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# Summary

This document considers the regulatory situation regarding the introduction of e-Navigation.

## Purpose of the document

The Committee is invited to note the Council decision not to approve the previous paper and consider the options of either doing nothing or making revised proposals for streamlining the regulatory process.

## Related documents

The previous paper as submitted to the 52nd session of Council by PAP 22 (Annex A).

# Background

Following discussions at e-Navigation Underway in January 2011 about the possible obstacles to the introduction of e-Navigation posed by the lengthy regulatory process, a note was submitted to e-NAV 9 in March 2011 setting out the problem and some potential solutions. A new task was added to the Work Program and approved by Council Session 51 in June 2011. A paper was submitted to e-NAV 10 and forwarded to PAP 22, where it was further developed and submitted to the Council 52n in December 2011.

The Council considered that the matter was beyond IALA’s remit and did not approve the paper.

# Discussion

Two approaches were proposed in the paper sent to Council. One was a single, over-arching standard for a display compatible with existing ship-borne equipment, supported by existing or new, generic, standards. This might be achieved by means of coordinated efforts with other international bodies and with the backing of national administrations.

The other approach was a complete reconsideration of the standardisation processes using a requirements driven, modular approach. It was suggested that a panel of experts (or IMO-led harmonisation group) might be set up to oversee the implementation process as a whole. This may have been seen by Council as stepping outside IALA’s remit.

Another approach would be to consider this issue purely from the perspective of aids to navigation service providers. IALA Members could harmonize the provision of IALA-relevant data to ships in accordance with the developing e-Navigation Architecture. By harmonizing the “packaging” of this data by AtoN service providers, IALA can influence the shipborne equipment without treading directly on the IMO process. Similarly, IALA could develop the provision of shore-based IALA-relevant information (and its transmission to ships) and later offer it as a component of e-Navigation. It is recognized that some of this information (e.g., charting information) falls within the remit of other Organizations (i.e., IHO) but in many cases its provision has traditionally been by IALA Members.

# Action requested of the Committee

The Committee is requested to consider the following options:

1. Discontinue this task, in which case the Work Program will need to be modified and the modification will need to be approved by Council.
2. Prepare a new paper for submission to Council, proposing a coordinated approach with other bodies, to move towards an over-arching standard, supported by generic standards.
3. Modify this task and the Work Program to pursue IALA harmonization and transmission of IALA-relevant information.

ANNEX A

From: Policy Advisory Panel 52/9.1/2 Formerly PAP/output/2

To: IALA Council 26 October 2011

**Information Paper**

**Regulatory Process for e-Navigation**

**1 Background**

The implementation of the IMO e-Navigation Strategy is expected to involve preparation of

performance standards, or as a minimum, harmonisation of equipment. The process for the

introduction of new standards can be lengthy and adopting an effective approach will facilitate and accelerate the introduction of e-Navigation. This note is intended to capture the outcome of

discussions on this matter within IALA and other bodies.

**2 What is the problem?**

The schedule for the e-Navigation initiative agreed at IMO NAV 57 is: completion of gap analysis by 2012; risk analysis & CBA by 2013; strategy implementation plan by 2014.

The timetable for the actual implementation has not yet been discussed formally, but might be in two phases: phase 1- existing equipment & standards (2014-2020?); phase 2: new equipment & systems (2020 onwards?).

New standards take 4-5 years to introduce and the implementation periods can be 10 years or more. Therefore, if several new items of equipment or complete systems are involved, the overall process could become so lengthy as to negate the expected benefits.

**3 Potential solutions**

Various possible solutions can be envisaged:

 a completely open-systems, market-led approach;

 an over-arching performance standard, referencing existing equipment performance

standards and test specifications;

 a complete review of the processes to speed them up and make them more flexible, for

example using a requirements register and modular structure (like INS);

 generic performance standards and test specifications.

There may be other solutions and the best option may be a combination of one or more approaches. However, it is worth noting that the first option of an unregulated, market driven approach has not received any support and there seems to be a consensus that some degree of regulation is necessary.

**4 Proposed Way Forward**

Based on the discussions so far, it is proposed that a two-stage approach might be adopted,

corresponding to the two phases envisaged for the implementation of e-Navigation:

* A single, over-arching standard for a display compatible with existing shipborne equipment should be prepared to allow for a rapid first-stage implementation. This could be supported by the introduction of generic standards, together with non-regulated applications, where appropriate, to provide early benefits and efficiencies.
* A complete reconsideration of the standardisation processes should be initiated for the longer-term, overseen by a panel of experts within IMO. One model would be a requirements driven, modular approach, similar to INS.
* Such a panel of experts (or IMO-led harmonisation group) might also be a productive approach to the implementation process as a whole.

**5 Action requested**

The Council is invited to consider this proposal as a possible input to the IMO Correspondence Group on e-Navigation.