

SSN Workshop 14
Lisbon 20-21 October 2010

**DATA QUALITY IN
SSN**

DATA QUALITY CHECKS

The following topics have been reported:

1. Missing Port & Hazmat notifications,
2. Rejected Port & Hazmat notifications,
3. Missing Mandatory Reporting Systems (MRS) notifications,
4. Missing AIS data,
5. Incident Report notifications sent to SSN,
6. Survey on the Phone&Fax solution,
7. Port notifications sent late (SentAt > ETA).

MISSING NOTIFICATIONS

PORT

Member State	Current Period (Jan 2010 - Jun 2010)			Previous Period (Jun 2009 - Aug 2009)
	Nr. Checks	Missing Notifications	Missing Notifications (%)	Missing Notifications (%)
Belgium	154	3	2%	0%
Bulgaria	153	13	8%	0%
Cyprus	169	1	1%	40%
Denmark	170	7	4%	0%
Estonia	*	*	*	*
Finland	170	7	4%	28%
France	170	45	26%	38%
Germany	162	4	2%	0%
Greece	140	29	21%	67%
Iceland	68	2	3%	7%
Ireland	158	59	37%	43%
Italy	139	9	6%	23%
Latvia	140	0	0%	0%
Lithuania	130	3	2%	3%
Malta	135	28	21%	77%
Netherlands	149	4	3%	6%
Norway	151	3	2%	5%
Poland	160	3	2%	0%
Portugal	148	21	14%	16%
Romania	147	0	0%	0%
Slovenia	145	1	1%	0%
Spain	170	60	35%	5%
Sweden	150	9	6%	18%
United Kingdom	168	24	14%	25%
Total EU	3446	335	10%	17%

HAZMAT

Member State	Current Period (Jan 2010 - Jun 2010)			Previous Period (Jul 2009 - Aug 2009)
	Number of Checks	Missing Notifications	Missing Notifications (%)	Missing Notifications (%)
Belgium	59	2	3%	5%
Bulgaria	13	4	31%	n.a.
Cyprus	3	3	100%	100%
Denmark	24	21	88%	50%
Estonia	7	7	100%	100%
Finland	47	21	45%	n.a.
France	64	33	52%	61%
Germany	61	11	18%	16%
Greece	25	15	60%	67%
Iceland	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Ireland	4	4	100%	n.a.
Italy	57	22	39%	40%
Latvia	46	12	26%	17%
Lithuania	28	10	36%	0%
Malta	58	9	16%	100%
Netherlands	64	7	11%	6%
Norway	30	2	7%	67%
Poland	28	2	7%	n.a.
Portugal	58	11	19%	25%
Romania	10	1	10%	25%
Slovenia	1	0	0%	n.a.
Spain	61	24	39%	100%
Sweden	45	12	27%	75%
United Kingdom	64	16	25%	n.a.
Total EU	857	249	29%	50%

n.a. - samples not available

MISSING PORT & HAZMAT NOTIFICATIONS

- **Legal obligation** (Articles 4 and 13, Annex I).
- **Methodology (sample checks):** MSS searches in SSN for Port & Hazmat notifications based on external sources (SSN GI, MRS notifications, etc.).
- **Findings: Overall, SSN is improving.**
 1. For Port: 10% missing against 17% last year. Only one MS has worsened.
 2. For Hazmat: missing Hazmat notifications had reduced from 50% to 29%, but still is very high.

MISSING PORT & HAZMAT NOTIFICATIONS

Proposals:

- Ensure that shipping community is aware of the reporting obligations and apply sanctions (art 25.2) if necessary.
- MSs implement their own checks (not relying only in MSS).
- Rejected notifications to be resent.

Clarifications:

- Within port limits, a port visited for bunkering or any other operation should be considered as next port or departing port.
- Ships under VTMIS Directive visiting inland ports are subject to the same reporting obligations.

MISSING MRS NOTIFICATIONS

- **Legal obligation** (article 5, Annex I).
- **Estonia, Iceland, Italy, Poland and Slovenia provide MRS notifications for all their declared MRS.**
- **France and Spain provide partially** (France does not provide the WETREP and Spain does not provide the WETREP and the CANREP).
- Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Portugal and the United Kingdom do not provide any MRS notifications.
- **Portugal is expected (November 2010)** to implement MRS notifications from the **COPREP** (Off the Coast of Portugal Mandatory Reporting System).

Objective: implement pending MRS

AIS NOTIFICATIONS

- **Legal obligation** (Article 9).
- **All AIS data is available in SSN**, either via XML to SSN EIS or provided to the SSN GI (in IEC format).

MISSING “INCIDENT REPORT” NOTIFICATIONS

- 1. Legal obligation** (articles 16, 17 & 21.2).
- 2. Methodology:** tables included in the report are based on the reporting activity of each MS. Reference periods are the first semester of 2009 and 2010.
- 3. Evolution:** In October 2008 only FR, LV and NL were reporting Incidents to SSN. **More and more MSs are reporting** but still 4 MSs are not reporting at all and 10 MSs have reported less than five incidents.

MISSING “INCIDENT REPORT” NOTIFICATIONS

Way forward: The IRWG has to conclude its mandate in order to:

- Update and improve the **Guidelines**,
- Add the **new notifications** and eliminate the **inconsistencies in the XMLRG** and
- Propose a solution to **distribute Incident reports via XML**.

An upgraded web distribution tool is needed but also more commitment from MSs.

Objective: MSs sharing relevant information on incidents

Member State	L/F Containers	Others	POLREP	SITREP	Waste	Grand Total	Tests with IMO "9999999"
Belgium		20				20	20
Bulgaria				1		1	0
Cyprus				2		2	0
Denmark		1				1	0
Estonia							
Finland							
France	6		96	189	195	486	0
Germany							
Greece		41	11	146		198	0
Iceland		5				5	1
Ireland	1			1		2	0
Italy	1	137	1	43	1	183	0
Latvia		13		2		15	0
Lithuania							
Malta		4		3		7	6
Netherlands	1	7	7	90		105	8
Norway				4		4	0
Poland		5		1		6	0
Portugal		21		46		67	1
Romania				3		3	0
Slovenia				3		3	0
Spain		13				13	0
Sweden				2		2	0
United Kingdom		3		27	12	42	4
Grand Total	9	270	115	563	208	1165	40

SURVEY ON THE PHONE&FAX SOLUTION

1. The survey clearly showed that the **phone/fax solution** for providing **Hazmat details** is highly **unreliable**.
2. Availability figures are low (**19,7% checks failed**).
3. The **timing requirements** are **not** nearly **satisfied** (an **average of 5.5 hours** for the Hazmat details delay in comparison with a required maximum of 15 minutes indicated in the ICD).
4. A full report was distributed to MSs in August.

PORT NOTIFICATIONS SENT LATE

- 1. Legal obligation:** (article 4 – timing requirements).
- 2. Methodology:** MSS compares in all Port notifications the “SentAt” against the “ETA”. If the first notification for the same voyage is sent after the “ETA”, we consider this notification being late.
- 3. Findings:** 10,1% are sent late. In 2009 percentage was 9,6%. Some of these could be explained (last minute change of destination, very short voyages, etc.) but this should be clarified/investigated internally by each MS.
- 4. Proposals:**
 - law enforcement (art 25.2)
 - MSs to implement their own checks (not relying only in MSS).

Objective: all notifications should arrive to SSN in time

CONCLUSIONS

1. Recognize progress already achieved (**all MSs** connected and exchanging some information).
2. AIS data shared by all. For other data, still a way to go.
3. The effectiveness of SSN fully depends on the MSs capacity to implement all due notifications = **No missing notifications.**
4. SSN will be the basis for other applications. **Next challenge for SSN is the THETIS system** for the new PSC inspection regime, (rely on SSN time of arrivals and departures).

Thank you

Any question?

