Minutes

Common Issues Meeting

Attendees

Representatives of the European Commission, UNECE, River Commissions, Member States, Members of the RIS Expert Groups, selected stakeholders

Date / Time

Wednesday, 15 June 2016

09:30 –17:00

Meeting Venue

Český svaz vědeckotechnických společností z.s
3rd Floor, Room #319
Novotného lávka 5, Prague 1

Hosts of the meeting

Státní plavební správa
(State Navigation Authority)
supported by the Ministerstvo dopravy
(Ministry of Transport of the Czech Republic) &
Ředitelství vodních cest ČR
(Waterways Directorate of the Czech Republic)

Authors

Mario Sattler and Jürgen Trögl (viadonau)

AGENDA

09:00   Registration and welcome coffee

09:30   **Welcome and Introduction** *(Hélène Gilkarov – viadonau)*

09:35   **Opening Speeches: Strategic Developments**
- Welcome in Prague
  *(Vojtěch Dabrowski, Ministry of Transport of the Czech Republic &
  Jaroslav Bimka, State Navigation Authority) - 5 minutes*
- River Information Services in the Czech Republic
  (Dalibor Fanta – State Navigation Authority) - 15 minutes
- Update on European Policy Developments in connection with River Information Services,
  Digital Inland Waterway Area (DINA) and Digital Multimodal Nodes (DMN)
  Status quo and next steps for the European RIS Reference Data Management System
  (ERDMS) and the European Hull Database (EHDB)
  (Luca Farkas – European Commission) – 20 minutes
- Questions & Answers *– 5 minutes*

10:20   **What are your requirements towards the further evolution of River Information Services?**
Where do RIS stand today; what has been achieved and what is necessary to bring RIS a step
forward? How does the legislation need to be adapted in order to facilitate innovations?
**This session is aiming at collecting viewpoints from a governmental and selected RIS-users'
standpoint:**
- Introduction by the moderator
- European Shippers Council *(Willem Buitenkamp - ESC) – 15 minutes*
- European Federation of Inland Ports *(Alexander van den Bosch – FEPI) – 15 minutes*

Short break – 10 minutes

- Application manufacturer *(Desiré Savelkoul - Autena Marine) –15 minutes*
- European Skippers Organisation *and* European Barge Union *(Henk van Laar) – 15 minutes*
- European RIS Platform *(Ivo ten Broeke - Rijkswaterstaat) – 15 minutes*
- Questions & Answers *– 5 minutes after each presentation*

12:30   Lunch

13:30   **What should be the next steps in River Information Services?**
- Panel discussion based on the viewpoints from the morning session *– 90 minutes*

15:00   Coffee break

15:30   **Technical Developments and Updates**
- Status Report of the RIS Expert Groups and taskforces, focussing on the preparation of the
  revised Commission Regulations
  *(Chairpersons of the RIS Expert Groups: Peter Stuurman - Rijkswaterstaat, Wieland Haupt and
  Stefan Bober – Federal Waterways & Shipping Administration, Christoph Plasil – viadonau)
  5 minutes per EG*
- Definition of eIWT
  (Fivos Andritsos, Joint Research Centre of the European Commission) – 15 minutes
- International organizations' report on the status of their RIS activities
  *(Raphael Wisselmann - Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine, Željko Milković –
  International Sava River Basin Commission) – 5 minutes each*
- Questions & Answers

17:00 **Closing words and end of the Common Issues Meeting** *(Hélène Gilkarov - viadonau)*

All presentations are available for pdf-download on [ris.eu](ris.eu) as well as in the CI section of [eg.ris.eu](eg.ris.eu)

1. Welcome and Introduction
Reference: 1_Moderation slides only_PPT.pdf

On behalf of the RIS Expert Group support Ms. Gilkarov welcomes all attendees of the Common Issues day. She expresses thanks to the Czech hosting organisations as well as to the local organizer Mr. Fanta and his big team.

Ms. Gilkarov informs that 93 attendees are registered for the Common Issues meeting and introduces the agenda of the day which is focussing on the strategic development of RIS in Europe from different points of view.

2. Opening Speeches

2.1 Welcome in Prague

On behalf of the host of the RIS Week, the Ministry of Transport of the Czech Republic, Mr. Dabrowski and Mr. Bimka of the State Navigation Authority and representative of the Czech PIANC section, welcome all attendees in Prague, underlining the importance of inland navigation for the Czech Republic and wish everyone a successful and interesting Common Issues meeting.

2.2 RIS in the Czech Republic
Reference: 2_Presentation of RIS in CZ - CID - v4.pdf

Mr. Fanta of the Czech State Navigation Authority and Mr. Knap of VARS BRNO a.s. provide an overview of the RIS organisation in the Czech Republic and the current state of art of River Information Services in the country (refer to presentation for further details).

2.3 Update on European Policy Developments
Reference: 3_2016-06-14-Farkas-2016 06 15 EC pres for CID RIS week.pptx

On behalf of the European Commission DG-MOVE, Ms. Farkas thanks the hosts of the RIS week for the perfect organisation and viadonau for the support.

Ms. Farkas presents European policy developments in connection with River Information Services. She provides the definition of DINA (Digital Inland Waterway Area) and DMN (Digital Multimodal Nodes) as key elements of the envisioned digitalisation of information flows for cargo transport on inland waterways. Both initiatives will have an impact on the future evolution of RIS.

Ms. Farkas reports from the first meeting of the DINA task force which has the goal to elaborate the DINA strategy as a roadmap for the harmonization activities in within the next years. The DINA task force is a diverse group consisting of different stakeholders of inland navigation. The next workshop of the taskforce will be held after the TEN-T days, next week in Rotterdam. The results are expected to be elaborated beginning of 2017.

Ms. Farkas informs about the progress of the revision of the four RIS standards. They are all under screening/redrafting by DG MOVE and the process is to be finalized until end of this year. The preparation will be executed according to the "Better Regulation" process (COM(2015) 215 final). After redrafting in close cooperation with the EG chairs external consultation, internal consultation and translation will follow. According to the Commission's work programme, the publication is still expected for the end of 2016.

The initiative of eIWT tools, DINA&DMN and the revision of the RIS Directive have to be seen together as a package to advance RIS on European level.

Ms. Farkas further informs that the European Hull Database (EHDB) and the European Reference Data Management System (ERDMS) have been successfully integrated into the IT hosting of the European Commission and will be operated there in the future.

For the EHDB AT, CZ, BG and SK are connected by web services, while UK, LUX, PL, FR, NL, BE, RO and HR are connected by GUI. Until now DE and HU are not contributing to the EHDB. Web service connection to the EHDB is to be implemented for BE, HR, FR, HU, NL and RO. For the EHDB Steering Committee AT, CZ, DE, FR, LT, PT, RO, SE and UK have formally appointed members.

A delegated act dedicated to the EHDB is planned to be launched in 2017 which will replace the current service agreement. Hopefully this will allow all countries to properly contribute to the EHDB.

The ERDMS system has been optimized/improved but more automated quality checks are necessary. Currently there is no RIS Index available for BG, HR, LUX, PL and UK. The EC expects a plan for these countries how to contribute to ERDMS.

She further reports that a new ERDMS steering committee has been founded in order to manage the future of the ERDMS. The next meeting is scheduled for 28.09.2016.

For the RIS Index as important element of RIS it is expected to give it more focus and legitimisation through the revision of the RIS standards.

In the current RIS Call of the CEF Program 8 proposals have been received. The indicative budget is EUR 20.000.000. The internal and external evaluation is completed. In July 2016 the member states will give their opinion on the result of the evaluation. The grant agreement is to be expected in 2016 (refer to presentation for further details).

2.4   Questions & Answers

Mr. Braunroth, Germany confirms that they want to strengthen the cooperation with the Czech Republic. He asks whether AIS is mandatory to be used on the Czech waterways. Mr. Dabrowski informs that currently there is no obligation to use AIS in the Czech Republic but it is in preparation, but shall be done in close cooperation with Germany. Mr. Braunroth replies that on the German Elbe an AIS and IECDIS obligation is planned for 2017.

Mr. Niculescu from ITS Romania asks for further information about the DINA initiative especially whether there are connections to INSPIRE and to initiatives from road. He further asks if there are also plans to introduce a delegated act for the ERDMS.

Ms. Farkas introduces Mr. van Punter from TNO who is supporting the EC in the organisation of the DINA task force and the development of the DINA strategy who is open for discussions at any time. Regarding the ERDMS the use shall be strengthened, mainly by a more prominent role in RIS standardisation. A separate delegated act is not planned for the moment.

Mr. Birklhuber from Austria remarks that the RIS Index is based on Annex I of the Commission Regulation while the RIS Standards are based on Annex II. Currently Annex I doesn't empower to provide a technical standard for the RIS Index. Ms. Farkas will verify with the legal services of the EC and will get back as soon as possible.

Mr. van Acker of Belgium wants to know about the progress of the DINA taskforce and who are the members, especially who is the representative of Belgium.

Ms. Farkas informs that there is no geographic staffing of the task force and there is no requirement to publish the list of members. The task force is really in an early stage but after the meeting next week hopefully more information will be available.

3.   Requirements towards the future evolution of RIS

3.1   Introduction

Reference: 4_2016-06-10-HGI_Introduction_RIS users.pdf

Ms. Gilkarov explains that this sessions aims at collecting viewpoints from application manufacturers, governmental and selected RIS users to the question where RIS stands today and what will be necessary to bringing RIS a step forward.

As an introduction Ms. Gilkarov presents her personal understanding of RIS and motivates especially the technical experts and RIS Providers to think out of their box and to break the wall to the RIS users which (may) have a completely different point of view and their own needs and expectations. While RIS Providers think in single systems and services, the users may rather expect integrated services providing all information linked to support daily business. The main question is why RIS did not meet up to the high promises and expectations yet.

A stakeholder consultation carried out in the CoRISMa project resulted in statements like too much fragmentation, too little communication about the services and possibilities of RIS, too little consultation and cooperation with the stakeholders, strengthen the focus on the needs of the cargo shippers and to improve the promotion of inland navigation towards the business community (refer to presentation for further details).

Ms. Gilkarov introduces the panel consisting of Mr. Buitenkamp the chairman of the European Shippers Council (ESC), Mr. van den Bosch of the European Federation of Inland Ports (EFIP), Mr. Savelkoul of Autena Marine (application manufacturers), Mr. van Laar of Bureau Telematica Binnenvaart on behalf of the European Skippers Organisation (ESO) and European Barge Union (EBU) and Mr. ten Broeke of Rijkswaterstaat of the Netherlands on behalf of the European RIS Platform.

3.2 European Shippers Council (ESC)
Reference: 5_2016-05-24-Buitenkamp_Prague presentation June 15, 2016.pptx

Mr. Buitenkamp of the ESC presents the shippers' view regarding RIS. The point of view is the one of these who are paying for the transport and who make the decision for transport modes. There's no preference for any mode of transport. It's only a question of quality and reliability of transport and about costs. Also the communication between the stakeholders of a transport and the regulatory framework are of great importance. From the ESC's point of view inland navigation is focussing very much on raw and half-built cargo but there's potential for transport of manufactured goods.

The shippers' vision on inland navigation has several requirements toward inland navigation. The shippers are looking for a full logistical partner providing reliable door-to-door transports with good, fast and state-of-the art communication. Another need is the reliable and continuous availability of the inland waterway infrastructure. For the end customers it is important to provide information about the carbon footprint of the transport per barge. Such kind of information is needed on the level of individual transports. Finally there is a strong need to improve the availability of ICT and quality systems.

Currently there is strong global competition which also results in competition between the modes. The end customers have very high demands in all aspects. The customers want to have access to the position and status of each single transport at any time. The ideal world would be that RIS would be a positive "big brother" providing all information through one central portal for all data flows. Of course there's a need for access rights and data protection. But the main requirement is to have seamless access to position information. Also the actual information about the infrastructure (locks, bridges, ports) shall be available when it is needed. So RIS should be a one-stop-shop facilitating a 24/7 transportation on major rivers. That would make inland navigation much more attractive for the shippers. Also the black box currently developed by JRC may play a role.

What is missing in RIS is a set of state-of-the-art Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) bringing the performance of inland waterway transport to a higher level. A proactive information system regarding incident management is another key requirement toward RIS. In case of incidents reliable information has to be actively provided to the shippers, especially concerning the consequences of incidents on the whole transport process.

Europe is putting a lot of effort and money in inland navigation, so it is of utmost importance to connect these initiatives and to work together very closely, especially when it comes to DINA / DMN. The development and evolution of RIS shall add value to the supply chain! (refer to presentation for further details)

3.3 European Federation of Inland Ports
Reference: 6_van den Bosch_Presentation on RIS AvdB, 15-06-16.pdf

Mr. Van den Bosch of EFIP presents the trends of economy in Europe and how inland navigation stands in relation. From the position of the inland ports the role of inland waterway transport is very different in different ports in Europe. RIS and DINA have the potential to improve the situation of IWT. What are missing are a blueprint and a legal basis for DINA.

There are a lot of challenges like the lack of data sharing, the lack of collaborative planning, the lack of legal standards for information exchange, a better cross-border exchange of RIS information and a central

platform for the access to RIS. There are already a lot of initiatives going on which shall be continued and brought together more closely and the EU shall continue to provide funds for European projects and initiatives. (refer to presentation for further details)

3.4   Questions from the auditorium

Mr. Blakeway from France thanks the first presenters for their excellent presentations and agrees on the statements made so far. There is indeed still a big gap between the services provided and the needs of the users. The current CEF proposal "RIS COMEX" aims at closing this gap and aims at involving the users right from the beginning.

Mr. van den Bosch asks what the best place is to collect and disseminate the RIS information in Europe. Mr. ten Broeke replies that there's no easy answer to that question but the approach has to be elaborated. There needs to be an independent platform, which needs to respect data protection legislation and also needs to respect the will of the data owner. Certainly data privacy is an important issue. The CEF Proposal "RIS COMEX" aims at coming up with a solution. All countries involved in the project gave a lot of commitment to provide a solution for the clear demands expressed.

3.5   Application manufacturers
Reference: 7_2016-06-09-Savelkol_Common Issues Meeting RIS Week 15-06-2016.pdf

Mr. Savelkoul of Autena Marine explains that RIS play an important role in inland waterway transport and therefore has to become a part of the logistics world. Based on the container transport and the obligation to report electronically Mr. Savelkoul underlines the role RIS plays. With the product Container Planner 2.0 Autena Marine will introduce its own electronic reporting application which will no longer make use of the BICS application. The process of cargo reporting of Container Planner 2.0 is based on standardized EDI messages: IFTMIN from Barge Operator to the vessel, the BAPLIE and MOVINS from the vessel to the terminal which will confirm with a BAPLIE message. Finally the vessel will send an ERINOT to the Fairway Authority to comply with reporting requirements.

The standardisation of reference data is of utmost importance for the provision of electronic services. Currently in electronic reporting some container operators are still not able to send cargo information with a standardized electronic message. Electronic reporting allows for less manual work and less chances to make mistakes.

An actual challenge is the electronic data exchange with deep sea terminals. They do not operate with the RIS Index but with UN Locodes at maximum. Therefore deep-sea terminals needed to upgrade their TOS (Terminal Operating System) services, which is currently not possible in an easy way.

Currently the world of logistics and RIS are still separate ones. Reference data is just one good example. RIS Expert groups and authorities should better take into consideration the different standards in different logistic areas. The reference data has to be maintained and update constantly in order to provide reliable services.

Mr. Persoons of Periskal Belgium supports the conclusions that there has to be more work on the location codes because currently these data fields are causing problems for the applications which is difficult to explain to users.

Mr. Birklhuber explains that the structure of the ISRS codes in inland navigation serve a lot different types of geographic objects and can therefore not easily be changed. Maybe a conversion table between the ISRS Location Codes and the deep-sea terminal codes would be a solution. (refer to presentation for further details)

3.6   European Skippers Organisations and European Barge Union
Reference: 8_2016-06-13-van Laar_Future of RIS - View points from the wheelhouse.pdf

Mr. van Laar representing EBU & ESO, presents his vision on the future of RIS from the point of the wheelhouse. He focuses on the realization of the benefits for IWT by the full implementation of the RIS Directive, on potential benefits for member states to invest in RIS swiftly and to implement RIS on the entire network and to ensure and prioritize the civil and economic privacy of stakeholders.

A recap of RIS and IWT related ICT is presented starting with the arrival of mobile telephony in the 1980s. One of the requirements of vessel owners toward ICT is certainly the availability of Wi-Fi hotspots in locks and ports. What is needed as well is more integration of RIS services and applications and a central interface to RIS.

Recently a lot of state-of-the-art technologies like Smartphones and tablets have arrived on wheelhouses providing new opportunities for access to RIS. Mr. van Laar further elaborates on the benefits of RIS.

The idea of the RIS Directive was to have harmonized RIS on all major fairways in Europe where one electronic report shall serve for the whole journey. Borders shall play no role and all information shall be provided electronically to the wheelhouses. There has to be a healthy give and take relation between skippers and authorities, e.g. when it comes to Fairway Information Services.

Mr. van Laar underlines the importance of the CEF proposal RIS COMEX to advance with the harmonization of RIS throughout Europe. Interesting topics for the future are advanced planning and control, e.g. lock management, cooperative depth measurements, electronic payment of dues, statistics, performance measurements and metrics. With respect to privacy the barge owners are willing to share their information with their clients.

There are three key takeaways from the presentation of Mr. van Laar:
1. Realize benefits of RIS for IWT by fully implementing (a revised) RIS Directive in all EU member states
2. Create incentives for member states to invest in RIS and swiftly implement it on their entire waterway network (support & enforce)
3. Ensure and prioritize the civil and economic privacy of stakeholders (data protection)

(refer to presentation for further details)

Mr. Blakeway from France remarks that the users want the RIS authorities to implement RIS on all waterways. Speaking for France it will be economically impossible to implement RIS on all French waterways. Only about 25% are class IV or higher and the rest cannot be covered because of financial reasons.

3.7   European RIS Platform
Reference: 9_ten Broeke_RIS common issues meeting European RIS Platform.pdf

Mr. ten Broeke of Rijkswaterstaat elaborates on the role of the European RIS platform which has been established as informal platform of the European Fairway Authorities in the year 2000. It is open for all EU fairway authorities which assisted in drafting the RIS Directive. At present the active members are AT, BE, DE, FR and NL.

It is important to underline that solely implementing the RIS key technologies is not the same as implementing RIS. What is required is to implement harmonized services. Therefore the RIS Directive directly addresses the authorities which are responsible for implementing RIS. The goal is to allow that one piece of equipment can be used in all EU member states. Currently only Notices to Skippers (NtS) and Inland Electronic Charts (IENCs) are to be provided on main waterways by the RIS Directive.

The RIS regulations of the RIS Directive leave room for implementing differences, therefore harmonization is only partially achieved. So far the focus has been mainly put on safety related services while logistics services are still behind. Cross-border data exchange is still not very easy in many cases, mainly because of different legal regulations in the countries.

An animation of the CoRISMa project is shown to introduce the concept of RIS-enabled Corridor Management (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MWeN_Py_oA4). The CoRISMa approach aims at implementing harmonized and seamless services in defined corridors and ultimately on the entire network. Therefore fairway authorities need to agree on the definition of Corridors and the services which shall be provided.

The European RIS Platform collected several topics which may be interesting for a revision of the RIS Directive:

- Waterway classes:
  The RIS Directive shall not demand that authorities are implementing RIS on waterways smaller than Class IV, that shall be up to the local authorities.
- Setting up a central FIS server:
  All countries effected by the RIS Directive are part in the CEF proposal RIS COMEX and it shall be solved there, not by the European Commission
- The use of the EHDB and the ERDMS:
  regulations are already underway;
- ISRS codes:
  initiatives for merging the different ISRS codes for electronic reporting and fairway related information services are underway;
- Corridor services:
  The CEF proposal RIS COMEX will deal with the implementation of Corridor services
- Inclusion of waterway users in mandatory implementations:
  The fairway authorities are responsible to make decisions.
- Coordination of the implementation:
  Rather an activity that should be organized
- Issues identified by PLATINA II:
  Each issue shall be evaluated if it is for the RIS Directive but probably it's better to deal with them during implementation.

Multi modal connections are required but still being researched and developed e.g. DINA. (refer to presentation for further details)

4. What should be the next steps in RIS?

Five panellists discuss about the next steps in RIS development based on the viewpoints and input of the morning session:
- Mr. Willem Buitenkamp of the European Shippers Council (ESC)
- Mr. Alexander van den Bosch of the European Federation of Inland Ports (EFIP)
- Mr. Desiré Savelkoul of Autena Marine
- Mr. Henk van Laar of the European Skippers Organisation (ESO) and European Barge Union (EBU)
- Mr. Ivo ten Broeke of Rijkswaterstaat representing the European RIS Platform

The panel discussion is trying to conclude on answers to eight different questions on central aspects of RIS and is supported by Mr. Bäck from viadonau.

4.1 Question 1

In 2005, the RIS Directive was a real breakthrough and innovative in comparison to other modes. It led to common standards for the RIS key technologies and minimum requirements for member states. **What was the key measure which was missing and which would have fostered the deployment of services?**

Mr. ten Broeke explains that the RIS Directive is a framework directive that set demands, but left many things to the Member States. A real key measure that was missing was the requirement for a coordinated approach, and that national implementations have been facilitated to strongly. RIS Corridor Management will now try to address and solve the consequences of that fact.

Mr. van Laar adds that nevertheless great achievements have been made. Still there is a need for stronger central coordination.

Mr. Savelkoul explains that before 2005 there was more active cooperation between application manufacturers and the authorities, while afterwards the cooperation got less.

Mr. van den Bosch states that there's a need for push and pull which means that certainly some enforcement is necessary.

Mr Buitenkamp adds that a directive leaves lots of open room for interpretation which makes it difficult to enforce the RIS Directive.

Mr. van Laar picks up the "Europe a la carte" idea which could be interesting for RIS.

Mr. Willems of the Netherlands agrees that lot of time has been invested to implement the key technologies but the services have been second priorities. The CEF proposal RIS COMEX aims at progressing on the level of the services.

4.2   Question 2

*Looking ahead – **Who should be in the driving seat for defining the next steps** (application manufacturers, (logistics) RIS users or public authorities) and **what should be the next development/deployment steps? How can the users and application developers be integrated in an optimal way?***

Mr. Buitenkamp states that the public sector shall take the responsibilities at highest level. Therefore the European Commission shall take a leading role.

Mr. van den Bosch adds that cross-border exchange of data needs an over-regional body to regulate that. Nevertheless RIS needs also more bottom-up approaches where the end users of RIS can make clear statements about the future.

Mr. Savelkoul explains that in the times of INDRIS and COMPRIS the cooperation between governments and application builders has worked well and in the future is shall be more like that.
Mr. van Laar states that both sides need to team up to realise the concept of smart mobility.
Mr. ten Broeke explains that authorities have to make best use of tax money. Lock management for example is in the clear focus of the authorities because of the importance and consequences. With respect to the CEF proposal RIS COMEX he has concerns how the involvement of users will work since it is always difficult to make private players travel and provide input.

Mr. Buitenkamp replies that in most panel discussions the real users (i.e. the freight owners) are not invited to speak. The European organisations try to attend as many meetings as possible to make their point and try to give input and defend their interest. Of course budget is always a concern. If meetings are organised in Brussels, the participation of the shipper's organisation will be easier. ESO is very much willing to contribute and to support.

Mr. Persoons from Belgium states that there is a need to solve how "private RIS" and "authority RIS" can cooperate more closely in the future. Let's join forces. Application builders are nowadays no longer involved in RIS projects. Authorities cannot solve everything on their own.

4.3   Question 3

The European RIS Platform is of the opinion that a revision of the legislation for RIS is not required at the moment. This seems to be a contradiction with the experience that it takes years for reaching a seamless coverage even for reference data services.
How can authorities assure that the services are available to the users seamlessly?

Mr. ten Broeke states that within the CEF proposal RIS COMEX the authorities will agree on corridors and in these corridors the authorities are fully committed to provide the services seamlessly. The next step is then to move from corridor to European network level.
Mr. Bäck refers to the presentation of Ms. Farkas about the ERDMS and raises the concern that it may not work to have the services being implemented voluntarily.
Mr. ten Broeke refers to the example of electronic reporting where after initial problems Germany and the Netherlands succeeded in making services working across border. Therefore the agreement of the fairway authorities is seen as the top priority.

Mr. Niculescu expresses the concern that there may be a risk to have isolated systems implemented which do not work throughout Europe. Also there may be a stronger role for the EC to make regulations on service level. He refers to the good example of the European ITS Directive for roads, which standardises and regulates the services instead of the technologies.

Mr. Persoons expresses the hope that the corridors of the future will be long enough. Also the AIS and display requirements of the CCNR are good measures. He sees corridor management as a good step, as it motivates the authorities to work closer together.

Mr. van Laar has the feeling that the RIS Directive is often referred to though not everyone seems to be very clear what the RIS Directive is really about. For example the RIS Directive could be more precise on electronic reporting or services for logistics where the current text is only very vague. Amendments of these parts of the RIS Directives are seen as a useful step.

Mr. Birklhuber explains that for example the Danube consists of 10 countries. What if one country does only implement level 1 services? Will then the whole corridor only provide level 1 services?

Mr. ten Broeke replies that a corridor is only a corridor if the services are harmonized. In the example given, you can either live with just level 1 or split up the corridor. Even if different corridors are implemented the goal is still to implement centralized services wherever possible. And of course the RIS Directive is still valid anyhow. For example if on the Danube different paper reports are required, it has to be ensured that it's also possible to report electronically. Here the action of the European Commission might be required in order to enforce the proper implementation of the RIS Directive.

Mr. Haupt from Germany states that CoRISMa reached a common understanding about services but still there a big difference in implementations of RIS. What can be achieved at the end of the day is different from country to country. Germany came to the conclusions that it's not the task of the authority to implement service but rather provide information.

4.4   Question 4

Up to date information on shallow water sections and long-term water-level forecasts are decisive for the load factor of vessels and the cost efficiency of cargo transport on waterways.
Who should be in the driving seat for the provision of such services and what should be the next steps?

Mr. Persoons makes a joint statement for question 4 and 5. The application manufacturers are not responsible for acquisition of the data, but will do it if nothing is provided officially. What is important is that the authorities are providing the data to the application manufacturers as quickly as possible. In reality there are a lot of users who are sailing with completely outdated equipment (especially IENCs) because they have been supplied with equipment from subsidy programs and do not take care of updates. Enforcement is required that outdated applications are removed from ships, especially those that were equipped within equipment programmes subsidised by tax payers money; quality requirements for applications on board of vessels need to be fulfilled, especially on the Danube.

Mr van Laar informs that the work on the CoVadem initiative is still continuing to extend the number of participating vessels to 250 in the next years. Everyone is interested in up-to-date depth information but budget is always a concern. He sees that collaborative systems and services are the future.

4.5   Question 5

How can application manufacturers ensure that up-to-date fairway information including actual charts is available on all vessels? What are the limiting factors for a more efficient chart-update?

See also the answer of Mr. Persoons to question 4.

Mr. Plasil of viadonau reports from a skipper of a cruise vessel who had charts from 2009 in use. Though internet was available on board no chart updates were loaded. Although a maintenance contract was available the skipper was not aware of the process of chart update.

Mr. van den Bosch adds that the availability of mobile internet in ports is very important for the use of RIS.

Mr. ten Broeke states that one needs to ask if the charts are used for navigation or for information purposes. If it's used for information purposes, then it is in the responsibility of the skipper / ECDIS user to make updates accordingly. In navigation mode this is a different story.

Mr. Blakeway states at a CCNR meeting the major IENC manufacturers have been invited to discuss how to ensure the availability of IENCs on board. The manufacturers are doing improvements and correction to the official charts, but neither the ECDIS users nor the ECDIS manufacturers give feedback to the authorities of what has to be improved in the IENCs.

Ms. Kluytenaar from the Netherlands states that the feedback to the authorities on errors in charts has become more difficult in the past 10 years. It is often very difficult to reach the right persons who have the necessary know-how to handle the feedback. The official charts are often not of the necessary quality and need improvement from the manufacturers. In the worst case it's necessary to go one step back and to just use radar.

Mr. Jacobs from Belgium adds that it can be very dangerous to operate with outdated charts, even in information mode.

Mr. Niculescu stated that money plays an important role in the production of high quality charts.

4.6   Question 6

Tracking and Tracing of vessels is regarded as a key service for supporting logistics processes. Such services are currently provided mainly by private service providers like vesseltracker.com. Public authorities do not – with a few regional exceptions –provide such services.
(a) Are services from private service providers satisfactory for the logistics operators?
(b) When comparing the services from private and public service providers, which services would you choose and why?

Mr. Buitenkamp states that for the shippers and cargo owners it is paramount to have a good overview about the whereabouts of the vessels. For the time being they can live with the private type of services but they are not perfect. There's no clear preference but there's a need for an open system, free of charge which can provide global coverage.

Mr. van den Bosch states that from the ports perspective it doesn't really matter who is providing the services as long as the service is ensured and protected. If the service shall be free of charge it's probably more the authorities to provide such services.

Mr. van Laar explains that tracking and tracing services are top of the list of what is wanted by the users. In the road area private solutions are predominant. Some shipping companies have developed similar solutions for their fleet. The private services in inland navigation are neither reliable nor complete. Only the authorities have complete coverage and quality data and those shall give access to the logistics users.

Mr. Buitenkamp adds that in the road area it's cumbersome to support multiple technical solutions. In order to attract more transport it would be key to have a reliable seamless T&T service in Europe.
Mr. Savelkoul adds that initiatives like CoVadem can add to the RIS portfolio e.g. by adding information about the carbon footprint.

Mr. Blakeway explains that in France there's a website where users can track their vessels and give access to their logistics partners. One big fleet operator uses the service very intensively, a second only occasionally and the third uses a private system.
Mr. Persoons adds that the provision of position information from vessels is possible anyhow because of the availability of mobile internet.

Mr. Bober from Germany informs that in the CoRISMa project the Vessel Position Information (VPI) system has been developed which aims at giving vessel owners access to position information, respecting privacy rules.

Mr. Buitenkamp questions what is the harm when someone has access to the position of any vessels. Mr van Laar answers that many cargo owners have also problems to share information about their cargo.

Mr. ten Broeke states that the major problem is that with total transparency the sector would be in the position that the market price would be challenged very much. Therefore position information and ETA information shall only be provided in a case by case situation e.g. only to the cargo owner for the duration of the transport. Currently users tend to lie at each other by providing wrong position information in order to safeguard their interests. So position information from a neutral source could help to overcome this situation.

Mr. van den Bosch states that it is important to take down the wall of today and make the sector more competitive by providing such kind of IT platforms.

Ms. Kluytenaar adds that for the skippers it would also be interesting to have more accurate information about the status and availability of the infrastructure.

4.7   Question 7

Several public authorities think that service providers like vesseltracker.com do not respect the European Data Protection Legislation.
(a) Do you agree?
(b) Private service providers forward data without the consent of the vessel operator, they just give the possibility to object the data transfer. This seems to be accepted practice. Why should then public service providers bother with the collection of permissions from the vessel operators?
(c) Would vessel operators be willing to share their position information with all their terminal operators and other actors in the logistics chain?

Mr. van Laar states that the local regulations are deviating a lot which is hindering the use of AIS information on the larger scale. The use of private tracking providers is still illegal.

Mr. Kurpinski from Poland explains that the private operators are breaking the law here and there but maybe it's also necessary to change the AIS standard to better facilitate data protection right in the AIS system.

Mr. Bober explains that AIS is a safety system which by definition needs to have unlimited access for unlimited stations. An encryption code implemented in ten thousand stations is not a secret any more. Mr. Stuurman from the Netherlands states that for several skippers it is not problem to share their position information.

Mr. ten Broeke adds that in the Netherlands the use of AIS for traffic management was initially also not allowed but had to be fixed before the introduction of the system. If there are privacy regulations in place in the countries they have to be respected. The approach of letting the skippers/vessel owners decide on whom to give access to their vessel information is the first step. Once the advantages of data sharing are obvious the reluctance to give access to the own vessel data will be reduced significantly. He estimates that within 10 to 15 years the sector will realise the benefit of information sharing, and the information will be made available freely.

Mr. van Laar fully agrees but adds that the use of AIS information for law enforcement would though kill the use of AIS. What is interesting is that no governments and also not the EU are doing anything against these illegal tracking and tracing providers.

4.8   Question 8

Electronic Reporting seems to be driven mainly by regulation.

What would be needed so that applications dealing with cargo and voyage information (stowage planner, ERInet, etc.) could be deployed on a broader scale?

Mr. Savelkoul doesn't see a problem as long as the receiving system is ready to receive the information.

Mr. van den Bosch states that electronic reporting is important and will create an added value in the end.

Mr. Buitenkamp states from the cargo owners point of view the stowage information is of minor priority while the position information is a must.

Mr. van Laar presents several preconditions like free applications and ease of use (e.g. smartphones). What is also needed is proper statistics and the vessel owners would be willing to provide electronic information if this goal can be achieved. He sees this as the reason why cargo- and voyage related data provision does not necessarily need to be obliged by legislation.

Mr. Stuurman adds that the introduction of ERI was not driven by regulations but by safety concerns.

Mr. Savelkoul underlines that still there's the need to have to possibility to have all important information be available electronically.

5. Technical Developments and Updates

5.1 Status report of the RIS Expert Groups

Electronic Reporting International
Reference: 10_Stuurman Presentation-status ERI.16.1.pdf

On behalf of the ERI Expert Group Mr. Stuurman reports that yesterday Mr. van Acker has been elected as Vice Chair of the ERI Expert Group. In the last reporting period the ERI EG has submitted the update of the ERI standard to the EC and received the first questions. Yesterday a change request for additional vessel codes has been accepted. At the last meeting in Lille the roadmap for the work up to 2020 has been agreed, but will be a living document. Currently there are 5 working groups of ERI: harmonistation of BICS tables, harmonisation of reference data, maintenance of reference tables, experiences from the use of ERI in specific transport scenarios and the elaboration of EDIFACT ⇔ XSD conversion documents for the relevant ERI messages. (refer to presentation for further details)

Inland ECDIS:
Reference: 11_Haupt_IEEG_12_2016_report.pdf

On behalf of the IECDIS Expert Group Mr. Haupt reports that standardisation of electronic charting is still going on. A big topic will be the development of the S-100 standard coming from the maritime world. After the last meeting in Lille a package was submitted to EC:

- Inland ECDIS Standard Edition 2.4
- bENC extensions of the Inland ECDIS standard
- Minimum requirements in information mode

In November 2015 the Standard Edition 2.4 has been adapted by the UNECE. Later on the Netherlands expressed their concerns with the minimum requirements for the information mode. It is now up to the EC to decide about acceptance of the standard. The EC wants to have a composition of the pros and cons of both points of view. The Navigation mode of Inland ECDIS is very powerful but needs substantial investments and has stringent requirements. The aim for the information mode is to come up with a digital environment to support save navigation at lower costs compared to the navigation mode. At the moment the information mode is not standardized at all. The focus of the information mode shall be to cooperate with AIS and to provide a strategic overview.

Since many countries are planning to issue obligations for the use of IECDIS in the information it is necessary to have official requirements in order to prevent different national implementations and to ensure harmonized applications. (refer to presentation for further details)

Mr. Blakeway supports the proposal of the Chairman to discuss and find a compromise for the standardisation of the Information Mode.

Vessel Tracking & Tracing:
Reference: 12_Bober_20160615 VTT_EG_ update-Prague_15_Juni_2016.pdf

On behalf of the VTT Expert Group Mr. Bober reports that the VTT group mainly deals with Inland AIS. The VTT group is closely cooperating with the IECDIS EG on the topic of visualisation of AIS information.
The VTT EG has two subgroups, one on the harmonisation of Application Specific Messages (ASM) and one for Aids to Navigation (AtoN). The ASM subgroup is maintaining an inventory of ASM and dealing with new message proposal. In addition there are several guidelines on the design, implementation and use of ASMs. The AtoN subgroup aims at adapting the information about aids to navigation from the maritime field to the needs of inland navigation. AIS AtoNs aim at enhancing the information from traditional aids to navigation. At the last meeting in Lille the VTT EG has approved version 2.0 of the VTT standard which will be slightly updated this week to facilitate recent developments with AIS AtoNs and ASMs. (refer to presentation for further details)

Notices to Skippers:
13_2016-06-15_Plasil_CI_Meeting_Prague_Plasil_NtS.pdf

On behalf of the NtS Expert Group Mr. Plasil reports on the process of updating the NtS standard since beginning of 2015. In December 2015 the revised version of the NtS standard has been submitted to the EC, UNECE and the CCNR. In UNECE the adoption of Rec 80 is expected for November 2016. CCNR will wait with the adoption of the NtS standard until the publication of the EC standard. Recently extensive feedback has been received by the EC:

- The standard has deficits of the baseline regulation (Better regulation)
- re-integration of NtS Reference Tables into the proposed NtS Commission Regulation required (reference to ERDMS to be removed)
- reference to ERDMS as repository for the RIS Index is possible

The NtS standard has 5 annexes and put a strong focus on harmonized encoding of the information.
The next steps are that the NtS EG will finalize the technical standard. The legal framework is out of the competence of the NtS expert group. (refer to presentation for further details)

5.2 Definition of eIWT
Reference: 14_2016-05-16-Andritsos_eIWT May2016.pdf

Mr. Andritsos of the Joint Research Center (JRC) of the EC gives an update on the status of the research on the electronic tools in support of IWT (eIWT). He presents planned initial eIWT implementations namely the electronic Service Record Book (eSRB) and the electronic log book (eLBK).

The aim of the eSRB is to ensure efficiency, fair competition, decent working conditions and safety of IWT. The building blocks for eWIT are the electronic inland vessel unit (eIVU) and the electronic inland worker's card (eIWC). Currently it is analysed in what way eIWT can best inter-operate with existing RIS tools like AIS, the EHDB and the ERDMS.

Mr. Andritsos is about to finalize nine detailed use cases including actors, procedures, information content etc. Six out of the nine use cases are almost complete and all use cases shall be draft final by mid of June for discussion at a stakeholder workshop to be held in September 2016 in Ispra, Itlay.

Mr. Andritsos provides an example on the eIWT process of on crew embarking and disembarking. Important issues are the necessary changes of the EHDB and the link to RIS. (refer to presentation for further details)

5.3   Reports of international organisations

Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine (CCNR)
Reference: 15_2016-06-10-Wisselmann_RIS week_PPT_CCNR_Prague_EN_V5.pdf

On behalf of the CCNR Mr. Wisselmann reminds of the work of the CCNR on its RIS Strategy developed in 2012 which contains 26 concrete measures. The goal of the strategy and its measures is to increase safety of navigation on the Rhine and to promote the economic development of inland navigation.

The needs of the Rhine corridor need special attention and RIS plays an important role to support safety of navigation. Since RIS is under continues development there is a string need for smooth standardisation. The CESNI committee can play an important role also in the standardisation of RIS.

Mr. Wisselmann further presents an outlook on the evaluation and amendment of the Police Regulations regarding an extension of the ERI reporting obligation for tanker vessels and the evaluation of the installation and use of Inland AIS and connected visualisation systems.

ES-TRIN will ensure safe RIS equipment as well as safe installation on board of vessels.
Also the work of CESNI is introduced which also comprises the development of technical requirements on automatic channel guidance systems and safety standards concerning ICT equipment on board of inland vessels. (refer to presentation for further details)

International Sava Basin Commission (ISBC)
Reference: 16_Milkovic_ISRBC RIS Week Prague 2016 ISRBC.pdf

On behalf of the International Sava Basin Commission (ISBC) Mr. Milković reports on the status of RIS on the Sava river.

RIS is fully installed and operational in Serbia. For Croatia the fully implementation of RIS is expected for November 2016. Inland IENCs are available according to edition 2.1 o the IENC standard. The ISBC RIS group is currently preparing a large number of RIS standards and guidelines for the river Sava.

6. Closing of the Common Issues Meeting

On behalf of the RIS Expert Group support, Ms. Gilkarov informs that next RIS week will be held in November (21-25) in Hasselt, Belgium and organized by de Scheepvaart and Waterwegen en Zeekanaal (WeNZ) in cooperation with Promotie Binnenvaart Vlaanders (PBV).

Ms. Gilkarov and Mr. Birklhuber use the occasion to thank Mr. Willems of Rijkswaterstaat in the Netherlands who is one of the fathers of RIS for his substantial contribution to the foundation of RIS and the energy, ideas and commitment he has put into bringing RIS to the status it is today.

Mr. Willems concluded that one of main assets of working in the RIS community was about the people involved. He sees a lot of potential ahead in the CoRISMa approach and the RIS COMEX proposal and the closer cooperation with the logistics.

Ms. Gilkarov thanks all participants and especially the presenters, panellists and discussants of today for their active contributions and the Czech hosts for the excellent environment in Prague.

Ms. Gilkarov closes the Common Issues Meeting at 16:50.

> *All presentations are available for pdf-download on ris.eu as well as in the CI section of eg.ris.eu*