

# FONASBA MEMBERSHIP ENQUIRY



## ENQUIRY RESPONSE FORM

<b>ORIGINATING ASSOCIATION:</b>	<b>VNC (Netherlands)</b>
<b>ENQUIRY DETAILS:</b>	<p><i>Do ship agents in your country use either a Port Community System (PCS) or maritime single window (MSW) to input data to the authorities? If yes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>1. How is it funded, by the users or by central government/the national maritime authority?</i></li><li><i>2. If it is funded by the users, does each user contribute to a specific cost item or to an assessed share?</i></li><li><i>3. If each user contributes to a specific item, what do the agents cover?</i></li><li><i>4. And what do the other users cover?</i></li><li><i>5. Does the port authority contribute to the operation of the PCS or MSW?</i></li><li><i>6. Are there any incentives for agents to deliver information to the PCS/MSW? If so, how are they structured?</i></li></ol> <p><i>Please note that no specific tariff information is being sought, so please do not provide it. Furthermore if you are unable to respond to any question for reasons of commercial confidentiality, please state this in your reply.</i></p>
<b>REPLY TO:</b>	<b>admin@fonasba.com</b>
<b>COPY REPLY TO:</b>	
<b>CLOSING DATE FOR REPLIES:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> November 2018</b>

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

Belgium	<p>The PCS/MSW in the port of Antwerp (for all nautical / vessel-related declarations) which is called 'APICS-loket' has recently become an integrated part of a larger portal called C-Point (powered by NXTPort). Please note that the information underneath only reflects the present situation, and a fundamental review due to the new set-up is to be expected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The 'APICS-loket' itself is funded by the Antwerp Port Authority. There presently is no cost at all for the users.</li><li>The use of the 'APICS-loket' is obligatory.</li></ol>
---------	---

Bulgaria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MSW is funded by government/the national maritime authority.</li> <li>2. N/A.</li> <li>3. Agent only supply information into MSW.</li> <li>4. Other users are state port authorities. The MSW is not open for other users.</li> <li>5. There isn't PCS in Bulgaria.</li> <li>6. No incentives only obligations for agent!</li> </ol>
Croatia	<p>MSW is used at national level covering all Croatian ports.</p> <p>PCS is presently used at local levels. Development of national PCS is still in process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Systems are being funded by national authorities.</li> <li>2. N/A</li> <li>3. N/A</li> <li>4. N/A</li> <li>5. Yes</li> <li>6. No</li> </ol>
Cyprus	<p>In Cyprus, Ship Agents use the Port Community System, which is funded by the Cyprus Ports Authority (the National Port Authority).</p> <p>The issue of funding however is expected to be shortly discussed by all port stakeholders with a view the port users – particularly the port operators – to participate in the funding of the said system.</p> <p>Should you need any further information please contact us.</p>
Denmark	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reporting formalities take place through National Single Window which is funded by the Danish Maritime Authority.</li> <li>2. No, see reply 1.</li> <li>3. The reporting party, e.g. the shipping agent, insert all necessary data for the port call.</li> <li>4. See reply 3.</li> <li>5. The ports does not contribute to National Single Window, but have user access to NSW where they can look up details as per the ISPS requirement.</li> <li>6. N/A.</li> </ol>

France	<p>As far as France is concerned, PCS and CCS are private companies and are used by shipping agents to input data.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PCS and CCS are mainly funded by users. As private companies, shareholders are Port authorities and local shipping federations.</li> <li>2. Users like Shipping Agents, Freight Forwarders, Terminal Operators pay an annual fee + a cost per transaction.</li> <li>3. Not relevant.</li> <li>4. Not relevant.</li> <li>5. Port authorities are minor shareholders in PCS/CCS private companies, but are not involved in PCS/CCS operation.</li> <li>6. No incentives.</li> </ol>
Malta	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funded by the Users.</li> <li>2. Yes, this is the idea behind it.</li> <li>3. Users do not contribute to a specific item, but to the whole system.</li> <li>4. N/A.</li> <li>5. NO.</li> <li>6. No there are no incentives, but ultimately, if and when we at arrive at the stage that the NSW is officially introduced, every agent will have to comply.</li> </ol>
Poland	<p><u>Port Community System (PCS)</u></p> <p>In Poland we still do not have PCS system. There are some steps made by Port Authorities (4 major Polish ports) to start the project. We recognize it as being at initial stage.</p> <p>During presentation of the framework, there were hints that users are to pay contributions for using the system.</p> <p><u>Maritime Single Window (MSW)</u></p> <p>This system is in force from 2015 and is owned, developed and funded by State Maritime Authority.</p> <p>By now end 2018 agents and vessels do not have access to it.</p> <p>For the tome being we do not have any info concerning contribution or fees to be paid for using the system.</p>

Portugal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It's funded by Port Authorities (100 pct public).</li> <li>6. The input is mandatory but no cost incurred.</li> </ol>
Slovenia	<p>We are working on maritime single window.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funded by national maritime authority</li> <li>2. For moment we are not covering anything, we believe that is all in Light dues we pay to the Harbour master.</li> <li>3. We have no Port Authority this job is performed by PORT OF KOPER</li> <li>4. No incentives for the moment as new Minister just start to work!!</li> </ol>
Spain	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>MSW: Ministry of Public Works and Transport</i> <i>PCS: Port Authority / Private Co</i></li> <li>2. <i>Users pay a fee based on data volume</i></li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. –</li> <li>5. <i>Yes, for their own PCS'</i></li> <li>6. <i>Use of MSW is compulsory to all users but free of charge, local PCS' owned by Ports Auth. Are compulsory at their ports.</i></li> </ol>
Sweden	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, all use MSW! Founded by the Maritime Administration, SMA.</li> <li>2. -</li> <li>3. -</li> <li>4. -</li> <li>5. The Port of Gothenburg is linked to the MSW, but I don't know if they pay anything for that. I think SMA pays for it all. And they want more ports to join.</li> <li>6. No special incentives, it just makes life easier even for them.</li> </ol>

UK	<p>All major ports in UK utilise PCS. There are 2 systems in use, Destin8 (run by M.C.P.) and CNS. Destin8 is used in the majority of the container ports.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Both systems are privately owned and funded. However, when they were developed in 1970s/80s, HM Customs was a major investor, but as a government organisation did not take any shares.</li> <li>2. Most of the shareholders in each of the systems are the users themselves. The systems charge for each entry type, whether manifest input, container release, customs entry etc.</li> <li>3. Ship agents use the system to upload vessel manifests, berth registration, generating unique consignment numbers and container release. Also used for VGM &amp; vessel statistics.</li> <li>4. The systems are used by all port users, stevedores, customs, warehouses, trucking companies, rail operators, freight forwarders, port health etc.</li> <li>5. There is no port authority involvement as such, as all UK ports are privately run. The stevedores (like all other users) pay for each entry to the system.</li> <li>6. Every port user, including agents, has incentive to use the PCSs, as without it they could not function effectively. As part of the process the agent is obligated to utilise the PCS, it only works because all involved are stakeholders. The systems have developed over the years to incorporate most of the functions required to bring the vessel alongside, process the manifest, receive and deliver the containers and consignments, and to form the structure of communication between all parties.</li> </ol> <p>The National Maritime Single Window is for agents to carry out ships reporting (essentially digitalising FAL forms) to Border Force and HMRC but it has not left the pilot phase in the UK. The MSW is funded by central government.</p> <p>However some ports (eg Felixstowe) still send FAL documents to HMRC Hub. There is no charge from central govt to use the MSW and certainly no advantage or incentive. There are no incentives for agents to deliver the info into the MSW.</p> <p>The port agents input the CERS documents but not the FAL documents.</p> <p>The UK Port Community Systems should have links into CERS, they are promised but they don't seem to work so even though we enter the CERS info into the</p>
----	---

UK cont...	<p>PCS we also send the CERS workbooks (by email) to the Port for them to enter to the CERS system and the Port emails us back any queries ....</p> <p>There does not seem to be any part of the Port Systems that requires or is connected to the Customs/ Border Force MSW</p> <p>The PCS system is funded by the user (the Ports Customers) through badge fees for the PCS and individual transaction fees.</p> <p>PCS is not free but is only required for inventory linked customs clearance agents - not port agents. Only really for LOLO and RORO traffic. This requires a licence fee and also a fee per submission. This cost is usually passed onto the customer. The ports would also have to buy a license as they need access to the same systems. Although it is all controlled by customs the systems are a 3rd party supplier and there are 2 different ones in the UK so customs agents need the one that is in operation at their port.</p>
------------	--