



Minutes of the PROTECT meeting # 25

Location: Rotterdam Port Authority, Location Heijplaat.

Date: 16 May 2014

1. Opening by Chairman

The chairman opened the meeting at 09:20 and welcomes James Douglas and Paul Ainscough of Exis Technologies, who are here to present their company to the PROTECT Group members.

2. Presentation EXIS Technologies

James gives a presentation about the activities of EXIS concerning the transport of dangerous goods. His presentation can be downloaded from the meeting page. **EXIS PROTECT MAY2014V5_FINAL.**

3. Agenda

For practical reasons the order of the items on the agenda has changed somewhat.

4. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting of February 19 were discussed. Since there are no remarks the minutes are adopted as-is. Nico has a question about the wording of item 3 in the minutes concerning the Crew List and Passenger List, which 'MUST be developed by PROTECT'. He believes the word MUST is perhaps too strong and should be 'MAY be developed by PROTECT'.

5. Update on the implementation of 2010/65.

Raymond explains the position of ESPO concerning 2010/65. The original ESPO paper can be found on the meeting page. A clarification is needed regarding the words 'ship identifier'. This is not the ship's IMO number or call sign, but the port's unique visit identifier.

Raymond continues with the status of the implementation of 2010/65 in the Netherlands. His presentations can also be downloaded from the meeting page. **PoR PoA update on the implementation May 2014** and **Position of ESPO on RFD 2010-65**

There are still many questions, including:

- Where is the MIG (Message Implementation Guideline)?
- Who will do what?
- What is the planning?



Other considerations and remarks:

- In order to be ready by 2015-06-01 we must implement NOW and not waste time with pilots.
- It is still not known which messages must be implemented.
- Nico: In Belgium it was decided that the PCS must implement and will use the existing messages.
- We now learned that the MIG, which should have been ready by 2013-10-01 and then 2014-04-30, will now be ready not earlier than 2014-10-01.
- In Spain also the PCS will implement the existing messages, which will be sent to the MSW.
- The deadline in France is end of June to have the message MIG available otherwise they have to reconsider their options.
- Germany is waiting for the Data Model and will start with the implementation of existing messages. However not all will be ready in time.
- The PROTECT Statement is still valid and does not need to be updated.

6. Outstanding action points

- a) Change request for IFTDGN by Cor Koert: Ger will ask Cor for the document and will try to integrate this request in the existing MIG. The new MIG will then be presented to the PROTECT members for comments and approval. In this case a change of the message structure is not foreseen and therefore a Change Request is not required.
- b) SMDG request to enhance DG-information in IFTDGN. Ger explains that, at the request of some mayor shipping lines, a new version of the BAPLIE message (Version 3.0) has been developed by a sub-group of SMDG. This version allows the transmission of additional data concerning dangerous goods on board and SMDG suggests PROTECT members to take note of these additional data elements and consider upgrading the IFTDGN with these additional data elements. You can download the description of these data elements from the meeting page. A full copy of the new BAPLIE MIG 3.0 can be downloaded from the SMDG website: <http://www.smdg.org/documents/ship-planning/>
- c) EMSA Request for support: Raymond reports. Questions raised:
 - a. Creation of an XML version of WASDIS is not required.
 - b. Health Declaration: There is no standard but no activity needed.
 - c. PROTECT input in HAZMAT group:
 - i. PROTECT was asked to prepare a statement with respect to the use of existing databases.
 - ii. Hans reports about the first meeting of 2014-02-25. You can download his report from the meeting page: **Report EMS SSN Workgoup meeting Feb 25th** Next meeting is planned for September/October. An input paper should be prepared by PROTECT. Download Raymond's presentation from the meeting page: **Protect input in Hazmat WG**. See also the letter from EMSA and the reaction. The Hazmat database is an issue.
 - iii. Legal aspects: Raymond will contact Mrs. Gerd Muyswinkel of DG-Move to try and get a written confirmation on the position of DG MOVE on the requirements: "Reporting Once" (Or NSW or PCS, not both).



7. Amendment BERMAN

With respect to the ports of call the message should transmit codes of the last 10 facilities (terminals) and not the last 10 ports. This is particularly useful in case the vessel will call at multiple terminals in one and the same port. The codes to be used can be found in various databases: GISIS is one source of terminal facility codes (GISIS.IMO.ORG). For inland terminals in W-Europe the RIS database could be consulted. SMDG is also maintaining a code list of worldwide terminals, in use by all mayor shipping lines worldwide: <http://www.smdg.org/smdg-code-lists/>

For this issue Txaber Goiri should be consulted.

8. Coding of stowage locations on Ro/Ro vessels

PROTECT was asked to provide standard coding of stowage locations on Ro/Ro vessels. It appears that Cor Koert has already worked on such coding system and Ger will ask him to provide input.

9. EPCSA meeting Rome (3-4 June)

Holger will report to this meeting on behalf of PROTECT. Participants should provide input to Holger. Download the Herman's report of the meeting of March 25 from the meeting page: [EMSA EPCSA PROTECT meeting 25032013](#)

10. Next meetings

The next meeting planned for June 25 will be skipped. It is too soon after this meeting.

The next meeting will now take place on October 1, 2014. Dakosy Hamburg will be our host.

The meeting thereafter will be on December 17, 2014 and the Port of Nantes-St.Nazaire will be our hosts.

11. List of Open Action Points

1. Implement IFTDGN change request by Cor Koert (Ger will ask Cor)
2. SMDG's proposal for DG information in BAPLIE 3.0 (Ger will publish details on meeting page)
3. EMSA's request for assistance by PROTECT (Raymond keeps in touch with EMSA)
4. Prepare a PROTECT statement about the use of existing Databases (Herman/Raymond)
5. Input for the next EMS SSN workgroup meeting (Herman/Raymond)
6. Legal Aspects: Contact DG-Move (Raymond)
7. BERMAN terminal facilities list: Contact Txaber Goiri (Herman/Raymond)
8. Coding of stowage locations on Ro/Ro vessels: Cor Koert to provide existing proposals (Ger will ask Cor)
9. Input for the next EPCSA meeting in Rome: Provide input to Holger (Hans/Raymond)



12. Any Other Business

Raymond once more explains that our proposal is now on the table at EMSA. So far we have not received a reaction.

13. Closing

Herman thanks all participants and closes the meeting at 15:00.

ATTACHMENT:

REMARKS FROM OLE KREBS OF MCP FELIXSTOWE.

Although Ole was not attending this meeting he did contribute his comments and made us aware of certain aspects of the relationship with EMSA.



ATTACHMENT

Below you will find an extract of some correspondence between Raymond Seignette and Ole Krebs:

Ger – I appreciate that my absence did not help but I feel that the notes may have a lost a bit in the translation process ☺. I am therefore including an extract from an earlier email exchange I had with Raymond from which the proposal was submitted to EMSA (via Cor) and I understand it was met with approval in principle and indeed supported by Ireland who seconded the request and, it is now on the agenda for the next DG working group! I hope this is of help.

.

“Hi Raymond – thank you for your email.

I am not suggesting that Protect asks for any holds being applied on the CHRD process, merely that they consider an accreditation process that will ensure that any third-party databases being used by industry are compliant with the CHRD and that this point is included in the guidelines **as an addition** to the proposed structure. Not having attended any of the meetings I will happily rely on your good self, Cor, Hans and Herman to judge whether this can be achieved during the debate if indeed there is agreement amongst the membership it is worthwhile pursuing.

To clarify the suggested accreditation process:

- In the HWG Progress Report dated 8 April 2014 the statement “the HWG highlighted that proper reporting to SafeSeaNet also depends on the quality of information that is supplied by the manufacturers and the shippers to the ship data providers. In other words, correct information can only be guaranteed if the source information is correct.” is key and is indeed, as you suggest, consistent with the agreed input from Protect.
- Yes, there are also references to hosting the CHRD centrally with the proviso that each member state develops a mechanism to make it available to national authorities and industry, yet any system-to-system interfaces (to a NCA and/or SSN) are only considered as a later phase of the project.
- The report also suggests that “The administrative burden of the shipping industry is simplified if the CHRD is linked to the **National Single Window**. The CHRD can be **used to fill in the HAZMAT notifications**, with the static data elements, after the **data provider inputs the name or the UN number of a product**. In this way significant manual input can be avoided, particularly in the case of container vessels.”. One has to question this on several fronts i.e. what if no National Single Window exists, how does the data provider access the CHRD data, if not through an ‘approved/accredited’ source how do they know the data is



correct and, more importantly, is it really expected they (manufacturers/shippers) or the ship reporting parties (carriers/agents) manually input every single Hazmat notification in anticipation of a system-to-system interface at every level of the process and at the same time must they abandon whatever systems/databases currently used?

- Nor must we forget that these applications also provides users with embedded functionality which further improves safety in terms of packaging, stowage and segregation conventions. Similarly, we all know that substances cannot always be defined by simply inserting a name or UN number e.g. the variant code potential.
- What I am proposing is that in order to reach what EMSA loosely call the 'industry', a bottom up rather than a top down approach surely should be considered for inclusion in the guidelines. That is to say, why not embrace existing practices which - apart from data quality - appears to function quite well by ensuring that the source data used at root level has been supplied by an EMSA approved or accredited provider and that their products are consistent with and validated against the current CHRD."

-0-0-0-0-