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Who is International Taskforce Port Call Optimization?

The Taskforce:
- Comprises subject matter experts with hands on expertise in shipping, ports and standards
- Works together with IMO NGO’s to make submissions to robust standardization bodies
- Provides input to Chainport, DCSA, IAPH Data project, IMO GIA low carbon shipping, Navelink, STM, WorldBank, WPCAP
- As a neutral body, consults but does not promote solution providers
Why did we start?

- Request from shipping to improve port data quality and availability to IHMA
- IMO MEPC 323/74: call for action to improve quality and availability of data in ship-port interface
- World Bank / IAPH request to prioritize 10 data elements in ship-port interface
Why is quality and availability of ship-port interface data important?

Movement of the vessel
• Realizing safe and sustainable berth to berth navigation: where is my berth, when is my berth available?
• Important for shipping and terminals

Movement of the vessel’s cargo
• Realizing sustainable end to end supply chain: where are my goods, when are my goods available for hinterland transport?
• Important for shippers
Why is data sharing by data owner important?

If data is not from data owner:

• Data becomes corrupt
• Data is not binding
Why is this difficult to organize?

There may be different owners for one data element.
E.g. for depths or planning:
- Deep water route: national authority
- Fair ways / harbor basins: local authority
- Berths: terminal
Why is it difficult to share data?

• Each data user uses different standards and formats, or requires updates via e-mail, telephone or websites
• Each data user has different needs for updates
What is needed?

Data owners like to share data one to many:

• To minimize administrative burden
• To avoid errors
• To avoid delays in update
• To increase the value of data
One to many data sharing requires global standardization

Many different parties per vessel per port call:

• Shipping operates in a network of up to 9,000 different ports
• Each port has many different suppliers of cargo and ship services
• Ports can receive up to 55,000 different ships
• Each ship can have many different cargo owners, especially containers ships with 24,000 TEU
Standardization requires investments

- Investments in IT: change data to fit format and standards, change management of related data bases
- Investments in people: culture change
Investments require scoping

Scoping to justify investments, based on basics first:

- To be compliant with IMO, BIMCO contracts, authorities
- To have impact on IMO objectives
Investments require robust standardization bodies

To ensure lifetime span of investments, only use standardization bodies which:

• Have commitment from both shipping and ports: it is common sense and imperative that shipping and ports use the same standardization bodies ensuring ships do not need converters for all ports and ports need only one converter for all ships

• Are robust: to avoid incompatibility between standards and systems, and ultimately futile investments into implementing standards that are not fit-for-purpose, not future proof or not viable for all stakeholders across the supply chain
Investments require a road map per data set

To plan investment decisions, ensuring harmonized implementation and providing confidence that full interoperability with any API instance is coming:

1) Data element definition; are we talking about same object
2) Logical data model: what is the relation between data elements
3) API specifications: how can we push data from system to system
4) Technical performance requirements: latency, security, confidentiality, availability, integrity
5) Business performance requirements: accuracy, completeness and timeliness
Scoping: agree on business process of port calls

To understand complete scope of data, data ownership and how actors work together, based on:

- IMO regulations
- BIMCO contracts
- Authorities
- Trade and port agnostic approach
Scoping: agree on minimum scope of data

Priority in data sets:
1) Nautical data
2) Administrative data
3) Operational data
1) Nautical data - scope

Scope:

a) General port data  
b) Maintained depths and/or soundings  
c) ID and location of terminals, berths and berth positions

Use cases:

a) To be compliant with IMO Resolution A.862(20)  
b) To be compliant with IMO Resolution A.893(21)  
c) To be compliant with ÌMO Resolution A.893(21)

For all data elements:

• To demonstrate due diligence / absolute warranty re. safe port clause  
• To demonstrate due diligence that Hydrographic Office and Port Authority have worked together to discharge their collective SOLAS responsibilities  
• Allowing Master and Pilot to navigate the ship using the same Electronic Navigational Charts and Sailing Directions
### 1) Nautical data – scope - example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Nautical chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APMTR</td>
<td>APM WZ &amp; APM OZ EUROPAAHAVN ZOZ</td>
<td>APM Terminal Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollard 101 – 178</td>
<td>8179 – 8203</td>
<td>8178 - 8203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bollard 101-178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Nautical data – robust standardization body

International Hydrographic Organization (IHO)

Because:

• From the start, IHO has been working with national hydrographic offices to create standards for nautical charts

• IHO being robust party for both shipping and port sector; has 93 Member States
1) **Nautical data – road map**

1) **Data element definition:**
- Submission marine harbor infrastructure (PIM)
- Submission definition UKC
- Submission definition heights of quay walls/manifolds
- Submission definition berth operator/user
- Submission definition mooring facilities

2) **Logical data model:**
- POC to exchange terminal, berth, berth position

3) **API specifications:**

4) **Technical performance requirements:**

5) **Business performance requirements:**
1) Nautical data – road map - submission

Paper for Consideration by NIPWG

Background and Update on requirements for detailed terminal and berth information.

Submitted by: IHMA – Ben van Scherpenzeel

Executive Summary: An update on the development of Harbour Infrastructure Product Specification. Explaining the background and requirement for detailed information on terminal, berth and berth positioning.

Related Documents: NIPWG letter 6/2019

Related Projects: None

Background

There is a need to address the precise identification of:

- Terminal
- Berth
- Berth position

from the perspective of the end user for the prime purpose of navigational safety. Under IMO Resolution A.893(21) re. “Guidelines for Voyage Planning” a detailed plan should cover the entire voyage, from berth to berth. The
1) Nautical data – road map - submission

Data definitions for Under Keel Clearance (UKC)

Introduction

UKC is a very important aspect of discussions related to maintenance of deep water routes, harbours, basins and berths. Such maintenance is very costly and a few centimeters less depth already result in millions of savings. Some applies to maximum draught: one centimeter extra draught for a VLCC or 12,000 TEU vessel already result in 150 Tons more cargo, equivalent to 50,000 to 180,000 USD, depending on type of cargo and market conditions.

Ports have their own UKC policies, which can be different in the approach versus e.g. all berth. UKC policy is also part of the charter party, the contract to hire a ship between owner and charterer. When a Captain is confronted with an UKC policy after boarding of the ship, it may result in last minute discussions with headquarters whether the ship will breach the charter party clauses or not, a time when the bridge team should be focused on the safe port passage. Especially in deep water routes it is important for the bridge team to understand how much allowance is available for e.g. ship movement. For design, maintenance and navigation discussions it is beneficial to have a clear understanding about the data definitions related to UKC.

Current publications related to UKC

PIANC - report no. 121:214

PIANC stands for Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses. PIANC has worked on a standard for design of vertical channel dimensions in her report 121:214, chapter 2 together with IAPH, BAPA and ICPA.
1) Nautical data – road map - POC

4.4.1.3. INDIRECT REFERENCE
Global Location Number (GLN) (ISO/IEC 6522)
E.g. 12345678901234 for ECT Delta Terminal

4.4.1.4. DIRECT REFERENCE
Decimal degree to a defined precision, (minus to indicate South and West). Datum WGS 84.
E.g.: 51.933216, 4.055622 for ECT Delta Terminal

4.4.1.5. OTHER REFERENCES
Name of the terminal
ISPS number
SMDG code (for container / ro-ro sector only)

4.4.1.6. PROPOSED STORE IN S-57
Object acronym : HABITAC (Point)
Attribute acronym : SOTDCN = Global Location Number; (E.g.: NL_2A_000000; GLN: 12345678901234) for ECT Delta Terminal
Position : central of gravity position
Attribute acronym : CATPAP = category of loadout; facility (E.g.: 10 (container terminal))
Attribute acronym : OJAHME = name of the terminal + SMDG code (E.g.: ECT Delta terminal - DBF, DCC, DOE, DDU)
Attribute acronym : INFOTM = ISPS Number (E.g.: ISPS Number: HRMTH-0071)
Attribute acronym : SORDAT = the production date of the source, e.g. the date of measurement
Attribute acronym : SAMIN = Scale minimum (E.g.: 7999)
1) Nautical data – road map – industry input
1) Nautical data – road map – results

NAUTICAL INFORMATION PROVISION WORKING GROUP

NIPWG Letter 5/2020 11 June 2020

NIPWG Members

Continuation of NIPWG activities
Ref: NIPWG letter 4/2020

Dear colleagues,

This letter discusses three items:

- The participation in, I call it, “Scoping Teams”;
- The scoping work; and
- The video conferences set-up.

Scoping Team Participation

First, I would like to express my deepest impression on the number of volunteers who would like to contribute to the scope development of the two referred product specifications.

The participants are (order according to the continuation received). I hope you’re not disappointed that I used your first names. That simplifies the collection (and typing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Organisation</th>
<th>S.126 (Marine Physical Environment)</th>
<th>S.1xx (Marine Harbour Infrastructure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben, NETHERLANDS (IHMA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification: Public
## 1) Nautical data – road map – results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>Nautical Information Provision (NIPWG)</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>S-49 – Mariners’ Routeing Guides (MRG)</td>
<td>HSSC agreed that S-49 Edition 2.1.0, as it stands, should be no longer maintained. MRG information to be provided by S-100 based products in the future as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>S-124 – Navigational Warnings</td>
<td>HSSC noted the progress made by the forthcoming S-124 PT on Navigational Warnings (Portrayal issues, Comms, etc.) ...and tasked NCWG to consider S-124 PT request in regard to its recommendations on portrayal options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Maritime Services, e-navigation (former HSSC11/36)</td>
<td>HSSC tasked the responsible HSSC WGs [and will invite also the IRCC/WWNWS-SC] to review the initial descriptions of “Maritime Services in context of e-navigation” under their remit and to provide them to NIPWG for further action if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Marine Harbour Infrastructure</td>
<td>HSSC agreed on the allocation of S-131 to the Marine Harbour Infrastructure Product Specification. IHO Sec. to update S-100 webpage and Registry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Classification: Public
1) Nautical data – road map – results

Dear S-129 Project Team Members,

I have been asked to forward to you the attached proposal from the IHMA regarding UKC definitions.

The proposal is regarding Under Keel Clearance (UKC) definitions, based on:
- Existing publications of PIANC, NP100 and industry
- Cross checks with shipping
- Cross checks with ports
- Real time testing during discussions with Port of Gothenburg and Rotterdam, their pilots and national administrations regarding dredging policies

If you have anything you would like to see added or amended in the attached ‘UKC definitions’ document, please include these in the ‘Comment form’ (also attached), and return to me by COB 30 October 2020.

For all addressees, if you no longer wish to receive S-129 Project Team correspondence, please advise by return email.

Regards,
2) Administrative data – scope

Scope:

a) IMO GISIS data base up to date for ID port facility
b) IMO FAL Compendium implementation
c) Planning of boarding and clearances

Use cases:

a) To be compliant with IMO SOLAS Regulation XI-2/13.4
b) To be compliant with ISPS and regional, national and local authorities, having an impact on the Master’s availability for safe navigation and swift clearance of ship and cargo
c) To be compliant with MLC, having impact on planning cargo operations, rest hours and shore leave
2) Administrative data – scope - example

Port A

Port B

Port C
2) Administrative data – robust standardization body

IMO Facilitation (FAL), with ISO, WCO, UNECE

Because:

- From the start, IMO FAL was assigned to set standards for notifications and declarations
- IMO being robust party for both shipping and port sector has 174 Member States
2) Administrative data – road map

1) Data element definition:
   ✓ Submission for arrival/departure times
   ➢ Time stamp definitions for boarding / clearances by authorities

2) Logical data model:
   ➢ IMO FAL EGDH contacting ISO TC8 for proposal, compatible with administrative, navigational and supply chain data, governance for data owner

3) API specifications:

4) Technical performance requirements:

5) Business performance requirements:
2) Administrative data – road map - submission

---

**FACILITATION COMMITTEE**

43rd session
Agenda item 7

**FAL 43/7/1**
1 February 2019
Original: ENGLISH

**REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE IMO COMPRENDIUM ON FACILITATION AND ELECTRONIC BUSINESS, INCLUDING ADDITIONAL E-BUSINESS SOLUTIONS**

Proposal for amendments to the IMO Compendium on Facilitation and Electronic Business

Submitted by Liberia, Marshall Islands and BIMCO

**SUMMARY**

Executive summary: Recalling the ongoing work in the informal Correspondence Group on harmonization of data definitions and map relationships among data

---

FAL 44/6
Annex, page 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change indicator</th>
<th>Data element number</th>
<th>Data element</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Code lists</th>
<th>Business rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time or arrival - planned</td>
<td>The date and time the ship plans to arrive at a specified location, PTA.</td>
<td>an..35</td>
<td></td>
<td>BR 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time of departure - requested</td>
<td>The date and time the ship is requested to depart from a specified location, RTD.</td>
<td>an..35</td>
<td></td>
<td>BR 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time of departure - planned</td>
<td>The date and time the ship plans to depart from a specified location, PTD.</td>
<td>an..35</td>
<td></td>
<td>BR 01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Administrative data – road map – industry input

**Arrival Time Pilot Boarding Place**
- **ETA PBP**
  - Estimated Time of Arrival Pilot Boarding Place
  - Data owner: Vessel

- **RTA PBP**
  - Requested Time of Arrival Pilot Boarding Place
  - Data owner: Port

- **PTA PBP**
  - Planned Time of Arrival Pilot Boarding Place
  - Data owner: Vessel

- **ATA PBP**
  - Actual Time of Arrival Pilot Boarding Place
  - Data owner: Vessel

**Arrival Time Berth**
- **ETA BERTH**
  - Estimated Time of Arrival Berth
  - Data owner: Vessel

- **RTA BERTH**
  - Requested Time of Arrival Berth
  - Data owner: Terminal

- **PTA BERTH**
  - Planned Time of Arrival Berth
  - Data owner: Vessel

- **ATA BERTH**
  - Actual Time of Arrival Berth
  - Data owner: Vessel

**Departure Time Berth**
- **ETD BERTH**
  - Estimated Time of Departure Berth
  - Data owner: Vessel

- **RTD BERTH**
  - Requested Time of Departure Berth
  - Data owner: Port

- **PTD BERTH**
  - Planned Time of Departure Berth
  - Data owner: Vessel

- **ATD BERTH**
  - Actual Time of Departure Berth
  - Data owner: Vessel
2) Administrative data – road map - results

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xD_rJQ4_SAw&feature=youtu.be
The group of experts which will help draft the new JIT clause consist of Raoul Baart from Anthony Veder and Paul Brown from Ineos. They both have first-hand experience with the successful commercial application of JIT in their tanker trade. The group also includes North P&I’s Steve Cockburn, who can provide Freight, Demurrage & Defence (FD&D) expertise and bring previous experience from assisting in the development of BIMCO’s Sea Traffic Management Clause. The drafting team will also produce a clause promoting the use of IMO data elements for communicating ship arrival and departure information in a standard “global” format between ships and ports. A first draft of the new clauses will be reviewed by BIMCO’s Documentary Committee at their next meeting in January 2021.
3) Operational data - scope

Scope:

a) Arrival/departure times at berth and pilot boarding place
b) Starting/completion times of cargo and ship services
c) Notifications of ISPS clearances for cargo and ship services, and for crew changes and crew visitors

Use cases:

a) Just In Time Arrivals, safe navigation
b) To be compliant with MLC rest hour planning, ISPS and has an impact on Just In Time Arrivals and safe navigation
c) To avoid delays of starting services which has an impact on Just In Time Arrivals and safe navigation and to avoid crew frustration not being able to go ashore or to see family
3) Operational data – scope - example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipper</th>
<th>Shipping</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Booking confirmation:**
- **Vessel:** MOL TRADITION
- **Voyage Code:** JOT90126
- **Estimated Sailing Date:** 23/11/2020
- **Estimated Berthing Date:** 21/11/2020
- **Entrance B.T.A. (PVT):** 23/12/2020

**Voyage Details:**
- **Place of Receipt:** ROTTERDAM, NETHERLANDS
- **Port of Loading:** ROTTERDAM, NETHERLANDS
- **Port of Discharge:** SINGAPORE
- **Place of Delivery:** JAKARTA, INDONESIA JAKARTA INTL
- **Container Service:** CY/CY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival at pilot station</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last B</th>
<th>Last line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-09-2020 05:45</td>
<td>22-09-2020 05:45</td>
<td>22-09-2020 05:45</td>
<td>22-09-2020 05:45</td>
<td>22-09-2020 05:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-09-2020 00:36</td>
<td>25-09-2020 00:36</td>
<td>25-09-2020 00:36</td>
<td>25-09-2020 00:36</td>
<td>25-09-2020 00:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-09-2020 05:33</td>
<td>26-09-2020 05:33</td>
<td>26-09-2020 05:33</td>
<td>26-09-2020 05:33</td>
<td>26-09-2020 05:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-09-2020 00:24</td>
<td>29-09-2020 00:24</td>
<td>29-09-2020 00:24</td>
<td>29-09-2020 00:24</td>
<td>29-09-2020 00:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-09-2020 05:21</td>
<td>30-09-2020 05:21</td>
<td>30-09-2020 05:21</td>
<td>30-09-2020 05:21</td>
<td>30-09-2020 05:21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification: Public
3) Operational data – robust standardization body

IMO Facilitation (FAL) – with ISO, WCO, UNECE

Because:

• Time stamps serve both administrative and operational data, it is common sense to develop them under the same body and build on existing work
3) Operational data – road map

1) Data element definition:
   ✓ Submission for including operational data FAL 44/18/2
   ✓ Submission for starting/completion times FAL EGDH 2/XX
   ✓ Proposal to IPCDMC/IALA to harmonize with IMO FAL
   ➢ Submission for PS to replace S-211 with IALA input
   ➢ Definitions for ISPS clearances
   ➢ Definition Notified Time of Arrival (Port of Newcastle) for BIMCO Documentary Committee?

2) Logical data model:
   ➢ IMO FAL EGDH contacting ISO TC8 for proposal, compatible with administrative, navigational and supply chain data, governance for data owner

3) API specifications:

4) Technical performance requirements:

5) Business performance requirements:
3) Operational data – road map - submission

FACILITATION COMMITTEE
44th session
Agenda item 18

FAL 44/18/2
17 January 2020
Language: ENGLISH
Pre-session public release: ☒

WORK PROGRAMME

Development of guidelines for harmonized communication and electronic exchange of operational data for port calls

Submitted by China, Liberia, Morocco, Singapore, BIMCO, IAPH, IHMA, IPCSA

SUMMARY

Executive summary: This document contains a proposal for inclusion of a new output in the agenda of the FAL Committee to develop guidelines for harmonized communication and electronic exchange of
3) Operational data – road map - submission

IMO DATA SET RELATED TO “PORT LOGISTIC OPERATIONAL DATA RELATED TO JUST IN TIME CONCEPT”

IMO reference data model

Submitted by BIMCO, IAPH, IHMA

SUMMARY

Executive summary: The document provides input to the IMO reference data model on port logistic operational data and real time data, in order to allow easy implementation of the IMO Just-In-Time Concept.

Strategic direction, if applicable: 5

Output: 5.8
3) Operational data – road map – proposal

From: International Harbour Masters Association

To: International Port CDM Council Secretariat

Date: July 3, 2020

Subject: Proposal to work together on a New Proposal to IEC for a port call message format

Dear Mr. Bergmann,

We would like to thank you for the great work that the IPCDM council and its working team have achieved towards climate change mitigation.

Forts, terminals and shipping are facing an enormous challenge to reduce emissions from shipping. One of the possible measures identified by IMO GIA is Just In Time (JIT) Arrivals. One of the barriers for JIT Arrivals is the real time exchange of time stamps related to the port call process.

We are of the understanding that concerns have potentially been raised that the current suggested data model for time stamps, 5-211, may not be as complete a solution as initially considered. We would like to encourage Port CDM and all other relevant stakeholders to work together to find a robust, single standard which could be endorsed by the proper authority (IMO P&I) so that the digital transformation of the marine industry continues to move forward.

To address this, and make best use of 5-211 development, the proposal is to:

- Work together with all other relevant stakeholders to address the potential gaps and if required develop a new proposal to IEC, which gives confidence to the industry to invest and accelerate digitization in the ship-port interface.

Sincerely,

IHMA
3) Operational data – road map – industry input
3) Operational data – road map - results

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEMS

Urgent matters emanating from the forty-fourth session of the FAL Committee

Note by the Secretary-General

SUMMARY

Action requested of the Council

5. The Council is invited to note the information provided and to take action, as appropriate, in particular to:

1. endorse the new FAL Committee output on “Development of guidelines for harmonized communication and electronic exchange of operational data for port calls” (paragraphs 2 and 3); and

2. endorse the holding of two intersessional meetings of the EGDH in 2021 (paragraph 4).
3) Operational data – road map - results

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xD_rJQ4_SA&feature=youtu.be
Incentives for data owners

- IMO and Industry can promote together implementation of guidance
- IMO by publication on their social media
- Industry by agreeing on certification of implementation

➢ Submission to IMO to realize incentives for first movers
➢ Industry to pull together group of first movers from shipping, ports and shippers willing to invest in global standards
Guidance for data owners

- Most shipping lines and ports have limited IT resources
- IMO cannot identify standardization bodies or enforce the use of standards in national waters; however IMO can adopt performance standards through resolutions
- IMO can provide non-mandatory instrumental guidance, referencing to industry standards as per Resolution A.911(22)

✓ Submission to IMO to develop guidance
✓ Submission to update MS4 Port Support Service with IHMA/IAPH/BIMCO
➢ Submission to organize a neutral, not for profit global platform for data sharing – aligning with local PCS / IPCSA – contact IPCSA, Navelink
Guidance for data owners

FACILITATION COMMITTEE
44th session
Agenda item 18

FAL 44/18/2
17 January 2020
Language: ENGLISH
Pre-session public release: ☑

WORK PROGRAMME

Development of guidelines for harmonized communication and electronic exchange of operational data for port calls

Submitted by China, Liberia, Morocco, Singapore, BIMCO, IAPH, IHMA, IPCSA

SUMMARY

Executive summary: This document contains a proposal for inclusion of a new output in the agenda of the FAL Committee to develop guidelines for harmonized communication and electronic exchange of
Guidance for data owners

4.1 Submitting organization

IHMA

4.2 Coordinating body

IMO

4.3 Description of the Maritime Service

Port Support Service (PSS) is defined as a digital service to improve the quality and availability of standardized data in support of a ship calling at a port. It provides information to organize and support the port call and varies depending on the local needs.

Examples of PSS include:

Data for notifications/declarations in port:

1) IMO GiSIS data base
2) Data with IMO FAL Compendium data format / structure
3) Planning of clearances

Nautical port data:

1) General port information
2) Maintained depths and/or soundings
3) Terminal, berth and berth positions
## Guidance for data owners - examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLU CODE</th>
<th>Port Information Manual</th>
<th>Just In Time Arrival Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="BLU CODE" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Port Information Manual" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Just In Time Arrival Guide" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Ship–port interface data is fundamental for safe and sustainable shipping
- Data quality and availability requires sharing by data owners
- Data owners like to share one to many
- One to many requires standardization and investments, to be realized by:
  1) Agree on business process of port calls
  2) Agree on minimum scope of data
  3) Agree on robust standardization bodies
  4) Agree on road map per data set
  5) Develop incentives for data owners
  6) Develop guidance for data owners
- This requires collaboration between IMO and Industry
FAQ 1

Current situation:
- Shipping is 5000 years old
- Roughly 80% of goods is transported by sea

Question:
- Why is the use of standards not more implemented?
- Why is shipping not connected to supply chain?

Answer:
- Old and fragmented industry, no big players able to push
- Also in supply chain no big players to push
- Shipping and ports had limited collaboration
FAQ 2

Current situation:
• Today there’s no roadmap to realize full interoperability per data set
• Shipping lines and ports who like to be first movers are developing in isolation
• Shipping lines and ports are happy to work with IMO FAL and IHO, BUT they need a road map with robust standards to plan investments for data changes

Question:
• How do we realize a road map per data set together with IMO / IHO, allowing first movers to be part of this?

Answer:
• IMO / IHO will be informed about need for road map
• First movers can offer testing of standards to IMO / IHO
International Taskforce

Port Call Optimization

THANK YOU