Feeder Working Group

SMDG#77 Minutes

Feeder	Feeder workgroup	Robert
workgroup	Joint workgroup for Feeder, presented	ROESTENBURG
18/04/2023	Challenges & Requirement form views of	RWG
13:30 - 15:30	Terminal, Mainliner, Feeder.	
13.30 - 13.30		&
	Feeder cell Terminel view	α
	Feeder call-Terminal view	
	Sönke started and took lead of terminal	Sönke WITT
	view.	HHLA
	Terminal View -Challenges	
	Mainline->feeder // Feeder->Mainline	&
	Terminal view – Request	
	Alignment of Voyage no. in Vessel Call and	Alex
	incoming EDI Messages very important for	HARTNOLL
	processing (matching) of all incoming data to	X-Press
	a vessel call.	Feeders
	Recommend unique voyage number.	
	Les min took the next of heath alairing	
	Jasmin took the part of berth plaining.	
	Terminal view- Berth planning	
	1 st MV to feeder// feeder to 2 ND MV	
	Berth planning in 2 steps:	
	1. contracts + berth/terminal layout	
	\rightarrow strategy (definition of berth windows for	
	services, feeder fill in what left)	
	2. Schedules	
	\rightarrow Create voyage in TOS (with vessel	
	operator's voyage no.) automatic or manual	
	berth assignment Berth assignment upon	
	schedule (vessel specifics in TOS,	
	recommend to use IMO-no. i/o call sign	
	because the IMO-no. does not change. Pain	
	point is still the different internal voy nos. of	
	each VSA partner	
	Unique identification of a voyage:	
	Vessel (IMO-no.	
	 Voy no. (unique) 	
	All incoming and outgoing messages and	
	other information for the terminal refer to a	
	very specific voyage in the TOS. Without a	
	unique identification the reference fails:	
	 risk of misinterpretation 	
	• the information might be lost,	
	• manual interference is necessary.	
	Robert took to part of Yard planning.	
	Yard planning -Request	

 On-carriage data is essential for 		
correct automatic stacking		
Activities of planning department		
Terminal planning department		
dependencies		
IFTSAI-voy/opr		
Decen on point points and OPA social		
Recap on pain points and Q&A section		
Discussed the importance of unique voy#,		
berth window for MV and feeder, expected		
outcome, transhipment in COPRAR.		
Recommendation:		
-use the vessel operator's voy no. in all		
messages as the voyage no. of reference		
- use the IMO no. in all		
messages/information transferred for clear		
identification of the vessel		
 Michael presented the view of a Corrier	Decision	
Michael presented the view of a Carrier.	Decision:	
Carrier View- Challenges	If required by	
Communication complexity	the industry, the	
 Limited option to automize process 	SMDG could	
steps	provide a new	
 High cost to keep track of feeder 	code list	
schedule.	"Reason for	
Carrier View-Requirement	Shortship".	
Simplification of communication	Topic left for	
	review at next	
Real time data exchange A discussion on Shortship should terminal	meeting.	
(A discussion on Shortship, should terminal	incening.	
to provide such and how, how carrier is		
dealing with shortship)		
Paul: shortship reason is also important to		
be added.		
Rodrick: reconcile is easy but carrier still		
need reason (ask from terminal)		
Steven: Frist to understand value chain		
why we need then talk tech.		
Automation of data exchange &		
 consecutive process steps		
Alex gave this view as Feeder.		
Feeder view—Challenges		
 Need to maintain a flexible network 		
while give stable connection to		
customer.		
 Tracking connection feasibility (lack 		
of transparency feasibility between		
MV, Terminal, Feeder. Clear		
guideline "stable connection"		
Opportunity to recover connection.		
Feeder view—Requirement		

 Use a Unique identifier code for connection in Schedule down to terminal pair levela new idea. Case study to understand the idea. Per terminal pair
Q&A section A lot of questions were raised to ask for more details of the new idea of connection code.