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Findings from Functional Requirements of Service Specification for Route Exchange

# Summary

Fintraffic VTS has been reviewing Service Specification for Route Exchange which IALA published this year as version 1.0.1. for testing. At the same time, other organisations have scrutinised the same specification. Fintraffic VTS has also been crosschecking published Service Specification with the S-421 product specification IEC 63173-1.

This input paper describes some findings that were identified by Fintraffic or were indicated to Fintraffic from other organisations.

## Purpose of the document

Fintraffic VTS would like to inform the Committee about findings from Service Specification for Route Exchange in section 3.3.1 Functional requirements. The issues in paragraph 2 would require some clarification or changes to requirements in order to ensure that the documentation is unambiguous for all implementors, the specification is in line with S-421 product specification and the services are eventually implemented in harmonised way.

## Related documents

IMO Resolution MSC.530(106)/REV.1 "Performance standards for electronic chart display and information systems (ECDIS)"

IALA SS0002 Service Specification for Route Exchange, edition 1.0.1

IEC 63173-1 “Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems - Data interfaces - Part 1: S-421 route plan based on S-100”

# Discussion

Based on the review of the Service Specification for VTS Route Exchange some needs to update the requirements in section 3.3.1 of Service Specification have been identified:

RESF007

* One of the identified mandatory information elements refers most likely wrong S-421 attribute. Instead of “All legs must have both port and starboard XDTL defined” the sub-requirement in RESF007 should state "All legs must have both port and starboard CL defined"
* Based on various discussions there appears to be some operational situations where vessels would need to plan a route where some waypoints have zero radius but different ETA and ETD (i.e. vessel stops for a time) and therefore zero turning radius should be allowed. Based on this new information the sub-requirement for non-zero turning radius in RESF008 should be discussed again.

RESF008

* The sub-requirement for routeInfoAuthor should be developed further. The required format of routeInfoAuthor should be defined more strictly in RESF0008 to ensure that vessel systems can display a reasonable name for the author of the received route. That could achieved by combining information in the digital certificate (organization common name) and the information in the routeInfoAuthor of the route.

# Action requested of the Committee

**The Committee** is requested to:

Review the identified findings and consider the need to revise functional requirements of Service Specification for VTS Route Exchange.
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