FONASBA MEMBERSHIP ENQUIRY 

# ENQUIRY RESPONSE FORM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ORIGINATING ASSOCIATION: | ECASBA |
| ENQUIRY DETAILS: | See the individual questions below. |
| REPLY TO: | [admin@fonasba.com](mailto:admin@fonasba.com) |
| COPY REPLY TO: | FPS Mobility and Transport  FPS Public Health  Federal Police  FPS Finance  Port of Antwerp Port of Ghent Port of Zeebrugge Port of Ostend Naves |
| CLOSING DATE FOR REPLIES: | 5th June 2015 |
| RESPONDING ASSOCIATION: | afd. Scheepvaartbegeleiding - Shipping Assistance Division  Agentschap voor Maritieme Dienstverlening en Kust Mobiliteit en Openbare Werken  Vlaamse overheid - Flemish government |

## RESPONDING ASSOCIATION COMMENTS: (Please include any attachments)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please indicate or provide links to the full sets of data that may be demanded of maritime carriers calling ports within your Member State as required under parts A, B and C of the Directive | Belgium has issued a document called “System Requirement Specification” for the Belgian Maritime Single Window, further called SRS. Simply speaking this is the “Plan of the Belgian MSW house”. So it defines in a harmonised way what formalities are applicable and on the basis of what legislation. This document is not publicly available. However, the intention is to make a subset of this document downloadable from [www.mswbelgium.be](http://www.mswbelgium.be) by mid-June 2015. The SRS is based upon documents from the eMS (Expert group on maritime administrative simplification and electronic information services), SafeSeaNet and the applicable legislation. The current version of the SRS (0.27) contains the following sections (the list is limited to the most important sections):   1. Exemptions; 2. General declaration; 3. Port State Control; 4. ISPS; 5. Waste and cargo residues; 6. Dangerous and polluting goods (DPG); 7. Passenger list; 8. Stowaway list; 9. Crew list; 10. Maritime Declaration of Health (MDH)   You may consider Port State Control and Stowaway List to be part C, although they are not.  Integration with customs is foreseen for next versions of the SRS and Ship’s Stores Declaration (FAL form 3) and Crew’s Effects Declaration (FAL form 4) will not be implemented in the Belgian MSW. |
| Are these requirements harmonised across all ports on your territory? | **Yes**, as explained above the SRS has been worked upon by all parties involved in the Belgian MSW and therefore guarantees harmonisation of the requirements. |
| Does your implemented National Single window allows the reporting of formalities through:  Web-based graphical user interface (Y/N)  Machine to machine interface (Y/N)  Allowing UN EDIFACT message formats to be used (Y/N)  Allowing XML message formats to be used (Y/N)  Third party systems (e.g. Port community systems, IT service providers) (Y/N)? | **GUI: Yes** The port community systems are essential components in the Belgian MSW architecture and in the current implementation the only place where information can be entered at the GUI; **M2M: Yes**,  Existing message formats will continue to be used; **UN Edifact: Yes** **XML messages:** Yes, but not yet implemented; **PCS: Yes.** See above  **IT service providers:** Please clarify because this depends upon on what services you are talking about. |
| Does your national implementation of the Directive enable the submission of maritime formalities once only and to one place in such manner that the information submitted can, when required, be shared across all ports on your national territory? | **Only once. Yes**  The only once concept depends upon the applicable legislation. If information is to be reported only once per country, such as in the case of MDH, then the information is to be submitted to the first port of call. If information is to be reported only once per port, such as in the case of DPG, then the information is to be submitted to all ports of call. **Sharing of information between ports: Yes** The fact that information is to be reported to only one or to multiple port does not exclude the fact that information can and will be exchanged between ports in those cases where the work of the reporting parties would be simplified. |
| Is all cargo related information to be submitted to the National single window, including information for Customs purposes? If “no”, please explain which arrangements are in place for exchanging and sharing cargo related information with Customs. | **Yes**: The target architecture is that cargo related information will be logged into the customs systems and forwarded to the MSW over a middleware. This is not yet implemented by June 1, 2015 |
| Is your national implementation of the directive based on a network of individual port based entry points for reporting formalities? | **YES**: In the current implementation, the port community systems are the only entry ports. We believe however that the question whether a MSW is based upon port community systems or there is a separate MSW system only triggers a false discussion. Looking from a modern enterprise architecture point of view a MSW is just a set of services that are exposed to reporting parties so that they can fulfil their duties under the RFD in a harmonised way. The physical building blocks used to implement such service orientation are of secondary nature. |
| If the answer to question 5 is ‘yes’ are the functional and technical specifications and message implementing guidelines for reporting formalities harmonised across all those entry points? | As mentioned above the requirements for the Belgian MSW are harmonised in the SRS. However, the fact that we have to write such a document only proves that harmonisation is unfortunately missing at European level. Moreover, the question itself brings us to the root cause of the problem.   1. At the one hand there are “requirements”, so WHAT should be done and WHY. This is described in our SRS. So, **YES the requirements are harmonised at Belgian level but unfortunately not a EU level;** 2. On the other hand there are design issues, so HOW something is built. Nobody except for the designer should interfere in this. It doesn’t really matter how something is made as long as it fulfils the requirements. A strict segregation between “requirement” and “design” is in fact a prerequisite to come to a harmonised solution. **To harmonise technical “specifications” is not relevant.** 3. The fact that you use the word “functional” shows that you overlook any other type of requirements. So the real question is what type of requirements do exist and what requirements should have been harmonised at EU level. 4. **MIG’s harmonised: YES** |
| Will existing mechanisms for reporting formalities be maintained after 1 June 2015?  Yes, because they are already in compliance with the Directive? (Y/N)  Yes, as part of a transitional phase in the implementation of the Directive? (Y/N) | **YES**, Belgium foresees a phased implementation of the MSW. On June 1, 2015 there will only be minor changes, not affecting the way the reporting parties are interacting with the port community systems. Further releases of the MSW are planned 2015 Q3 and Q4. |
| If transitional measures are to be implemented after 1 June 2015 to complete the implementation of the directive please give details or indicate where such information can be obtained. | If the question is specific to one of the parties involved, then please contact these parties directly. There are 4 possibilities to get more general information about the Belgian MSW:   1. Look at <http://mswbelgium.be>. This website is on June 1 2015 still in a beta version and will soon be fully released and made available in English. There is background information about the MSW, a Q&A and a contact form; 2. Send an e-mail to [info@mswbelgium.be](mailto:info@mswbelgium.be); 3. Contact the project manager ir Gilbert Bentein : G: +32 479 65 41 44 [gilbert.bentein@mow.vlaanderen.be](mailto:gilbert.bentein@mow.vlaanderen.be); 4. Contact the MSW NCA [pierre.bodiaux@mobilit.fgov.be](mailto:pierre.bodiaux@mobilit.fgov.be); |