SMDG

12 May 2022	**SMDG Plenary Meeting Helsinki**		
	Presentation: 220512_SMDG_DGPartnerBooking.pptx		
Session	**Description**	Category (Information, Decission)	**Presenter**
DG Partner Booking	Members, who would like to participate the work group (or name Person within their company)		Ramina Maschal
	- CMA		
	- ZIM		
	- Hamburg Süd		
	- Maersk		
	- Hapag-Lloyd		
	- Further members expected, that were not able to join meeting e.g. HMM and MSC		
	Slide 2 Upgrade industry standard 5.15		
	- urgent need to further enhance industry standard		
	- MSC is owner of industry standard file, thus MSC should be part of SMDG Board to enable further improvements under umbrella of SMDG		
	Slide 3 IFTMBF Replacements after DG Closing		
	- Late IFTMBF REPLACES after DG Closing Cut-Off are causing major problems		
	- Messages primary caused by customer/ shipper		
	- Parties agree that it is valid to reject booking when late REPLACES		
	- Rejection does include risks on commercial side. When customer bookings are transported by carrier only using own vessels, carrier can do what ever. But when transport does also include leg on partners vessel, customer and partner-carrier shall respect DG Closing time		
	- Issue to be taken to DCSA to form a recommendation that can be used in die working procedure agreements of partner lines		
	- To differentiate what change should be accepted and what rejected requires receiving IT system to determine the exact change. Many partners are overwriting when receiving REPLACEMENTS. Thus they can not support such system behavior		
	- Terminals are also negatively impacted by these late changes of bookings		
	Slide 5 Embedding PDF exchange to Dataflow		
	- Proposed solution is to include Rejection reason codes to IFTMBC message (because there are many reasons why booking can be rejected)		
	- Target of request is to automatize IFTMBC receiving program to have automatic steps based on rejection reason		
	- In question whether aligning message types to PDF-process will give value, because at the end a human needs to check what documents need to be sent to partner.		

	Full automation not possible anyway.		
	Slide 6 Terminal Codes - Agreement that SMDG terminal codes should be transmitted in LOC segment **Slide 7 SADT / SAPT** - EDIFACT has a clear specification on how to transmit e.g. ">" mark - DG cargo sometimes has TEMP, that when reached one "can only run away" - It is often declared as e.g. >50 °C. So this TEMP of no return can be at 55 °C or 89 °C - Currently an accurate value is transmitted in standard, so it does not meet the real indication - Transmitting correctly including > mark would give no benefits from operational view, because from e.g. 50 °C all emergency steps are already started **Slide 8 Further open points** - ZIM is reporting alignment needs when it comes to variant and use of Exis		