![EMSA - European Maritime Safety Agency]

Workshop Report

SafeSeaNet Workshop 17

Held in Lisbon on
23 & 24 May 2012

Background

As a follow up to SSN Workshop 16 (18 and 19 October 2011), EMSA organised the SSN workshop 17.

The meeting was opened by Mr Lazaros Aichmalotidis, Head of Unit C.2 and chaired by Mr Yann Le Moan, Senior Project Officer for SafeSeaNet. Mr Michele Avino represented the **European Commission** (DG MOVE).

Delegations from **Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom** attended the meeting. A representative of ESPO participated as observer.

The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**. A list of documents distributed to participants is included as **Annex 2**. All the SSN workshop documentation may be obtained from:

http://www.emsa.europa.eu/documents/workshop-presentations-a-reports.html

Workshop Programme

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Opening

Mr Aichmalotidis welcomed all participants and introduced the main workshop objectives as follows:

- introduce the outcome of the work carried out by the Incident Report Working Group (IRWG) during its 2 year mandate (since Oct. 2009). This includes a proposal for incident report improvements through XML and its distribution (currently only available through web);
- present a revised version of the Incident Report Guidelines with minor changes for approval;
- present the report on SSN Data Quality and the status of implementation at national level including the SSN–THETIS interface;
- report on the progress made by the IFCD Working Group and validate the IFCD draft (v0.14) to be submitted to the HLSG;
- update on the implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive. The SSN group will play an important role in defining the technical specifications of the next version (SSN V3).

I.2 Approval of the agenda

The chairman presented the agenda and proposed to add a new item on the IP switching latest tests results.

The UK and Ireland questioned the inclusion of the IMDatE project in the SSN workshop agenda. EMSA proposed to clarify the questions raised during the presentation of the document, however EMSA stated that matters relating to the governance of IMDatE were outside to scope of SSN Workshop and would be addressed elsewhere.

The agenda was adopted with the proposed modification.

I.3 Minutes of previous meeting Workshop 15 and follow-up actions

The minutes/report of the previous workshops (SSN 16) were approved. EMSA summarised the items outstanding from the previous workshops and clarified that the action 9 of SSN 16 related to the SSN group rules of procedure was postpone to SSN 18.

II. INPUT FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr Avino, on behalf of Commission, thanked the SSN group members for their participation and for the work achieved. He highlighted the need to close the open issues and proceed with the new tasks of the Reporting Formalities Directive.

The Commission informed that the next HLSG will take place on the 4th of July and that the agenda will include important items (i.e. IFCD).

Other general information was also transmitted regarding the Expert Group on Integrated Maritime Surveillance of DG MARE, (5-6 June) and the demonstration of the BlueMassMed project (7 June).

III. SAFESEANET OPERATIONAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS

III.1 SSN 17.3.1 Incident report WG progress report (IRWG)

EMSA presented, on behalf of the IRWG, the work carried out and the follow-up actions.

Incident Report (IR) guidelines

EMSA presented the revised Incident Report Guidelines with some changes proposed by Italy and the Commission.

The members of the SSN group discussed the changes introduced in the new version and issues related to two types of IR (Ships failed to notify, or do not have, insurance certificates or financial guarantees and Ships reported by pilots or port authorities), potential conflict between SSN and THETIS and the need to avoid duplication of reporting in both systems.

France proposed to include in the document a footnote regarding the discussions still on-going at the COSS committee. Several members of the SSN group raised the issue of the content of Appendices 7 and 8 not being approved by COSS. EMSA clarified that the information included is very general and regardless of the content, the reporting obligation is uncontested. **Sweden** noted that there had been a lot of changes regarding the waste incident report and that some of the new inserted text need further examination.

The SSN group **agreed** to:

a. Include a footnote regarding the still on-going discussion at the COSS committee (Ships failed to notify, or do not have, insurance certificates or financial guarantees; Ships reported by pilots or port authorities); **(Action point 1)**

b. MS to provide comments on the IR Guidelines updated version and review the templates in Appendices 7 and 8 by the end of June 2012. EMSA will publish the new IR Guidelines version following comments received. **(Action point 2)**

Incident Report distribution through XML

EMSA presented the proposal of the IRWG for implementing via XML the correction of inconsistencies, identification of type "other" and their distribution aligned with the current web distribution. In addition, a mock-up explaining how the new XML solution should be implemented at national level was presented.

The conditions for the development of the technical solution were presented: the proposal needs first to be validated by the HLSG and then implemented on a voluntary basis and be backward compatible with the current XML protocol. Nevertheless a minimum number of participating MS is required to justify the development. The proposed time plan for implementation was also discussed.

The UK with the support of **Italy** proposed that the inconsistencies identified in the current XML protocol should be corrected in any case as a base line. EMSA agreed with the proposal and highlighted that this might have an impact to the national applications.

The UK proposed no date to be set for the phase out of the existing XML protocol. **France** stated that the new XML protocol of the Incident Report distribution is complex and informed that they would be willing to implement, as a first phase, the minimum requirements. EMSA confirmed the feasibility of a phase-in implementation and will provide further information on this issue.

The following MS having expressed their willingness to participate in the initial phase (subject to further confirmation): **Belgium, Denmark, France** (with minimum phased in approach)**, Ireland, Norway** and **Poland**.

The SSN group agreed the following:

a. The new IR protocol to be developed and implemented on a voluntary basis if agreed by the SSN HLSG 7 **(Action point 3)**.

b. EMSA is invited to clarify the following **(Action point 4)**:

- the possibility to have an amended XML protocol to correct only the IR inconsistencies[1] for those MSs not implementing the new protocol. If the possibility is confirmed, the change in the current protocol will become the "minimum mandatory" for the MSs not implementing the new IR (as per action 3).
- how to implement the new XML protocol using a phase-in approach.

c. The new Incident Report protocol will be presented at the HLSG 7 for validation. If validated, **EMSA** shall prepare the new XML v2.07 by end July 2012 and submit it to the SSN group for approval by correspondence **(Action point 5)**.

d. The preliminary time plan for implementation would be April 2013 **(Action point 6).**

III.2 SSN 17.3.2 Presentation of the draft IFCD

On behalf of the IFCD working group, **EMSA** presented the final report of the IFCD WG and the new draft IFCD v0.14. The IFCD draft included the LRIT information and the chapter 7 "System Security".

EMSA informed on the next steps towards the IFCD approval by the HLSG (expected in December 2012). Until the approval, the SSN group might be requested to work further following the comments received by the HLSG 7.

The SSN group revised the **chapter 7 "System Security"** taking into account the guidance from the HLSG.

Member States of the SSN group discussed on the question of whether the baseline security requirements should be considered as "optional" for the national and local systems (as referred to in the HLSG 6 report, and supported by **Greece** and **the Netherlands**) or mandatory "principles": *access control, authentication, authorisation, traceability and accountability, confidentiality, integrity, training and audit* should in that case be fulfilled at all system levels. The responsible authorities at national and local level could in any case determine the most appropriate method for their implementation. The issue should be raised again with the HLSG to explain further the impact of the different wording ("optional" vs "mandatory principles") and MS' positions.

---

[1] Post meeting comment: **EMSA** confirms this possibility and will propose an XML reference guide correcting the inconsistencies of the current XML protocol (mandatory for those keeping this current protocol) and proposing the new IR protocol on a voluntary basis.

The SSN group **validated** the draft IFCD presented

a. Regarding the AIS Regional Server definition (IFCD section 1.4, page 8), **Germany** confirmed that they would raise this issue at the HLSG.

b. On the issue of the SSN Graphical interface (IFCD section 2.5.2, page 18), **Ireland** confirmed its position that the graphical interface should not be considered as a mandatory exchange mechanism of SSN and stated that they would raise the issue at the HLSG.

c. **Germany** also asked if it was necessary to maintain the backup time of 2 weeks (IFCD section 4.4, page 29) for all information, considering that the maximum period of down-time is 12 hours. **EMSA** explained that the backup procedure shall be applied in exceptional situations (i.e. major catastrophes) and proposed to include the possibility to down-sample the AIS ship position information.

d. **The UK** raised the question of the 5 year data retention required that the IFCD will introduce. At a recent UK industry stakeholder group significant concerns had been raised about this requirement and there seems to be no clear justification for this length of data retention. It was agreed that this was an issue for the HLSG to concern therefore **the UK** will raise the issue at HLSG during the discussion of the IFCD draft.

e. The SSN group **agreed** to include in the draft IFCD the proposal to down-sample the ship position information for the backup procedure. **(Action point 7)**

No other SSN group member raised any remark with the current drafting.

III.3 SSN 17.3.3 Review of SSN Technical and Operational documentation

EMSA presented the proposal to review the SSN documents by setting up a correspondence group for the: SSN Common Operational Procedures (former SSN Handbook), the SSN Change Management Framework and the SSN Security Guidelines (formed Network and Security guidelines).

The SSN group **agreed** to set up the Documentation Correspondence Group (DCG) according to the terms of reference presented with the following MS which volunteered to participate: **Germany**, **Greece**, **Italy**, **Norway**, **Poland**, **Sweden**, **the Netherlands** and **the UK**. **(Action point 8).** The DCG shall report at the next SSN Workshop.

The UK invited EMSA to ensure that enough time will be allocated within the next SSN Workshop agenda for the proper, detailed consideration and approval of these documents.

IV. SAFESEANET TECHNICAL ASPECTS

IV.1 SSN 16.4.1 SSN Deployment Plan

EMSA presented the road map for the planned evolution of SSN taking into account the decisions made at SSN meetings, the current legal framework, the Incident Report working group's proposal and the implementation of the waste and security messages (Directive 2010/65/EU). The document presents the deployment plan up to 2015.

France requested more information on the business rules implemented by the SSN system (in particular regarding the correlation of Hazmat information). EMSA clarified that the business rules for the correlation were presented at the SSN workshop 15 (document SSN 15.4.4).The SSN group **agreed** to include in the SSN Technical and Operational documentation the SSN business rules. **(Action point 9).**

IV.2 Presentation on the IP switching latest results

EMSA informed that Internet Service Providers (ISP) will change due to re-tendering. Accordingly, IP addresses for SSN will also change to a new range. EMSA presented the results of the tests made for the central SSN system IP switching which demonstrate that all national systems are prepared for a smooth transition to the new IPs. EMSA recalled the date for the IP switching (31 May 2012).

V. SAFESEANET STATUS

V.1 SSN 17.5.1 SSN Status National Level

EMSA distributed (before the meeting) a template inviting MSs to provide information on the status of SSN implementation at national level.

EMSA presented the information received by each MS indicating the current status and data quality. In addition, MS were asked to report on their plans to discontinue the SSN v.1 messages (Port and Hazmat notifications) and if they have at national level procedures to monitor the rejected notifications.

Regarding the 120 days limitation to update PortPlus notifications, **Germany** invited EMSA to analyse this issue as there are many notifications that cannot be updated because of system limitation. **Denmark** and **Estonia** supported this request. EMSA informed that a technical solution to handle the ship calls sent in advance (early bookings) and the ships that stay in port for long periods (e.g. repairs in shipyard) is being analysed and could be included in the new version to be deployed in June/July. **(Action point 10)**

Based on the MS feedback, revised information is available on the EMSA web site at:

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

V.2 SSN 17.5.2 SSN Data Quality Report

EMSA presented the SSN Data Quality Report summarising the status of SSN implementation at MSs and highlighting the data quality issues. **The UK** requested clarifications regarding the downtimes for the national SSN systems. EMSA explained that only the total downtimes are considered and the availability of the national SSN systems was above the agreed 99%.

The SSN group **noted** the information provided and **invited** EMSA to present the definition of downtime of the national SSN systems at the next workshop **(Action point 11)**.

VI. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

VI.1 SSN 17.6.1 Business Continuity Facility (BCF) plan

EMSA presented its BCF facility for all the critical maritime applications, including SSN, as well as the pending actions to be taken by EMSA and the MS to allow for certification. **Greece** and **Ireland** underlined that BCF has no S-TESTA connection. Ireland reminded that connection to SSN shall be possible via both sTesta and internet (as stated in the IFCD).

The SSN group **noted** the information provided in the document and invited EMSA to include the S-TESTA connection in the BCF plan in Porto. (**Action Point 12)**

VI.2 SSN 17.6.2 THETIS / SSN interface

EMSA presented the analysis of the issues affecting the SSN–THETIS interface: data provided by SSN but rejected by THETIS; missing attributes in SSN which are relevant to THETIS and; ship calls created for vessels no longer in service

Mr Frank Rohling (EMSA - B.2) provided additional clarifications regarding the SSN-THETIS interface.

Cyprus requested clarifications on how to cancel PortPlus notifications after ATA is provided. **EMSA** explained that there is no possibility to cancel the notification after ATA provided through SSN. The only possibility is for the authorized user to delete it manually in THETIS.

Germany raised the issue of the double-notifications in THETIS caused by the Hazmat information provided at the next port of call. EMSA confirmed the issue and explained the reason for SSN generating this "pseudo PortPlus notifications". This was implemented to solve some issues of missing information. However, there is only duplication of ETA and not ATA. The MS have expressed different positions, some considered to receiving this information from the departing port as useful while others not. **EMSA** has analysed the situation and will implement in THETIS a possibility for the user to filter the information provided based on the sender.

Ireland questioned the proposal regarding the management of the LOCODES by the MSS as this is a responsibility of the NCA. EMSA clarified that the MSS can manage on behalf of the NCA because of the errors detected. The management of the LOCODES in SSN remains under the responsibility of the NCAs, the MSS can provide assistance if required.

In order to improve the management of LOCODES, **Denmark** proposed to include a chapter in the SSN Operational Procedures document. **EMSA** confirmed this activity to be considered by the Drafting Correspondence Group (DCG).

Poland requested EMSA to present only one set of business rules for SSN and THETIS, as it is very difficult to manage different sets of rules for both systems that interface. EMSA confirmed that there is already an on-going work with the objective of aligning both sets of business rules, within the framework of the different underlying legislation. Furthermore, Poland requested the shipcallID to be available on the screens in THETIS for easy reference and fault finding. **EMSA** clarified that this is part of an on-going development.

The UK questioned the interpretation of 3 hours for "within reasonable time" to provide the ATA and ATD. They stated that the interpretation was 72h and this is currently implemented in the UK. EMSA stated that the 72h was never agreed as a common interpretation of "reasonable time". In addition the limit of 3 hours is for the notifications containing ATA or ATD in the future only. Messages with ATA and ATD in the past will not be rejected, even if sent with a delay up to 1 year.

Noting EMSA's comment **the UK** believed that in the absence of a common interpretation of "reasonable time" it was still incorrect for notifications made after 3 hours to be characterised as late, and suggested for **the UK** that future notifications should be considered as late if they were made in excess of 72 hours after the ATA/ATD.

Italy welcomed the information provided in the report and proposed to have these reports regularly. Italy also questioned the obligation to report pleasure-crafts above 45 meters and the need to have LOCODES for ports used only by pleasure crafts. EMSA clarified that the ATA/ATD reporting obligation was not associated with the size but with the eligibility of the ship for PSC. This implies that a LOCODE is required to report arrivals and departures of ships.

The SSN group **noted** the information and agreed that the DCG will include a chapter in the revision of the Operational Procedures document with the guidelines for the Locode management **(Action point 13)**.

VI.3 SSN 17.6.3 Integrated Maritime Data

EMSA presented the Integrated Maritime Data project. The presentation was a follow up to the 1st IMDatE meeting which decided to set up two temporary working groups on the "Value added services" and the "Reference vessel database (RVR)".

The UK questioned the governance of the IMDatE and the assignment of this task to the SSN group. They also declared not to be in a position to approve the terms of reference of the groups until the governance is clarified. EMSA clarified that the mandate to develop IMDatE is stated in EMSA work programme 2012, approved by the Administrative Board (MS and Commission).

France wondered whether the RVR should be setup under the IMDatE or under the Single Window (according to Directive 2010/65/EU). In addition, France considered that SSN could not be the best starting point for the RVR and that THETIS should be considered instead. EMSA clarified that it will not be only SSN or THETIS to be used as reference to the RVR but all (including also LRIT and commercial sources). The RVR is a service to be provided to all maritime applications and to all its users, this is the reason for developing under the IMDatE.

Denmark also expressed some concerns regarding establishing the RVR under the IMDatE umbrella and not under SSN, as this issue was initially raised by the SSN group.

Finland explained that they will participate in the working groups with 3 representatives, because the Finnish Traffic Safety Agency is nominated to participate in the IMDatE.

Estonia expressed its availability to participate in the "Value added services" working group, following the mandate from HLSG.

Sweden mentioned that limitation of 1 representative to the IMDatE meetings is very restrictive as there are many user communities to be represented in the project.

The UK added that it did not question the remit of EMSA to develop the IMDatE project but the mandate of an IMDatE meeting to task the SSN group. The HLSG should be the only group that can task the SSN group.

The **UK,** supported by **Ireland, Poland** and **the Netherlands**, considered that this matter does not fall under the mandate of the SSN group.

The SSN group **agreed** that in the absence of a mandate from the HLSG it was currently unable to discuss IMDatE and that it would ask the HLSG for guidance on whether IMDatE should form part of the work of the SSN group **(Action Point 14).**

VI.4 SSN 17.6.4 New naming convention to apply in SSN

EMSA presented the new naming convention to apply in SSN and introduced a common naming convention to be adopted in order to ease the integration of SSN with the Identification Management System and Single-Sign-On.

The **UK** noted that there had been some confusion around the roll out of Single Sign On within the LRIT community and asked EMSA to review the process to ensure lessons are learned and any roll out to the much larger SSN user community do not encounter the same issues.

The **UK** also raised the issue of the high number of users and the impact of this change on NCA administrative resources. EMSA advised that they would support this task to avoid a resource impact on Member States.

The SSN group **noted** the information provided in the document and EMSA was invited to provide support to MS in the migration of the users to the new naming convention by end of 2012. MS were invited to create already any new user using the new naming convention. **(Action Point 15).**

VI.5 Update on the implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive

EMSA presented the updated status on the implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive. The SSN group was informed of the amendments in the EMSA founding regulations and the impact on its tasks. The implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive is a new task assigned to EMSA as a core task.

The SSN group will actively participate in phase 2 (technical specifications) once the functional specifications (phase 1) will be defined. The SSN group can expect an increased workload in 2013 for the technical specifications concerning SSN and the Reporting Formalities. A more detailed plan will be presented at next SSN workshop once more elements will be available.

VI.6 Any Other Business

Ireland asked for an update regarding the €700k granted for the 'Evolution of SafeSeaNet' and whether the SSN WG would be involved. **EMSA** clarified that the issue is still under discussion and the Agency has not got yet the mandate.

VII. INFORMATION PAPERS

The SSN 17.3.3 document "List of SSN technical and operational documentation" was not presented but distributed for information.

Workshop Conclusions / Follow-up Actions

The Chairman thanked all participants for the active and fruitful discussion and closed the meeting. The workshop conclusions and follow up actions are noted in the relevant paragraphs of the minutes. The follow-up actions are indicated in Annex 4.

The provisional date for the SSN 18 is 18 October 2012.

Annexes

Annex 1 – List of participants

Annex 2 – List of documents

Annex 3 – Workshop Agenda

Annex 4 – Action items

Annex 1 – Attendance List

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 23.05.12	Attendance on 24.05.12
Belgium	Deman	Johan	Agency for Maritime Services & Coast	johan.deman@schelderadar.net		
Belgium	Maekelberg	Yves	Agency for Maritime Services & coast	yves.maekelberg@mow.vlaanderen.be		
Bulgaria	Ivanov	Peter	Executive Agency "Maritime Administration"	peter_iv@marad.bg		
Cyprus	Evriviades	Themis	Department of Merchant Shipping	tevriviades@dms.mcw.gov.cy		
Czech Republic	Vydra	Evzen	Ministry of Transport	evzen.vydra@mdcr.cz		
Denmark	Ahl	Martin	Admiral Danish Fleet HQ	martinahl@ml.dk		
Estonia	Siht	Alar	Estonian Maritime Administration	alar.siht@vta.ee		
Finland	Arkima	Antti	Finnish Transport Agency	antti.arkima@liikennevirasto.fi		
France	Duchesne	Philippe	Ministry of Transport - Maritime Affairs	philippe.duchesne1@developpement-durable.gouv.fr		
Germany	Brunet	Werner	Traffic Technologies Centre	werner.brunet@wsv.bund.de		
Germany	Buchheim	Alf	Federal Agency for IT-Services	alf.buchheim@dlz-it-bvbs.bund.de		
Greece	Sofikitis	Ilias	Hellenic Coast Guard	hsofikitis@hcg.gr		
Ireland	Greg	Houlihan	Department of Transport, Tourism & Sport	greghoulihan@dttas.ie		
Italy	Michele	Avino	European Commission DG MOVE	michele.avino@ec.europa.eu		
Italy	Gionfriddo	Marco	Capitanerie di PortoGuardia Costiera	marco.gionfriddo@mit.gov.it		
Latvia	Deniss	Bickovs	Latvian Coast Guard Service	deniss.bickovs@mrcc.lv		
Lithuania	Valdemaras	Ezerskis	Lithuanian Maritime Safety Administration	valdemaras@msa.lt		
Malta	Zahra	Antoine	Authority for Transport in Malta	antoine.zahra@transport.gov.mt		
Malta	Spiteri	Paul	Authority for Transport in Malta	paul.a.spiteri@transport.gov.mt		
Norway	Ervik	Jon Leon	Norwegian Coastal Admistration	jon.leon.ervik@kystverket.no		

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 23.05.12	Attendance on 24.05.12
Norway	Hauge	Jarle	Norwegian Coastal Administration	jarle.hauge@kystverket.no		
Poland	Kurpinski	Konrad	Gdynia Maritime Office	konrad.kurpinski@umgdy.gov.pl		
Poland	Jacek	Szymanski	Gdynia Maritime Office	jacek.szymanski@umgdy.gov.pl		
Portugal	Santos	Ricardo	IPTM, IP	ricardo.santos@imarpor.pt		
Portugal	Santos Marques	Nelson	IPTM, IP	nelson.marques@imarpor.pt		
Romania	Ghenovici	Ana-Maria	Teamnet (Supplyer for Romanian Naval Authority)	anamaria.ghenovici@teamnet.ro		
Romania	Apostol	Silviu	Romanian Naval Authority	sapostol@rna.ro		
Slovakia	Mrkva	Josef	Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development	josef.mrkva@mindop.sk		
Spain	Alejandro	Busto	SASEMAR	alejandrobg@sasemar.es		
Spain	Fco Javier	Castillejo	Dirección General de la Marina Mercante	fjcastillejo@fomento.es		
Sweden	Sundklev	Monica	Swedish Transport Agency	monica.sundklev@transportstyrelsen.se		
Sweden	Per	Lundqvist	Swedish Maritime Administration	per.lundqvist@sjofartsverket.se		
Sweden	Mats	Kannerstål	Swedish Maritime Administration	mats.kannerstal@sjofartsverket.se		
The Netherlands	Arjen	Doosje	Rijkswaterstaat Vessel Traffic Management Centre	arjen.doosje@rws.nl		
The Netherlands	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	Enright	Chris	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	Chris.Enright@mcga.gov.uk		
United Kingdom	Gwilym	Stone	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	Gwilym.stone@mcga.gov.uk		
PORTUGAL	MARQUES	CARLOS	ESPO	CMARQUES@PORTO DE SETUBAL.PT		

EMSA staff

S/N	Name	First Name	E-mail
1	AICHMALOTIDIS	Lazaros	Lazaros.AICHMALOTIDIS@emsa.europa.eu
2	LE MOAN	Yann	Yann.LE-MOAN@emsa.europa.eu
3	RAMON JARRAUD	Helena	Helena.RAMON-JARRAUD@emsa.europa.eu
4	LIMA GALVAO	Marta	Marta.LIMA-GALVAO@emsa.europa.eu
5	GIRONELLA	Enrico	Enrico.GIRONELLA@emsa.europa.eu
6	PANAGIOTARAKIS	Nikos	Nikos.PANAGIOTARAKIS@emsa.europa.eu
7	SARASUA IBARBURU	German	German.sarasua@emsa.europa.eu
8	FERNANDES	Rute	Rute.FERNANDES@emsa.europa.eu
9	AMIGO	Lorena	Lorena.AMIGO-LOPEZ@emsa.europa.eu
10	ERONEN	Matti	Matti.Eronen@emsa.europa.eu
11	ROHLING	Frank	Frank.ROHLING@emsa.europa.eu
12	DE SOUSA	Justino	Justino.DE-SOUSA@emsa.europa.eu

Annex 2 – List of SSN 17 documents

I. Introduction

SSN 17.1.1: Detailed Agenda (EMSA)
SSN 17.1.2: SSN 16 minutes (EMSA)

II. Input from the Commission

III. SafeSeaNet Operational and legal Aspects

SSN 17/3/1: Incident Report Working Group - Presentation of the outcome (IRWG)
SSN 17/3/2: IFCD Drafting Working Group – Final Report (IFCD WG)
SSN 17/3/3: Review of SSN Technical and Operational Documentation (EMSA)

IV. SafeSeaNet technical aspects

Presentation: SSN v2.06 Deployment Plan (EMSA)
Presentation: IP switching latest results (EMSA)

V. Status at National Level

SSN 17/5/1: SSN Status National level (MS)
SSN 17/5/2: SSN Data Quality report (EMSA)

VI. Any Other Business

SSN 17/6/1: Business Continuity Facility (BCF) of the SSN central system (EMSA)
SSN 17/6/2: SSN – THETIS interface (EMSA)
SSN 17/6/3: IMDATE working groups (EMSA)
SSN 17/6/4: New user naming convention in SSN (EMSA)
Presentation: Update on the implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive (COM/EMSA)

For information

SSN 17/3/4: List of SSN technical and operational documentation (EMSA)

Annex 3 –Workshop Agenda

Wednesday, 23 May 2012		
Time	**Agenda Item**	**For**
09:00 – 09:15	**Registration and coffee**	
09:15 – 09:30	Opening / Introduction (EMSA)	
	SSN 17.1.1 Approval of the agenda (EMSA)	Approval
	SSN 17.1.2 Approval of the SSN 16 minutes and follow up actions (EMSA)	Approval
09:30 – 09:45	**Input from the Commission**	
09:45 – 11:00	SSN 17.3.1 Incident report WG final report (IRWG)	Approval
11:00 – 11:15	**Coffee break**	
11:15 – 12:00	SSN 17.3.1 Incident report WG final report (IRWG) *(cont.)*	Approval
12:00 – 12:45	SSN 17.3.3 Review of SSN Technical and Operational documentation (EMSA)	Approval
12:30 – 14:00	**Lunch break**	
14:00 – 14:45	SSN 17.5.2 SSN Data Quality report (EMSA)	Information
14:45 – 15:30	SSN 17.6.2 THETIS / SSN interface (EMSA)	Information
15:30 – 15:45	**Coffee break**	
15:45 – 16:00	Presentation on the IP switching latest results	Information
16:00 – 17:30	SSN 17.5.1 SSN Status National level (MS)	Information

Thursday, 24 May 2012		
Time	**Agenda Item**	**For**
09:00 – 09:30	**Welcome second day**	
09:30 – 11:00	SSN 17.3.2 IFCD draft – status report (IFCD WG)	Validation
11:00 – 11:15	**Coffee break**	
11:15 – 12:00	SSN 17.4.1 SSN v2.06 Deployment Plan – *presentation* (EMSA)	Information & Approval
12:00 – 12:30	SSN 17.6.1 Business Continuity Facility (BCF) plan (EMSA)	Information
12:30 – 14:00	**Lunch break**	
14:00 – 14:30	SSN 17.6.3 Integrated Maritime Data, consultative user groups on: • Reference Vessel Registry databases • Value added services	Approval
14:30 – 15:15	Update on the implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive – *presentation* (COM/EMSA)	Information
15:15 – 15:30	**Coffee break**	
15:30 – 16:15	SSN 17.6.4 New naming convention to apply in SSN (EMSA)	Approval
16:15 – 17:30	**Discussion and summary of the follow up actions** **End of meeting**	

Other Information paper	SSN 17.3.4 List of SSN technical and operational documentation (distributed not discussed during the meeting)

Annex 4 – List of action items from the SSN 17 Workshop

Action point	Topic and Action	Resp.
1	**Incident reports Guidelines:** Include a footnote regarding the issues still on-going at the COSS committee (Ships which failed to notify, or do not have insurance certificates or financial guarantees; incidents reported by pilots or port authorities).	EMSA
2	**Incident reports Guidelines:** MS to provide comments on the IR Guidelines updated version and review the templates in Appendices 7 and 8 by end of June 2012. EMSA to publish the new IR Guidelines version following comments received.	MS EMSA
3	**Incident Report new protocol:** The new IR protocol to be developed and implemented on a voluntary basis if agreed by the SSN HLSG 7	
4	**Incident Report new protocol:** The following clarifications were requested to EMSA: • To investigate the possibility to have an amended XML protocol to correct only the IR inconsistencies. If the possibility is confirmed, this change in the current protocol will become the minimum mandatory changes for those MSs not implementing the new IR as per action 3. • To clarify how to implement the new XML protocol using a phase-in approach.	EMSA
5	**Incident Report new protocol:** Submit the new Incident Report protocol to the HLSG 7 for validation and for confirmation of a minimum number of voluntary member states participating. If agreed, EMSA is requested to prepare the new XML with the IR new protocol (and the amended current protocol solving the inconsistencies) by end July 2012 and to submit it to the SSN group for approval by correspondence	HLSG EMSA
6	**Incident Report new protocol:** If agreed by HLSG, the preliminary implementation plan for the new IR protocol on a voluntary basis would be April 2013.	MS
7	**IFCD draft:** include in the proposal to down-sampled the ship position information for the backup procedure (IFCD section 4.4, page 29)	EMSA
8	**Review of SSN documentation:** The SSN group agreed to set up the Documentation Correspondence Group (DCG) according to the terms of reference presented and the following MS volunteered to participate: Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Poland, Sweden, the Netherlands and the UK. The DCG shall report the next SSN Workshop	DCG
9	**SSN Deployment Plan:** include in the SSN Technical and Operational documentation the SSN business rules.	EMSA
10	**SSN Status National Level:** Analyse possible solution to remove the 120 days limitation to update PortPlus notifications in the new SSN version to be deployed in July 2012.	EMSA

Action point	Topic and Action	Resp.
11	**SSN Data Quality Report:** Present the definition of downtime of the national SSN systems to the next workshop.	EMSA
12	**Business Continuity Facility:** evaluate options and include the possibility to have S-TESTA connection in the BCF plan in Porto	EMSA
13	**THETIS / SSN interface:** include a chapter in the revision of the Operational Procedures document with the guidelines for the Locode management.	DCG
14	**Integrated Maritime Data working groups:** request guidance from the HLSG.	HLSG
15	**New naming convention to apply in SSN:** EMSA is invited to provide support to MS in the migration of the users to the new naming convention by end of 2012. MS are invited to already create new users using the new naming convention.	EMSA MS