

Meeting: 1st SSN / LRIT Group Meeting

Place and date: Lisbon, 17 May 2017

Agenda item: List of errors and warnings in SSN receipt messages

Document number: SSN/LRIT 1.4.3

Submitted by EMSA

Summary	This document proposes a revision of the list of errors and warnings generated by central SSN and inclusion of the revised list in the XML RG.
Action to be taken	As per paragraph 4.
Related documents	n.a.

1. Background

In November 2006 (SSN WS 6), the SSN Group decided to set up a working group (WG) on “data quality.” Sometime later, the EMSA Maritime Support Services (MSS) was set up (June 2007) and, among other things, was given a specific task related to data quality.

The WG outcome was presented at SSN WS9 (May 2008), at which time Member States (MSs) agreed that, in order to maintain appropriate data quality and consistency, information exchanged within SSN should comply with the structure, format and specific business rules developed by the group. The business rules (BRs) were implemented, following which invalid messages (i.e. those not compliant with the standards set in the SSN technical and operational documentation) began to be rejected by the central SSN system.

2. Current Status

The MSS provides 24/7 monitoring of notification requirements and network coordination, as well as support to MSs in the monitoring of the national SSN systems in terms of the availability and data quality of the information exchanged (i.e. the availability of notifications, rejected messages, etc.). With respect to rejected messages, the MSS carries out regular checks and provides detailed figures to MSs on a monthly basis. In addition, EMSA drafts SSN status reports that are sent to each MS on an annual basis, and these highlight, among other things, the rejected notifications that are summarised in the SSN data quality reports that are presented during SSN Group and HLSC meetings.

MSs are invited to rectify reported quality problems in order to eliminate rejected messages, in particular by implementing the business rules relating to data consistency in national SSN systems.

As a result of this regular system evaluation, MSs began to correct the systematic errors in compliance with the IFCD, which requires that invalid messages should be less than 0.1% of the total number of messages sent.

Following these actions, the overall percentage of rejected PortPlus notifications messages is now between 0.6% and 1.2%, although this normally increases when a new version of SSN is implemented (NB the detailed figures can be found in the SSN and LRIT Data Quality Report - SSN / LRIT 1.5.1).

It should be noted that SSN is used more and more to support other messages and applications (e.g. Thetis), and that the number of BRs will continue to increase whenever further messages and applications are linked to SSN. Also, it is of note that the rejection messages provided by central SSN are outdated (i.e. they were developed many years ago), and that they are, in many cases, unclear or even misleading.

3. Proposals

In order to better support MSs in analysing the rejected notifications, and to decrease the number of rejections, the following actions are proposed:

- a. Revision of the text provided in SSN_Receipt in order to better describe the reason for a rejection, or the provision of warnings in order to make it more understandable.
- b. Grouping of the list of rejections as follows (depending on the reason for rejection):
 - Group 1: "Time" not respected (comparing the timeliness between ETAs and ETDs, etc.).
 - Group 2: Missing "mandatory" information (element or attribute).
 - Group 3: Invalid values or references (IMO, MMSIs, LOCODES, ShipCallIds, etc.).
- c. Assigning a rule number to each reason for rejection (e.g. **R11** "A Port Plus notification must have ETAToNextPort subsequent to the ETDFromPortOfCall" or "ETAToNextPort greater than ETDFromPortOfCall", **R31** "The IMO number is not valid"). The first number after the letter "R" should correspond to the group (i.e. R11 is the rejection from Group 1; R21 is the rejection from Group 2).
- d. For those rejections where the text provided in SSN_Receipt may not be clear (e.g. R 37 "MID [MID] does not identify any flag that is in the ITU list of MIDs), additional text should be provided in the XML RG (e.g. Maritime Identification Digits (MID) are the first three digits of the MMSI number. The list of the valid MID numbers can be found at: <http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/terrestrial/fmd/Pages/mid.aspx>).
- e. Inclusion in the XML RG of the list of possible rejections, together with the rule number and additional details as proposed above. Whenever a new business rule is implemented, this table should be updated.

It should be noted that the proposed changes would require a minor amendment to messages implemented at central level, but would have no impact on MSs.

4. Actions required

Member States are invited to review and approve the proposal.