status of hydrographic surveys in each region. <i>Can/will RHCs do this?</i> <i>Will this measurement monitor cooperation of hydrographic services under the RHCs?</i></p> <p>WPI 20 - Percentage of agreed INT chart schemes, percentage of INT charts available. <i>What will be the 100% baseline for this measurement?</i></p> <p>WPI 21 - Percentage of agreed ENC schemes, percentage of ENC available. <i>What will be the 100% baseline for this measurement?</i> <i>This is very similar to WPI 20. Is there a need for two similar measurements?</i></p> <p>WPI 22 - Increase in effective MS participation in RHC activities. <i>How will this be measured? What is meant by "effective" - will States accept being considered as "ineffective"?</i></p>
	<p>2.3 expanding membership of the IHO.</p>	<p>WPI 23 - Percentage of Coastal States which are IHO Member States;</p> <p>WPI 24 - Number of new Coastal States joining the IHO during the reporting period.</p> <p>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.</p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
	2.4 encouraging and supporting the establishment of new Hydrographic Offices.	<p>WPI 26 - Percentage of Coastal States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office. <i>Who will determine this and how?</i> <i>Should it be "establishment of a national hydrographic authority" rather than hydrographic office?</i></p> <p>WPI 27 - Number of States which have achieved phase 1, 2 or 3 and established a National Hydrographic Office in the reporting period. <i>Who will determine this and how?</i></p>
	2.5 encouraging and supporting the development and promotion of integrated navigation systems and geospatial data infrastructures.	<p>WPI 28 - Percentage of Coastal States which provide ENC coverage directly or through an agreement with a third party. <i>This is also SPI 1.</i> <i>Does this measure the success or failure of SD 2.5?</i></p> <p>WPI 29 - Percentage of Coastal States which have set up a national geospatial infrastructure. <i>Who will determine this and how?</i> <i>Should IHO be monitoring national geospatial infrastructure or limiting it to MSDI?</i></p>
	2.6 promoting the use of new technologies and the opportunities offered by globalization and international cooperation.	<p>WPI 30 - To be determined in relation with the relevant items in the Work Programme. <i>??????????????</i></p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
<p>3. Raise global awareness of the importance of hydrography</p> <p>The IHO will champion the awareness at national, regional and global levels of the importance and benefits of hydrography and the provision of hydrographic services for all marine activities, through:</p>	<p>3.1 ensuring that the role and responsibilities of national Hydrographic Offices are clearly understood at all levels in the marine and public communities.</p>	<p>WPI 31 - Number of promotion actions in the reporting period along with feedback indicators of notable impact. <i>What is a "promotion action". - Who decides, who records it/?</i> <i>How will this measurement indicate success or failure of SD 3.1?</i></p> <p>WPI 32 - Number of invitations received and taken up to participate in engagement with other government agencies / maritime interest groups in the reporting period. <i>The acceptance rate will always be limited by the resources available to the presenters – so not a good indicator.</i></p>
	<p>3.2 supporting and promoting the benefits of national Hydrographic Offices and hydrographic programmes.</p>	<p>WPI 33 - Number of promotional events or activities conducted in the reporting period - including letters, meetings, and seminars for this purpose. <i>The participation rate will always be limited by the resources available to the presenters – so not a good indicator.</i></p>
	<p>3.3 bringing the importance of hydrography on issues affecting safety of navigation at sea, protection of the marine environment, maritime security and economic development to the attention of International Organizations, funding agencies, national governments, maritime stakeholders and others.</p>	<p>WPI 34 - Number of participations in national and international events in the reporting period year and specific examples of resultant successes. <i>The participation rate will always be limited by the resources available to the presenter – so not a good indicator.</i></p>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
	3.4 preparing and promoting education and outreach programmes which involve fostering a well informed citizenry and creation of a public awareness of the importance of hydrography and its role in daily life.	WPI 35 - Number of initiatives in the reporting period. <i>What is an "initiative"? - Who decides? Is this IHB or MS? In either case, collecting the data may be onerous.</i>
4. Assist Member States to fulfil their roles The IHO will help and support its Member States in fulfilling their present roles and in meeting future demands and requirements as effectively and efficiently as possible, through:	4.1 acting as a focal point and forum for all hydrographic matters.	WPI 36 - Number of events dealing with hydrographic matters without any IHO participation in the reporting period. <i>How will this data be obtained?</i>
	4.2 supporting national initiatives aimed at developing and enhancing hydrographic infrastructure.	WPI 37 - Number of initiatives in the reporting period. <i>Where will the data come from? What will be the baseline that determines success or failure in achieving SD 4.2?</i> WPI 38 - Number of requests for support met in the reporting period. <i>Requests from whom? How will this measurement indicate program success or failure?</i> WPI 39 - Number of proactive measures taken during the reporting period to engage national hydrographic authorities. <i>What will be considered to be "a proactive measure", and by whom?</i>
	4.3 encouraging bilateral and regional cooperation on hydrographic and related matters.	WPI 40 - Number of agreements signed in the reporting period, including bilaterals and RENC membership, etc. <i>Where will the data come from? States may not wish to divulge bilateral or similar arrangements.</i>

IHO Goal	Strategic Direction	Working level PI's (... to measure success in achieving specific objectives)
	<p>4.4 strengthening the IHO capacity-building programme in order to better support the needs of Member States, especially those developing their capabilities from maritime safety information through surveying to nautical charting and marine spatial data infrastructure.</p>	<p>WPI 41 - Percentage of planned CB events that are achieved</p> <p>WPI 42 - Number of acceptable CB requests received Is an increase in requests measuring the strength of the CB program?</p> <p>WPI 43 - Percentage of “acceptable” CB requests which are planned. WPI 41 takes this into account.</p>