

Industry Consultation Questionnaire

Common Framework for Digital Exchange of Maritime Emissions-Related Data

Tripartite JIWG consultation on Operational Vessel Data (OVD)

Introduction

The Tripartite Joint Industry Working Group (JIWG) invites interested stakeholders to provide feedback on the use of Operational Vessel Data (OVD) as the baseline for a common framework for the digital exchange of operational vessel data relevant to maritime emissions reporting. This work forms part of a broader industry initiative to support a harmonised, practical and scalable approach to the exchange of emissions-relevant data across regulatory and commercial use cases.

For the purpose of this consultation, OVD refers to the proposed common data exchange framework/protocol for operational vessel data. It does not require the use of any specific software platform, verifier, reporting system or service provider.

For clarity, OVD does not introduce new data points. It provides a standardised structure and common definitions for the exchange of operational vessel data that organisations already collect (e.g. from log abstracts and noon reports). In this questionnaire, "operational data" refers to what your organisation collects in practice, while "OVD" refers to how that same data is structured and exchanged.

This consultation seeks industry input on whether OVD provides an appropriate and sufficiently mature baseline for a common framework for the exchange of log abstract and noon report data used in support of maritime emissions reporting.

This consultation does not start from a blank page, as OVD has been identified as the proposed baseline for further consideration. However, stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on its suitability, limitations, implementation conditions, governance arrangements and any material concerns that should be addressed before wider industry adoption.

In particular, the consultation is intended to help determine whether the proposed framework:

- reflects operational practice across different ship types, trading patterns and business models;
- supports consistent interpretation and reuse of operational data across regulatory and commercial contexts;
- contains sufficiently clear definitions, structures and guidance to support implementation;
- can be adopted incrementally without requiring replacement of existing onboard or shore-based reporting systems.

The responses received through this consultation will be reviewed by the Tripartite JIWG and used to identify areas where the proposed framework may require clarification, guidance, incremental improvement or further governance development. The purpose of the consultation is to support a stable and practical framework for long-term industry use, while avoiding fragmentation and incompatible approaches.

Respondents are invited to submit their comments using the consultation questions and feedback template provided alongside this note. Structured responses will help ensure consistency of feedback and facilitate balanced review of the issues raised.

Instructions for respondents

- Please complete this template as fully as possible. If a question is not relevant to your organisation, please indicate "Not applicable".
- Where possible, please provide concrete operational examples, suggested wording changes, and an indication of the likely impact of the issue identified.
- Should you wish to submit more information, feel free to submit an email to marinesurveys@bimco.org.

Thank you for taking the time to contribute.

[Next](#)

Initial consent - Privacy Policy Agreement

The personal data you provide in this form will be processed by BIMCO for the purpose of organising and facilitating the OVD Industry Consultation. Your data will be handled in accordance with applicable data protection legislation and BIMCO's Privacy Policy. Please review our privacy policy at <https://www.bimco.org/web/privacy-policy/> and check the box to confirm you agree. You may withdraw your consent at any time by contacting us at privacy@bimco.org.*

☐ I have read and agree with the BIMCO Privacy Policy above.

This information and the associated workshops will be held under the **Chatham House Rules**. Participants are free to use the information received during the meeting, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed.*

☐ I agree to abide by the Chatham House Rules before, during and after this consultation and its associated workshops

Back

Next

Use of responses, confidentiality and follow-up

The information provided in this questionnaire will be used by the Tripartite JIWG to assess stakeholder views and identify areas where the proposed framework may require clarification, guidance or further development.

Individual responses will be reviewed by the JIWG for consultation purposes. Any external summary of the consultation will normally present findings in aggregated or anonymised form, unless the respondent has given specific consent for their organisation to be named or for comments to be quoted.

Please indicate your preferences below:

May the JIWG contact you for clarification or follow-up discussions?*

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

May your organisation be named as having participated in the consultation?*

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

May your comments be quoted anonymously in consultation summaries, reports or follow-up material?*

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

May your comments be attributed to your organisation if relevant and agreed separately?*

- ☐ Yes, subject to separate agreement
☐ No

Back

Next

Section 1. Respondent and company profile

Please enter your name. *

Please enter your position within the organisation. *

Please enter the name of your organisation. *

Please enter the name of your department / division.

Please enter your email. *

What best describes your company's role? (Select all that apply) *

- ☐ Shipowner
- ☐ Ship manager
- ☐ Commercial operator
- ☐ Crewing manager
- ☐ Crewing agent
- ☐ Charterer
- ☐ Classification Society
- ☐ Accredited verifier or Recognized Organization
- ☐ Shipyard
- ☐ Solution provider / Software vendor
- ☐ Data or analytics provider
- ☐ Regulator / Authority
- ☐ Industry Association
- ☐ Other

Primary Role in the Maritime Value Chain (Select all that apply) *

- ☐ Commercial
- ☐ Technical
- ☐ Regulatory
- ☐ Digital / IT
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Other

What is your level of involvement in topic (Select all that apply) *

- ☐ Operational
- ☐ Technical
- ☐ Strategic
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Other

Does your organisation currently use OVD, OVD-like structures, or another standardised exchange format? *

- ☐ OVD
- ☐ OVD-like structure
- ☐ Another standardised exchange format
- ☐ Primarily custom-built exchange arrangements
- ☐ Not sure

Name which other solution you are currently using for the exchange of maritime emission reporting?

How familiar is your organisation with the OVD standard? *

- ☐ We have already implemented the OVD standard
- ☐ We are currently implementing it
- ☐ We are actively planning implementation
- ☐ We are aware of it
- ☐ We are not familiar with the OVD standard
- ☐ Other

Back

Next

Section 2. Overall position

Do you support the use of OVD as the baseline for a common framework for exchanging log abstract and noon report data for GHG reporting?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Yes, provided that certain definitions or guidance are clarified
- ☐ Yes, provided that specific gaps or missing elements are addressed
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure / no position

Please explain briefly the reasons for your answer, including any important conditions or reservations

In your view, what are the principal benefits of establishing a common industry framework for the exchange of emissions-relevant operational vessel data?

In your view, what are the principal risks, concerns or barriers associated with the proposed framework?

Please identify the three most important issues that should be addressed before wider industry adoption of the framework. Also, explain briefly why each issue is important to your organisation.

First important issue:

Please also indicate whether it is:

- ☐ Critical for adoption
- ☐ Important but manageable
- ☐ Useful improvement
- ☐ Not sure

Second important issue:

Please also indicate whether it is:

- ☐ Critical for adoption
- ☐ Important but manageable
- ☐ Useful improvement
- ☐ Not sure

Third important issue:

Please also indicate whether it is:

- ☐ Critical for adoption
- ☐ Important but manageable
- ☐ Useful improvement
- ☐ Not sure

Back

Next

Section 3. Operational suitability

Does OVD adequately reflect the operational data that is actually collected and exchanged in your organisation today?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure / not applicable

If partly or no, please identify the main issue(s): (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Missing data elements
- ☐ Unclear definitions
- ☐ Different event or boundary interpretation
- ☐ Incompatibility with existing systems
- ☐ Too much detail or burdensome data requirements
- ☐ Insufficient granularity
- ☐ No issues
- ☐ Other

Please explain and provide concrete examples where possible.

Are there particular ship types, trading patterns, operational scenarios or business models for which the proposed framework may be less suitable or incomplete?

Would it be useful for the framework to define a limited number of operational reporting profiles or schemes, with agreed minimum levels of granularity for different ship types, trading patterns or operational scenarios?

- Please indicate which profiles would be most relevant to your organisation, such as conventional trading, frequent short voyages, tanker operations, STS operations, shuttle/offshore activity, chemical tanker parcel operations, LNG/gas carrier operations, or other cases.

- Please also indicate what minimum level of granularity would be needed, such as event-level, berth call, port call, voyage leg, voyage, reporting period, or other aggregation level.

In your experience, which operational events or reporting boundaries most often lead to inconsistent interpretation or divergent reporting outcomes?

Do different voyage, leg, port call or reporting boundary definitions create practical difficulties when using the same operational data for different regulatory, commercial, charterparty, verifier or reporting purposes?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Maybe

If yes, please describe the definitions or boundary points that most often lead to inconsistency, such as berth-to-berth, pilot station, sea buoy, customary anchorage, port limits, cargo operation period, charterparty voyage, regulatory reporting period, or other boundaries.

[Back](#)

[Next](#)

Section 4. Content, definitions and structure

Are the current OVD data elements, concepts and definitions sufficiently clear for practical implementation?

- Please elaborate:

Are there any material data elements that are missing from the current framework for common emissions-related exchange purposes?

- Please elaborate:

Does the framework provide sufficient structure for reporting alternative fuels, biofuels, fuel blends and related supporting evidence?

- Please consider, where relevant, fuel type, blend ratio, lower heating value, emission factor, sustainability certification, Proof of Sustainability documentation, chain-of-custody information, delayed receipt of documentation, and the need for later correction or reconciliation once supporting evidence becomes available.

- Please elaborate:

Are there any data elements that appear unnecessary, duplicative, too burdensome, or difficult to populate consistently in practice?

Would additional implementation guidance, worked examples or interpretation notes be useful? If so, please identify where such guidance would be most valuable.

Would common interpretation guidance be needed for key operational events and parameters to support consistent verification, assurance or acceptance of data by different verifiers, charterers, counterparties or reporting schemes?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Other

Back

Next

Section 5. Business process and exchange protocol

What practical steps are needed to ensure that emissions-related operational data can be exchanged reliably between different parties and systems?

- Please consider, where relevant, data validation, correction handling, version control, confirmation of receipt, reconciliation of differences, and audit trail.

At what stages in the current exchange process (the process you currently have in place for exchanging environmental data) do you experience the greatest friction or inefficiency?

Would implementation of an OVD-based exchange framework create practical integration challenges with existing onboard systems, shore-based systems, commercial platforms, verifier platforms, charterparty reporting tools or regulatory reporting solutions?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure / not applicable

If yes or partly, please describe the main challenges, including mapping between systems, API requirements, duplication of reporting, workflow changes, replacement or adaptation of existing platforms, or other integration issues.

What level of implementation effort, cost or organisational change would your organisation expect if the framework were adopted more widely? (select all that apply)

- Please consider, where relevant:

- ☐ onboard system changes
- ☐ shore-based system changes
- ☐ integration with commercial, verifier or regulatory reporting platforms
- ☐ internal workflow changes
- ☐ staff training
- ☐ data mapping and validation
- ☐ vendor dependency or reliance on specific service providers
- ☐ indicative cost or resource implications, if known
- ☐ Other

How significant do you expect the implementation burden to be?

- ☐ Low
- ☐ Moderate
- ☐ High
- ☐ Not possible to assess at this stage

Please explain:

What information should accompany each exchanged dataset to make it clear where the data comes from, which version it is, and how it can be checked or reconciled?

- Please consider, where relevant, dataset identifiers, reporting period, vessel and voyage references, version number, correction history, source system, supporting documents, and references to underlying records.

Are there any concerns regarding data ownership, access rights, commercial confidentiality or onward sharing of data under the proposed OVD framework?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure / not applicable

If yes or partly, please describe the main concerns, including who should be able to access the data, for what purpose, under which conditions, and whether restrictions are needed for onward sharing, commercial use, charterparty settlement, ETS/FuelEU cost allocation, verifier access, benchmarking or other downstream use.

Back

Next

Section 6. Governance and maintenance

What governance model would give you sufficient confidence to adopt and rely on the framework over time?

- Please consider, where relevant, decision-making structure, stakeholder representation, transparency of processes, independence, and the balance between stability and flexibility.

How should changes to the framework be proposed, reviewed, agreed and communicated?

- Please consider, where relevant, change proposal mechanisms, consultation processes, versioning and release cycles, stakeholder involvement, and communication of updates.

What level of backward compatibility would be necessary for your organisation to implement the OVD framework with confidence?

- Please consider, where relevant, tolerance for breaking changes, transition periods, version coexistence, and the availability of migration guidance.

What practical support would help your organisation implement the framework in a consistent and reliable way?

- Please consider, where relevant, implementation guidance, reference examples, validation tools, testing procedures, training material, and access to clarifications or support channels.

Back

Next

Section 7. Alignment and future use

Does the proposed framework appear sufficiently aligned with international maritime regulation related to environmental reporting?

Does the proposed framework appear sufficiently aligned with the IMO Compendium and related international data structuring efforts?

In your view, should the framework also support downstream output structures such as standardised Vessel Emission Reports (VER), and if so, what should be the priority for future work in this area?

- ☐ Yes, this should be a priority for the next phase
- ☐ Yes, but only after the OVD-based input data framework has been further developed
- ☐ Yes, but limited to guidance and principles rather than a fixed report format
- ☐ Possibly, but the need and use cases require further assessment
- ☐ No, the framework should focus only on operational data exchange
- ☐ Not sure / no position

Please explain your answer, including which VER-related use cases, data fields, assurance status or reporting boundaries should be prioritised, if any.

Would your organisation be interested in participating in further workshops, pilot activities or practical implementation discussions following the consultation? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Maybe
- ☐ No

General feedback

Please provide any final comments, including suggested priorities for next steps after the consultation closes.

Follow-up events

Please note that a **workshop will be held at SMM in Hamburg on 2 September 2026**. Registration is available on the main consultation site.

A virtual **workshop to follow up on the consultation will take place on Thursday October 15, 2026**. Please save the date - more information will follow.

- ☐ I'm interested in this event

Thanks for your interest and input.

[Back](#)

[Submit](#)