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LIAISON NOTE

Technologies to support Maritime Single Window.

DRAFT

# Introduction

The ENAV Committee has tasks related to the identification of technologies to support maritime single window (MSW) reporting (ENAV tasks 4.3.1, 4.3.5 and 4.3.10). As part of this work, members of the ENAV Committee have participated in the work of the ARM Committee Task Group developing IALA G1159 – Ship Reporting from a shore-based perspective. .

# Background

The Committee reviewed the proposed changes to G1159 with a focus on the technology to support Maritime Single Window. In addition, the Committee reviewed the document at a holistic level, noting the outcome of IMO FAL45 which has approved draft amendments to the annex of the FAL Convention and updated the IMO FAL.5/Circ.42/Rev.1 on Guidelines for setting up a Maritime Single Window.

As noted by the IMO (<https://www.imo.org/en/MediaCentre/MeetingSummaries/Pages/FAL45thSession.aspx> ):

*“The newly approved amendments will make it mandatory for public authorities to establish, maintain and use single window systems for the electronic exchange of information required on the arrival, stay and departure of ships in ports. In addition, public authorities will have to combine or coordinate the electronic transmission of the data so as to ensure that information is submitted or provided only once and re-used to the maximum extent possible.*

*During the session, the Committee approved revised guidelines for setting up an MSW, updating the previous provisions, and agreed to create a new GISIS module to share information on maritime single windows implemented by Member States.”*

# Discussion

The Committee noted that MSW is being discussed in a number of other organisations. In addition, the Committee noted that IALA is not involved in many of these discussions.

1. The MSW concept is being addressed by the ISO group ISO/TC 8/SC 11 - Intermodal and Short Sea Shipping.
2. The messages needed are apparently contained in the ISO documents ISO/PAS 28005-1:2012 and being updated by ISO/CD 28005-1, Ships and marine technology — Electronic Port Clearance (EPC) — Part 1: Application protocol interface and message structures.
3. IALA is not represented as a liaison at the ISO/TC 8/SC 11 working group which does include:
   1. BIMCO
   2. CIRM
   3. GS1
   4. IAPH
   5. WCO
   6. World Shipping Council

ENAV (WG2) does not have a copy of the ISO/CD 28005-1, document to make any additional progress in respect of the MSW and G1159. The ISO web site reflects the following in respect of this document:

* ISO/PAS 28005-1:2012 provides necessary guidance information related to electronic port clearance (EPC), such as message transmission requirements, business scenarios, message structures and software requirements. Within the context of ISO/PAS 28005-1:2012, EPC includes the activities that a user, such as a ship's master, a shipping agency or a ship owner undertakes to submit electronic data to appropriate organisations to approve or reject the clearance for the ship to enter or leave a port.
* ISO/PAS 28005-1:2012 defines XML message structures for transmission or information between a ship or its representatives and certain organisations responsible for the processing of the ship's port clearance request. The information to be transferred is that which is defined by the FAL Convention and other related international instruments as defined by ISO 28005-2. These message structures are primarily intended for machine-to-machine data transfers.
* ISO/PAS 28005-1:2012 allows different configurations of the single window (SW), from a minimum solution to support basic clearance requirements to a more complex system to facilitate more extensive cooperation between ship and shore organisations.

# Comments

In the review of the draft revision of G1159 the Committee identified minor amendments to section 5.6.5 with the addition of a reference to the need for redundancy of system (i.e. through alternative, compatible system).

Considerations when selecting the communication systems could include:

* Data rate to carry the digital data.
* Cost
* Coverage in the area of interest.
* Use of a combination of communication systems.
* Reliability/Availability of the selected communication system.
* Redundancy of system (through alternative, compatible system)

In addition, the Committee raised three focus questions with regards to G1159:

1. Where does this document fit within the framework of the outcome of FAL45 and the revision to FAL.5/Circ.42/Rev.1 on Guidelines for setting up a Maritime Single Window?
2. How is the work on G1159 being coordinated with the work being done by other organisations as noted in this liaison note?
3. What data is expected to be required, and where (as this will have an impact on the suitable technology). i.e. for many elements identified in the FAL.5/Circ.42/Rev.1 data will be from shore entity to shore entity. The focus of the work of the ENAV Committee task would be on the data required from ship/shore and shore/ship.

# Action requested

The committee and/or IALA Secretariat is requested to:

1. Address the three focus questions regarding the scope and coordination of the work on G1159 and the other activity around MSW.
2. Consider the most appropriate manner to be engaged with the related work at the ISO group ISO/TC 8/SC 11 (for example, through a rapporteur or with direct IALA participation in the same manner as similar organisation)
3. Obtain the ISO/CD 28005-1 document that deals with the MSW and share this with the IALA membership to support coordination of the work on MSW.
4. Obtain clarity on the activity surrounding MSW and document the interface between the Local Port Services (LPS) and Vessel Traffic Services (VTS) for those MSW components that affect these IALA domains
5. Review the proposed addition from the ENAV Committee regarding technologies to support ship reporting (section 5.6.5).