

MINUTES – PLATINA SWP 5.2 RIS Common ISSUES MEETING

Date	16 th November 2011
Location	Port Authority of Venice Spazioporto Ex church Santa Marta Area Portuale 30123 Venezia
Time	9:30 – 17 hrs
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DG-TREN: represented by Marc Vanderhaegen (Project Officer) • RIS Expert Groups members • RISING representatives • IRIS II representatives • NEWADA representatives • Representatives from National RIS projects • PLATINA representatives <p>See attendance list in attachment</p>
Author minutes	Nora Schmorak en Roeland van Bockel

A.1 Welcome and introduction by Mr. van Bockel

Mr. van Bockel welcomes the participants and thanks them for their presence. The meeting aims at informing each other about issues of common interest, discussing what is going on and getting acquaintance with the new project officer of the EC, Mr. Vanderhaegen.

A.2 Welcome and introduction by Prof. Costa

Mr. van Bockel gives the floor to Professor Paolo Costa, currently President of the Venice Port Authority - former mayor of Venice and chairman of the TRAN Committee of the European Parliament.

Professor Costa welcomes the participants in the old church Sta Marta of Venice. He stated that Venice is following closely everything that is happening on the rivers and channels. They are considering the extension of the channel connecting the river Po to Milan and to Trieste. For the first time, Italy considers the possibility of an inland waterways network. Regular services with hazardous goods are being run in Italy for the first time. Furthermore, Prof Costa stressed the importance of information and infrastructure for the Italian inland waterways: “being the first time that Italy is making regular use of the inland waterways as transport mode, we are facing lack of knowledge, information and infrastructure. We need for instance, inland waterways vessels as see- ships are navigating the canal at this moment. We need all kind of information to use for this new challenge”.

Mr. van Bockel thanked Professor Costa for the introduction and the privilege to have such a prominent person present in the meeting.

A.3 Agenda approval

The attendance list circulates for sign up by the participants.

Mr Bockel asked whether the proposed agenda of the meeting can be adopted. After that, the agenda is adopted.

A.4 EC introduction by Mr. Vanderhaegen

Mr. Vanderhaegen starts by saying “I’m pleased to be with you. This is my first encounter with RIS and the RIS community. I see RIS as one of the most advanced traffic information services compared to other transport modes and that makes me proud. I’m looking forward to open discussion today.”

Mr. Vanderhaegen gives an overview of the current EC policy context.

1. The EC is has published a white paper on transport in March 2011, towards a single EU transport market – a main objective being decarbonisation and getting road transport over 300 kilometres onto other transport modes, like barges. A key issue is

to maximise the use of available systems. Value for money is more than ever, important.

2. The EC considers RIS as essential in progressing on the recently published EC legislative proposal on TEN-T (revision) framework and the Connecting Europe Facility. Implementation progress is being followed closely. I'm asking you please to promote RIS!.
3. In the context of the Horizon 2020 programme on innovation, RIS can be considered one of the issues where Europe is at the front, a leading player, the driven force of innovation.
4. Actions within the e-Maritime and single window obligations have to be followed and taken into account within RIS development. The EC has a key role to play in this coordination between modes.
5. In 2012, the publication of NAIADES II is foreseen. RIS play there an important role as well. EC is engaged in the preparatory process towards a NAIADES communication. Today's discussion will serve as important input for that communication.

The RIS Directive has been a main milestone. A number of issues need to be addressed in order to reach full implementation of the RIS Directive. "I'm aware of the need for effort from the EC towards reaching this goal."

Mr. Vanderhaegen states furthermore that PLATINA has covered till now the need for support. EC is committed to find a solution for the continuation of this support. In his RIS priorities, Mr Vanderhaegen is planning to work first on the consolidation of results and then look for the steps further on towards full RIS deployment.

Mr. Vanderhaegen would like to address during the discussion questions such as: is the quality of RIS services enough? Are we sufficiently user driven? How to make IWT more competitive? Which are the upcoming technologies to adopt?.

Mr. Vanderhaegen wants to address as well the definition of the needs under the current TEN-T framework. There is still substantial budget available under the current framework. Mr. Vanderhaegen calls the RIS stakeholders to make use of it and to prepare for the future, let's put RIS on the map.

Mr. Van Bockel thanks Mr. Vanderhaegen for his words and opens the discussion.

Mr. de Lijster asks about the way EC is looking at the need for continuation of the already implemented systems. Mr. Vanderhaegen replies by saying that we have to realize that we are dealing with a strong budget constrain. Every expense has to be justified. Regarding RIS, it is essential to keep *an open eye on* what are the benefits for the society. Maintenance is of course an absolute precondition for success. We have to develop and keep it up-to-date and make the RIS potential a reality in order to justify the costs.

Mr. Niculescu remarks that skippers have a lot of problems to upgrade their systems and to keep up with RIS developments so support from the EC on this issue would be welcomed. Mr. Vanderhaegen remarks that innovation in inland waterways transportation is an absolute requirement in order to keep up competing with other modes. Innovation is needed, not only for system development but also for the fleet. Statistics show that the IWT is losing ground regarding its share. Not only on-board has to be innovation, but also on-shore/terminals. The sector needs a change in the way of thinking. It is a major challenge and the EC is discussing about how to support the needed change.

A.5 State of the play RIS experts groups

A.5.1 Inland ECDIS by Mr. Birkhuber

Mr. Birkhuber presents some statistics about the use of Inland ECDIS proving Inland ECDIS to be a successful product. Peru and Venezuela are trying to implement it, as well as China. IHO has recognised the harmonization group. Additional issues:

- In Europe a test for the provision of water level is currently in execution. There are still open action points but a lot has been achieved.
- The IECDIS standard has been adopted by CCNR. UNECE will decide in 2012 and is discussing on a possible adoption of a mandate for the expert group to maintain the annexes of the standard. Such a mandate has already been provided by CCNR.

The EC has promised to publish version 2.3, but this appears not to happen until 2013. This means that EU Member States are not obliged to implement Inland ENC's before the second half of 2015. The current economical recession forms therefore a danger for the ENC's, because there is no obligation for publishing. Some countries rely only on surveys of private companies.

Without suitable ENC's, it will be not possible to meet the strategic and tactic Traffic Management goals that RIS aims to. Mr. Birkhuber concludes that there is an urgent need of EU legal basis for IECDIS.

A.5.2 Notices to Skippers and RIS index Joint Taskforce by Mr. Rafael

Mr. Rafael is chairing both the Expert Group NtS and the JTF RIS index. The EC regulation on NtS in force, clearly states an obligation regarding NtS implementation regarding:

- safety of navigation and
- voyage planning.

The NtS Expert Group has already prepared a text amending the standard and will keep on updating this text until next year. In 2012, the EU is due to adopt a new version of the standard.

Mr. Rafael states that the EG is very proud of the web services available for users and providers towards end-users. Bi- and trilateral tests have been done lately proving that it does work. User can read messages in other languages than the one of the original message.

One of the key issues NtS is dealing with at the moment is the reference tables with translations of codes in all EU languages. Furthermore, several countries are implementing an upper version than is mandatory by EC regulation.

Regarding the JTF RIS index, its main goal is to update the RIS Index Encoding Guide. The RIS index is an essential element, ensuring the link between an object and its identifier. Applications need the RIS index in order to link information unambiguously to objects.

The NtS Expert Group has agreed on roadmap for the JTF work. Beginning next year, the JTF will distribute a draft result for comments among the four Expert Groups. The updated RIS index encoding guide will be ready for decision within the 4 Expert Groups mid next year.

A.5.3 Electronic Report International by Mr. van Splunder

Mr. van Splunder presents the ERI objectives as follows:

- To enable authorities to receive harmonised electronic reports of ships.
- To inform competent authorities about the voyage of a vessel and the cargo on board.
- To ensure interoperability within all modalities especially the Maritime.
- For cross border transport, the reported information is transmitted to the next competent authority.

The tasks of the ERI Expert Group are as follows:

- To extend and maintain the standards for electronic reporting in inland navigation, including: Data standards, Technical standards, Message standards, Codes and reference tables. Privacy and security aspects and uniform procedures, elaboration of clarification documents with respect to the standards, maintenance procedures, harmonisation of standards and procedures for electronic reports to and between governmental bodies and were applicable to other parties involved in inland waterway transport.
- To submit proposals for the extension or amendment of standards to EC, CCNR, DC, Sava Commission, Mosel Commission, UN/ECE and other interested international standardisation bodies.

Commission Regulation no 164/2010 technical specification:

- ERINOT (IFTDGN) shall be used for the reporting of voyage related information in inland navigation.
- PAXLST shall be used for the exchange of passenger and crew data in inland navigation.
- BERMAN pre-arrival/pre-departure legal requirements of the notification of a ship to a port.
- ERIRSP (APERAK) may be generated by a competent authority to indicate whether or not the original message has been processed.

Mr. van Splunder stressed the importance of solving consistency issues with maritime information. Especially customer is interested in making the communication flow as fluid as possible.

Erinot standard that has been published is also used in maritime. It is Important to combine actions for harmonization with maritime info.

During a CCNR meeting that recently took place, both skippers and shippers concluded that the current focus on traffic management should shift more to transport management (cargo).

Questions:

Mr. Vanderhaegen asks how far we are from paperless inland water navigation. Mr. van Splunder replies that it depends on the country. One single window will make it possible in the Netherlands. For other countries will be more difficult. The Netherlands and Germany plan jointly to make it also possible for the Rhine countries.

Mr. Niculescu adds that in the case of Romania, the entire Danube stretch will have ERI implemented by the end of next year. It will be possible soon in the Romanian Danube to navigate paperless.

Mrs Kluytenaar remarks that the original goal is failing since we need to deal with the connection with the users. For that purpose, a European single window is needed instead of the current plans for different national single windows.

A.5.4 Vessel Tracking and Tracing by Mr. Bober

Mr. Bober is the new chairman of the Expert Group VTT. Mr. Bober states that VTT is currently gaining speed. 80.000 vessels are equipped Europe wide. Most of the VTT services are implemented.

A major issue to solve concerns the definition of what data can be used when, for which purpose and by whom. It is important to investigate in the coming future. One should come to an optimal mix of RIS services.

A proposal for new version of the VTT standards is ready for adoption by the EU.

The Expert Group is currently working on:

- the quality of data,
- the development of guidelines for class B and
- user guidelines both for on-board and on-shore.

A new CCNR leaflet has been issued. Together with IECDIS, VTT is working on the presentation of information on the ENCs. Furthermore, VTT is investigating issues within IRIS II.

Mr. Bober is optimistic on the potential of intelligent traffic management based on a mix of RIS data from different services.

A.6 State of the play ongoing EU projects

A.6.1 IRIS II

Mr. Sattler presents the results of IRIS Europe II. The project will end this year. A joint final event, IRIS II and RISING, will take place on December 1 2011 in Duisburg. The main objective is to ensure information interchange through whole Europe and to provide interfaces, especially for logistics partners. See the ppt-file in the attachments.

A.6.2 NEWADA

Mr. Mezo presents the results of NEWADA. This project focuses on the Danube region and has many links to other projects. The main result of the project consists of the Danube portal, which is not meant as substitute for the national web services. It is an addition. Danubeportal.com will be on Internet in January 2012.

Mr. Mezo asks the presents to send their feedback on the portal. In the future push services are planned together with an evaluation towards customer- oriented services. See the ppt-file in the attachments.

A.6.3 RISING

Mr. Gehlhaar presents the results of RISING. The project includes a set of pilots aiming at the demonstration of the added value of RIS for different logistical purposes. See the description of the pilots in ppt-file in attachments.

One of the key problems encountered in all demonstrations is the availability of position information. There are two parallel approaches dealing with this issue, the European Position Information Server (EPIS) developed in PLATINA and the RIS Date Exchange Reference Document (R2D2) developed in IRIS Europe II. RISING suggests that one common approach should be defined and followed.

Questions:

Mr. Vanderhaegen asks what the difference between R2D2 and the EPIS approach is.

Mr. Gehlhaar answers that R2D2 is a concept for decentralized exchange of data while EPIS proposes a centralized approach.

Mr. Vanderhaegen states that RISING should aim at the evaluation and quantification of the benefits for companies. Mr. Gehlhaar responds that RISING will provide an assessment of these benefits. Mr. ten Broeke adds that the major problem lays on the transparency of information in relationship with the competition between companies.

He states that in the Netherlands, logistic parties are not interested in RIS if Germany is not implementing position services (AIS land infrastructure). The current commercial services offered on the internet are not being considered as legal.

Mr. Niculescu adds that AIS data is in principle accessible for everybody¹, and therefore not a legal issue to share it and make it available. Cargo information is the issue to solve. Mr. Gehlhaar states that companies need reliable information about what cargo is where.

Mr. Nefkens remarks that the term logistics is too generic. It depends on what kind of transport; container and tank transport are very much different. Moreover, one of the issues is that RIS covers only class V but for logistics needs to have coverage in class IV as well².

Mr. Niculescu asks about the current key RIS technologies that are most important for logistics and if any need for new technologies has been identified. Mr. Gehlhaar replies that within RISING the following RIS technologies are used for logistics purposes: AIS, ERIVOY, ERINOT and NtS. Mr. Klein, member of the RISING team, adds that the demonstration

¹ Comment on the MoM by Arne Gehlhaar: No it is not. Data privacy issues prevent third parties (e.g. terminals) to access AIS information.

² Comment on the MoM by Arne Gehlhaar: That's not true. See RIS Directive:

"This Directive applies to the implementation and operation of RIS on all inland waterways of the Member States of class IV and above which are linked by a waterway of class IV or above to a waterway of class IV or above of another Member State..."

cases in the Danube make use of the TES and TOS messages, developed in the EU projects Freightwise and E-Freight.

A.6.4 PLATINA/RIS support

Mr van Bockel presents the results of PLATINA concerning the RIS support. He states that PLATINA is since 2008, assisting the development of common European ground in RIS. There is insufficient communication between policy and implementation and PLATINA is trying to foster this communication.

See the ppt-file in the attachments.

Mrs. Kluytenaar states the following about the PLATINA objective to prepare the ground for a European FIS portal: “We made the mistake not to implement RIS as a European concept but only on national level”. The consequence is that users get lost in the national websites, when looking for RIS data such as ENC’s.

At this moment, users need intermediaries to get to the ENC’s. They have to pay for the service of collecting them and making them accessible from the national websites. As a first step towards a European solution, PLATINA will collect the different ENC links in the RIS portal.

A better solution is to make in the future an EU FIS portal to collect NtS and ENC’s EU wide. This needs cooperation with the industry as well as a bigger effort than the one PLATINA can afford to do now until may 2012.

Mrs. Kluytenaar states that the original idea was to use the available technologies as developed by FIS NL, NEWADA (Danube portal) and PLATINA (RIS portal) and work on common solutions. Unfortunately, this idea turned not to be feasible within the constraints of time and budget of both NEWADA and PLATINA.

Mrs Kluytenaar ends by urging the RIS community to stop reinventing the wheel time after time: “Let’s share EU money and man-power to implement a EU FIS portal.”

Questions:

Mr. Smeets asks whether any agreement for continuation of the PLATINA work is regarding for instance hull database. Mr. Vanderhaegen replied that some EU Member States have approached him with this question. It does not happen often that EU Member States ask for EU support. EC is very positive about supporting RIS actions and discusses the best way to support: “We are aware of the urgency and try to set up priorities and find solutions.”

Mr. ten Broeke adds that it is essential to coordinate the objectives of the new white paper, those in NAIADES with the actions within the continuation of PLATINA. It is important to define what we need to achieve. The logistic partners are not being reached. Please, decide whether we still have to achieve this goal and how.

On the other hand, RIS is addressing water authorities and not the end-users. It is necessary to define from an EU perspective what it is needed to implement instead of letting the choice to the member states.

Mr. van Splunder asks about the position of the EC regarding EPIS. Various logistic parties seem to be interested in being provided position information, but the community should develop a standpoint on how to deal the conditions.

Mr. van Bockel puts this issue on hold for discussion during the afternoon session.

A.7 TEN-T developments

A.7.1 RIS Italy

Mrs. Sorze and Mr. Crose present the RIS implementation project in Italy. The project kick-off meeting took place in June. The aim is to develop the Northern inland waterways network of Italy. Territoriale is leader partner of the project. The project end is planned for December 2013.

See the ppt-file in the attachment.

A.7.2 Other RIS national implementations

Mr. van Bockel shows the template to fill in projects for publication through the RIS portal and asks everybody to fill in the overview description of the national projects in ris.eu.

Mr. Vanderhaegen would encourage everybody to fill in the form in order to have an overview. It would help a lot.

Mr. Niculescu remarks that the form is meant for implementation project but not for research projects.

Mr. van Bockel corrects that the form can be filled for any kind of project, also planned projects. The template allows for sufficient room to add information.

AP (Platina). Send the form to the participants again. The next 6 months the RIS community shall be requested once every month to fill out the forms on all projects in their countries (current, previous and planned projects)

A.8 Discussion about common issue

Mr. van Bockel opens the discussion about common current and future issues. The discussion is based on a list of issues that emerged out of the morning discussions.

A.8.1 Consolidation (maintain – closing the gaps - use)

Mr. van Bockel asks the participants whether sufficient knowledge is available on the status of RIS implementation in the various countries. Mr. Stuurman informs that on a yearly basis the CCNR leaflet describes the status of implementation in every EU member state and Switzerland regarding the four key technologies.

Mr. Baeck states that RIS implementation has been a question for the last 7 years. PLATINA has set up a questionnaire for measuring implementation. The results have been presented to the RIS committee. In his view, to make an accurate assessment of the status a team of engineers is needed to study and to evaluate the situation at every member state for at least a week per country. The available overviews provide an indication of the status. It is important to identify the next steps necessary and what data should and should not be obtained.

Mrs. Schmorak remarks that in order to answer these questions, one should rather look at the overviews from an EU strategic perspective. Based on the EU policy objectives, stages of implementation should be defined as targets. It is important to measure implementation from the perspectives of:

- what services reach the end-users,
- the perceptions of the end-users perceive and
- the geographic coverage of the services.

Implementing the targets should be the focus of all the RIS actors, everyone from his/her own perspective. As the RIS Framework Directive allows for different interpretations it is important to identify:

- what kind of data is needed
- what kind of data is available
- what kind of data are different from each other

On the progress of various activities in the RIS domain, Mr. de Lijster stresses the need for consolidation in time of recession. Mr. Stuurman urges for consolidation instead of developing new things, even if it appears less interesting than starting with new things. Mr. Birkhuber agrees. However, he stresses that it must be possible to improve standards to meet specific needs and requirements of countries.

Mr. Bober iterates the importance to know the information requirements in the various countries. AIS Data requests differ per country: “I would investigate what kind of data is needed and what is available from the different services. What is needed from the point of view of EU traffic management and what is needed from the regional/national perspective?” Furthermore, legislation is different in the various countries, also between the Danube/Rhine countries. Therefore, the data needs and requirements are different. Mr. Bober realises that the differences need to be justified based on a harmonized approach.

Mr. ten Broeke remarks that highlighting the differences would not help harmonization. RIS aims at harmonization among countries and regions. It would be good to discuss further harmonization from the EU perspective. An important issue to solve to make harmonization possible is data protection. Find a solution for data security and this will solve many problems of data exchange. The problem now is that every EU Member State has the freedom to decide on its own how to tackle the problem.

Mr. van Bockel draws back the attention to the definition of consolidation. What should be minimally done from the EU perspective?

Mr. Nefkens would expect the national authorities to clearly state a view on minimal required services. One should define minimal services. This should be followed by defining the necessary data and the common ground.

Mr. Vanderhaegen concludes that there is a clear need for consolidation. The question is what should be the scope. M. Vanderhaegen proposes PLATINA to come up with some recommendation on this issue. This is one of the issues to address within NAIADES II framework.

Mr. van Bockel asks the RIS community to give feedback to PLATINA through the forum of ris.eu

A.8.2 RIS to be part of total (connectivity) - RIS to connect to e-Freight/e-Maritime/Single Window (further streamline Information Services)

Mr. van Splunder identifies this issue being on the agenda since the COMPRIS project. The maritime sector has its Blue Belt project. Within this concept, an EU single window - one way of working, one place to provide the information/data - is to be developed. From this perspective on, Mr Van Splunder suggests to follow up this EU maritime issue with an inland navigation perspective defining corridors which allow full fledged IT services. This would be an ideal starting point to kick-off the discussion about consolidation, also taking the viewpoint of the fairway authorities. A RIS approach from a corridors perspective rather than a nation state (nation borders related) perspective would be beneficial for RIS developments.

Mr. Vanderhaegen remarks that the corridor approach may be useful for wider RIS application. The TEN-T guidelines identify corridors. Some feedback on possible options for synergy is appreciated.

Mr. Birkhuber comments that for instance at the corridor to Constanza, non-EU countries will not be able to participate. He adds that there is a need for some basic preconditions like UNI (unique identification of vessels). Furthermore, he remarks that because of not binding standards with third countries, it is not always possible to have contracts with those countries because of legal issues. Therefore, it appears difficult to develop cooperation with third countries towards corridor management as long as there are no agreements on data protection regarding the exchange of RIS data between the EU and those countries.

A.8.3 RIS Framework Directive not fully implemented (do we need monitoring)?

Mr. Vanderhaegen would like to know if the objectives of the RIS Framework directive are being reached, for instance interconnectivity. He would like to know whether there is a need for change from the policy perspective.

Mrs. Kluytenaar wonders whether the question should be answered from the view point of the legislator. As requested by PLATINA, she looked at this issue from the point of view of the user needs and identified some gaps to be addressed.

Mr. Torfs sees a lot of implementation, but not everywhere with the same intensity. Monitoring from EU would be a good idea.

Mrs. Ghenovici wonders whether is it possible to monitor and to get to know how to monitor a RIS implementation project. Some guidance on how to do a project and how it is to be monitored would be appreciated.

Mr. ten Broeke is of the opinion that the objectives of the RIS directive has not been met yet. This does not relate to the written objectives, but more to what participants had in mind when discussing the issue. It would be interesting to execute some policy evaluation on whether the RIS Framework Directive achieved its goals. According to Mr Ten Broeke, RIS in the Rhine basin countries foremost relate to the need for implementation. In the Danube and riparian states, RIS very much focuses on new technological developments.

A.8.4 Legal issues – International data exchange

Mr. van Bockel asks what legal issues are blocking implementation. He iterates the most important conclusions of the IRIS Europe II Awareness Paper on international data

exchange. Some work by the EC is needed to update current legislation in order to allow for data exchange requirements to allow for an overarching RIS EU architecture.

Mr. Dabrowski states that the legal taskforce of IRIS II concluded that the problems are not only legal, but also the fact not every country is on the same stage of implementation. He adds that for instance, it is not clear where to send the data or what to do if a trip has been cancelled and the data has already been sent to another country, or what to do if the data is not available in the neighbour country. The RIS directive stipulates that data have to be sent, but many technical and organizational/procedural problems are still not solved. He concludes by saying that he agrees that the legal problem are more important than the technical ones. ERI should be implemented as stipulated by the RIS directive as soon as possible.

Mr. Niculescu thinks there is more a legal problem and he is convinced that the technical issues can be solved.

Mr. Baeck remarks that within IRIS II, a long term solution has been identified as an important issue where the EC should play a role. In short term, a way has to be found to make data exchange possible. The two solutions found are feasible for nine countries. For cargo data exchange a solution has also been found and will be implemented beginning of 2012. For logistics, the solution needs some private contracts to be concluded.

There are two approaches to solve several legal issues:

1. the various countries should try to solve the emerging issue by concluding various kind of agreements between national authorities, like service agreements (rather EU Member States than EC).
2. the EC should provide for an overarching legal EC architecture allowing for cross bordering data exchange (rather EC than EU Member States)

Mr Vandenhaegen supports the first approach - M Van Bockel prefers the second approach.

A.8.5 Are we sufficient USER driven (who are the actors, and what do they want)?

Mr. Nefkens states that the focus on the end users is lost. He sees RIS portals growing like trees, but they are not harmonised.

Mr. Niculescu remarks that a modernisation of the fleet is also essential. Skippers have to benefit from what we are doing. Training is also needed, for skippers as well as the operators need in RIS centres. Schools do not teach how to use RIS technologies and how to make proper use of RIS services.

Mrs. Kluytenaar says that everyone is looking at RIS as a goal in itself. They seem to have forgotten the reason why we are doing things. More balance is needed in requirements for users and for authorities on how to fulfil their role. Regarding the ENC's, users are required to carry AIS while there are not ENC's of enough quality.

Mr. ten Broeke remarks that the user perspective and the policy perspective are absolutely not the same thing. Two perspectives:

- The focus onto the users, what do you need to have?
- The focus on the RIS directive, safety and competitiveness with other modes.

The focus so far is rather on the policy domain, thus not putting the user at the centre. The major reason being that the actors within IWT are foremost concerned with each other than competing with other transport modes. It would be challenging and necessary to have this

turned around. A perspective to do this would to focus on the demand (rather than the users). The demand for the services.

Mr. Vanderhaegen thanks Mr. ten Broeke for this interesting insight, policy driven versus user/demand driven. It is important to reflect on this.

Mrs. Kluytenaar remarks that the budget constrains can only be tackled by means of being more cost efficiency. Look for cooperation and use other's experiences.

Mr. Vanderhaegen stresses the importance of seeking for maximal cooperation. We should try to work bottom-up. This is an intrinsic feature of the system. Please think about cooperation. It will only strengthen your case.

Mr. ten Broeke explains that regarding the discussion on one FIS portal, national governmental authorities seek applause from users. Actually, co-operation is difficult for civil servants, e.g. national focus and budgetary restrains. An EU FIS would be an interesting avenue to take.

Mr. de Lijster states that the vision we had years ago, has still to be accomplished.

Mr. Haberkamp proposes to fix a date for implementation of the last version of the standards so every provider knows exactly what to deliver.

A.9 Concluding remarks

Mr. Vanderhaegen closes the discussion by thanking the participants for their contributions. This first contact with the RIS community has certainly been an enrichment: "I 'm taking a lot of insights and ideas with me to incorporate in the EC internal discussions". He adds that beginning of January the EC will organise a stakeholder consultation on NAIADES II. The contributions of today will certainly be taken on board.

Mr Vanderhaegen thanks the participants very much and is looking looks forward to continue the cooperation.

A.10 End of the meeting

Mr. van Bockel states that PLATINA will keep on facilitating the discussion within RIS till 1 June 2012. The meeting closes at 17h10