



European Maritime Safety Agency

Workshop Report

Incident Report Working Group

Held in Lisbon on
14 December 2010

Background

I. Introduction

The "Incident Report Working Group" (IRWG) was established by the SSN WG 12 with the objective to propose to the SSN group "an agreed XML messaging framework that should fulfil both technical and operational requirements" by October 2011.

The meeting was opened and chaired by Mr. Lazaros Aichmalotidis Head of Unit C2 (EMSA).

The meeting was attended by delegations from: **Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden and the United Kingdom.**

Mr. Jean-Bernard Erhardt attended the meeting as a representative of the European Commission (DG MOVE).

The meeting agenda as **Annex 1 and the** list of participants is attached as **Annex 2.**

Note: workshop documentation may be obtained from:

https://extranet.emsa.europa.eu/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=cat_view&gid=267&Itemid=121

Workshop Programme

1. Opening / Introduction (EMSA)

Mr. Lazaros Aichmalotidis welcomed the participants, identifying the specific objectives of the meeting as follows:

- a. Review and upgrade the Incident report messages guidelines.
- b. Identify the inconsistencies of the XMLRG related to the Incident report (IR) messages; propose a solution and timing for completing the work taking into account the impact to the MS national applications.
- c. Identify improvements of the "IR distribution tool" through the SSN web interface and the information provided to the recipients of the distributed IR.
- d. Discuss on the possible pro-active distribution of IR ("pushing" the information to the coastal state when the specific ship crosses the boundaries of a predefined area).

Mr. Erhardt recognised the effort and commitment of the participants and reminded the necessity to fulfil the Directive requirements but also to build a system useful covering the user' operational needs.

2. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Work plan

EMSA presented to the Group a Work Plan proposing the tasks and time plan for achieving each task. The group agreed on the proposed plan.

According to the plan, the Incident report messages guidelines, the actions to improve and standardise the IR and the improvements of the web distribution tool will be presented to the SSN WS 15 (May 2011) for agreement.

An intermediate meeting should be scheduled in June 2011 to work further on the business logic and update the Incident report messages in order to fulfil its distribution through XML, eliminate the inconsistencies and improve the operational value of the system (push mechanism proposal). A decision should be taken including the timing for its implementation.

The IRWG should propose for approval the upgraded XML interface including timing for implementation to the SSN WS16 (October 2011).

EMSA proposed that all changes in the XML interface should be aligned with the major change in the interface deriving from FAL Directive (implementation of the waste, security messages for 1st June 2015 the latest).

IE raised the issue that MS are unable to efficiently obtain information from SSN, and are unable to combine it with their information to build up an effective Maritime Operation Picture. IE suggested that splitting the XML Reference Guide or creating separate Reference Guides for Mandatory and Optional functionality can allow the SSN XML interface to grow and release functionality and proposed an earlier implementation (e.g. by 2012 or 2013).

The participants agreed to further discuss on the implementation plan at the 3rd meeting of the IRWG (June 2011).

The participants **agreed** with the work plan as well as to discuss at the IRWG 3 the early implementation of the "push mechanism" through XML.

4. Incident reports: solving existing inconsistencies (IRWG 2/2)

The UK introduced the document proposing solutions on how to resolve the detected inconsistencies (manly related to the occurrence of some attributes and upgrading the SITREP report) of the XML messages.

DE reminded the need to align the XML and the web interface and **SE** suggested necessary to clarify the meaning of the attribute "structural failure" and "MEDICO" in the annex B of the XMLRG as MEDICO isn't a requirement according to the Directive. EMSA proposed that this should be clearly stated in the description and general rules of the XML attributes definitions of Annex B, which was accepted.

Regarding the timing, most of the MS expressed their preference for an early implementation (sooner than 2015) as the inconsistencies prevent full operational use of the reports. The group **agreed** that these changes are necessary and do not appear to impact seriously the MSs' systems therefore subject to confirmation of the backward compatibility there would be no reason to delay their implementation in SSN EIS.

The participants **agreed** with the proposals and that a final version of the document will be discussed at the next meeting with the objective to finalise it at SSN 16 (**actions 1 and 2**).

5. Outcome of the questionnaire on Incident Reports (IRWG 2/8)

The SSN Working Group on "Incident Reports" (IRWG) agreed during its 1st meeting (Lisbon, 29 June 2010) EMSA to distribute a questionnaire to the MSs related to the IR issue. The questionnaire included 4 sections: technical and operational implementation, employment of the system and further developments.

16 MSs replied to the questionnaire, including one land-locked country. Not all questions were replied by the participants.

EMSA introduced the summary of the conclusions and appropriate follow-up actions. The outcome is that the IR in SSN and particularly the web distribution should be upgraded to better fit the operational needs although so called "IncidentPlus" did not receive enough support to be taken forward. The need to upgrade the IR guidelines was also highlighted.

It was announced that training on SSN for the Mediterranean MSs is scheduled to take place in Malta in March 2011. NL proposed that other MSs may be invited for a wider discussion¹.

The group **acknowledged** the value of the information provided and appreciated the effort.

6. Revision of the Incident Report messages Guidelines (IRWG 2/3)

¹ Another training will be managed for the other MSs (tentative date mid-June)

As a follow up of the discussions of the first IRWG meeting and the further work carried out by some MSs (mainly **DE** and the **UK** which provided comments) **EMSA** introduced the IR guidelines. During the discussion no major comments were provided except for the POLREPs section. It was stressed that the purpose of the document, as indicated in the Introduction of the Guidelines, "...is to provide information and advice to European Union Member State and participating EFTA State SafeSeaNet Users (hereafter referred to as "Users") on how to report Incident in SafeSeaNet...".

The group **agreed**:

- a. the proposed structure and in general wording of the document,
- b. the proposed distinction between the distributed (with warning purpose) and non distributed (for information) IR,
- c. DE, NL and SE will revise by the 15 February 2011 section 5.2.1 POLREP incident report according to art. 16-1(b) and art. 16-1(a) as described in art. 17-1(c) and (d), including the CleanSeaNet related examples (**action 3**),
- d. MSs will propose further examples or revise the existing ones by the same date (**action 4**),
- e. EMSA will gather the information received by that date and propose a final document to be presented at SSN 15 (**action 5**).

COM indicated the need to add (**action 6**):

- a reference to Directive 2005/35 "on ship-source pollution and on the introduction of penalties for infringements" in section 5.2.1;
- a reference to article 14 of Directive 2002/59 for reference to the exchange of information between MSs in chapter 3;
- a footnote indicating that sections 5.3.5 and 5.3.6, and associated forms, can not be finalised due to ongoing discussions at COSS and therefore were not discussed.

7. Improvements of the SSN Incident Report distribution tool (IRWG 2/4)

Moreover **EMSA** (on behalf of **DK**) presented a proposals to include more information in the email that SSN is sending to the recipients of distributed IR (such as sender, IMO identifiers, type of IR, etc.) as well as to improve the web interface in order to list alphabetically the possible recipients.

SE proposed that the list of users will be simplified, i.e., only the MS list will be in the selection box. The system will then forward the email to the SSN users pre-selected by the MS in their respective lists.

The participants **agreed** with proposal (**action 7**) with the addition of the **SE** proposal.

8. Incident Report Structure (IRWG 2/5 & IRWG 2/6)

EMSA introduced new concept for the automatic reception of IR (triggering of an IR message/response when the ship crosses the boundaries of a polygon defined by each MS). **EMSA** also described the process for an automatic distribution of IR via XML (that requires several changes in the XML interface).

IE proposed certain enhancements in the XML interface to leverage benefits from the current interface, including the concept of a flexible XMLRG, with a mandatory and an optional part.

The group **agreed** on the following:

- a. the new concept proposed in IRWG 2/5 ("pushing" IR to coastal states when the ship enters in their "declared" area of interest), subject to review of technical details when developed.
- b. the new principle that some parts of the XMLRG would not be mandatory for all MS to implement (on the condition that it should be validated and the terms "optional" and "alternative" appropriately defined by the HLSG).
- c. MSs should be able to select the way of receiving IR (via distribution or push mechanism): e.g. XML, email, SMS, etc.

- d. the need to develop an updated set of XML messages to allow MSs to distribute IR via XML. This will align the XML and the web interface (**action 8**),
- e. that the XML format of the IR type "Others" will be frozen until further agreements will be made,
- f. that the concept for pushing IR and other possible messages should be part of the Proxy Pilot Project. This group (EMSA, LV, NL, NO and PL joined by IE) shall work out (**action 9**) an XML solution and present it to the IRWG at its 3rd meeting (June 2011).

9. Revision of the Incident report forms (IRWG 2/7)

IT introduced the proposed changes in the IR forms. The participants **agreed** that:

- a. The XML messages and data requested in the forms must be harmonised (SITREP, POLREP, Waste and L/F containers) and if any additional amendment is identified as required a proposal covering both the XML and the paper forms needs to be presented. The XML IR type "others" will keep the current format until otherwise decided with the forms acting as guidance to the completion of the free text section.
- b. The forms with an IMO background (like SITREP) should be as close as possible to the IMO forms.
- c. The same forms have to be in the SSN web interface and the guidelines,
- d. The forms have to be digitalised,
- e. **SE** and **IT** will revise (**action 10**) the forms according to the above. Deadline should coincide with the final revised version of guidelines (action 5).

10. Actions to improve and standardise the level of reporting for IR

EMSA opened the discussion on how MSs with the assistance of EMSA could harmonise reporting on incidents. Shared ideas and next steps are:

- a. training is necessary (already mentioned in section 5) and the possibility to share training material,
- b. MSS and/or MSs may monitor distributed IR to verify whether they are relevant to the recipient(s),
- c. MSS and/or MSs may monitor distributed IR for which a visit/inspection is requested by the sender and the existence of any feedback from the destination MS/port.
- d. MSs to share examples where information obtained from an IR enhanced the effective management of a vessel or situation in their waters.
- e. **EMSA** will draft a consolidated document (work by correspondence) to introduce at SSN 15 (**action 11**).

UK mentioned that there is no information as to when a request should be made, which needs to be considered regarding request/response messages.

SE raised concerns about the meeting being held during vacation time as happened last year and also asked EMSA to consider planning the one-day meetings back-to-back with other similar meetings due to the long travelling time to Lisbon. **EMSA** promised to consider this. A tentative date for the next meeting was therefore set to the 1st June 2011 (alternative 8th June).

Workshop Conclusions / Follow-up Actions

The following tasks, leaders and participants were agreed:

Action point	Item	Task leader	Associated partners	Deadline
1	Verify if there are any further inconsistencies or slight changes in the XMLRG. Draft a final document for next meeting, including a timing implementation.	UK	EMSA	01 April
2	Verify and report on the backward compatibility of the changes proposed in action 1 with the existing XML version (impact on the current implementation).	EMSA	UK	01 April
3	Revise of section 5.2.1 POLREP of the Incident report messages guidelines.	DE, NL and SE	EMSA	15 February
4	Revise Incident Report messages guidelines (provide further examples)	All MS		15 February
5	Draft a merged version of the IR guidelines.	EMSA		15 March
6	Introduced in the IR guidelines suggestions from COM.	EMSA/COM		15 February
7	Draft requirements to upgrade the SSN web interface (distribution tool and email).	EMSA		15 February
8	Upgrade XML messaging system for IR distribution through XML	EMSA	all	01 May
9	Upgrade XML messaging system for the push mechanism. ²	EMSA	Proxy Pilot Project (LV, NL, NO, PL)	01 May
10	Revise the IR forms (according to section 9)	IT, SE		1 March
11	Draft a document proposing actions to improve and harmonise IR reporting	EMSA	all	1 March

Annexes

Annex 1 - Workshop agenda

Annex 2 - List of participants

² Post meeting note : EMSA would assess the implementation of the proposal once will get a formal mandate

Annex 1: Meeting AGENDA**SSN INCIDENT REPORTS WORKING GROUP****2nd Meeting****Lisbon, 14 December (9:30 – 17:30)**

Item		Speaker	objective
I	09:00 – 09:30 Welcome and approval of the agenda	EMSA/COM	Recall : - ToR of the Group - Working procedures - List the documents submitted for the meeting
II	09:30 – 09:45 Approval of the Work Plan of the Group Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/1 Action plan 1.0	EMSA (GSI)	Agreement on the specific topics and programme for the WG (meetings, deliverables, etc.)
III	09:45 – 10:45 Incident reports: solving existing inconsistencies Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/2 V1.0	UK/IE	Presentation of the proposals to remove inconsistencies in the Incident reports (Annex A of XML ref guide and in messages)
	10:45 – 11:00 Coffee break		
VIII	11 :00 – 11 :15: Outcome of the questionnaire on Incident Reports Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/8	EMSA(GSI)	Analyse the outcomes of the questionnaire sent to MSs
IV	11:15– 12:00 Revision of the Incident Report messages Guidelines Ref. doc.: IRWG 2/3 Incident Report Messages Guidelines	EMSA(GSI)/ All	Revision of the current guidelines in order to: 1. propose new guidelines. 2. incorporate the new messages
V	12:00 – 12:30 Improvement of the distribution tool through the web interface Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/4	DK (EMSA on behalf)	Proposal to improve the distributed Incident report through the current web distribution tool
	12:30 - 14:00 Lunch break		
VI	14:00 – 14 :45 Incident Report Structure Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/5	EMSA(YLM)	Concept paper to push and distribute the Incident reports.
VII	14 :45 – 15:30 Incident	IE	Analysis and proposals for enhancing the XML interface for MSs

	Report Structure Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/6		
	15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break		
IX	15 :45 – 16:15 Revision of the Incident report forms Ref. Doc.: IRWG 2/7	IT	As define in task 1 of the IRWG 1
X	16 :15 – 17 :00 Actions to improve and standardise the level of reporting for IR Doc : Discussions	EMSA (YLM)	As defined in the Tor, the purpose is to discuss on how to improve and standardise the level of reporting IR (Actins from EMSA, from the MSs, trainings...), to propose ideas.
XI	17 :00 – 17:15 Closure + Date and place of the next meeting	Participants	Define: - the solutions agreed, - the actions remaining with the roadmap - the period for another meeting

Annex 2: List of participants

SSN Incident Reports Working Group, 14th December 2010

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 14.12.10
Germany	Brunet	Werner	Traffic Technologies Centre	werner.brunet@wsv.bunb.de	
Ireland	Greg	Houllhan	Marine Survey Office	greghoullhan@transport.ie	
Italy	Lofu	Antonio	Italian Coast Guard	antonio.lofu@mit.gov.it	
Italy	Di Fazio	Luigi	Italian Coast Guard	luigi.difazio@mit.gov.it	
Latvia	Deniss	Bickovs	Coast Guard Service	denis@mrc.lv	
Malta	Spiteri	Paul	Authority for Transport in Malta	paul.a.spiteri@transport.gov.mt	
Malta	Bugeja	David	Authority for Transport in Malta	david.bugeja@transport.gov.mt	
Norway	Jon Leon	Ervik	Norwegian Coastal Administration	jon.leon.ervik@kystverket.no	
Norway	Hauge	Jarfe	Norwegian Coastal Administration	jarfe.hauge@kystverket.no	
Poland	Kurpinski	Konrad	Maritime Office in Gdynia	konrad.kurpinski@emsa.europa.eu	
Sweden	Sundklev	Monica	Swedish Transport Agency	monica.sundklev@transportstyrelsen.se	
The Netherlands	van Splunder	Jos	Rijkswaterstaat Vessel Traffic Management Centre	jos.van.splunder@rws.nl	
The Netherlands	Kortekaas	Joram	Rijkswaterstaat Vessel traffic management Centre	joram.kortekaas@rws.nl	
United Kingdom	Stone	Gwilym	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	gwilym.stone@mca.gov.uk	
EC	Erhardt	Jean-Bernard	EU Commission (DG Move)	jean-bernard.erhardt@ec.europa.eu	

EMSA participants:

Lazaros Aichmalotidis, Helena Ramon-Jarraud, German Sarasua, Yann Le Moan