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# Summary

That work programme Tasks 1.2.4 (*Produce a Guideline on Maritime Services for VTS*) and 1.2.7 (*Develop Guidance on the Development and Implementation of VTS related MS’s other than MS 1, 2 and 3*) are in need of review and updating, noting:

* Recent outcomes from HGDM2 and NCSR6.
* The pending review of Assembly Resolution A.857(20) by the IMO during the 2019-2020 biennium.

This will ensure the intent of the Tasks remain relevant and minimise confusion amongst Committee members as to the purpose and expected outcome of the Tasks.

## Purpose of the document

The purpose of this input paper is to highlight concerns and to propose a revised strategy for delivering this task.

## Related documents

Work on this VTS Committee task relates to input by the VTS Committee to a document currently entitled “*MARITIME SERVICE PORTFOLIOS: DIGITISING MARITIME SERVICES*” being developed by the ARM Committee.

# Background

An output was forwarded in the middle of VTS 45 by the VTS Committee to Council as a “*first draft … prepared to assist in the process of developing MSs at IMO/IHO HGDM*”. Concern was voiced at the time by some committee members that this input had been rushed through the VTS Committee for approval by the IALA Council and the Committee final report added a caveat stating that “*The Committee noted that there still is considerable work to be undertaken to finalize these templates/descriptions*” (Reference 1 section 8.4). This input was forwarded jointly by IALA, WMO, IHO and IMPA to HGDM 2 (Nov 2018) and, with only minor amendments to MS 1, 2 & 3, forwarded on to NCSR 6 (Jan 2019) (Reference 2).

At NCSR6, a proposal for MSC approval was agreed that a two-step approach should be adopted (Reference 2 paragraph 8.4) whereby the overall policy for should be issued as an IMO Resolution entitled “*GUIDANCE ON THE DEFINITION AND HARMONIZATION OF THE FORMAT AND STRUCTURE OF MARITIME SERVICES IN THE CONTEXT OF E-NAVIGATION*” and that this should be accompanied by an IMO MSC Circular entitled “*INITIAL DESCRIPTIONS OF MARITIME SERVICES IN THE CONTEXT OF E-NAVIGATION*”. The justification for this two-step approach was that there was an urgency to progress the e-Nav initiative but that descriptions of maritime services were incomplete in some areas and still open for update and revision. Issuing the second document as an MSC Circ. would enable changes and revisions to be made more quickly and simply than would be possible if it was included in the parent Resolution. It was specifically recognised that the descriptions of MSs 1-3 would probably be out of date almost as soon as the MSC Circ. was issued due to changes being proposed in the review of the VTS Guidelines.

NCSR approved a change to the title of MS4 to “Port Support Services” to remove the conflict with “Local Port Services” in the VTS context. A further proposal by Japan supported by IHMA to change the title of all “Maritime Services” to “Maritime Data Services” was rejected as involving too many changes in related documentation. However, the logic of the proposal was recognised and a compromise agreed to amend the title of both the Resolution and the MSC Circ. to include the words “in the Context of E-Navigation”. Additionally, a definition was added to the Resolution that “*For the purpose of the Guidance ……* ***Maritime Service****refers to the provision and exchange of maritime-related information and data in a harmonized, unified format*” (Reference 3, Annex 10 page 4).

At MSC 101 (June 2019), “Guidance on the definition and harmonization of the format and structure of Maritime Services in the context of e-navigation”, was adopted as Resolution MSC.467(101) and the “Initial descriptions of Maritime Services in the context of e-navigation” was approved as MSC.1/Circ.1610.

# Discussion

## It is clear that there is considerable duplication between the developing IALA Guideline and both Resolution MSC.467(101) and the accompanying MSC Circular MSC.1/Circ.1610. Much of the Guideline is taken up with descriptions of Maritime Services that duplicate those in the MSC Circular. Additionally, the timelines for promulgation of the MSC Circular suggest that there is no time to amend the first issue of the Circular and that there is little point in attempting to refine MSs 1 – 3 for NCSR 7 and MSC 102 when these are likely to be merged in a more functional approach on the delivery of VTS with the revision to the VTS Guidelines. It is, therefore recommended that further work on Maritime Services in the Context of E-Navigation should turn immediately to drafting up a revised version that aligns with proposals for the revision to A.857(20) so that this is ready to be forwarded to IMO for the appropriate revision to the MSC Circular as soon as the revised Resolution on VTS guidelines is approved.

## The current draft of Maritime Services 1 -3 as in the MSC Circular are also now in conflict with the definition of Maritime Services as they relate to these IMO documents. As currently drafted, both the description of the Maritime Service and the User Needs/User Case sections reflect the delivery of the physical service itself. This was a key concern raised at VTS 45 when the draft of October 2018 was forwarded to HGDM. If detail of the physical services themselves for MSs 1 – 3 are required, it was felt that it would be better to make reference to the appropriate IALA documentation to avoid misunderstanding through the extraction of selective concepts that may be read out of context and the difficulty of keeping documents current between IALA Committees, let alone between IALA and IMO. The definition of Maritime Services that has now been added to the draft Recommendation now makes it clear that, in the context of e-Navigation, a Maritime Service refers to “the provision and exchange of maritime-related information and data”. Thus, in developing a new Maritime Service to cover VTS as a whole following the revision of IMO Resolution A.857(20), the description and user needs sections will both need to address the provision and exchange of information and data rather than describing the physical service as in the current draft.

## The report of VTS 46 (Reference 4) indicates that the subgroup believes that work on MSs 1-3 is finalised. Whilst this is true, it is suggested that task 1.2.4 now needs to turn to the development of a revised version ready for exchange with ARM and IMO after the Resolution on VTS Guidelines is approved. Work on the information requirements (Reference 5) has already merged the data and information requirements for MSs 1 – 3, which is an important step towards the revision that will follow IMO approval of a revised VTS Resolution. The note to ENAV and ARM (Reference 6) may need to be amended to update ARM on intentions and to seek clarification on the purpose, content and title of the draft Guideline on Maritime Service Portfolios: Digitising Maritime Services since much of the content now duplicates MSC.1/Circ.1610 recently approved at MSC101.

# References

1. VTS45-14 Report VTS45
2. NCSR 6-23 - Report To The Maritime Safety Committee (Secretariat)
3. NCSR 6-23-Add.1 - Report To The Maritime Safety Committee (Secretariat)
4. VTS46-14 Report of VTS46
5. VTS46-13.3.1.1 Appendix 1 MS 1-3\_merged revised WG 1 VTS46
6. VTS46-13.2.7 Liaison Note to ENAV and ARM
7. MSC.467(101) on Guidance on the definition and harmonization of the format and structure of Maritime Services in the context of e-navigation
8. MSC.1/Circ.1610 on Initial descriptions of Maritime Services in the context of e-navigation

# Action requested of the Committee

The Committee is requested to consider how Tasks 1.2.4 and 1.2.7 should be progressed in the light of decisions as HGDM2, NCSR6 and MSC 101 and specifically:

* 1. Review / update these in the Task Register to align them with developments by the IMO and clearly articulate the objectives and expected outcomes.
  2. Consider progressing a draft of a new single Maritime Service that reflects the likely outcome of the review of IMO Resolution A.857(20)
  3. Review the definition of a Maritime Service in the context of e-Navigation and to consider the need to align the Description and User Needs sections of any revised version with this definition to address the provision and exchange of information and data rather than describing the physical service itself
  4. To seek clarification from ARM on the purpose, content and title of the draft Guideline on Maritime Service Portfolios: Digitising Maritime Services.
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