



**CIRCULAR LETTER 20/2018**  
**15 February 2018**

IHO File No. SPRWG

**ADOPTION OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE  
STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW WORKING GROUP AND MEMBERSHIP**

References:

- A. 1<sup>st</sup> Session of the IHO Assembly P-6 – *Proceedings including List of Decisions*
- B. 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the IHO Council C-1 – *Summary Report (Version dated 31 October 2017)*
- C. General Regulations of the IHO
- D. IHO CL66/2017 dated 23 November 2017 – *Call for Approval of the ToR and RoP of the Strategic Plan Review Working Group (SPRWG)*.

Dear Hydrographer,

1. In accordance with Art. 6. (b) and Art. 6. (g) (i) of the IHO General Regulations (Reference C) and following the instructions of the Council (Reference B, Action C1/41 refers), the approval of Member States on the draft ToRs and RoPs of the SPRWG was requested by Reference D.
2. The Secretariat would like to thank the following 55 Member States that replied to Reference D: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom and the United States of America.
3. All 55 Member States approved the proposed ToRs and RoPs of the Strategic Plan Review Working Group. Six Member States offered comments in addition to their vote. These comments and the outcome of their review by the Chair of the SPRWG are provided in Annex A to this Circular Letter. The amended ToRs and RoPs are reported in Annex B.
4. In addition to the Member States who indicated their intention to join the SPRWG at the first meeting of the IHO Council, nine Member States (Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mozambique, Singapore and Suriname) have expressed their intention to become active members. The consolidated SPRWG Membership List is provided in Annex C.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Mathias JONAS  
Secretary-General

- Annex A:** Member States' comments to IHO CL 66/2017 and responses from the SPRWG Chair and the IHO Secretariat.
- Annex B:** Strategic Plan Review Working Group Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure (with track changes in red)
- Annex C:** SPRWG Membership List
- Copies:** RAdm Shephard Smith (Chair of the Council) – Adm (Ret.) Luiz Fernando Palmer Fonseca (Vice-Chair of the Council) – Ing. General Bruno Frachon (Chair of the SPRWG)

**MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS TO IHO CL 66/2017 AND RESPONSES FROM THE  
SPRWG CHAIR AND THE IHO SECRETARIAT**

**CANADA**

Canada is pleased to provide the Secretary to this WG and looks forward to working with all the interested Member States.

*The SPRWG Chair thanks Canada for their support*

**CHILE**

We would like to ensure that the following comments offered as a reply to CL 17/2016 be taken into consideration:

- We consider that "hydrographic surveys programs" is a crucial and basic element that requires to be specifically highlighted in the Plan.
- We would prefer to make a clear separation and distinction between the Strategic Plan and the Work Program. Actual text is confusing.
- The Strategic Plan could have been built considering the strategic assumptions and strategic directions identified by the IHO, in line with IHO's mission and functions.
- The Work Program could be in line with the Strategic Plan and constitute the collection of the activities to be executed, considering the "real" needs and capabilities of the IHO bodies.
- The monitoring of both is different and should follow a different reviewing cycle.
- Being the Strategic Plan a set of "concepts/principles/wishes", the assessment of its validity might be performed at each Assembly, triggered by proposals made by the Council. We think it's worth reviewing from time to time the concept under which the Strategic Plan was developed.
- Being the Work Program a set of "tasks/commitments/actions", the assessment of its accomplishment must be performed annually, triggered by evaluations made by the Secretariat (Programme 1); HSSC (Programme 2) and the IRCC (Programme 3), and comments by Member States and Council. We think that it's worth knowing, on an annual basis, if the Work Program was or was not achieved, and why, and experiences we can get from such exercise.
- For the assessment of the validity of the Strategic Plan and of the accomplishment of the Work Program, two different approaches are required. One at the strategic level (conceptual) and one at a tactical level (to identify the level of achievement).

*The SPRWG Chair thanks Chile for their comments on the relations between the Strategic Work Plan and the Work Programme and expect that Chile will express its views as input to the deliberations of the WG.*

**CROATIA**

Croatia strongly supports these very important activities and believes in the successful work of the SPRWG and is willing to give its contribution as the capacity of CHI office will allow.

*The SPRWG Chair thanks Croatia for their support.*

## INDONESIA

The Proposed ToRs and RoPs have shown a comprehensive flow of strategic plan drafting, so we would looking forward for further discussion.

*The SPRWG Chair thanks Indonesia for their support.*

## SPAIN

For us the item 2.5 is not clear. It is mentioned that the decisions shall generally be made by consensus. And what happens in case there would be no consensus? Who decides what is going to be voted: the Chairman of the Working Group or a number of qualified members? It is also mentioned that votes could be required on any matters. Who decides it? According to Article 6.e of the IHO General Regulations, the mentioned procedures are not clear to us.

*The Secretariat has the following comment: The Rules of Procedures to come to decisions as given under 2.5 are common practice on various Working Groups since years. They give the chair the flexibility to decide how to apply his authority for the question at hand. No such problems as supposed in Spain's comment have ever been reported so far since the search for consensus has always been the overarching ethos. The approval of the ToR & RoPs by all of the 55 Member States who responded to CL 66/2017 suggest that the requirements of Article 6.e of the IHO General Regulations are fully met.*

*The SPRWG Chair thanks Spain for its comment and has the following opinion: on important matters, if a vote is necessary for the progress of work, significant dissension / divergence will be reflected in the SPRWG's report to the Council*

## USA

Proposed edits to the ToR attached. Please consider only if these comments will not result in a delay in the adoption of the ToR and RoP.

*The SPRWG Chair thanks the United States of America for the comments. All proposed **adaptations** have been incorporated into the final Version of the ToR and RoP by the Secretariat with one exception: the Secretariat understands that C-3 will provide the endorsed SPRWG to A-2 instead of the SPRWG itself.*

IHO File No SPRWG

## **STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW WORKING GROUP (SPRWG)**

### **Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure**

#### **Preamble**

The IHO Council, as directed by the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the IHO Assembly (Reference A, Decision A1/03), discussed how to conduct a comprehensive review of the Strategic Plan in order to provide a draft revised Plan in time for the consideration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Assembly in 2020. This document will provide the SPRWG guidelines and direction to progress the work and for members' participation.

#### **1. Terms of Reference**

- 1.1 Conduct a comprehensive review of the Strategic Plan in two successive phases: scoping and drafting.
- 1.2 In the scoping phase (T0<sup>1</sup> + 6 months):
  - 1.2.1 review and restate the current and future strategic context in which the IHO operates;
  - 1.2.2 propose the definition of success for the IHO in 2026;
  - 1.2.3 identify the deficiencies in terms of content, shape and interrelation to the implementation instruments in the existing Plan;
  - 1.2.4 consider appropriate goals, ways and means that could address any identified deficiencies;
  - 1.2.5 establish the management plan and timetable for developing and drafting any proposed revisions to the existing Plan;
  - 1.2.6 submit a proposal at C-2 for the draft framework of the revised strategic plan.
- 1.3 In the drafting phase (T0 + 18 months):
  - 1.3.1 define the criteria for measuring success and propose priorities for the IHO;
  - 1.3.2 consider the interrelation to other management elements such as budget, work plan and performance indicators (Ref. d/);
  - 1.3.3 prepare the draft revised plan in accordance with the management plan and the timetable;
  - 1.3.4 prepare the supporting documents for submission to A-2.
- ~~1.4 Provide an intermediate report at C-2 (- two months)~~
- 1.4 Provide a draft final report at C-3 ( - two months) for endorsement and recommendations to be submitted to A-2.
- 1.5 These Terms of Reference can be amended in accordance with Article 6 of the General Regulations.

#### **2. Rules of Procedure**

- 2.1 The Working Group is open to all Member States. It shall be composed of representatives

---

<sup>1</sup> T0 is the effective date of the establishment of the Working Group.

of Member States. The Chairs of the HSSC, IRCC, FC, or their nominated representatives, should participate in the work of the Working Group.

- 2.2 ~~Canada, as decided at C-1, A Member State~~ shall act as Secretary to the Working Group. The Secretary shall prepare the reports required for submission to each meeting of the Council and to sessions of the Assembly as directed by the Council.
- 2.3 The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be a representative of a Member State having a seat at the Council. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be nominated at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Council and the nominations shall be determined by vote of the Council Members present and voting. **As decided at C-1, France will serve as the Chair, and Japan the Vice-Chair.** If the Chair is unable to carry out the duties of the office, the Vice-Chair shall act as the Chair with the same powers and duties.
- 2.4 The Working Group should normally work by correspondence, but if decided by the Working Group, meetings can be scheduled in conjunction with any IHO meetings. The Chair or any member of the Working Group, with the agreement of the simple majority of all members of the Working Group, can call extraordinary meetings. In case of meetings, all intending participants shall inform the Chair and Secretary ideally at least one month in advance of their intention to attend meetings of the Working Group.
- 2.5 Decisions shall generally be made by consensus. If votes are required on issues or to endorse proposals presented to the Working Group, decisions shall be taken by a simple majority of Working Group Members present and voting. When dealing with matters by correspondence, a simple majority of all **responding** Working Group Members shall be required.
- 2.6 The draft record of meetings shall be distributed by the Secretary within ten working days of the end of meetings and participants' comments should be returned within ten working days of the date of despatch. Final minutes of meetings should be distributed to all IHO Member States and posted on the IHO website within thirty days after a meeting.
- 2.7 The working language of the Working Group shall be English.
- 2.8 Recommendations of the Working Group shall be submitted to the Council for endorsement.
- 2.9 The Working Group will be disbanded after A-2.
- 2.10 These Rules of Procedure can be amended in accordance with Article 6 of the General Regulations

### SPRWG Membership List

Member State	Point of Contact	Email
Australia	Hilary Thompson	hilary.thompson@defence.gov.au
Brazil	Luis Fernando Palmer Fonseca	palmer@marinha.mil.br
Canada	Doug Brunt (Secretary)	douglas.brunt@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Chile	Hugo Gorziglia	<a href="mailto:hgorziglia@shoa.cl">hgorziglia@shoa.cl</a> and <a href="mailto:hgorziglia.hydro@gmail.com">hgorziglia.hydro@gmail.com</a>
China	<i>To be confirmed<sup>2</sup></i>	
Colombia	Herman Leon Rincon	<a href="mailto:jefcioh@dimar.co">jefcioh@dimar.co</a> , <a href="mailto:ddavid@dimar.co">ddavid@dimar.co</a> <a href="mailto:ddavidviteri@gmail.com">ddavidviteri@gmail.com</a>
Croatia	Zeljko Bradaric	zeljko.bradaric@hhi.hr
Denmark	Jens Peter Hartmann	<a href="mailto:jepha@gst.dk">jepha@gst.dk</a>
Ecuador	Humberto Gomez Proano	direccion@inocar.mil.ec
France	Bruno Frachon (Chair)	bruno.frachon@shom.fr
Indonesia	Yanuar Handwiono	handwionoy@gmail.com
I.R. of Iran	Akbar Rostami Saeid Parizi	<a href="mailto:akrostami@pmo.ir">akrostami@pmo.ir</a> sparizi@pmo.ir
Italy	Marco Grassi	marco.grassi@marina.difesa.it
Japan	Shigeru Nakabayashi (Vice-Chair)	<a href="mailto:shigeru.nakabayashi@jodc.go.jp">shigeru.nakabayashi@jodc.go.jp</a> ico@jodc.go.jp

<sup>2</sup> No response received to IHO CL 66/2017.

Rep. of Korea	Hak Yoel You	infokhoa@korea.kr
Mozambique	Susana Fembe	sut0412@yahoo.com.br
Netherlands	Marc Van Der Donck	MCJ.vd.Donck@mindef.nl
Norway	Evert Flier	evert.flier@ kartverket.no
Singapore	Thai Low Ying-Huang	hydrographic@mpa.gov.sg
Spain	José Maria Bustamante Calabuig	ihmesp@fn.mde.es
Suriname	Michel Amafo LL.M	<a href="mailto:info@mas.sr">info@mas.sr</a> or <a href="mailto:mamafo@mas.sr">mamafo@mas.sr</a>
United Kingdom	Tim Lowe	<a href="mailto:tim.lowe@ukho.gov.uk">tim.lowe@ukho.gov.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:internationalrelations.ukho@ukho.gov.uk">internationalrelations.ukho@ukho.gov.uk</a>
USA	John Lowell Stan Harvey Jonathan Justi	<a href="mailto:john.e.lowell@nga.mil">john.e.lowell@nga.mil</a> <a href="mailto:stanley.b.harvey@navy.mil">stanley.b.harvey@navy.mil</a> <a href="mailto:jonathan.justi@noaa.gov">jonathan.justi@noaa.gov</a>