



European Maritime Safety Agency

Workshop Report

SafeSeaNet Workshop 6

Held in Lisbon on:

22 & 23 November 2006

Draft Workshop Report: SafeSeaNet Six (6)

Background

I. Introduction

The workshop was to open and conclude in plenary sittings (chairman Mr Lazaros Aichmalotidis), with much of the work in between being split into two sessions "User's Requirements" (chairman Mr Lazaros Aichmalotidis), and "Operational and Technical" (chairman Mr Yannick Texier), held concurrently in separate rooms, reconvening the plenary to conclude with common issues and agree the conclusions.

The meeting was attended by delegations from: Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands (the), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom (the).

Representatives of Intrasoft International (EMSA contractor), the MarNIS Project, the PROTECT group and ESPO also participated.

The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**.

A list of documents distributed to the SSN 6 participants is included as **Annex 2**.

Note: Fuller details of the issues presented (including an allocation of papers to each of the sub-groups) may be obtained from:

<http://www.emsa.europa.eu/end805d009.html>

Workshop Objectives

The most important issues of the workshop were:

- COSS WG results: note and consider issues recently discussed by the COSS Working Group input for the Commission;
- SSN data quality: propose for the development of a "Data Quality Guideline" that will contribute to the reliability of the data exchanged into the SSN system;
- Users access rights: present proposals for revision and process for revision of SafeSeaNet Users' Roles and Access Rights;
- Alerts distribution: provide some views regarding the alerts messages distribution in SSN and proactive use of information by SSN operational users;
- SSN V.2: present proposals for a new version of SafeSeaNet (V.2) with improved and extended functionality and improved stability and capacity;
- Single window: provide some guidance on the possibly application of the single window concept for the submission of electronic notifications from masters, vessels owners or operators to the competent national Authorities.

Workshop Programme

I.1 EMSA main tasks (after SSN 5)

The chairman referred briefly the main EMSA tasks related to SSN which took place after the SSN 5 workshop as follows:

- **MARSEC Committee meetings:** A series of meeting with the MARSEC Committee and MARSEC experts' group concluded that the security messages can be included in future development of SSN.
- **MARNIS activities:** The MarNIS Consortium provided to EMSA three (3) reports concerning the LRIT, the "one stop shop" concept and the alerts distribution. Two of the three reports were satisfactory and contributed in the work of EMSA for the further SSN evolution.
- **ISWG:** A new Intersessional SSN Working Group was set up consisted of IT, PT, PL, SW, NO, GE, FR and the NL.
- **Visit to a MS :** EMSA participated in a meeting with French officials in MRCC Jobourg. The objective was to discuss the interface of SSN with the French system Traffic 2000.
- **Second EMSA Workshop with Mediterranean MS:** The MS, acceding and candidate countries of the Mediterranean basin (plus Portugal) agreed to work together with the objective of discussing and coordinating development of a common Mediterranean Sea monitoring system (target date end of 2008). The Mediterranean MS requested EMSA support in launching and leading a cooperative procedure between them.
- **Dialogue with maritime related Agencies:** There are synergies between the tasks of some Agencies (EDA, FRONTEX, EUSC) and the EMSA activities in the area of traffic monitoring. EMSA attended meetings organised by FRONTEX and EDA aiming to achieve a close cooperation with them in the area of traffic monitoring.
- **EU/Russia cooperation:** EMSA, the Commission and the Russian Federation met and discussed technical issues related to the Russia / EU Transport Dialogue and in particular the cooperation on SSN. The meeting concluded that an *ad hoc* working group will be set up to investigate the legal and technical elements of such cooperation.
- **Second workshop on VTMISS and the STIRES 1st expert review:** EMSA organised a two day workshop of experts representing Member States and acceding countries on the 7 and 8/11/06. The objective was to present progress made regarding development of the traffic monitoring infrastructure in EU. On the second day Saab presented the results of the STIRES study (SSN Traffic Monitoring Relay and Exchange System) and received feedback from the MS' experts. These will be further elaborated by Saab and presented to them again at the 2nd experts review workshop.

I.2 Approval of the agenda

The chairman suggested adding in the agenda an update on developments for the WETREP MRS and a discussion on the participation of 3rd Countries in SSN for the afternoon session of 21st November within the Users' Requirements sub-group.

The group approved the agenda with the proposed additions.

I.3 Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the previous workshop (SSN 5) were approved, including the actions resulting from that meeting.

ACTION ITEMS FROM THE SSN 5 WORKSHOP**I. ACTION ITEMS FOR THE MEMBER STATES SSN W5**

| S/N | Topic and Action | Section | Action carried out |
|------------|--|----------------|--|
| 1 | By the end of April 06 M.S. shall provide their comments on the latest version of the ICD (Annex II of SSN 5/3/7). | III.1.d | Completed |
| 2 | M.S. should include in their national solutions a strategy for applying mapping table techniques. | III.2.a | |
| 3 | M.S. will implement the proposed changes at their national systems in V1.9 (expected deployment of V1.9 in January 2007). | III.5.b | |
| 4 | M.S. are recommended to use the list of single hull tankers at their shore based monitoring systems for the automatic detection of any vessel of the lists and alarm activation (indicated at their national systems). | III.8.b | Ongoing |
| 5 | M.S. should send their views regarding the content of the detailed part of the AIS notification message. | IV.2.b | Dealt with in the ISWG |
| 6 | FR will provide a contribution on the business checks in application in Trafic 2000. | IV.5.c | SSN 6/5/2 |
| 7 | Some M.S. asked the assistance of EMSA by visiting their premises. | V.1.a | Completed (Fr) others planned |
| 8 | NO will send to EMSA relevant information on the content and the progress of the cooperation on SSN with Russia. | V.1.b | Norway/RF MOU |
| 9 | FR will give a presentation of the INGRID module (INGRID combines PSC, SIRENAC and SSN functions). | V.1.c | Not possible due to current contractual difficulties |
| 10 | MS will send their responses to the SSN Questionnaires to EMSA by 19 May 2006. | VI.1 | Completed |
| 11 | M.S. are recommended to apply the "one stop shopping" approach for the benefit of their Administrations and the shipping industry. | VII.1.a | Ongoing |
| 12 | PT will send information to EMSA regarding the WETREP message and SSN. | VIII.1 | WETREP minutes |
| 13 | M.S. wishing to participate in the ISWG will express their interest by the end of April 06 the latest. | VIII.3 | Completed |

II. ACTION ITEMS FOR THE EMSA SSN W5

| S/N | Topic and Action | Section | Action carried out |
|------------|--|----------------|---|
| 1 | Propose to the Commission to extend the definition of the "coastal station" to include it in the amendment to the TMD. | III.1.a | Completed (proposal declined) |
| 2 | The ICD reference documents (XMLRG, SNSRG etc.) should be harmonised with the ICD provisions. | III.1.c | Part completed – in process SSN 6/3/1 (Fr) |

| S/N | Topic and Action | Section | Action carried out |
|-----|---|------------|--|
| 3 | Minor modifications identified at SSN 5 will be incorporated in the ICD. The ICD will be finalised intersessionally by end of May 06. | III.1.e | Completed |
| 4 | The use of LOCODE mapping techniques should be included in Chapter 8 of the ICD. | III.2.b | Completed |
| 5 | The benefits of using LOCODEs for indicating the port facilities will be presented to the MARSEC Committee. | III.3 | Completed |
| 6 | The "waste message" issue will be discussed at the next COSS Committee meeting. | III.4 | Completed |
| 7 | The ICD and XMLRG will be amended in accordance with the SSN 5/3/1 (including the modifications agreed). | III.5.a | Completed for the ICD - amendment of XMLRG pending |
| 8 | The proposed changes at the SSN core in SSN V1.9 will be implemented (expected date for deployment of V 1.9 is January 2007). | III.5.b | On track SSN 6/4/6 |
| 9 | The XMLRG and the ICD of SSN V.2 will be modified to reflect the agreed changes (new alerts). | III.6.c | Future action |
| 10 | The list of banned vessels and the list of single hull tankers will be introduced in the SSN core. The changes will be implemented in SSN V1.9. | III.8.a | On track SSN 6/3/4 |
| 11 | Update the XMLRG, integrating minor corrections implemented in SSN V 1.821. | IV.1.a | Completed |
| 12 | Address the proposal on "HAZMAT request" for discussion in a policy meeting under Commission responsibility. | IV.3 | Completed, dealt with under COSS |
| 13 | Address the proposal on the "enrichment of the SSN XML interface" for discussion in a policy meeting under Commission responsibility. | IV.4 | Ongoing |
| 14 | Revise the documentation and modify the implementation of SSN core according to the agreed proposals (SSN 5/4/4 on IMO number unique for a vessel). | IV.5.a & b | Pending |
| 15 | Revise the documentation (as defined in paragr. i. ii. v and vi) and address the proposal of paragr. iv. to the Commission. | IV.7.b | Dealt with under COSS |
| 16 | Conduct a feasibility study on the "alerts distribution". | IV.8.a | SSN 6/4/4, SSN 6.4.11 (PL) |
| 17 | Consult the Commission on the proposed changes. | IV.8.b | Completed |
| 18 | Submit a new Commissioning Test Plan document. | IV.9 | Modified but ongoing for SSN 7 |
| 19 | The "acknowledgment of receipt" proposal will be implemented in the SSN version 1.8. | IV.10.a | SSN 6/4/5 |
| 20 | The agreed "issue tracking procedure" will be implemented. | VI.2 | See EMSA website |
| 21 | The development of a common EU front end application connected to all of the SSN | VII.2.b | Pending – agreed but for future action |

| S/N | Topic and Action | Section | Action carried out |
|-----|---|---------|--|
| | national applications will be analysed further. | | |
| 22 | The possibility of setting up an EU destination should be further analysed. | VII.2.c | Pending – agreed but for future action |
| 23 | Provide input to MARSEC Committee on the “security message”. | VIII.4 | Completed with a positive response |

III. ACTION ITEMS FOR THE EMSA AND THE ISWG SSN W5

| S/N | Topic and Action | Section | Action carried out |
|-----|--|---------|------------------------------|
| 1 | The requirements of paragr. 5.2.2.1 “ship notifications” will be reviewed. | III.1.b | Ongoing – impact in STIRES |
| 2 | The detailed part of the AIS notification message will be further analysed. | IV.2.b | SSN 6/4/3 |
| 3 | Further study of the outlined issues of SSN 5/4/5 (admittance of JSP files). | IV.6 | Completed SSN 6/4/2 |
| 4 | Redefine the functional requirements for the access right within the SSN Network and Security reference guide. | IV.7.a | SSN 6/4/1 and 6/4/10 (Fr) |
| 5 | The policy of the message exchange flow will be reviewed in the frame work of the next version of SSN (V.2). | IV.10.b | SSN 6/4/5 |

II. INPUT FROM THE COMMISSION

II.1 Introduction

Mr. Urban Hallberg representing the Commission summarised current issues of significance to SSN and to the Directive 2002/59/EC. Mr. Patrik Vankerckhoven represented the Commission on maritime security issues.

On short term policy (2006/2007), Port State Control needed to be supported by information systems, hence the reference to the broader concept of a Maritime Information System. On mid-term policy, there was recognition of the need to increased cooperation between the different authorities for surveillance at national level. There was increased interest by 3rd countries to cooperate and exchange data with SSN, particularly in the Mediterranean under the SAFEMED project, e.g. Morocco (awaits the political process), Russia (currently limited through Norway), the Ukraine and Japan.

On the COSS, it can be expected that there would be a “new way of doing business”, with the preparation of decisions to be taken by COSS which will take an increased role in the future development of the SSN system, (this was later expanded to include also MARSEC for security matters).

Amendments to Directive 2002/59/EC were currently being discussed in the Parliament. It would be at least 18 months before the amendments were in place, to enter into force by 2009, unless otherwise decided due to the pressure of a new accident. As a summary of the amendments, these would include:

- AIS carriage to be extended to fishing vessels;
- ISPS notification to be included;
- LRIT extended to domestic voyages; and
- A new legal basis for SSN

The SSN Group were not to work on the ICD any further until the Commission had reviewed the document for "legal concerns".

III. USERS REQUIREMENTS ISSUES

III.1 SSN 6/3/1 - Interface Control Document (France)

EMSA reminded the group that in accordance with the actions from SSN 5 and recalling the need to formally agree a version of the ICD for MS, comments on the draft ICD had been received from France, the Netherlands and Portugal. These had been incorporated wherever possible, with some small changes to the text proposed and some further additional editorial changes submitted by EMSA.

The paper SSN 6/3/1 was introduced by France during which the importance of security of the data was emphasised with the need to have a document in which it is "clearly documented who has access to what and the benefits". However, ESPO supported by the Netherlands reminded the group of the need to consider other SSN users, otherwise there could be a system in which "the administrations have everything but others nothing". Other MS believed that these problems could be avoided through the use of the national applications (defined by the NCA) and SSN. France explained that their intention was not to "close the door", but as they had stated before in MARSEC, to have a confident way of defining the users.

There was in general a positive response to all of the principles put forward by France in the paper. Any changes that these proposals would produce would need to be discussed again, in the context of the form of ICD document that would be agreed by the Commission.

In particular the group agreed on the following:

- a. Paragraph 2.1 - "Implementation of restricted access to data"
A definition of data requester has to be agreed. As a matter of principle Administrations such as SAR or PSC should have access to all information. Limitation to access rights should be granted for ports however within the port there are different Authorities having various roles and therefore they deserve different access rights; it would be necessary to define the levels of the specific users at port level.
- b. Paragraph 2.2 - "Notification requirements"
Further improvements are required for the final definition of the requirements. These issues will be further elaborated in the framework of the STIRES study.
- c. Paragraph 3.1 "Management of failure within communications"
The retry period and the subsequent procedures have to be defined. MS are requested to express their views on the possible options.
- d. Paragraph 3.2 "Commissioning tests"
The whole "commissioning tests" procedure has to be reviewed. EMSA is working on this issue and will present its views at SSN 7.
- e. Paragraph 3.3 "Documents downloading"
The proposal should be dealt with the access rights issue.
- f. Paragraph 3.4 "Duration of the archives"
The minimum storage period has to be defined. MS are requested to express their suggestions at SSN 7.

III.2 SSN 6/3/2 - XMLRG change tracking

EMSA presented the document, explaining that the changes had been discussed and agreed at previous SSN workshops and were not introducing new functionalities. The objective is to resolve some inconsistencies problems and to introduce minor changes.

The Commission considered them only minor changes and invited MS to consider that as SSN was their system, if the proposals were refused, they would have to live with the consequences of these problems.

Norway considered this an opportunity and called for MS to remember to take care if a need had been established and to keep a trace of SSN proceedings.

The group agreed EMSA to present the paper again at SSN 7 in a traceable format clearly indicating the changes and the relevant decisions taken during the previous SSN workshops and with additional changes regarding the LOCODEs (see SSN Workshop 5).

III.3 SSN 6/3/3 – SSN Security

Some MS believed that the issue is chiefly technical matter and requested the paper to be discussed to the "Operational and Technical Sub-Group". The Chairman agreed to refer the paper for further discussion on the agenda of the Operational and Technical Sub-Group.

On presentation of document 6/3/3 to the Operational and Technical Group, they were reminded that the paper proposes to reinforce the security of the SSN application by the use of the 2-way SSL certificate for incoming and outgoing messages.

The Commission recalled that the secure transmission of data is a prerequisite requirement for supporting the exchange of certain message and that the MARSEC committee encourage all action leading to improve the security of communication.

Greece noted that the implementation of the 2 way SSL in a Proxy Server (or a Reverse Proxy Server) instead of the actual SSN Server has the following effects:

- a. Does not guarantee secure communication in the portion of the network between the Proxy Server and the actual SSN Server (either to the E.I.S. or M.S. side);
- b. Since the digital certificate will be installed in the Proxy Server, in case of use of electronic signature in the messages exchanged through SSN it would be necessary to install an additional digital certificate in the actual SSN Server.

The Netherlands indicated the delivery of the digital certificate is a long process (10 months in this case) and noted a non-proportionality in the recommended solution, with the possibility for requesting details by phone or fax. EMSA provided technical explanations and recalled that the download of details by phone and fax is a temporary solution not applicable to all functionalities.

Provided the reserve notified by Greece regarding the compatibility of the 2 way SSL with the use of the electronic signature, the group supported the proposal for improving the security of SSN application.

The group agreed that:

- a. EMSA will implement in SSN V1.9 the proposal based on the requirements detailed in the presented document.
- b. Greece will submit a contribution to the next workshop on the use of the Electronic signature.

III.4 SSN 6/3/4 - EMSA alerts on "banned" and "single hull" vessels

The paper was presented by EMSA. France questioned how EMSA updated and managed the lists. EMSA responded that the list of banned ships was with the Paris MOU, with EMSA being a designated user. It was admitted that there were problems with the single hull tanker list and requested the assistance of the MS. France agreed to assist in revising the tanker list.

The group agreed with the proposals and resulted in three conclusions:

- a. MS can use the EMSA list supplied to detect single hull tankers and comments are invited on this list.
- b. MS users may access the SSN management console to download the latest available single hull tanker list.
- c. Those authorities with information on tankers that should be added to the list are invited to come forward with this information.

After the workshop, Greece requested EMSA to include in the report the following comment:

"Considering that SafeSeaNet has been foreseen in the Directive 2002/59 and is defining in the amending proposal of the Directive, any new functionality of the project should be escorted by the necessary legislative framework. In this respect the new functionalities related to Single Hull and banned vessels are causing further expansion of the application domain of the Directive 2002/59. In this context, it's not considered necessary to prejudice the outcome of the deliberations within the Council and the European Parliament. Therefore we consider the current discussion as premature, until M-Ss have agreed on a concrete outcome of the ongoing Council deliberations.

Irrespective of the above, we don't oppose to an exchange of views regarding the issue or any inclusion of the new functionalities to the training interface."

III.5 SSN 6/3/5 - Procedure to obtain a digital certificate

EMSA presented the steps that the Member States should follow to obtain or to update their digital certificates through the DG ENTR/IDABC services. Furthermore EMSA suggested an alternative solution to the current method of issuing the certificates foreseeing the possibility for each MS to obtain their certificates directly from the relevant national issuer of their own choice.

This proposal was adopted by the Group.

III.6 SSN 6/3/6 - Locodes Management

The proposal from the UK and Norway was introduced by EMSA.

There was discussion of current examples in the MS used in addition to the five letter code recognised by the UN ECE and for the sake of harmony; MarNIS and the Netherlands undertook to make available similar codes currently applied in river transport.

The proposals in the paper were discussed in detail. A new optional field would be developed within SSN with five (5) characters in the Roman alphabet. It was understood that those MS that as in the proposal, currently use three characters would as an immediate solution, be able to use two letter "O"s (Oscar) preceding these, to complete the five that would be required.

Some MS referred to the existing detailed facility number system adopted by IMO for the implementation of the ISPS code. Since the SSN group launched the discussion on implementing ISPS messages in to SSN, it is worth considering if the Locodes and the facility numbers can be the same by incorporating the IMO facility number system with some amendments (if necessary). It would be strange for SSN if users have to report using two different Locodes.

It was the view of ESPO that the case should be brought to the attention of the IMO, bearing in mind that the problem extended to its inclusion in AIS messages as another data source.

The group agreed that the discussion on the Locodes will continue trying to find an appropriate harmonised solution.

III.7 SSN 6/3/7 - TESTA connection for SSN (DG Enterprise)

A valuable insight into the structure and status of the Testa network was provided. The Group was requested to note the current development of the Testa network (Testa 2), including the planned future migration to S-Testa.

In the opinion of the Commission, that the decision of the MS whether to use Testa has to be carefully taken considering their actual needs.

The group noted the information.

III.8 SSN 6/3/8 - SafeSeaNet "Data quality"

The document was presented by EMSA and was well received by the participants. A representative of MarNIS asked the participants to note that they were also looking into the system architecture and data quality.

The group considered the data quality issue as of major importance which is an on going and long term task. The data quality checks will be part of the data quality plan.

The group agreed with the EMSA proposals for setting up a Technical Working Group (TWG) on "Data quality" with mission to develop and submit at SSN 7 a "Data Quality Guideline" based on the terms of reference Annex to the document SSN 6/3/8. The TWG will be constituted by volunteer participants and EMSA. The TWG suggestions will be presented at the ISWG and thereafter at SSN 7.

III.9 Other Issues

III.9.1 Third Country Participation in SSN

The chairman referred briefly to the discussions of the COSS Working Group (Brussels 27 and 28 September 06) and the exchange of the views on maritime safety and security cooperation initiatives with non EU States. He reminded that special attention has to be given to a number of important legal aspects and invited the participants for a first discussion and exchange of views. The Commission reminded participants of the view from COSS that MS should "endeavour" to cooperate with 3rd countries.

Particular interest was expressed for the potential value with for an exchange of information with Egypt and the Suez Canal.

The views expressed at the meeting could be summarised as :

- Similar rules to the LRIT distribution could be applied
- Different rules may be applied for different States
- The cooperation has to be beneficial for both MS and the Third Countries
- Third countries should be given limited access rights to information on ships of their own flag and on those bound for their ports.

III.9.2 WETREP

The chairman invited the participants on a brief discussion on the WETREP message and the possibility of including it into SSN. Under Portuguese chairmanship the WETREP Technical Experts Group had a first discussion on the issue and invited the WETREP Coordination Committee to promote SSN towards accommodating the WETREP message into SSN.

A WETREP Coordination Committee meeting would take place on 7th December and the agenda includes the cooperation with EMSA. France who has the chairmanship would report on behalf of the participating MS the decision of the Coordination Committee.

IV. OPERATIONAL & TECHNICAL ISSUES

IV.1 SSN 6/4/1 - Users' Access Rights (EMSA)

EMSA presented the document that propose the implementation of a new "role matrix" taking into account the recommendation provided by the participants at the ISWG 3. The major change relies on two separate matrixes distinguishing the functionalities and information type from the area access.

The participants exchanged their view regarding the role of the NCA, the identification of the users, the need for validating the access rights through the committee and other considerations. The Netherlands representative recalled the access right must satisfy the following basic requirement: who needs to know.

The Commission recalled that an *ad hoc* committee have to validate the access rights defined in SSN in line with the security message and the Pre-notification arrival form.

An ad hoc group (Gr, Fr, Ir and EMSA) was set up in order to summarise the remarks and find a compromise agreement. Based on the conclusion of the ad hoc group, the group

reached a compromise and agreed for validating the EMSA proposal as a first step provided further study leading to the introduction of additional criteria (e.g. factor of flag) will be conducted.

The group agreed that:

- a. EMSA should engage the process for the revision of the present "access rights" based on the requirements contained in documents 6/4/1 and 6/4/10. The impact for Member State interfaces shall be evaluated and communicated to the users. The correction shall be implemented as soon as possible. The results will be first discussed at the ISWG and then at SSN 7.
- b. Greece and other volunteer MS would provide a contribution justifying the need for the additional criteria (expected to be submitted at SSN 7).

IV.2 SSN 6/4/2 - JSP Files

EMSA presented the document SSN 6/4/2 that suggest maintaining the current way for downloading the Hazmat details. The proposal is in accordance with the conclusion of the ISWG 3.

The group agreed for maintaining the current method for downloading the Hazmat details. There will be no follow up action.

IV.3 SSN 6/4/3 - AIS notification message

EMSA presented the document that proposes to correct the ShipNot and ShipRes messages in order to simplify and harmonize the fields with the existing standards. During the discussion, the participants requested two additional corrections (DimRefForPosition occurrence and the insertion of Hazardous cargo type description).

The group agreed on the conclusion of the document. A revised version of document is delivered and becomes 6/4/3 rev. 1 including the requested corrections. EMSA is requested to implement the correction in SSN V1.9.

IV.4 SSN 6/4/4 - Alert Distribution

EMSA presented the document that was prepared with the support of the MARNIS project. The objective was to propose a technical solution to support the requirement in Directive 2002/59 art. 16 para. 2 & 3. The proposal integrates comments provided by the participants of the ISWG 3.

The participants provided the following comments:

- Need for using the existing ShipNot in place of creating a new message,
- Define the appropriate Format of the alert message (Xml or other, e-mail)
- Time schedule for implementation,
- Need for getting the route plan details
- Need for implementing additional intelligence into the system
- Need for defining the appropriate procedure for distributing the alert,

The group agreed that:

- a. EMSA should conduct a feasibility study, taking into account the comments the principles of the proposals. EMSA will prepare a project plan for developing the "Alerts distribution" within SSN and report to the next ISWG on the progress.
- b. MS are invited to provide their contribution to the next ISWG based on the comments during the discussions.
- c. Further cooperation with MarNIS Consortium is necessary.

IV.5 SSN 6/4/5 - Acknowledgment of Receipt

EMSA presented the document that proposes an acknowledgement of receipt of all Request and Response messages and to indicate whether the notification has been successfully validated and processed or not.

Participants noted the absence of definition for the "Invalid "message and requested to specify the definition into the SSN literature. IR and others agreed on the proposal and requested a date for implementation.

The group agreed for implementing the correction as specified into document 6/4/5. The correction is planned to be implemented on a future release of SSN V1.9 (after mid-2007).

IV.6 SSN 6/4/6 - SSN Version 1.9

The document was an information paper presented by EMSA in order to inform MS on the progress of the SSN V1.9. EMSA informed that the SSN V1.9 is expected to be available by March 2007.

The objective of that new version is to reach the Full Operational Capability level that will be confirmed after a phase of validation (initially fixed at 3 months). The group noted the information.

IV.7 SSN 6/4/7 - Message Flow simplification

EMSA presented the document that aims to propose a new functionality by processing the ShipNot request in a similar manner to the PortReq.

Though that proposal enlarges the scope of functionalities of SSN without any consequences for the MS interfaces, the group noted an incompatibility in the proposal with the current behaviour of the system. According to the Xml MRG, the ShipRes provides the last Ship notification details, i.e. for a ship the last position available into the MS server at the time of the ShipReq. The group agreed for maintaining the current system requirement.

Germany requested a study for merging the ShipNot generated by AIS with the ShipNot generated by MRS in one single message.

The group did not support the proposal for modifying the ShipReq message. Due to the technical impact on the existing interfaces and the design of the SSN core the re-design of the messages will be studied in the framework of SSN V2. There will be no follow up action.

IV.8 SSN 6/4/8 - Commissioning report

The document was not presented due to shortage of time. The document objective was to inform the SSN community on the progress made by MS for entering in operational production with SSN and to report on the level of compliance of each interface developed by the MS.

The participants were asked to read the document and to send to EMSA any comments on the commissioning of Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy and Lithuania.

IV.9 SSN 6/4/9 - Commissioning report for France

France presented document 6/4/9 reporting on the commissioning carried out on 24th October 2006.

It was noted that a list of minor difficulties necessitated particular attention. Taking care of the opportunity of the presence of the French representative involved in the management of Traffic 2000, a splinter group was set up with EMSA Ops and IT in order to review the pending issues and propose an action plan.

The Commissioning process concluded that France is compliant with the SSN specification and may enter in production. The pending technical issues will be resolved in the framework of the next release of SSN V1.8.

EMSA is to prepare the Welcome on Board document. The IT pillar ensures the follow up of the requested corrections (Re: Commissioning report).

IV.10 SSN 6/4/10 - Access Rights and visibility area (FR)

FRANCE presented the document summarising the method followed by France for implementing the access rights in their national system Traffic 2000.

The participants noted that the solution implemented by France is in line with the proposal submitted in document 6/4/1. Greece and other supported the proposal described by France.

The views of the "Users requirements group" were that the NCA will manage the access rights at national level. Procedures have to be set up in order MS to apply the "access rights" in a harmonised way.

The group agreed that when EMSA implementing the correction as required in document 6/4/1, the following proposals shall be taken into account:

- Each NCA should notify their participant's profile (access rights and visibility area) in SSN
- At SSN level, the participant's profile is integrated and managed
- A log book of all requests and answers may be created
- A directory of all SSN participants may be available through SSN platform

IV.10 SSN 6/4/11 – Alerts distribution (PL)

The paper was introduced by Poland and discussed at "User's requirements" sub-group. This document provided some views regarding the alerts messages distribution in SSN and proactive use of information by SSN operational users.

The groups agreed that:

- a. The spitting of the existing and future operational messages to "alerts" and "warnings" is a valid proposal. This is in line with the proposal of the STIRES study where reference as made to the alert and warning messages. Further follow up will be considered in the framework of the STIRES study.
- b. The limitations listed in paragraph 3 of the document should be taken into account in the further elaboration of the "alerts distribution" issue.

V. STATUS AT NATIONAL LEVEL

V.1 SSN 6/5/1 - MS Current Situation

The paper was presented by EMSA and noted by the participants. Each of the MS present (in the User's Group) gave an oral update report of their national status within SSN.

ESPO supported by some MS, questioned some aspects of the EMSA GIS developed from Questionnaires on national VTM infrastructures:

- How would it be kept up to date?
- Was the data intended to replace data held by the IHO?
- What would be the access rights to the information?
- Why does EMSA require such information?
- Had EMSA studied the security implications and could security be guaranteed?

In response it was made clear that the information gathered was a mixture of information already freely available plus information that was solely for the internal use of EMSA.

The Commission explained that in accordance with EU procedure, documents are classified at three main levels, to be decided by the initiator. It was therefore up to the MS to classify the documents. The classification is automatically transferred, but if not classified, strong arguments would be needed to prevent the public gaining access.

Some MS announced that they had only one NCA as a single point of contact, and was therefore not necessary to designate LCAs for the purposes of SSN. It was clarified that this position applied only to national systems using the XML interface. EMSA declared that it was a good principle to collect all of the data at national level and a good technical solution.

Germany, Norway, Sweden, Ireland, Poland and the Netherlands supported the idea of using only the XML Interface for data providing and requesting and to eliminate the possibility of the Web interface in a short term period that will be defined. Also they invited the COM to bring this issue at the next COSS meeting for further discussion and approval.

MS to note as a good principle for technical solutions at national level, for information to be collected or requested centrally through the NCA/SPOC, consequently without needing to separately identify the LCAs.

The groups agreed that:

- a. EMSA will request to the European Commission that the issue of the discontinuation of the Web Interface be raised at the next available COSS or COSS WG meeting.
- b. In the context of the security of information supplied to EMSA in response to the questionnaires, MS should (in accordance with Commission procedures) clarify the security status of the information and specifically, which elements cannot be made available to the public.

V.2 SSN 6/5/2 - Trafic 2000 System

France provided a formal presentation.

Due to contractual issues, France was unable to provide a presentation on INGRID as previously announced.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

VI.1 System management

Was noted by the participants.

VII. SYSTEM ASSESSMENT AND EVOLUTION

VII.1 System Assessment

The Commission invited participants to note that progress on LRIT was subject to issues being discussed by the Commission, COSS and at MSC.

The Netherlands received clarification from the Commission that the multi-point of access national solution was "so far" still an acceptable one.

VII.2 SSN 6/7/2 – Single window

A presentation was made by Mr Alexander de Lijster (a representative of the MarNIS project) and was very well received by the participants.

Comparisons were made between the e-navigation concepts of MarNIS and e-maritime of MarNIS. It was stated that e-maritime had a wider scope, e.g border police and customs. MarNIS would publish and would take part in the IMO and IALA correspondence group.

The group agreed that due to the importance of the single window concept for the proper implementation of SSN, the issue should be kept in the future agenda of the SSN group.

VII.3 SSN 6/7/3 - LRIT

The UK wished it to be made clear that the decision of the MARSEC Committee was to agree that EMSA only carry out an investigation into the use of the LRIT system. Concerns had been raised regarding the engineering solution.

The Commission regarded the creation of a European LRIT data centre for reasons of economy.

VIII. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

VIII.1 SSN 6/8/1 - MSSU

The paper co-sponsored by Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands, was presented by the Netherlands, recognising the importance of the issue to be presented to the EMSA Executive Board on 24/11/06.

Co-sponsors of the paper were unable to discuss matters relating to activities outside of SSN and it was therefore concluded by the Group that it was not the proper forum for this type of discussion.

VIII.2 Metadata on ship movements in European ports and terminals

EMSA Unit D gave a short presentation for a study on "metadata on ship movements in European ports and terminals" that will launch soon. Since the study is related with the SSN data collection at port level, MS were invited to cooperate with the contractor and to facilitate the visits to their ports. More information about the study could be found at: <http://www.emsa.europa.eu/end805d009.html>

VIII.3 Future meetings

Tentative dates were set for future meetings in 2007 including:

- SSN W7 15th/16th May
- SSN W8 24th/25th October
- SSN Training 28th March (*)
- Intersessional Working Groups, normally 1½ months before SSN Workshops.

Ireland proposed to reduce the interval and the number of agenda items dealt with in the workshops. The group agreed this was to be both crucial and beneficial to the SSN project due to the number of unresolved items and the impending deadline.

(*) SSN Training will possible be shift to the 29th of March

Workshop Conclusions / Follow-up Actions

The workshop conclusions and the follow-up actions are indicated in the attached Annex IV.

Annexes

Annex I - List of participants
Annex II - List of documents
Annex III - Workshop Agenda
Annex IV – Action items from SSN 6

ANNEX I

SSN Workshop 6
22 & 23 November 2006
List of Participants



| ID# | Country | NAME | First Name | Organization | E-mail address | 22/11/06 AM | 22/11/06 PM | 23/11/06 AM | 23/11/06 PM |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Belgium | MAEKELBERG | Yves | Flemish Maritime Administration | yves.maekelberg@mow.vlaanderen.be | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 2 | Czech Republic | VYDRA | Evzen | Ministry of Transport | evzen.vydra@mndcr.cz | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 3 | Denmark | AHL | Martin | Admiral Danish Fleet HQ | martinahl@mil.dk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 4 | Denmark | BALDORF | Erling | Naval Material Command | smk.e210@mil.dk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 5 | Denmark | GÖTTSCHE | Anders | Systematic Software Engineering | ang@systematic.dk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 6 | Denmark | KHAYAT | Habib | Royal Danish Administration of Navigation and Hydrography | hak@rhy.dk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 7 | Denmark | GLENN JENSEN | Carsten | Danish Maritime Authority | CGJ@dma.dk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 8 | Estonia | SIHT | Alar | Estonian Maritime Administration | alar.siht@vta.ee | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 9 | Finland | ARKIMA | Antti | Finish Maritime Administration | antti.arkima@fma.fi | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 10 | France | LE MOAN | Yann | | Yann.Le-Moan@equipement.gouv.fr | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 11 | France | ERHARDT | Jean-Bernard | Maritime Safety Division | jean-bernard.erhardt@equipement.gouv.fr | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 12 | Germany | NEUHAUS | Ralph | Federal Waterways Engineering and Reserach Institut | ralph.neuhaus@baw.de | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 13 | Germany | CALLSEN-BRACKER | Hans-Heinrich | Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs | Hans-Callsen@bmvbw.bund.de | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 14 | Greece | FATMELIS | Konstantinos | Hellenic Ministry of Mercantile Marine | gus@ymn.gr | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 15 | Ireland | HOULIHAN | Greg | Marine Sourvay Office | greg.houlihan@transport.ie | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 16 | Ireland | FENSOM | Stephen | Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources | stephen.fensom@dcmnr.gov.ie | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 17 | Italy | AULICINO | Giuseppe | Italian Coast Guard | aulicino.g@navmil.trasportinavigazione.it | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 18 | Latvia | BIOCKOVS | Deniss | Latvian Coast Guard Service | dj-denick@one.lv | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 19 | Latvia | VIRBICKIS | Vitauts | Latvian Coast Guard Service | vitaut@mrcr.lv | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 20 | Lithuania | DAUNIENE | Eugenija | Lithuanian Maritime Safety Administration | eugenija.davuniene@msa.lt | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 21 | Malta | BUGEJA | David | Malta Maritime Authority | david.bugeja@mma.gov.mt | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 22 | Netherlands | KOERT | Cor | Rotterdam Port Authoritie | C.Koert@portofrotterdam.com | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 23 | Netherlands | FOEKEN | Johan Godfried | North Sea Directorate | J.G.Foeken@dnz.nws.minvenw.nl | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 24 | Netherlands | Á CAMPO | André | | aim@acampo.nl | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 25 | Poland | ROJEK | Bogdan | Maritime Office Gdynia | dim@umgdv.gov.pl | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 26 | Poland | KURPIŃSKI | Konrad | Maritime Office Gdynia | irm@umgdv.gov.pl | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 27 | Portugal | CRUZ | José | IPTM - Instituto Portuário e dos Transportes Marítimos | jose.cruz@imarpor.pt | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 28 | Portugal | BISPO | Paulo | IPTM - Instituto Portuário e dos Transportes Marítimos | paulo.bispo@imarpor.pt | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 29 | Portugal | BAPTISTA | José | IPTM - Instituto Portuário e dos Transportes Marítimos | jose.baptista@imarpor.pt | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 30 | Spain | RUIZ DE LOBERA | Alfonso | SASEMAR - Spanish Maritime Safety Agency | interoper@sasemar.es | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 31 | Spain | MARTIN | Itziar | Directorato General for Merchant Marine | imartin@cmemto.es | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |



SSN Workshop 6
22 & 23 November 2006
List of Participants

| ID# | Country | NAME | First Name | Organization | E-mail address | 22/11/06 AM | 22/11/06 PM | 23/11/06 AM | 23/11/06 PM |
|-----|----------------|---------------|------------|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 32 | Sweden | RENZ | Mikael | Swedish Maritime Administration | Mikael.Renz@Sjofartsverket.se | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 33 | Sweden | DREIJER | Malin | Swedish Maritime Safety Inspectorate | malin.dreijer@sjofartsverket.se | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 34 | United Kingdom | TOWNSEND | Paul | Maritime & Coastguard Agency | Paul.Townsend@mcqa.gov.uk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 35 | Bulgaria | IVANOV | Peter | Bulgarian Maritime Organization, EA | peter_iv@marad.bg | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 36 | Romania | PRICOP | Laurentiu | Romanian Naval Authority | lpricop@rna.ro | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 37 | Romania | GUSA | Emil | Romanian Naval Authority | ggusa@rna.ro | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 38 | Iceland | BJARTMARSSON | Baldur | Icelandic Maritime Administration | baldur@siqing.is | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 39 | Norway | ERVIK | Jon Leon | Norwegian Coastal Administration | Jon.leon.ervik@kystverket.no | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 40 | Norway | OLSEN | Kristine | Norwegian Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs | ko@fkd.dep.no | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 41 | | DECROP | Patrick | ESPO (Protect Message Management Group) | patrick.decrop@haven.antwerpen.be | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 42 | | GOLDMAN | Barry | ESPO (Port of London Authority) | barry.goldman@pola.co.uk | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 43 | Speaker | de LIJSTER | Alexander | MarNIS (Global Solutions) | lijster@tip.nl | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 44 | Speaker | WELLENS | Pieter | DG Enterprise and Industry (EC) | Pieter.WELLENS@ec.europa.eu | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 45 | | ARGYROPOULOS | Aggelos | EMSA (INTRASOFT) | aggelos.argyropoulos@intrasoft-intl.com | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 46 | EC | VANKERCKHOVEN | Patrick | DG TREN (EC) | | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 47 | GERMANY | Brunel | Werner | FUT | | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 48 | MARNS | GLANS DOER | COENE | MARNIS | | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 49 | MNCMS | KUTEM | LEA | MARNIS | | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 50 | Malta | Paul | Spiteri | Malta Maritime Authority | Paul.spiteri@mma.gov.mt | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| 51 | Estonia | Ehavel | Juri | Estonian Maritime Admin Administration | juri.ehavel@vka.ee | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> | <i>[Signature]</i> |

The Commission DGTREN and EMSA staff

| S/N | Name | First Name | E-mail |
|------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | HALLBERG | Urban | Urban.Hallberg@cec.eu.int |
| 2 | VANKERCKHOVEN | Patrick | Patrick.Vankerckhoven@ec.europa.eu |
| 3 | MARTIN BAUZA | Emilio | Emilio.MARTIN-BAUZA@emsa.eu.int |
| 4 | AICHMALOTIDIS | Lazaros | Lazaros.AICHMALOTIDIS @emsa.eu.int |
| 5 | TEXIER | Yannick | Yannick.TEXIER@emsa.eu.int |
| 6 | WILKINS | Paul | Paul.WILKINS@emsa.eu.int |
| 7 | WOJCIESZEK | Dariusz | Dariusz.WOJCIESZEK@emsa.eu.int |
| 8 | KJENNBAKKEN | Reidar | Reidar.KJENNBAKKEN@emsa.eu.int |
| 9 | NICOLAAS | KOK | Nicolaas.KOK@emsa.eu.int |
| 10 | RAMOS | Paulo | Paulo.RAMOS@emsa.eu.int |
| 11 | LIMA GALVAO | MARTA | Marta.LIMA-GALVAO@emsa.eu.int |

Annex II**LIST of SSN 6 documents**

- SSN 6.1.1 Draft agenda
- SSN 6.1.2 Detailed agenda
- SSN 6.1.3 Minutes of SSN 5
- SSN 6.1.4 Communication of the report of the ISWG 3

- SSN 6.3.1 Interface Control Document **(FR)**
- SSN 6.3.2 XMLRG change tracking **(YTE)**
- SSN 6.3.3 SSN Security **(PRA)**
- SSN 6.3.4 EMSA alerts on "banned" and "single hull" vessels **(DWE)**
- SSN 6.3.5 Procedure to obtain a digital certificate **(RKJ)**
- SSN 6.3.6 LOCODEs management **(UK+NO)**
- SSN 6.3.7 TESTA connection for SSN **(DG Enterprise)**
- SSN 6.3.8 SafeSeaNet "Data quality"

- SSN 6.4.1 Users access rights **(RKJ)**
- SSN 6.4.2 JSP files **(LAM)**
- SSN 6.4.3 AIS message **(DWE)**
- SSN 6.4.4 Alerts distribution **(RKJ)**
- SSN 6.4.5 Receipt acknowledgement **(PRA)**
- SSN 6.4.6 SSN version 1.9 **(NKO)**
- SSN 6.4.7 Message flow simplification **(MLI)**
- SSN 6.4.8 Commissioning tests report **(YTE)**
- SSN 6.4.9 Commissioning Test France **(FR)**
- SSN 6.4.10 Access Rights and Visibility Area **(FR)**
- SSN 6.4.11 Alerts distribution **(PL)**

- SSN 6.5.1 Status in M.S. **(DWE)**
- SSN 6.5.2 TRAFFIC 2000 **(FR)**

- SSN 6.6.1 Welcome on board document **(YTE)**

- SSN 6.7.1 SSN version 2.0 **(RKJ)**
- SSN 6.7.2 Single window and SafeSeaNet **(AVV/GS)**
- SSN 6.7.3 LRIT Long Range Identification and Tracking **(YTE)**

- SSN 6.8.1 Maritime Support Services Unit (MSSU) – Questions to SSN Group

Annex III

AGENDA OF THE SSN 6 WORKSHOP 22 & 23 NOVEMBER 2006 (9:30 – 17:30)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

II. INPUT FROM THE COMMISSION

SafeSeaNet policy, legislative initiatives and any other relevant issue

III. SAFESEANET USERS REQUIREMENTS

1. Interface Control Document (ICD)
2. Network and messaging
3. Security
4. Other

IV. OPERATIONAL & TECHNICAL ISSUES

1. Adaptive / corrective maintenance
2. System functionality
3. SSN new development
4. Commissioning test
5. Other

V. STATUS AT NATIONAL LEVEL

1. Member States' current situation

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

1. System management
2. Other

VII. SYSTEM ASSESSMENT AND EVOLUTION

1. System assessment
2. System evolution

VIII. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

DETAILED AGENDA**OF THE SSN WORKSHOP (22 & 23 NOVEMBER 2006)**

| Day 1 : Wednesday 22/11/2006 | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| 09:00 – 09:30 | Registration and coffee | | |
| 09:30 – 11:00 | Mornings session 1 (Plenary) Opening / Introduction (EMSA – EMB) SSN 6.1.1 Draft agenda (EMSA - LAI) SSN 6.1.2 Detailed agenda (EMSA - LAI) Input form the Commission (COM) SSN 6.1.3 Approval of the minutes (EMSA - LAI) SSN 6.1.4 Communication of the report of the ISWG 3 (EMSA - YTE) | | |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Coffee Break | | |
| 11:15 – 12:45 | Mornings session 2 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.1 (Interface Control Document) (FR) SSN 6.3.4 (EMSA alerts on “banne and “single hull” vessels) (EMSA–DWE) </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.1 (Users access rights) (EMSA–RKJ) SSN 6.4.10 (Access Rights and Visibility Area) (FR) SSN 6.4.2 (JSP files) (EMSA–LAM) </td> </tr> </table> | SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.1 (Interface Control Document) (FR) SSN 6.3.4 (EMSA alerts on “banne and “single hull” vessels) (EMSA–DWE) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.1 (Users access rights) (EMSA–RKJ) SSN 6.4.10 (Access Rights and Visibility Area) (FR) SSN 6.4.2 (JSP files) (EMSA–LAM) |
| SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.1 (Interface Control Document) (FR) SSN 6.3.4 (EMSA alerts on “banne and “single hull” vessels) (EMSA–DWE) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.1 (Users access rights) (EMSA–RKJ) SSN 6.4.10 (Access Rights and Visibility Area) (FR) SSN 6.4.2 (JSP files) (EMSA–LAM) | | |
| 12:45 – 14:15 | Lunch | | |
| 14:15 – 15:45 | Afternoon session 1 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.5 (Procedure to obtain a digital certificate) (EMSA-RKJ) SSN 6.3.6 (LOCODEs management) (ISWG-UK+NO) </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.3 (AIS message) (EMSA–DWE) SSN 6.4.7 (Message flow simplification) (EMSA–MLI) </td> </tr> </table> | SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.5 (Procedure to obtain a digital certificate) (EMSA-RKJ) SSN 6.3.6 (LOCODEs management) (ISWG-UK+NO) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.3 (AIS message) (EMSA–DWE) SSN 6.4.7 (Message flow simplification) (EMSA–MLI) |
| SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.5 (Procedure to obtain a digital certificate) (EMSA-RKJ) SSN 6.3.6 (LOCODEs management) (ISWG-UK+NO) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.3 (AIS message) (EMSA–DWE) SSN 6.4.7 (Message flow simplification) (EMSA–MLI) | | |
| 15:45 – 16:00 | Coffee Break | | |
| 16:00 – 17:30 | Afternoon session 2 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.2 (XMLRG change tracking) (EMSA-MLA) SSN 6.3.3 (SSN Security) (EMSA-PRA) SSN 6.3.8 SafeSeaNet “Data quality” (EMSA) </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.4 (Alerts distribution) (EMSA–RKJ) SSN 6.4.11 Alerts distribution (PL) SSN 6.4.6 (SSN version 1.9) (EMSA–NKO) </td> </tr> </table> | SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.2 (XMLRG change tracking) (EMSA-MLA) SSN 6.3.3 (SSN Security) (EMSA-PRA) SSN 6.3.8 SafeSeaNet “Data quality” (EMSA) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.4 (Alerts distribution) (EMSA–RKJ) SSN 6.4.11 Alerts distribution (PL) SSN 6.4.6 (SSN version 1.9) (EMSA–NKO) |
| SSN Users Requirements SSN 6.3.2 (XMLRG change tracking) (EMSA-MLA) SSN 6.3.3 (SSN Security) (EMSA-PRA) SSN 6.3.8 SafeSeaNet “Data quality” (EMSA) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.4 (Alerts distribution) (EMSA–RKJ) SSN 6.4.11 Alerts distribution (PL) SSN 6.4.6 (SSN version 1.9) (EMSA–NKO) | | |
| 17:30 | End of Day 1 | | |

| Day 2 : Thursday 23/11/2006 | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| 09:00 – 09:30 | Registration and coffee | | |
| 09:30 – 10:45 | Morning session 1 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Status at National Level SSN 6.5.1 (Status in MS) (EMSA–DWE) SSN 6.5.2 (TRAFFIC 2000) (FR) </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.5 (Receipt acknowledgement) (EMSA–PRA) SSN 6.4.8 (Commissioning tests report) (EMSA–YTE) SSN 6.4.9 (Commissioning Test France) (FR) </td> </tr> </table> | Status at National Level SSN 6.5.1 (Status in MS) (EMSA–DWE) SSN 6.5.2 (TRAFFIC 2000) (FR) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.5 (Receipt acknowledgement) (EMSA–PRA) SSN 6.4.8 (Commissioning tests report) (EMSA–YTE) SSN 6.4.9 (Commissioning Test France) (FR) |
| Status at National Level SSN 6.5.1 (Status in MS) (EMSA–DWE) SSN 6.5.2 (TRAFFIC 2000) (FR) | Operational & Technical SSN 6.4.5 (Receipt acknowledgement) (EMSA–PRA) SSN 6.4.8 (Commissioning tests report) (EMSA–YTE) SSN 6.4.9 (Commissioning Test France) (FR) | | |
| 10:45 – 11:00 | Coffee Break | | |
| 11:00 – 12:45 | Morning session 2 (Plenary) Conclusions of the working groups SSN 6.6.1 (Welcome on board document) (EMSA–YTE) SSN 6.7.1 (SSN version 2.0) (EMSA–RKJ) | | |
| 12:45 – 14:15 | Lunch | | |
| 14:15 – 15:45 | Afternoon session 1 (Plenary) SSN 6.7.2 (Single window and SafeSeaNet) (AVV/GS) SSN 6.7.3 (LRIT Long Range identification and Tracking) (EMSA–YTE) | | |
| 15:45 – 16:00 | Coffee Break | | |
| 16:00 – 17:00 | Afternoon session 2 (Plenary) SSN 6.3.7 (TESTA connection for SSN) (DG Enterprise) SSN 6.8.1 (Maritime Support Services Unit/MSSU – Questions to SSN Group) | | |
| 17:00 | End of Day 2 | | |

ANNEX IV**ACTION ITEMS FROM THE SSN 6 WORKSHOP****I. ACTION ITEMS FOR THE MEMBER STATES**

| S/N | Section | Topic and Action |
|------------|---------------------|--|
| 1 | III.1.c and III.1.f | The "retry period" and the subsequent procedures as well as the "duration of the archives" have to be defined. |
| 2 | III.3.b | Greece will submit a contribution to SSN 7 on the use of the Electronic signature. |
| 3 | III.4 | MS can use the EMSA list supplied to detect single hull tankers and comments are invited on this list. Users may access the SSN management console to download the latest available single hull tanker list. Those authorities with information on tankers that should be added to the list are invited to come forward with this information so they can be added to the list. [for SSN V1.9] |
| 4 | III.9.2 | France who has the chairmanship would report on behalf of the participating MS the decision of the Coordination Committee. |
| 5 | IV.1.b | Greece and other volunteer MS would provide a contribution justifying the need for the additional criteria. |
| 6 | IV.4.b | MS should provide their contribution on the "alerts distribution" issue to the next ISWG. |
| 7 | V.1.b | In the context of the security of information supplied to EMSA in response to the questionnaires, MS should (in accordance with Commission procedures) clarify the security status of the information and specifically, which elements cannot be made available to the public. |

II. ACTION ITEMS FOR THE EMSA

| S/N | Section | Topic and Action |
|------------|----------------|---|
| 1 | III.1.d | Submit a new Commissioning test plan document. |
| 2 | III.2 | Present the modified XMLRG in a traceable format clearly indicating the changes and the relevant decisions taken during the previous SSN workshops and with additional changes regarding the LOCODEs (see SSN 5). |
| 3 | III.8 | To produce a Data Quality Guidelines text in time for SSN W7. |
| 4 | III.3.a | Implement in SSN V1.9 the 2 way SSL. |

| S/N | Section | Topic and Action |
|-----|--|--|
| 5 | III.6 | The discussion on the Locodes will continue trying to find an appropriate harmonised solution. |
| 6 | III.8 | Coordinate the works of the Technical Working Group (TWG) on "Data quality" that will be set up with mission to develop and submit at SSN 7 a "Data Quality Guideline" based on the terms of reference Annex to the document SSN 6/3/8. The TWG will be constituted by volunteer participants and EMSA. The TWG suggestions will be presented at the ISWG and thereafter at SSN 7. |
| 7 | IV.1.a, IV.10, III.1.a, III.1.e | Engage the process for the revision of the present "access rights" based on the requirements contained in documents 6/4/1 and 6/4/10. The impact for MS interfaces shall be evaluated. The results will be first discussed at the ISWG and then at SSN 7. |
| 8 | IV.3 | Implement the correction for the "AIS notification message" in SSN V1.9. |
| 9 | IV.4.a, IV.4.c IV.10.b | Conduct a feasibility study on the "alerts distribution". , Prepare a project plan for developing the "Alerts distribution" within SSN and report to the next ISWG on the progress. Seek for further cooperation with MarNIS Consortium. |
| 10 | IV.5 | Implement the correction on the "acknowledgment of receipt". The correction should be implemented on a future release of SSN V1.9 (after mid-2007). |
| 11 | V.1.a | Request to the Commission to rise at the next COSS or COSS WG meeting, the issue of the discontinuation of the Web Interface. |
| 12 | VII.2 | Keep the single window concept in the future agenda of the SSN group. |