From: CG on VTM

To: VTS Committee

**CORRESPONDENCE GROUP (CG) REPORT**

**ON VTM**

**Background**

As agreed at PAP20 October 2010, Chairmen of VTS, e-NAV, EEP and ANM Committees, under the leadership of the VTS Committee Chair, were requested to review the use of the name VTM and its definition intersessionally and provide an input paper to VTS32. The aim of this task was to eliminate ambiguities and uncertainties caused by the use of the name and the definition of VTM and to make the VTM Concept clearer and more understandable.

Subsequently, the IALA Council at its 50th session in December 2010, decided to expand the correspondence group by including the Chairs of the VTS Committee WGs. The Council did not approve the “VTM Communication Plan” and the “VTM Workshop Proposal” which had been submitted by the VTS Committee and held over these two documents for a decision at the next Council meeting in June 2011.

**Correspondence Group**

Expanded Correspondence Group consists of the following names;

1. Tuncay Cehreli, Chair VTS Committee
2. William Cairns, Chair e-NAV Committee
3. Omar Frits Eriksson, Chair EEP Committee
4. Phil Day, Chair ANM Committee
5. Neil Trainor, Vice Chair VTS Committee
6. Barry Goldman, Chair WG1 on VTS Operations
7. René Hogendoorn, Chair WG2 on Technical
8. Terry Hughes, Chair WG3 on Personnel and Training
9. Pieter Paap, Chair WG4 on VTM
10. Raymond Seignette, Vice Chair WG4 on VTM

**Discussions**

The main issue that seems to make the concept ambiguous and its perception difficult is; “M” (Management) in the abbreviation of VTM. This is commonly understood as the “control and direction” of vessel traffic, although this is not the aim of the concept. Moreover, the definition of VTM is considered as having potential overlap with other systems or concepts, such as e-Navigation.

Although, the scope of the CG’s task is limited by reviewing the name used for and the definition of VTM, some other aspects of the concept, including the most appropriate place for it to be developed inside or outside of IALA have also been discussed.

Because of some stakeholders and their sphere of duties within the extensive scope of VTM are outside of IALA’s field (e.g. customs, security and law enforcement agencies), one issue discussed was that the concept should not be a subject for IALA alone. It was also discussed that the e-NAV Committee may be a more appropriate place than the VTS Committee for VTM, considering the area of work and expertise of the Committees.

Members of the CG are agreed on the need to rename the VTM Concept and refining its definition. Members have also provided various proposals in this respect and all proposals provided were evaluated in a comprehensive and detailed manner.

**Conclusions**

In the work of the CG, the following name and definition came to the fore among other proposals and have majority agreement;

Proposed name; ***“MATCH” (Maritime Transport Collaboration and Harmonization)***

Proposed definition; ***MATCH is the functional framework of harmonized arrangements, measures and services supporting the collaboration between stakeholders within the maritime domain to enhance the safety, security, and efficiency of shipping and the protection of the marine environment in all navigable waters”***

*The existing name and definition are; Vessel Traffic Management (VTM) is the functional framework of harmonized measures and services to enhance the safety, security and efficiency of shipping and the protection of the marine environment in all navigable waters.*

It is obvious that the proposed name MATCH and its definition are more clear and descriptive than the current name (VTM) and its definition and cover the scope, objectives and aims of the concept.

According to its Constitution, the aim of IALA is to foster the safe, economic and efficient movement of vessels, through improvement and harmonization of aids to navigation worldwide and other appropriate means, for the benefit of the maritime community and the protection of the environment. Thus, all members of the CG agreed that IALA should continue to develop the MATCH concept and to progress it at least until a certain level of its development. Furthermore, the majority of the CG state that the concept should stay with VTS Committee but that the e-NAV and VTS Committees should work very closely on this matter. It also has to be taken into account that at a later stage some aspects of MATCH may need further development by the e-NAV Committee.

**Action requested**

In the light of this report, VTS32 is requested to review the use of the name VTM and its definition and provide an input paper to PAP21.