

Update from



on Implementation of RFD 2010/65

Strategy (1)

- Maximum re-use of existing information infrastructure and utilisation of current PCS functionality;
- Maintain current functionality of the Harbourmaster P/O Box (on PCS), and minimize the dependence of data-sharing with MSW, coming from reporting formalities around PCS;
- Make mandatory reporting through PCS (B2G) as attractive as possible, and arrange for an as complete as possible dataset on PCS

Strategy (2)

- Arrange that PCS removes the administrative burden of the new B2MSW message for reporting parties, by facilitating the by MSW required conversion “in the back office”;
- When, apart from the introduction of this new message, the reporting process needs to be revised, then assess the impact on the reporting procedures in PCS first. Further decisions to be based on this impact analysis
- Let PCS/Portbase develop functionality for the reporting formalities which are not yet covered (IMO-FAL 5: Crew List; IMO-Fal 6: Passenger List. The IMO-Fal 4 is not necessary).
- Arrange that as many ports as feasible connect to the PCS-HaMIS system.

Strategy (3)

- PoR and PoA will not participate in the AnNa project, nor will they engage in the Dutch MSW-pilots.
- PoR and PoA are constructive towards a timely implementation of MSW, under the following conditions:
 - The Port companies will finance the arrangements and measures necessary to support the public tasks of the Harbourmasters. Additional public funds are required when additional functionality for the PCS-MSW interface is requested.
 - Facilitating reporting formalities on the PCS, for other authorities than the Harbourmasters, is a commercial decision of the port companies.

Strategy (4)

- Arrange governance for PCS/Portbase as public infrastructure.
- Continue to participate in all relevant national and international bodies/committees
- Harmonize our position with PROTECT, EPCSA, ESPO and EHMC, to validate our opinions, and timing of our strategy.