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## Introduction / Background

We have a good understanding and data flow of bathymetric data collected by UK ports to support SOLAS. We have less understanding of the Marine Harbour Infrastructure data of UK Ports. At UK Hydrographic Office we have a User Research team within our Research Development and Innovation team which we consulted with to undertake user research. The research has been broken into two phases. Phase one has been completed which was pre-V1.0.0 of S131. We circulated a Survey to the UK Harbour Masters Association and other port contacts. Phase two one v1.0.0 of the standard is published can support more targeted research.

## Discussion

We contacted 450 members of the UK Harbour Masters Authority and an additional 105 Port Contacts - received 66 responses representing 100 ports/harbours. Responses received from a range of sizes of port , estimated largest 46 300 000 annual tonnage per annum and smallest 30 000.

The focus of the research was to highlight types of data supplied to us and to look further into what was submitted to the UKHO, not submitted, not collected , how that data was managed and the data supply methods both current and preferred. We used a draft of the standard and combined some of the categories for a sensible number of data types.

**Data Collection**

We asked about 31 data types and asked:

* What data was supplied
* What data was collected but not supplied
* What data was not collected

Results were as expected for data supplied top of the list are safety related data Aids to Nav, Entry info, channels, hazards and safety fairways. But this did highlight that when we come to the infrastructure items such as waste disposal/supply services less information was supplied.

Following those through to what data is collected but not supplied such as waste disposal is top of this list. Showing the customer requirement for that type of information. Supply services also fairly high on that list.

With the data not collected data shows what was less important from a ports perspective in terms of data.

**Data Management**

Large majority of the ports we asked collected data in excel formats and word with only 25% able to share .SHP and .TIF files 33% having that in another GIS format.

**Data Supply**

When asked how data is currently supplied majority email, some send direct to an FTP site, some physically in digital format and some still paper based. When asked how they would like to supply data to us slight dip in email but direct upload/spreadsheet and extract of their own port database did increase.

## Conclusions

Data collection: Varying degrees of data is collected regardless of port size. More infrastructure data is collected than sent to UKHO, some infrastructure data is not collected.

Data Management: Based on ports surveyed for this research only a third share that information in a GIS based format. Paper and physical data management methods still exist.

Data Supply: Large variety of how information is supplied but preference for the future is more direct uploading or extracts from databases.

## Recommendations

V1.0.0 of S131 should add clarity for ports on what infrastructure information ports should be collecting. As a community we should be mindful of smaller ports across the world that might not have the technology to supply the information required for S131.

Next steps: When version 1.0.0 is published we plan to resurvey participants to see if the standards meet their needs and could potentially work with a port to create a trial/test data set.

## Action Required of NIPWG

The NIPWG is invited to:

c. note this paper.