

Meeting: 2nd SSN / LRIT Group Meeting

Place and date: Lisbon, 18 October 2018

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

Document number: SSN/LRIT 2.4.3

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	SSN 9.4.1 Revision of the warning status codes

1. Background

In order to maintain appropriate data quality and consistency, information exchanged within SSN should comply with the structure, format and specific business rules (BRs) agreed by the Member States. In accordance with these BRs, invalid messages are rejected by the central SSN system (i.e. those not compliant with the standards set in the SSN technical and operational documentation).

2. Current Status

The EMSA 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 sends formal status reports to individual MSs once per year highlighting rejected notifications, among other things, and inviting MSs 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).

The joint EMSA/MS efforts produce significant results in terms of data quality by correcting 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 0.5% and 1.2%, although this number 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 2.5.1).

The types of rejection messages supported by SSN require continuous updating and revision because SSN is evolving to support other messages and applications (e.g. Thetis), and because the number of BRs will

continue to increase whenever further messages and applications are linked to SSN. Furthermore, the rejection messages currently supported by the central SSN system are outdated because they were developed many years ago, and in many cases, they are 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. Revise 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. Group 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. Assign 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. Include the list of possible rejections in the XML RG, together with the rule number and additional details as proposed above. Whenever a new business rule is implemented, this table should be updated.

Furthermore, it is proposed that the "warning" status codes employed in the receipt sent back when accepting a message conformant with the XML schema (but containing attributes that failed referential validation) should be revised.

The proposed changes require minor amendments to messages implemented at central level, and will have no impact on MSs.

4. Actions required

Member States are invited to review and approve the proposal.