Meeting Report

Meeting of the SafeSeaNet Incident Report Working Group (SSN IRWG)

Held in Lisbon on

19 June 2019

Final version
Date: 7 October 2019

EMSA

1. Background

The 1st Incident Report Working Group (IRWG) was established at SSN Workshop 12 (October 2009) with the objective to develop and propose a revised version of the Incident Reports messages to be exchanged between MS through SSN. In addition, the IRWG was also tasked to review the Incident Report Messages Guidelines.

The incident reporting through SSN has improved significantly following the work carried out by the IRWG with the implementation of the automatic distribution of the Incident Report messages to the MS authorities along the planned route of the vessel. In addition, a link has been established between SSN and the Common Emergency Communication and Information System (CECIS), managed by DG ECHO, in order to avoid double reporting of POLREP messages (POLWARN and POLINF information).

Today, SSN is used for the reporting and exchange of information on incidents or accidents, as required by the VTMIS Directive. During pollution response exercises, SSN is used to the test incident reporting procedures in preparation for a real incident. As a follow-up of these exercises e.g. SCOPE 2017 Member State authorities, in particular the pollution response authorities, have provided feedback with proposals to further improve the exchange of Incident Reports through SSN.

Following this feedback, and recognising the positive results achieved by the IRWG, EMSA proposed to re-establish the IRWG. This was discussed in October 2018 at the 4th SSN/LRIT Group Meeting and the 12th Consultative Technical Group for Marine Pollution Preparedness and Response (CTG MPPR), noting the importance of input from both the SSN users and the Pollution Response Authorities users. The High Level Steering Group for Governance of the Digital Maritime System and Services (HLSG), at its 4th meeting held on the 11 December 2018, agreed the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Working Group (WG). The ToR are attached as Annex I.

The 1st meeting of the re-established IRWG was held at EMSA on 19 June 2019. Delegations from **Belgium, Denmark, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden,** and **the Netherlands** attended the meeting. Ms. Asta Mackeviciute from the European Commission (DG ECHO) was invited to participate regarding CECIS-MP aspects. Mr. Uffe Ernst-Frederiksen from MAERSK participated briefly in the meeting by giving a short presentation on incidents and accidents with Hazmat on containers.

The agenda of the meeting is attached as Annex II.

2. Meeting Programme

2.1 Introduction and opening

The meeting was opened by Mr Frederic Hebert, Head of Unit C.1 for Pollution Response Services (EMSA).Mr Hebert welcomed the participants and recalled the background of the WG.

2.2 Terms of Reference for the WG and meeting objectives

EMSA presented the ToR and mandate of the group which is to;

- review the XML Incident Report messages to remove inconsistencies;
- propose improvements to the SSN web interface for the exchange of incident reports;
- review of the Incident Report Guidelines;
- propose training modules specific for the exchange of Incident Reports through SSN;
- and; to review the user feedback received regarding POLREP Incident Reports.

The proposed approach for the WG is to determine the business requirements to improve the Incident Reporting and exchange through SSN (and link with CECIS), taking into consideration the existing SSN specifications. Following the drafting of the business requirements, consequential changes need to be made to transform the business requirements to technical specifications. The business requirements will be provided to the HLSG meeting during the 1st semester of 2020.

The objectives of this first meeting are:

- Initiate the work of the IRWG;
- Demonstrate the present reporting and exchange of Incident Report information in SSN and link with CECIS;
- Review feedback from the questionnaire sent to the working group in advance of the first meeting with the purpose of drafting a preliminary set of business requirements;
- Identify the main changes to the SSN XML message structure of Incident Reports.

EMSA requested that due to time limitations the agenda item on "Proposed improvements to the Incident Report Guidelines" be postponed to the 2nd meeting of the WG. The revised agenda was approved by the WG.

2.3 Overview of Incident Reporting in SSN

EMSA presented an overview of the SSN system (at national and central level) and Incident Report Guidelines. This was followed by a description of the SSN-CECIS link for POLREPs.

A second presentation from EMSA described the link between SSN and THETIS/THETIS-EU, web based tools for PSC and for recording ship inspections regulated by EU legislation respectively. Both systems currently use Ship Details and Port Call details from SSN. Furthermore, THETIS-EU uses waste notifications from SSN to support the Port Reception Facilities (PRF) regime. This functionality will be developed to align with the new PRF Directive.

2.4 Review of feedback from the Questionnaire

A questionnaire "Review of Incident Report Types" was sent to the WG on the 16th of May. BE, DK, ES, NL, NO, PL and RO provided responses before the meeting. The responses were discussed in detail with the WG. Necessary clarifications were sought from the contributors and the participants shared their views on the issues raised.

The table with all the business requirements and open issues following the discussions at the meeting is presented in Annex III. Hereafter a summary of the main issues discussed with a reference to the business requirement number in Annex III (e.g. BR #).

2.4.1 Proposed general improvements

Many proposals addressed general improvements for the usability of the SSN web interface (Textual Interface and Graphical interface) for the creation and distribution of Incident Reports. .

SSN TI - Help menu and guidance

Spain commented that the SSN Textual Interface (TI) does not clearly show the functions available to the operator. Moreover the Help menu is hidden, and the help contents should be improved, for example not all of the terms available under the drop down lists are explained.

The **WG** agreed to draft these requirements[1] (**BR 1, 2 and 3**).

SSN TI - Indication of mandatory fields

Belgium commented that in the SSN TI the mandatory fields need to be consistently marked with an Asterix and that all fields should have an explanatory tool tip. The **Netherlands** requested that the meaning of mandatory fields should be made clear.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 4**).

Belgium proposed that the principle should be to have a minimum set of required fields. This should allow an initial incident report (when not a lot of information is available) and to update the report later.

EMSA confirmed it is possible for a user to create a SITREP with basic information, and for the same user to later update the SITREP with more information.

[1] This means that the WG agreed to write the draft business requirement (BR) by correspondence. The draft BR are numbered and relate to the table in Annex III.

SSN TI - Structured data

Belgium noted that to receive the IR in an ICT system as much information as possible should be reported within structured data fields. The use of PDF's for reporting of incident reports should be phased out because it does not allow the processing of structured information. **Poland** commented that the availability of file attachments for sending SITREPs should still be possible. **EMSA** noted that it is always mandatory for the user to associate these files with structured metadata.

Some participants suggested using spreadsheets similar to NSW to upload information in the system in a structured way.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (template upload, web form filled-in, or xml message) (**BR 5 and 6**).

2.4.2 Creating and sending an IR

EMSA noted the feedback from the Netherlands stating that the interface should allow the operators to create an incident report quickly and confidently.

EMSA further noted feedback from Member States following exercises regarding the need for some field sizes to be resized to accommodate inserted text. For example, the POLINF form fields P_41, P_42, P_43, P_48 and P_50 are too small and it is not possible to see the full text that was inserted,the same when viewing the IR details, and the SSN TI forms should be improved accordingly.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 7**).

Spain emphasised the importance of having the units for wind speed, visibility etc required for the relevant fields.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 8**).

EMSA recalled other feedback from exercises which indicated that the Geo-Coordinates in 1/10,000 format is not useful should be removed. The **Netherlands** reported that there should be an option to enter decimal minutes (DMM). **EMSA** proposed to align the options for submitting Geo-Coordinates with that displayed in the SEG, namely; DMS (DD MM SS) 51°30'17"N, DM (DD MM.mm) 51°30.29'N and Decimal (DD.ddddd) 51.50487°.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 9**).

Poland considered it a restriction to only enter data in English, however **EMSA** noted that English is the international maritime language and using other national languages would be difficult for other MSs to understand.

The **WG** discussed the naming of Incident Report type "VTS Rules Infringement" and proposed to revise the name of the IR to "Traffic Rules Infringement".

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 12**).

Belgium asked why the forms require the number of persons on board needs to be reported twice? **EMSA** answered that the fields correspond to (i) the number of persons on board from voyage information, and (ii) the number of persons at risk and this should be clarified in the form, for example through a tool tip.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 13**).

Belgium asked when reporting an IR there is a need to include voyage information of the ship involved in the incident. Can voyage information/selection of a voyage be done through central SSN?

EMSA demonstrated how a voyage can be searched and associated with a report.

EMSA agreed to analyse how to improve the association of voyage information after identification of the vessel, possibly through a reduction in the number of steps needed to do so (**BR 14**).

The Netherlands indicated that frequently there is a mismatch between the vessel name and IMO number they wish to report, with the vessel name and IMO number in the CSD. As a result the operators choose unidentified to be able to submit a report or report the IR with the 'old' name of the vessel. **EMSA** answered that the, MMSI Number, Call Sign and Ship Name should be editable and can be changed by the operator. This temporary version of the vessel will be created in the database and associated with the Incident Report.

EMSA answered that this will be analysed further to ensure the system is working as expected (**Open issue[2] 1**).

System to System communication (S2S)

Belgium indicated a need for further functionalities to get a list of voyages for the ship involved in the IR (request/response) and to get a list of countries along the planned route of the ship.

EMSA will analyse this requirement further (**Open issue 2**).

SSN Ecosystem Graphical user interface (SEG)

Spain proposed the possibility of being able to create a SITREP in the SEG, for example by right clicking on a ship. The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 15**).

Spain proposed that all SSN IR should be visible in the SEG.

EMSA answered that they will investigate the possibility to extend the validity period of incident reports visible in the SEG (**Open issue 3**).

Poland asked about the possibility for drift oil spill model results from "SeaTrackWeb" in the SEG. EMSA explained that previously there has been some work done with the Swedish Meteorological and Hydrographic Institute, on using CSN detections to trigger an oil spill forecast in "SeaTrackWeb".

EMSA will investigate the possibility of including drift modelling information in the **SEG** (**Open issue 4**)**.**

2.4.3 Distribution of IR

Netherlands requested that the box "distribute to flag state" should always be selected, especially in the case of SITREP and POLREP.

The **WG** agreed to draft both these requirements (**BR 16**).

There was a discussion regarding the message type categories amongst the group. It was proposed that in addition to "Distress" and "Urgency", the types "Security" and "Routine" should be added as type categories.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 17**).

There was a proposal to remove the option of "select all" for the distribution. The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 18**).

Belgium and **Denmark** supported the possibility to be able to select countries for IR distribution per Regional Agreement e.g. Bonn Agreement, HELCOM agreement.

The **WG** agreed to draft these requirements **(BR 19)**.

Belgium proposed to allow the pushing, via S2S services, of the IR via the integrated ship report, as this would be very useful to the MRCC when a ship enters their area of interest.

EMSA clarified that this is currently being analysed through a dedicated pilot project to improve the reuse of information from SSN ("Ship Shore Facilitation pilot project").

The **Netherlands** and **Spain** stated that it would be helpful if there was some better indication of the level of urgency of the IR in the emails received. Currently, there is no distinction between the types of IR in the email received by the operators. The group discussed this point and the **WG** proposed to include in the body of the email the message type "Distress", Urgency" etc and to include the request for action (Ack). (**BR 20**)

2.4.4 POLREP and link to CECIS

The questionnaire responses on the link between SSN and CECIS MP were noted by the group. The responses provided in the questionnaire by **Denmark** and **Belgium** are presented below:

[2] Open issues will be further analysed by EMSA and presented at the next WG meeting. The open issues are indicated in the table in Annex III.

Denmark reported that it would be better to do all POLREP handling in 1 system CECIS-MP and not in 2 systems (SSN and CECIS-MP). DG ECHO supported the comments of Denmark. CECIS MP could develop to become accessible from the SEG. In many countries' users are the same and it would ease the switch over. CECIS MP should remain accessible as a separate system to allow 3rd countries to enter. Attached files must be shared with CECIS. All three POLREP types should be fully mirrored between CECIS MP and SSN.

Belgium supported the comment from Denmark, to think about using only CECIS-MP for all POLREP handling. Belgium reported that there was a discussion in the POLREP community (Bonn agreement) with the conclusion that there is a request to move POLREP messages to CECIS. SSN would contain the maritime incident (SITREP) and have a feature to provide early warning for CECIS audience. More functionalities could be developed in CECIS e.g. risk analysis based on information in SSN + Equasis + Thetis inspection reports, for identification of ships with a high POLREP risk for ship inspection targeting. The **WG** noted this as an open issue to be forwarded to the Commission services (DG MOVE and DG ECHO) for clarifications[3] (**Open issue 5 + 6**).

Denmark recalled that the original POLINF was developed and approved by the BONN contracting parties and that the IMO format is used nowadays.

The **WG** agreed that the POLREP form in the SSN TI should be aligned with the IMO format. Furthermore, based on feedback from previous exercises, the **WG** agreed to include P_42 Pollution Characteristics as a mandatory field and to include an additional field "Oiled wildlife information" (**BR 23, 24 and 25**).

It was noted that there was a CleanSeaNet (CSN) pilot project with MUMM (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Science – OD NATURE) in the past. This project has enabled CSN to receive oil spill drift prediction information from the MUMM prediction tool. The tool predicts the drift of oil spills detected by CSN for part of the North Sea and English Channel. A dialog on such services could be raised by Member States at the CSN User Group meeting and the CTG meetings.

2.4.5 Guidelines to reply to or acknowledge receipt of message

Norway had reported in its written feedback that after a CECIS message is established that the information is circulated to all Europe which is unnecessary. There should be a mechanism to ensure that the correct authority also is the one that gives response, and that the country that consider the reply understand that the reply/Acknowledge is from the correct authority. **DG ECHO** clarified that they understood that the messages are not distributed by default to all Europe and said that they would investigate this further.

Spain also stated the need for clarifications for the Acknowledge procedures. **Belgium** had similar questions regarding the field E_Assistance required in the SITREP. When an IR is distributed to another country multiple maritime authorities will receive this IR, and which authority should provide the assistance.

The **WG** agreed that the business rules about who has the responsibility for providing a reply and/or acknowledgement should be made clearer in the national guidelines as well as the IR Guidelines and CECIS guidelines (**BR 26**).

2.4.6 SITREPs

The **Netherlands** proposed that it would be useful to revise the "Nature" fields that are available in the SITREP form and include additional fields for example "loss of anchor", "engine failure", "not under command".

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 27**).

The **WG** also agreed inclusion of the Places of Refuge Situation Report Annex in SSN in a structured format. (**BR 28**)

Following a request for clarification from **Poland**, **EMSA** demonstrated that it was possible to attach and submit files to a SITREP with the exception of image files.

[3] Post-meeting note: These issues are outside the Terms of Reference of the WG.

EMSA agreed to include the possibility to attach and submit image files (JPEG) with the SITREP (**BR 29**).

It was proposed to make vessel identification mandatory, either vessel ID or description for SITREP. The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement. (**BR 30**)

2.4.7 Lost and Found Objects

Spain proposed to include an additional field "Warning Broadcasted" if there are broadcasts over VHF, NAVTEX, INMARSAT etc. The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement. (**BR 31**)

Poland, proposed to change the name of "Lost and Found Containers" to "Lost and Found Objects" as this is relevant in the case of lost navigational buoys and other objects. The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 32**).

2.4.8 Waste

Belgium noted the need for a clarification on the nature of the waste IR in the Incident Report Guidelines. Furthermore **Romania** noted the need for the structure of the waste IR XML to be amended as currently the structure reflects the PRF inspection report and this is not the purpose.

The **WG** agreed to change the IR Waste template to be in line with the business requirements from the Port Reception Facilities Directive. (**BR 33**)

2.4.9 Searching and Viewing Incident Reports

Norway had proposed in its written feedback that the search functionality for IR should be improved. This was discussed by the WG, in terms of search IR per authority and per country in the SSN TI and to allow search per type and time period.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 34 and 35**).

2.4.10 Updating Incident Reports

Following a proposal from **the Netherlands**, it was proposed that SSN should allow the registration of individual IR messages without overwriting the previous IR. Moreover the group discussed the possibility of the web interface highlighting the new/updated information in comparison with the previous message.

The **WG** agreed to draft this requirement (**BR 36 and 37**).

2.4.11 Other comments

The **WG** agreed that the IR Guidelines should include instructions and a data mapping on how to report and define each data elements (**BR 38**)

2.5 Incidents and accidents with Hazmat containers

Mr. Uffe V. Ernst-Frederiksen from Maersk presented the complexity of the dangerous goods issue. He referred to the tragic accident of the brand new Maersk vessel (Maersk Honam) that happened in March 2018, where this vessel suffered a devastating fire resulting in the loss of five seafarers and causing severe damage to both the vessel and her cargo. The presentation contained the summary of actions taken on board of the vessel and was followed by the results of investigation done by Maersk.

The Maersk investigation showed that it was the amount, type, composition and location of the dangerous cargo that led to the catastrophic fire onboard Maersk Honam. Maersk together with other container lines were quite active after this accident in discussing the need for improving the dangerous good reporting practices and implemented several changes including the following:

- Set up a new booking and scanning policy for containers shipped with Maersk;
- Begun physical inspections of import and export cargo in four US ports to verify contents match descriptions and cargo is correctly stuffed, latched and secured before being loaded onto container ships.

Since August 2018, 350 containers (75% with DG) were verified and the fail rate was very high reaching to 57%;

- Implemented preliminary guidelines for the stowage of dangerous goods. The company developed a new set of principles (called Risk Based Dangerous Goods Stowage) with the objective of minimising risk to crew, cargo, environment and vessel in case of fire.

2.6 e-Learning course on SSN Incident Reporting and CECIS-MP

EMSA presented a demo of the new e-Learning course "SSN and CECIS MP: reporting, consultation and coordination of international assistance for maritime pollution incidents and accidents" available from EMSA's e-Learning platform MaKCs. When the e-Learning course becomes available (July 2019) EMSA will send instructions to the WG on how to access the course and the CNTA contact for their country. The CNTA contact is responsible for the co-ordination of MaKCs users at national level.

3. Meeting Conclusions/Follow-up Actions

Mr. Lazaros Aichmalotidis, Head of Unit C.2, Vessel and Port Reporting, joined the meeting for the conclusions. He thanked the participants for their active contributions to a positive meeting which set a solid basis for the revision of Incident Reporting in SSN. The objective is to continue to work by correspondence between July and October 2019 to develop draft business requirements. In October EMSA will send the meeting documents: draft business requirements; review of incident report guidelines; review of training modules. The 2nd meeting will be held at EMSA on the new date of **12th of November 2019**. The aim of the 2nd meeting will be to finalise the draft business requirements and to review proposed updates to the Incident Report Guidelines and the training modules

Annexes

Annex I – Terms of Reference

Annex II – Meeting Agenda

Annex III – Draft Business Requirements and Open Issues

Annex I – ToR

Annex I

Working Group on "Incident Reports"

Terms of Reference

1 - Mandate

The Working Group on "Incident Reports" (IRWG) should, taking into account existing specifications of the SSN system; develop and propose to the SSN Group a revised version of the Incident Reports messages to be exchanged between MS.

The WG shall in particular:

- review the XML Incident Report messages to remove inconsistencies;
- propose improvements to the SSN web interface for the exchange of Incident Reports;
- review the Incident Report Guidelines;
- propose training modules specific for the exchange of Incident Reports through SSN; and
- review the user feedback received regarding the POLREP Incident Reports.

The Working Group on "Incident Reports" shall propose an XML messaging framework that should fulfil both technical and operational requirements.

2 - Resources and Members of the Group

Member States participating in SSN Group have the right to nominate members. The Pollution Response Authorities of the Member State will also be invited to participate through the CTG MPPR.

EMSA will provide the secretariat; and will coordinate, collate and amalgamate the information sources identified by the members of the group into working electronic documents for ongoing dissemination and agreement.

The Working Group will work mainly by correspondence but will organise at least two coordination meetings. When meeting outside EMSA's premises, travel costs shall be covered by each participant. EMSA may chair the meeting if the hosting MS requests. When meeting at EMSA premises, EMSA will reimburse the participants' travel costs, in accordance with the EMSA Reimbursement Rules.

3 - Report

The working group report(s) will cover the defined objectives, reflect the views of the participants and cover the topics listed under point 1 "Mandate".

4 - Deliverables and timing

The reports should be ready by the end of January 2020 and then will be transmitted to the SSN Group and CTG MPPR members for their feedback. The report will be presented at the meetings by nominated representatives of the IRWG.

5 - Acceptance

The final result of the Working Group will be submitted to the SSN Group and CTG MPPR for agreement and then to the HLSG for validation.

6 - Duration of these ToR

The mandate of the IRWG will expire by the end of May 2020 (the SSN/LRIT meeting is planned to take place in May 2020) and can be prolonged/renewed by the HLSG, if necessary.

Annex II – Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, 19 June 2019

Time	Agenda Item	Speakers
09:15 – 09:30	Arrival and Registration	
09:30 – 09:45	Welcome – Introductory remarks	EMSA / Commission
09:45 – 10:00	Meeting objectives and terms of reference of the WG	EMSA
10:00 – 10:30	Overview of Incident Reporting in SSN ■ CECIS link ■ Issues with the IR type Waste & link with THETIS EU/PRF	EMSA
10:30 – 11:15	Review of the feedback from questionnaire: ■ Submission of Incident Reports to SSN ■ Improvements to the SSN Web Interface (TI and SEG)	EMSA All participants
11:15 – 11:30	*Coffee break*	
11:30 – 13:00	Review of the feedback from questionnaire (cont.): ■ Other comments and links (including CECIS)	EMSA All participants
13:00 – 14:00	*Lunch break*	
14:00 – 15:00	■ SSN XML Message Structure	EMSA
15:15 – 15:30	*Coffee break*	
15:30 – 16:00	Incidents and accidents with Hazmat containers – lessons learned presentation from MAERSK	Mr Uffe Ernst-Frederiksen
16:00 – 16:45	Demo of e-learning course: "SSN and CECIS MP: reporting, consultation and coordination of international assistance for maritime pollution incidents and accidents"	EMSA
16:45 – 17:15	Proposed improvements to the Incident Report Guidelines	EMSA All participants
17:15 – 17:30	Conclusions & next steps	EMSA / Commission
17:30	End of meeting	

Annex III – Summary of draft business requirements and open issues

BR	Description	Status
General improvements in IR		
1	Improve the overall user friendliness and navigation of SSN Textual Interface	Agreed
2	Make the online help button visible	Agreed
3	Improve the information provided in the online help and tooltip functionality	Agreed
4	Revise the mandatory elements marked in the web interface	Agreed
5	Implement templates (spreadsheets similar to NSW) to upload information in the system in a structured way to allow the S2S exchange	Agreed
Creating Incident Reports		
6	Keep the document upload option to include additional information to the IR, but he input of the IR information should be done in a structured approach (template upload, web form filled-in or XML message)	Agreed
7	Review the size of some fields to allow additional information to be included	Agreed
8	Add the units regarding wind-speed, visibility etc required for the relevant fields	Agreed
9	Geo-coordinates, as default DMS, minutes option to be removed (1/1000 Minutes, add decimal degrees option (DM) -> align with SEG	Agreed
10	Allow users to navigate through the IR with the “tab” function	Agreed
11	Write words separately e.g. “Assistance Required” instead of “AssistanceRequired”	Agreed
12	VTS Rules infringement, revise the name of the IR proposal “Traffic Rules Infringement”	Agreed
13	D_Number of Persons clarify the meaning of the field, possibly adding tooltips	Agreed
14	Improve the association of voyage information after identifying the vessel (reduce nr of steps)	Agreed
OP1	EMSA to check if the MMSI Number, Call Sign and Ship Name are editable and can be changed by the operator	Open issue
System to System communication (S2S)		
OP2	EMSA to analyse how to get a list of voyages for the ship involved in the IR (request/response) and to get a list of countries along the planned route of the ship also for the S2S implementation.	Open issue
SSN Ecosystem Graphical user interface (SEG)		
15	Report incident reports though SEG	Agreed
OP3	Revise the validity period of Incident Reports to be visible in SEG	Open issue
OP4	EMSA to investigate the possibility of including drift modelling information in the SEG	Open issue
Distributing IR		
16	Distribute to flag state should be always selected	Agreed
17	Message type, in addition of “Distress” and “Urgency”, add “Security” and “Routine”	Agreed

18	Remove the option of select all in the Distribution	Agreed
19	Include the possibility to select countries for IR Distribution per Regional Agreement	Agreed
20	Include in the body of the email the message type: “Distress”, “Urgency”…. And the add the request for action also (Ack)	Agreed
POLREP – interface with CECIS		
OP5	Further integration of CECIS, SSN and SEG to facilitate the access to an integrated maritime picture.: • CECIS MP could develop to become accessible from the SEG (DK) • a request to move POLREP messages to CECIS (BE/DK)	Open issue
OP6	Need to include the needs of Regional Agreements 3rd countries to facilitate their use of the system, preferable to be reported in CECIS and establish the link CECIS -> SSN	Open issue
23	Lack of enough space in fields to write information (align with IMO format) and the field size should be adjustable allowing to read all information	Agreed
24	Include P_42 Pollution Characteristics as a mandatory field	Agreed
25	Include additional field “Oiled wildlife” information	Agreed
26	Include in the IR guidelines the need for ack the IR if requested	Agreed
SITREP		
27	Revise the “Nature” fields to include additional e.g. loss anchor, Not under Command NOC, etc…	Agreed
28	Include the PoR annex in a structured format	Agreed
29	Include the possibility to attach image files (JPG, etc)	Agreed
30	Make Vessel Identification element mandatory, either vessel ID or description for SITPEPs	Agreed
Lost and Found Object		
31	Include additional field “Warning broadcasted”	Agreed
32	Change the name to Lost and Found Objects (not containers)	Agreed
Waste		
33	Change the IR Waste template in line with the business requirements from PRF Directive	Agreed
Searching and viewing Incident Reports		
34	Search IR per authority and country reporting in SSN TI	Agreed
35	Search IR per type and time period	Agreed
Updating IR		
36	Register individual IR messages without overwriting the previous IR	Agreed
37	Display on the web interface the IR highlighting the new/updated information compared with previous message	Agreed
Other comments		
38	Include in the IR Guidelines instructions on how to report and the definition of each data elements (e.g. Like the data mapping)	Agreed

European Maritime Safety Agency
Praça Europa 4
1249-206 Lisbon, Portugal
Tel +351 21 1209 200
Fax +351 21 1209 210
emsa.europa.eu