



European Maritime Safety Agency

Workshop Report

Incident Report Working Group

Held in Lisbon on
29 June 2010

Background

I. Introduction

The "Incident Report Working Group" (IRWG) was created by the SSN WG 12 with the objective to propose by October 2010 to the SSN group "an agreed XML messaging framework that should fulfil both technical and operational requirements".

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Yann Le Moan of EMSA.

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

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

All the documentation presented and power point presentations and this report are available at:

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

Workshop Programme

1. Opening / Introduction (EMSA)

Mr. Yann Le Moan welcomed the participants, highlighting the wide scope of the issues to be dealt by the WG. He mentioned that the IRWG should provide to the SSN group a revised version of the Incident Report XML messages in order to remove the inconsistencies between the XSD and the XMLRG, to include the 3 new messages agreed during SSN5 and the 2 agreed in SSN12 and to incorporate the possibility to distribute Incident reports provided via XML. This revision could be profited to improve as a whole the Incident report messaging as described below.

2. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Work plan

The chairman introduced the work plan for the whole IRWG activity and pointed out the need to ask SSN Group 14 for prolonging the yearly mandate of the IRWG to the whole year 2011.

UK raised the issue of the need to reduce as much as possible the number of meetings and also recalled the possibility to work via correspondence.

DE agreed on the proposed planning but suggested to review the topics of each meeting according to the previous discussions, including any input from the SSN Group.

NL underlined the common budget constraints of MSs and stressed that due to the existing commitment for the ongoing developments of SSN v.2 any further developments which would affect MSs will have to be carefully considered and only beyond 2012.

EMSA clarified that in accordance with the mandate of the IRWG, the group might propose a time plan to the SSN Group for further consideration and adoption.

IT declared that a unique form per type of Incident reports (through the web) should be used by all. EMSA recalled that these forms are accessible through the SSN web interface, but an action can be undertaken to propose new ones (for the cases others) and therefore propose a full set of forms (Action point 1)

UK highlighted the fact that inconsistencies listed in the Annex I of the current XMLRG 2.03 were not being discussed in the first meeting. UK stressed the priority of the corrections to the current SSN implementation which were one of the four items of the mandate given to the Working Group by SSN 12.

The chairman clarified that EMSA has already started to work on this issue and that it will be an item of the next meeting (Action point 2).

4. Incident reports: background and summary of the complete set of proposals.

EMSA introduced this document to provide an overview of the proposals, including the reasons supporting these and the possible alternatives.

IE recalled that the notification side of the web-interface of SSN is to be phased out. The point being made was that Member States are faced with meeting these developments needs to satisfy their reporting requirements according to the current XML specification.

EMSA underlined that the phase-out of the SSN web-interface for notification purposes is not a decision to be taken at SSN Group level but at the SSN HLSG level and is beyond the mandate of the IRWG.

IT has not yet implemented an XML version for Incident reports in SSN2 but it has already implemented it in the current XML version. **IT** doesn't consider it usable from an operational point of view due to the fact that the XML interface requires several mandatory elements that may be not known at the time the report is drafted. In case any of these elements are missing, the notification is not accepted by the system.

IE pointed out that user requirements have to be carefully analysed before proposing to the SSN plenary group any further development. Any XML solution that will require thorough development at MSs level has to be assessed first taking into account those MSs which have already implemented an XML solution on their side.

After several interventions the group **agreed** to prepare a questionnaire to be distributed to all MSs (Action point 3). The questionnaire will serve for a user requirements survey to be conducted with all MSs and to verify the current technical & operational implementation; including elements discussed during the meeting (possible ways to receive distributed Incident reports, impact on their systems if proposed changes are agreed, etc.).

The questionnaire shall be agreed by email among the members of the IRWG before distribution to all MSs.

UK and **NL** underlined that they have been audited by EMSA in 2009 for the implementation of Directive 2002/59 and that results of such inspection visits – which concern also incident reporting into SSN - could be reported to all MSs.

5. Reporting obligations

EMSA introduced the document IRWG 1/3 which aimed at clarifying the reporting obligations according to art. 16, 17 and 21.2 of Directive 2002/59 (as amended).

EMSA recalled that currently there is confusion about what has to be notified to SSN, what instead has to be distributed along the planned route of the ship, when and why; it also emphasized that the Directive requires MSs to report all incident reports to SafeSeaNet, should they be received by the designated authority pursuant to art. 16 and 17.

DE pointed out that based on their reading of art. 16 requirements, the national authority concerned should apply threshold values to not undermine the value of the whole system which requires that the national competent authorities concerned has to assess which cases have to be notified and which can be omitted for notification , since considered " the vessel posing no potential hazard to shipping or a threat to maritime safety, the safety of individuals or the environment" and therefore are not of interest of other member states. The note from Germany regarding this professional judgement will be sent by EMSA to the group.

EMSA clarified that the current text of the Directive does not reflect this possibility to apply professional judgement and therefore all incident and accidents, regardless of their magnitude and follow-up, shall be notified to SSN; professional judgement should be then applied in assessing such information upon receipt, to take the appropriate measures against the ship.

UK, while understanding the position put forward by Germany, had to concur with EMSA's reading of the Directive.

The group acknowledged that the reporting obligation given by the Directive is twofold:

- to make the information available at any time upon request by another Member State;
- to distribute the information to the coastal stations concerned located along the planned route of the ship, whenever the latter is known.

Some delegations stressed the current implementation of the web distribution tool has been proven being not fully adapted to the needs, since the users are receiving e-mails from SSN but without any valuable information which might help to know whether the ship is of immediate interest for the coastal authority or not.

The group **agreed** to update the Incident Report messages Guidelines (Action point 4) and to work for reviewing the web distribution tool of SSN and to improve the quality of the service (Action point 5).

6. New notification mechanism

EMSA introduced the document IRWG 1/4 which proposed that all data related to an Incident report (notification and response) is provided in the Incident report notification itself.

IE and **UK** were not in favour of this proposal because of the financial impact as it will imply thorough changes in their systems (using the XML interface).

DE proposed this to be discussed at the HLSG because the current ICD defines SSN as an index server, where no data is stored.

The proposal was recognised to have certainly several advantages but no agreement was reached.

7. IncidentPlus message in SSN

EMSA introduced the document IRWG 1/5 which proposed to adopt the same structure for the Incident reports as the one employed for the Port notifications implemented in SSN version 2: a single message allowing to notify all the incident reports, to update the information and to link incident related to a same event.

Although the idea for a single modular IncidentPlus message was accepted in principle, some MS (mainly the ones that have already developed an XML interface at national level) disagreed with the proposal, given the significant impact that this solution might have on their existing applications. Anyhow, bringing ALL MSs up to a common level will impact more on the MSs that hasn't developed yet an XML interface.

It was agreed that the IncidentPlus proposal will be distributed to all Member States along with the implementation survey (ref. 4 above). Further development of the proposal will take into account the existing XML solutions at MS level with the view to minimise the impact on MS.

UK suggested that the timing of the implementation of any changes to the structure of Incident reports should take into account the various other activities that are currently within the HLSG's SSN roadmap, although the decision about the timing of implementation would have to be made by the HLSG.

UK, DE and **FR** proposed an alternative approach for the distribution of incident reports via XML, such as:

- MS should notify to SSN through XML, specifying the list of MS which to distribute the report to,
- SSN should then notify to the MS recipients through different solutions, (full XML, e-mail, SMS or a combination of them).

IT underlined that besides dealing with a new notification framework, there is a need also to review the current forms used for reporting incidents and accidents through SSN, since MS are using different forms and sometimes information is not provided in English language.

The group **agreed**, after the review of the questionnaire, to work on and propose improvement of the Incident report messages structure (Action point 6).

8. Identification of possible polluters

EMSA introduced the document IRWG 1/6 about the CSN service thanks to the AIS data provided by SSN is able now to "correlate" possible oil spills with ships causing this pollution. This possible infringement falls under art. 16.1.(b) of Directive 2002/59 (as amended). Therefore, MSs are obliged to report these ships to SSN (Incident report type POLREP).

The group **agreed** that these ships are of interest and should be tracked and reported to the SSN system. On the other hand, the following issues were raised:

DE indicated that such a report has serious consequences according to their national legislation (pollution is considered a criminal act).

DK requested to clarify if all the possible polluters have to be reported to SSN or those for which it has been possible to corroborate this possibility (i.e., visually verifying that it is a real oil slick and/or visually identifying the ship as the polluter).

The group requested certain clarifications on how CSN was working (distribution of the information, number of ships reported, etc.).

The group **proposed** EMSA to redraft the document in order to clarify the above aspects. Once agreed, it could be presented at SSN 14 (Action point 7).

Workshop Conclusions / Follow-up Actions

The group agreed to meet by the end of the year and mainly work by correspondence.

NI proposes to host the next meeting.

The following tasks, leaders and participants were agreed:

Action point	Item	Task leader	Associated partners
1	Revision of the Incident reports forms	Italy	EMSA
2	Solving existing inconsistencies in the incident report messages	UK	IE, EMSA
3	Incident Report implementation survey	EMSA	all
4	Incident Reports guidelines revision	EMSA	DE, NL
5	Improvement of the distribution tool through the web interface	DK	EMSA
6	Revision/improvement of the Incident reports messages framework (structure, distribution...)	IE	UK, FR, EMSA
7	Draft an amended version for the identification of the possible polluters	EMSA	NL

Annexes

Annex 1 - Workshop agenda

Annex 2 - List of participants

Annex 1: Meeting AGENDA**SSN INCIDENT REPORTS WORKING GROUP
1st Meeting: Lisbon, 29 June 2010 (9:00 – 17:30)**

Item		Speaker	objective
I	09:00 – 09:30 Welcome and approval of the agenda	EMSA	Recall : - ToR of the Group - Working procedures - Distribute list of members of the group (EMSA) - Name list of documents submitted for the meeting
II	09:30 – 10:00 Approval of the Work Plan of the Group Ref. Doc.: IRWG 1/1 Action plan 1.0	EMSA/GSI	Agreement on the specific topics and programme for the WG (meetings, deliverables, etc.)
III	10:00 – 11:00 Incident reports: background and summary of the complete set of proposals Ref. Doc.: IRWG 1/2 Background and proposal	EMSA/YLM	Presentation of all the background information, current issues and the set of new proposals for the Incident Reports.
	11:00 – 11:15 Coffee break		
IV	11:15– 12:30 Reporting obligations Ref. doc.: IRWG 1/3 Reporting obligations and Incident Report Messages Guidelines v 1 .7	EMSA/LFI	Reporting obligations review Revision of the current guidelines in order to: 1. Align the guidelines with the 2002/59 Directive. 2. Incorporate the new messages
	12:30-14:00 Lunch break		
V	14:00 – 14:45 New notification mechanism Ref. Doc.: IRWG 1/4 New notification mechanism	EMSA/GSI	Proposal to store all data (notification and details) at SSN Core level,
	14:45 – 15:30 Alignment of the Incident Reports framework to the PortPlus modular one Ref. Doc.: IRWG 1/5 SSN_IncidentPlus 1.0	EMSA/YLM	Proposal to: - align the Incident Report messages format to the agreed for the PortPlus XML message, - distribute notifications via XML.
	15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break		
VI	15:45 – 16:30 Identification of possible polluters: the correlation between AIS data and possible oil slicks provided by EMSA services (CleanSeaNet) Ref. Doc.: IRWG 1/6 Identification of possible polluters 1 02	EMSA/GSI	Raise the issue that MSs are provided with the identity of possible polluters via CSN. Agree on a common approach and procedures (for MS and EMSA/MSS) for these cases.
VII	16:30 – 17:00 Distribution of the follow-up work and definition of deliverables	Participants	Agree the initial report to be presented at SSN14 (October 2010) in order to: - Propose the extension of the mandate up to SSN16 (October 2011) - Obtain the approval of the SSN Group for the initial agreements regarding the IncidentPlus message - Propose an implementation date for the revised Incident Reports Messages Guidelines Agree other tasks such as proposing the content of each type of Incident report.
VIII	17:00 – 17:30 Closure + Date and place of the next meeting	Participants	Objective of next meeting and Invite attendees to offer next location

Annex 2: List of participants



Working Group on Incidents Reports Meeting, 29th June 2010

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 29.06.10
France	Berger	David	Maritime affairs Directorate	david.berger@developpement-durable.gouv.fr	<i>[Signature]</i>
Germany	Brunet	Werner	Traffic Technologica Centre Koblenz	werner.brunet@wvz.bund.de	<i>[Signature]</i>
Ireland	Fensom	Stephen	Department of Transport	stephenfensom@transport.ie	<i>[Signature]</i>
Ireland	Greg	Houlihan	Marine Survey Office	gregkoulihan@transport.ie	<i>[Signature]</i>
Italy	Loftu'	Antonio	Italian Coast Guard	antonio.loftu@mit.gov.it	<i>[Signature]</i>
Italy	Di Fazio	Luigi	Italian Coast Guard	luigi.difazio@mit.gov.it	<i>[Signature]</i>
Italy	Conti	Walter	Italian Coast Guard	walter.conti@mit.gov.it	<i>[Signature]</i>
Latvia	Deniss	Bickovs	Latvian Coast Guard Service	denis@mrcc.lv	<i>[Signature]</i>
Norway	Miljeteig	Tor Inge	Norwegian Coastal Administration	tor.inge.miljeteig@kystverket.no	<i>[Signature]</i>
Poland	Gomulka	Pawel	Maritime Office in Gdynia	pawel.gomulka@umgdy.gov.pl	<i>[Signature]</i>
Sweden	Andersson	Ulf		Ulf.Andersson@Sjofartsverket.se	<i>[Signature]</i>
United Kingdom	Stone	Gwilym	Maritime And Coastguard Agency	Gwilym.stone@mcg.gov.uk	<i>[Signature]</i>
United Kingdom	Townsend	Paul	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	Paul.Townsend@mcga.gov.uk	<i>[Signature]</i>
Denmark	<i>ABL</i>	<i>MARTIN</i>	<i>Admiral Danish Fleet HQ</i>		<i>[Signature]</i>
Netherlands	<i>J. Splinder</i>	<i>Jo</i>	<i>Vessel Traffic Management Centre</i>	<i>jos.van.splinder@rws.nl</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>