European Maritime Safety Agency

<div>

Workshop Report

SafeSeaNet Workshop 16

Held in Lisbon on
18 & 19 October 2011

</div>

Background

As a follow up to SSN Workshop 15 (4 and 5 May 2011), EMSA organised the SSN workshop 16.

The meeting was opened by Mr Leendert Bal, Head of Department C and chaired by Mr Yann Le Moan, Senior Project Officer for SafeSeaNet. Mr Jean-Bernard Erhardt represented the **European Commission** (DG MOVE).

Delegations from **Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, 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 Bal welcomed all participants and introduced the main workshop objectives:

- review and agree the proposals made by the Incident Report Working Group, (including the Incident Report Guidelines), revise the XML Incident Report messages, improve the distribution of Incident Reports via the XML interface and revise the Incident Reports forms;
- perform the first complete revision of the draft IFCD (v0.09) and validate the IFCD draft to be submitted to the HSLG;
- present the conclusions of the SSN security study carried out by an external contractor and review the first draft of the Network and Security Reference Guide;

I.2 Approval of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without modifications.

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

The minutes/report of the previous workshops (SSN 15) were approved. EMSA summarised the items outstanding from the previous workshops.

The Netherlands and **France** requested clarification regarding some business rules of SSN V.2 that would cause messages' rejection. The Netherlands, France and Greece invited EMSA to eliminate business rule that could modify the information sent to THETIS. EMSA clarified that some issues related to the XSD are going to be corrected (e.g. net and gross weight) and a hotfix is being tested that should not impact MSs applications. EMSA clarified that the correlation rules that will be implemented along with the XML 2.06 were validated at SSN 15 and will be tested before being applied in production.

Germany requested updated information regarding the CSN/SSN link and the discussions on CISE. EMSA clarified that the CSN/SSN link is not related to the CISE and the Commission added that SSN/CSN is relevant to the maritime transport community.

II. INPUT FROM THE COMMISSION

The Commission made a presentation on the evolution of SSN and recalled the roles of the HLSG and the SSN Group (including a reference to the IFCD and IR working groups). The Commission also mentioned the role of the e-MS group in the preparation of the Reporting Formalities Directive and introduced the work plan of the e-MS group referring to the 5 subgroups (General maritime, Customs, Border, MARSEC and Health) and the five possible additional horizontal groups (Transposition, Single window, Interoperability, Confidentiality and Data protection).

Two specialised Expert Groups have been established: one for the definition of the business rules of the ship security message, another one for the definition of the business rules of the waste notification.

The Commission summarised the planning for next meetings as follows:
- 21 October: Customs subgroup
- 9 November: General maritime subgroup
- 10 November: e-MS group
- 15 November: MARSEC committee. The approval of the draft business rules of the ship security message is on the agenda of this meeting
- 23 November: Waste subgroup (later on postponed on 30 November)
- 13 December: HLSG 6

The SSN Group raised several questions on the e-MS group and the Reporting Formalities Directive. COM recalled that the objective of the presentation is to inform MS on the work and meetings scheduled by end 2011, due to the fact that several MS representatives are involved in the SSN Group and the eMS Group or sub-groups. EMSA is actually committed to take into account the ship security message and the waste notification. All the questions regarding the implementation of the Reporting Formalities Directive are relevant for the eMS meeting on 10 November.

Regarding the status of the report on anomalies by Pilots and Ports, the Commission informed that the draft regulation is on the agenda of the next COSS meeting that will examine the legal aspects. The technical aspects will then be analysed by the HLSG and the SSN Group.

III. SAFESEANET OPERATIONAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS

III.1 SSN 16.3.1 Incident report WG progress report (IRWG)

The UK, Italy and **EMSA** presented the work carried out by the IRWG during the 2 years of its mandate, including the deliverables.

Incident Report (IR) guidelines

EMSA presented the revised Incident Report Guidelines. The aim of the document is to provide information and advice to SSN users how to report Incidents in SafeSeaNet. EMSA indicated that two issues remained open for future versions:
- the revised forms and
- the inclusion of a possible new type of incident to report on polluters (article 16.1.b) as proposed by Germany, Sweden and the Netherlands.

Germany proposed to include in the document a reference that the Guidelines are a living document that needs continuous update. **The Netherlands** mentioned that the web interface is not user friendly for providing IR. Almost all the fields are mandatory (wind speed, tide, etc.) making it difficult to provide the IR with all the mandatory information filled in. **The Netherlands** proposed to align both ("distributed" and "non-distributed" incidents) in a single functionality with the option not to distribute at the end the report. EMSA agreed to further analyse the proposal.

The Netherlands also questioned the provisions of section 3.2.2 'Reports to be notified to the central SSN system', stating that there is no requirement to report the incident to SSN if the accident does not affect other MSs. EMSA recalled the requirements of Article 21.2 of Directive 2002/59/EC whereby the information contained in Article 17 shall be available at any time upon request.

Ireland questioned the content of the annex, section 4.4 'Results of inspections', of Article 16.1 which falls under the PSC competency and so it should not be notified to SSN but rather to THETIS. The Commission clarified that it is not only a PSC competency but also a report for the port authorities. EMSA clarified that the results of the application of Article 16.1.e) is on hold pending COSS validation. To avoid any possible misunderstanding the SSN group requested not to include the content of Appendix 8 until its validation.

The SSN group **agreed** on the revised Incident Report guidelines to be attached to the meeting report including the following changes **(Action point 1)**:

a. Include in the introduction a statement that the guidelines are a living document to be maintained on a regular basis;
b. Delete the content of Appendix 8 as it is pending COSS validation;
c. Draft a clarification on section 4.4 and submit it to the SSN group (with the support of Ireland).

Incident Report distribution through XML

EMSA presented the proposal for implementing Incident Reports distribution via XML, aligned with the current web distribution. Several MS expressed concerns with the proposal presented and the impact on the national SSN systems and agreed that MSs need to further evaluate the impact of the proposal before approval.

The SSN group **agreed** on the principle of the Incident Report distribution through XML and to extend the mandate of the IR working group up to SSN 17 to present a detailed technical proposal with an impact assessment at the next workshop 17 **(Action point 2)**.

The proposal should consider the following:

*   The management of update messages (update, cancel and provide feedback);
*   The 2 new queries for IR proposed in the document;
*   The failure management;
*   The management of details (all details should be provided in the notification or using the request/response possibility).

Identification of the types "Others"

The document proposed splitting the Incident Report "Others" to six new Incident Report sub-types: "FailedNotification", "VTSInfringement", "BannedShip", "ResultInspection", "InsuranceFailure" and "Pilot/PortReport" (the last two messages are still on-hold).

The SSN group **agreed** on the general proposal to identify the type "Other" but there was no agreement on the best solution and timing for implementation (2013 or 2015). The following actions were **agreed**:

*   Change the wording for the "VTSinfringement" in the forms **(Action point 3)**;
*   EMSA should work further with the IR working group on defining the optimal solution and the time of implementation (2013 or 2015) and come back with a proposal at SSN 17 **(Action point 4)**.

Standardise and improve Incident Report

The IRWG proposed a set of actions in order to develop a common understanding on reporting incidents such as:

- the inclusion in future SSN workshops of an agenda item dealing with the assessment of best practice on incident reporting (the purpose is to share and benefit from the experience of MSs), and;
- the holding of regular exercises to promote reporting in compliance with the Incident Reports guidelines, and to collect regular feedback from the SSN community.

The SSN group **agreed** with the proposal **(Action point 5)**.

Inconsistencies

The UK presented the amendments for resolving XML RG inconsistencies relating to IR and proposed their implementation alongside with the changes on the IR distribution through XML. **Sweden** raised an issue with the attribute "persons at risk" in the SITREP indicating that it should refer to "Number of persons on Board". EMSA clarified that the "Number of persons on Board" is already included in another field under the "Voyage" Information. The information of the persons at risk should be optional but at least one of the two fields should be provided.

The SSN group **agreed:**

a) On the proposal with the above mentioned correction on the SITREP (section 3.1): the number of POB and Persons at Risks should be optional (occurrence 0-1) but at least one should be provided **(Action point 6)**.

b) The time plan for the implementation of the inconsistencies should be reviewed at SSN 17 following the proposal of the IR working group for the XML distribution.

Incident Report forms

Italy presented the proposal for revising the current IR forms. The changes that should affect the XML structure of the messages were evaluated, and the IRWG agreed on the need to harmonise the XML messages with the data provided in the Incident Report forms. In addition, it was agreed that the forms with an IMO background (e.g. SITREPs) should be kept as close as possible to the IMO forms

Sweden proposed to rename the "Lost & Found Containers" to "Lost & Found Object" as this can be any floating objects.

The SSN **agreed** on the revised forms with the correction of wording proposed by Sweden. The changes will be done along with the XML changes (for consistency) **(Action point 7)**.

IRWG - Time Plan for implementation

The SSN group **agreed** that the implementation of the IR Guidelines and the actions to "standardise and improve IR" to be applied after the SSN workshop 16. The improvements on the IR web distribution tool will be launched in production by end 2011. The timing for implementation of the other technical developments (inconsistencies related to IR, XML distribution and type "others") should be reviewed at SSN 17 along with the IR working group reports on the XML distribution (2013 or 2015) **(Action point 8)**.

III.2 SSN 16.3.3 SSN group "Rules of Procedure"

The document was not presented. The SSN group was requested to provide comments. **The UK** proposed to forward to EMSA minor comments on the document. **Germany** requested rule 4 to be changed to guarantee at least two months of warning regarding the meeting dates.

The SSN group **agreed** on the change proposed by **Germany** and EMSA to evaluate the changes proposed by the UK. If the UK changes will be substantial the document will be presented at next SSN 17; otherwise it will be considered as approved **(Action point 9)**.

III.3 SSN 16.3.2 Presentation of the draft IFCD

On behalf of the IFCD working group, **France, Sweden, the Netherlands** and **EMSA** presented the first complete draft IFCD v0.09 for the SSN group validation. The IFCD draft presented reflects the current SSN system implementation, including the access rights policy. Only chapter 7 "System Security" includes additional requirements recommended by the security study (SSN 16.4.1).

The SSN group was invited to validate the technical chapters of the draft IFCD (chapters 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6). The policy related chapters (chapters 3 and 7) were presented to receive the feedback of the SSN group that will be included in the draft version to be submitted to the HLSG. EMSA stated that the IFCD working group will continue its work by correspondence to integrate the comments received from the current SSN group and the next HLSG.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

The Netherlands presented chapter 1 draft and the SSN group validated the chapter and agreed to remove the list of technical and operational documents from the IFCD and to include a reference to "the list of documents managed by the SSN group and published on EMSA website". In addition, the group agreed to forward to the HLSG the comment of **Germany** about the AIS regional servers.

Chapter 2 - SafeSeaNet overview

The Netherlands presented chapter 2 draft and the SSN group validated the chapter with the exception of the SSN Graphical Interface (GI). In particular, **Ireland** supported by **Malta** and **Norway** proposed that this interface should not be mentioned under section 2.5.2 "Information exchange mechanisms" as it is not an "exchange mechanism" but only a means to visualise data. **Denmark, Spain, Sweden and the UK** said that the SSN GI is used to support their operations and would like to have it among the interfaces to be maintained by EMSA according to SSN performance requirements. EMSA was requested to reflect the different positions in the draft IFCD.

Chapter 3 - Roles and Responsibilities

Sweden presented chapter 3 draft and the SSN group agreed with the draft except the following issues that require further elaboration:

- LRIT flag information: **Bulgaria** questioned why to limit the distribution of LRIT only to flag information. **Ireland** stressed that the LRIT information is only available through the SSN GI and that regardless of the interface the information available in SSN should be the same. EMSA suggested to reviewing the draft together with the Unit in charge of the LRIT and present a new proposal.

- Access rights for Incident Reports to ports: **The UK** raised the issue that some types of Incident Reports include information that should be restricted to the ports (commercially sensitive information). EMSA clarified that the access rights reflect the current SSN implementation whereby Incident Reports information is not limited for ports. The proposal of **the UK** shall be presented to the HLSG. However EMSA noticed that the UK proposal has several implications (distinguish the different accesses to different types of IR, include the previous port/next port in the IR, etc).

Chapter 4 - SafeSeaNet Performance

France presented chapter 4 draft and the SSN group validated the chapter. **The Netherlands** underlined that the 4 minutes maximum time for response is too much and that this does not meet the SSN operational requirements. Other MSs indicated that they cannot commit to minimum time. **The Netherlands** proposed to revaluate their position following a data quality analysis on the real SSN request/response times to check if it is feasible to reduce the requirement.

The SSN group **agreed** EMSA to evaluate the effective request/response times and for the time being to leave in the draft IFCD an "average time" conditioned to this check.

Chapter 5 - Operational Services and Procedures

Sweden presented chapter 5 draft and the SSN group validated the chapter. **The UK** proposed to remove the Fax option as a back-up means of communication in section 5.3. The SSN group **agreed** with the proposal. EMSA will make the necessary amendments in the draft.

Chapter 6 - System Management and Tests

France presented chapter 6 draft and the SSN group **validated** the chapter without comments.

Chapter 7 - System Security

EMSA presented chapter 7 draft and recalled that this chapter is outside the mandate of the SSN group. The legal framework of the SSN security policy is defined in the Annex III of Directive 2002/59/EU as amended.

The draft includes the proposals presented in the Security Study (SSN 16.4.1).

The UK questioned the requirement related to the audits. Their system is already audited by multiple authorities and there is no need for additional audits. The UK proposed to introduce the principle of "recognition" of audits. **The UK** was invited to present a proposal for redrafting the text.

The Netherlands informed that they have several comments to the proposed draft and questioned the scope of the security measures (up to the NCA level or also covering the interface between the NCA and LCA). EMSA proposed to **the Netherlands** to submit their comments in written and clarified that the security policy is applicable to the entire SSN system.

The SSN group **agreed** to indicate their concerns to the HLSG and not to submit the draft chapter 7 together with the IFCD draft. EMSA clarified that the draft chapter 7 will be included as an annex to the Security Study and will be submitted to the HLSG.

The **Action point 10** summarise the decisions and comments reflected above.

III.4 SSN 16.3.5 SSN Handbook review

This document was not presented due to shortage of time. The presentation was deferred to SSN 17. The SSN group **agreed** to provide comments by February 2012 and EMSA will present a new draft at SSN 17 **(Action point 11)**.

IV. SAFESEANET TECHNICAL ASPECTS

IV.1 SSN 16.4.1 SSN Security Study

EMSA presented the outcomes of the SSN security study carried out by an external contractor on behalf of EMSA. The study proposals were the result of an assessment made by the contractor to the current SSN system (including the feedback provided by

MS on their national SSN system through a security questionnaire and at a Focus group meeting). The study concluded that there is a need for a common baseline security policy. The security study also concluded on the system classification, the SSN System is an "unclassified system" with commercial sensitive information.

The UK expressed their concern on the security measures proposed by the study, considering that the measures are quite demanding for an unclassified system. **The Netherlands** questioned the applicability of the security measures at local level. **Greece** requested clarifications on the time schedule to implement the security requirements and expressed their support to increase the security measures at port level.

The SSN group **noted** the results of the security study presented and expressed a general concern on the impact of the proposed security policy at MS national systems and on the local competent authority systems. Some MSs requested more time to analyse the entire document.

Two specific concerns were raised:

- The scope of the security policy: the security study suggests that the scope of the SSN baseline security policy should apply to the whole SSN network including national and local systems (since SSN data is available everywhere, and therefore security threats exist at all systems). Some MSs question the feasibility of applying the security measures at local level, especially in ports which, in some cases, are private companies;

- The authentication and traceability of users' actions: the study proposes protocol changes which require originators and providers (both notifying and requesting data) to be declared in the message transaction. Some Member States do not see any benefit in this requirement, as they believe that they should be trusted to control those who send messages on their behalf. Nevertheless it has to be noted that some MSs have already implemented or promote it.

MSs are invited to provide comments on the security study outcomes (**Action point 12**).

EMSA recalled that the security study will be presented at the next HLSG meeting and that the main concerns raised will be reflected in the cover document.

IV.2 SSN 16.4.3 Network and Security Reference Guide

EMSA presented the proposal to update the Network and Security Reference Guide in order to reflect the enhanced SSN architecture, the EMSA Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) and the technical requirements needed to support the current SSN security measures as proposed in the Security Study (SSN 16.4.1).

The UK questioned the legitimacy to impose the security requirements at local level. EMSA clarified that the IFCD chapter 7 will include the SSN security policy applicable to the whole SSN system.

France requested clarification on what is understood as a local user and if users' traceability should apply at local level. EMSA replied that according to the study, the security measures shall be applicable also at port systems. The proposal presented is to identify the ports as user of the national system and map the individual users at port level to allow tracing the use made of the system (accountability).

Ireland required more time to analyse the document and the real impact of the measures proposed. The mapping requirement should be clarified, in particular if it requires going down to the data submission level.

Malta shares with the other SSN group members the concerns on the impact of the minimum security standards applicable to users. The main issue is to avoid putting too many security measures to protect information already publicly available and to balance cost and security.

The SSN group **agreed** to provide further comments (on the parts not relevant to the IFCD chapter 7) to EMSA by end of January 2012. A new draft document will be submitted at SSN 17 workshop **(Action point 13)**.

IV.3 SSN 16.4.2 SSN Deployment Plan

EMSA presented the overall road map of the planned evolution of SSN taking into account the decisions made at SSN meetings, the current legal framework and the proposals of the Incident Report working group. The document proposes a deployment plan up to mid-2012 (releases A and B) and beyond mid-2012 (releases C and D)

The UK expressed the constrains caused because of the delay of release B by EMSA and requested EMSA to inform the SSN group as soon as possible of any delay because of the implications at national level and the changes regarding the personal data management.

Regarding the road map beyond mid-2012, the following comments were made:

- Release C will be further detailed by the IRWG on the technical proposal for IR distribution through XML and distinction of 6 "Others" IR types. The technical proposal and the impact assessment will be presented at SSN 17.
- **The UK** proposed to update the time plan of release D taking into consideration that the business rules approval is pending on the e-MS group and MARSEC. EMSA agreed to update the completion of business rules in March instead of January 2012.
- **France** stressed that the plan foresees the XML for v.3 to be ready only at the end of 2012 and that this does not give enough time for the development at national level.

The SSN group **agreed** on the proposed deployment plan with the following remarks **(Action point 14)**:

- Release B: Approved with correction to refer to personal data "consultation" instead of "management";
- Release C: Renew the ToR of the IRWG to work on the technical requirements for the IR XML distribution, IR inconsistencies and the type "Others";
- Release D: Approved with the changes on the time plan for the business rules of the waste and security (by end of March 2012). In addition the time plan will be reviewed at each workshop.

EMSA presented a proposal for correcting the current SSN schema regarding the "Weight Gross / Weight Net" information fields in the Ship Call response message. This change will align the XSD with the XML and should not have an impact on MSs national systems.

The SSN group **agreed** to implement the change on the XSD with an emergency fix available by mid-November on the SSN Training environment **(Action point 15)**.

IV.4 SSN 16.4.4 MS Commissioning test plan

EMSA presented the updated version (1.60) of the Member States Commissioning Test Plan for SSN group approval.

The UK proposed that the PortPlus test case 1604-01 should not be a mandatory test case. EMSA agreed with the proposal and will amend the document.

France informed that they are planning to develop the WETREP (MRS) message and questioned if they should use the existing MRS test cases. EMSA confirmed that they should use the MRS tests cases.

EMSA reminded MSs that they should always communicate one month in advance to the MSS the exact dates of commissioning and the tentative plan for the next 12 months. This would allow EMSA to allocate resources to support the MS commissioning tests.

The SSN group **agreed** on the changes to MS Commissioning Test Plan with the remark of UK on test case 1604-01 **(Action point 16)**.

IV.5 SSN 16.4.6 Phase-out of SSN v1 messages (Port & Hazmat)

EMSA presented a proposal to phase out the SSN version 1 Port and Hazmat messages.

The SSN group **agreed** to phase out the Port and Hazmat notifications by 14 December 2012 and to phase out the Port and Hazmat requests by 12 December 2013 **(Action point 17)**.

V. SAFESEANET STATUS

V.1 SSN 16.5.1 SSN Status National Level

Due to shortage of time the presentation by each MS was stopped. EMSA will draft the report and publish it at the EMSA restricted website under SSN 16 documents **(Action point 18)** at:

https://extranet.emsa.europa.eu/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=cat_view&gid=280&Itemid=121

V.2 SSN 16.5.2 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 on the SSN-THETIS interface. Mr Frank Rohling (EMSA - B.2) provided additional clarifications regarding the SSN-THETIS interface.

France raised the issue that the cancellations (with Locode 'ZZCAN') are accepted by SSN but not by THETIS. This causes an operational impact, because PSC resources may be allocated to a ship call that was cancelled. EMSA confirmed that THETIS is not accepting the ZZCAN to cancel a call. This issue is being analysed by the THETIS team.

Denmark informed that the MRS BELTREP is going to start its operation in February 2012. For the SOUNDREP MRS, there is a change of authority and EMSA will be informed when the exchange of information with SSN will start. Denmark also requested clarification on some messages that are accepted by SSN but not by THETIS. EMSA clarified that if the ETA does not materialise in ATA within three days of the ETA, the THETIS system is 'cleaning up' the ship call information with the purpose not to disturb PSC officers with non-materialised ETAs. If the same shipcall ID is re-used to notify ATA, then the initial ETA is reinstalled in the interface.

The UK noticed that it is important to keep the possibility of having test ships in SSN Production for final testing, however its use should be limited. EMSA stressed that there are other test ships used by MSs in SSN Production. The ship calls created for these tests ships are contributing to the MS obligation to inspect ships. The use should be limited to the approve test ship IMO '9999999'.

The Netherlands requested the list of rejected messages of THETIS each month and to receive the ship call ID identified both in SSN and THETIS, as this is an important reference to the ship call. EMSA clarified that the requests made to SSN via the XML interface already include the ship call ID in the response messages. For the SSN web interface, it can also be included. Regarding THETIS, the list of rejected messages will require a development and for the display of the ship call ID also. In addition, PSC users did not want to have it on their screen as it is already quite full. The requests will be analysed.

Germany requested clarification on the rejected messages when the ship call ID has expired and requested to have this rule described in the XML reference guide. EMSA confirmed that there is a time window of 120 days to avoid degrading the system performance. The rule will be documented in XML Ref Guide v2.06

Belgium informed that France will be reporting the WETREP information they received from ships, to SSN by the end of the year. Belgium also informed the SSN group that due to the phase out of the Phone and Fax solution for providing Hazmat details, they are concerned on the automated requests and the lack of information regarding the

originator of the requests and the purpose. EMSA clarified that the automated requests for Hazmat could be limited as the PortPlus message allows to request Hazmat information without the full details (only the Yes/No or a summary). The SSN security study also proposes to track the requester.

The SSN group **noted** the information provided in the report and **agreed** to include in the XML Ref Guide 2.06 a reference to the expiration date of 120 days for the Port Plus notifications **(Action point 19)**.

V.3 SSN 16.5.3 Quality checks and reporting

EMSA presented a proposal for a new set of SSN data quality checks to be carried out by the MSS. **The UK** questioned the checks on non-mandatory information like the next port. EMSA agreed that this information is provided on a voluntary basis.

The SSN group **agreed** on the new data quality checks presented for the following Data Quality report (except the reports on the non-mandatory fields) **(Action point 20)**.

VI. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

VI.1 SSN 16.6.1 Pilot projects status report

EMSA presented an update on the SSN related pilot projects: VMS/SSN synergies, Exchange of radar data through SSN, SSN Proxy, Blue Belt and Satellite-AIS. For the clarifications on the Satellite-AIS pilot project Mr Lawrence Sciberras (EMSA - C.3) was present to provide additional clarifications.

EMSA communicated its intention to discontinue the SSN Proxy pilot project as no request was received to maintain the project. **Latvia** and **Norway** reacted and requested to continue the pilot project nevertheless.

The UK requested clarifications on the Blue Belt further enhancement. EMSA clarified that the enhancements are related to the inclusion of additional information regarding unusual behaviours, such as, loss of AIS signal, vessels stopping outside port areas and encounters at sea.

Regarding Satellite-AIS data pilot project, EMSA informed the participants that the Norwegian SAT-AIS data will be stored and processed by the SAT-AIS data processing service that is currently being developed as a module within EMSA's Integrated Maritime Data Environment (IMDatE) where Member States will be able to visualise SAT-AIS directly through IMDatE's SAT-AIS processing service. It is envisaged that the service will be available during Q3 of 2012.

Furthermore, EMSA informed the participants that it plans to host an IMDatE user group meeting during Q1 of 2012 (date to be communicated in due course) where further details on IMDatE and its services will be given.

Ireland asked for a clarification on how the SAT-AIS data will be made available to Member States and referred to the enhancement of the XML interface within the context of IMDatE. EMSA said that the storage and processing of SAT-AIS data will be handled by IMDatE and that additional clarifications will be provided by EMSA through a paper that will be presented during the upcoming HLSG 6 meeting.

The Netherlands asked when the Norwegian SAT-AIS data would be made available to MSs. EMSA said that the plan is set for the 3nd quarter 2012. The Netherlands also referred to the ESA-EMSA SAT-AIS initiative and asked an update on the current state of play. EMSA said that the Agency is collaborating with ESA as the latter is exploring the possibility of establishing a hybrid European SAT-AIS capability with global coverage, where EMSA's role would be that of SAT-AIS data distribution through the SAT-AIS data processing services capability that it is currently developing. EMSA informed the participants that the 3rd EMSA-ESA SAT-AIS information meeting is set to be held in January of next year and further details on the ESA-EMSA SAT-AIS initiative will be given at that time.

Denmark stressed that AIS data (terrestrial or satellite) should be shared with MSs via SSN. EMSA informed the Group that, for the SSN community, this will be done in accordance with the existing access right rules of SSN.

Ireland expressed its concern about the lack of information on IMDatE and its relation to SSN's IFCD. In addition, Ireland questioned why the user community was not being consulted on IMDatE. EMSA informed the Group that during the SAT-AIS info meetings (and other workshops such as LRIT/SSN workshop), information on the IMDatE project was given and that EMSA now plans to further engage the MSs during IMDatE user group meeting that will be held early next year.

The SSN group **noted** the information provided in the document and requested additional information on the IMDatE[1].

VI.2 SSN 16.6.2 Personal Data Protection

EMSA presented the personal data protection measures to be implemented in the central SSN system, and proposed that MSs should establish similar measures in their national SSN systems.

The UK raised the issue on the personal data included in the Incident Report details, in the description of the incident itself. EMSA will further analyse this issue.

The SSN group **noted** the information provided in the document. EMSA will further access the content of the detailed part of the Incident Reports as regards the existence of personal data that should be protected **(Action point 21)**.

VII. INFORMATION PAPERS

The following documents were not presented but distributed for information and review before the meeting:

- 16.3.4 Waste and Security messages - progress report
- 16.3.5 SSN Handbook review
- 16.3.6 List of SSN technical and operational documentation
- 16.4.5 2-way SSL implementation and Digital Certificates renewal

No comments were received, except of the request made by the UK to shift by one month the date for renewal of the Digital certificate **(Action point 22)**.

Workshop Conclusions / Follow-up Actions

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 17 is 23 & 24 May 2011.

Annexes

Annex 1 – List of participants

Annex 2 – List of documents

Annex 3 – Workshop Agenda

Annex 4 – Agreement and action items

---

[1] Post meeting note: information about IMDatE will be presented at HLSG 6.

Annex 1 – Attendance List

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 18.10.11	Attendance on 19.10.11
Belgium	Deman	Johan	Agency for Maritime & Coastal services, shipping assistance division	johan.deman@schelderadar.net		
Belgium	Maekelberg	Yves	Agency for Maritime & Coastal services, shipping assistance division	yves.maekelberg@mow.vlaanderen.be		
Bulgaria	Ivanov	Peter	Bulgarian Maritime Administration	peter_iv@marad.bg		
Cyprus	Themis	Evriviades	Department of Merchant Shipping	tevriviades@dms.mcw.gov.cy		
Czech Republic	Dlouhy	Marek	Ministry of Transport	marek.dlouhy@mdcr.cz		
Denmark	Ahl	Martin	Admiral Danish Fleet HQ	martinahl@mil.dk		
Estonia	Siht	Alar	Estonian Maritime Administration	Alar.SIHT@vta.ee		
Finland	Arkima	Antti	Finnsh Transport Agency	antti.arkima@liikennevirasto.fi		
France	Duchesne	Philippe	Ministry of Transport - Maritime Affairs	philippe.duchesne1@developpement-durable.gouv.fr		
France	Berger	David	Direction des Affaires Maritimes	david.berger@developpement-durable.gouv.fr		
Germany	Callsen-Bracker	Hans-Heinirch	BMVBS	Hans.Callsen@bmvbs.bund.de		
Germany	Brunet	Werner	Traffic Technologies Centre	werner.brunet@wsv.bunb.de		
Greece	Bellas	Stylianos	Hellenic Coast Guard	sbellas@yen.gr		
Italy	Gionfriddo	Marco	Italian Coast Guard	marco.gionfriddo@mit.gov.it		
Italy	Lofu	Antonio	MARICOGECAP	antonio.lofu@mit.gov.it		
Latvia	Bickovs	Deniss	Latvian Coast Guard Service	denis@mrcc.lv		
Lithuania	Valdemaras	Ezerskis	Lithuanian Maritime Safety Administration	valdemaras@msa.lt		
Malta	Spiteri	Paul	Transport Malta	david.bugeja@transport.gov.mt		

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 18.10.11	Attendance on 19.10.11
Malta	Bugeja	David	Transport Malta	david.bugeja@transport.gov.mt		
Norway	Hauge	Jarle	Norwegian Coastal Administration	jarle.hauge@kystverket.no		
Poland	Konrad	Kurpinski	Martime Office in Gdynia	konrad.kurpinski@umgdy.gov.pl		
Portugal	Marques	Carlos	ESPO - European Sea Ports Organisation	cmarques@portodesetubal.pt		
Portugal	Maciel	José	IPTM, IP	jose.maciel@imarpor.pt		
Portugal	Santos	Ricardo	IPTM, IP	ricardo.santos@imarpor.pt		
Portugal	Marques	Nelson	IPTM, IP	nelson.marques@imarpor.pt		
Romania	Apostol	Silviu	Romanian Naval Authority	sapostol@rna.ro		
Slovenia	Miran	Bordon	Slovenian Maritime Administration	miran.bordon@gov.si		
Spain	Fco Javier	Castillejo	Dirección General de la Marina Mercante	fjcastillejo@fomento.es		
Spain	Ruiz de Lobera	Alfonso	SASEMAR - Spanish Maritime Safety Agency	interoper@sasemar.es		
Sweden	Joshi	Brij	Swedish Maritime Administration	Brij.Joshi@sjofartsverket.se		
Sweden	Sundklev	Monica	Swedish Transport Agency	monica.sundklev@transportstyrelsen.se		
The Netherlands	Kortekaas	Joram	Rijkswaterstaat Vessel Traffic Management Centre	JORAM.kortekaas@RWS.nl		
The Netherlands	à Campo	André	RWS SVC	aacampo@acampobv.nl		
The Netherlands	Koert	Cor	Rotterdam Port Authorities	c.koert@portofrotterdam.com		
United Kingdom	Stone	Gwilym	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	gwilym.stone@mcga.gov.uk		
United Kingdom	Enright	Christopher	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	Chris.Enright@mcga.gov.uk		

Country	Name	First Name	Organisation	E-mail	Attendance on 18.10.11	Attendance on 19.10.11
	Erhardt	Jean-Bernard	EC - DG MOVE	Jean-Bernard.Erhardt@ec.europa.eu		
Lithyanian	Rimantas	Mažonas	LMA Lithuanian maritme Admi nistration.	rimantas.mazona@msa.lt		
IRELAND	HOULIHAN	GREG	MARINE Survey Office	greghoulihan@dttas.ie		

EMSA staff

S/N	Name	First Name	E-mail
1	LE MOAN	Yann	Yann.LE-MOAN@emsa.europa.eu
2	RAMON JARRAUD	Helena	Helena.RAMON-JARRAUD@emsa.europa.eu
3	LIMA GALVAO	Marta	Marta.LIMA-GALVAO@emsa.europa.eu
4	FERNANDES	Rute	Rute.FERNANDES@emsa.europa.eu
5	PANAGIOTARAKIS	Nikos	Nikos.PANAGIOTARAKIS@emsa.europa.eu
6	SARASUA IBARBURU	German	German.sarasua@emsa.europa.eu
7	BELINSKIS	Edmunds	Edmunds.BELINSKIS@emsa.europa.eu
8	GIRONELLA	Enrico	Enrico.GIRONELLA@emsa.europa.eu
9	FOTI	Niki	Niki.FOTI@emsa.europa.eu

Annex 2 – List of SSN 16 documents

I. Introduction

SSN 16.1.1: Detailed Agenda (EMSA)
SSN 16.1.2: SSN 15 minutes (EMSA)

II. Input from the Commission

III. SafeSeaNet Operational and legal Aspects

SSN 16/3/1: Incident report WG progress report (IRWG)
SSN 16/3/2: Presentation of the IFCD draft (IFCD WG)
SSN 16/3/3: SSN group Rules of Procedure (EMSA)

IV. SafeSeaNet technical aspects

SSN 16/4/1: SSN security study (EMSA)
SSN 16/4/2: SSN Deployment Plan (EMSA)
SSN 16/4/3: Network and Security reference guide (EMSA)
SSN 16/4/4: MS Commissioning Test Plan (EMSA)
SSN 16/4/6: Phase-out of SSN v1 messages (Port & Hazmat) (EMSA)

Presentation: Correction on SSN schema regarding Weight Gross and Weight Net (EMSA)

V. Status at National Level

SSN 16/5/1: SSN Status National level (MS)
SSN 16/5/2: SSN Data Quality report (EMSA)
SSN 16/5/3: Quality checks and reporting (EMSA)

VI. Any Other Business

SSN 16/6/1: Pilot projects status report (EMSA)
SSN 16/6/2: Personal Data Protection (EMSA)

For information

SSN 16/3/4: Waste and Security messages - progress report (EMSA)
SSN 16/3/5: SSN Handbook review (EMSA)
SSN 16/3/6: List of SSN technical and operational documentation (EMSA)
SSN 16/4/5: 2-way SSL implementation and Digital certificates renewal (EMSA)

Annex 3 –Workshop Agenda

Tuesday, 18 October 2011		
Time	**Agenda Item**	**For**
09:00 – 09:30	**Registration and coffee**	
09:30 – 10:00	Opening / Introduction (EMSA) SSN 16.1.1 Approval of the agenda (EMSA) SSN 16.1.2 Approval of the SSN 15 minutes (EMSA)	 Approval Approval
10:00 – 10:15	**Input from the Commission**	
10:15 – 11:15	SSN 16.3.1 Incident report WG progress report (IRWG) - Incident Report Guidelines - Incident Report distribution through XML - Identification of the types "Others" - Standardise and improve Incident Report - Incident Report forms	Approval
11:15 – 11:30	**Coffee break**	
11:30 – 12:00	SSN 16.3.1 Incident report WG progress report (cont.)	Approval
12:00 – 12:30	SSN 16.3.3 SSN group Rules of Procedure (EMSA)	Approval
12:30 – 14:00	**Lunch break**	
14:00 – 14:45	SSN 16.4.1 SSN security study (EMSA)	Information
14:45 – 15:30	SSN 16.4.3 Network and Security reference guide (EMSA)	Review
15:30 – 15:45	**Coffee break**	
15:45 – 16:15	SSN 16.5.2 SSN Data Quality report (EMSA)	Information
16:15 – 17:15	SSN 16.5.1 SSN Status National level (MS) *(*)*	Information
17:15 – 17:30	SSN 16.5.3 Quality checks and reporting (EMSA)	Approval

(*) Not presented due to time restrictions

Wednesday, 19 October 2011		
Time	**Agenda Item**	**For**
09:00 – 09:30	**Welcome second day**	
09:30 – 11:00	16.3.2 Presentation of the IFCD draft (IFCD WG)	Approval
11:00 – 11:15	**Coffee break**	
11:15 – 11:45	16.3.5 SSN Handbook review (EMSA)	Review
11:45 – 12:30	16.4.2 SSN Deployment Plan (EMSA) *(*)*	Approval
12:30 – 14:00	**Lunch break**	
14:00 – 14:45	16.4.6 Phase-out of SSN v1 messages (Port & Hazmat) (EMSA)	Approval
14:45 – 15:15	16.4.4 MS Commissioning Test Plan (EMSA)	Approval
15:15 – 15:30	**Coffee break**	
15:30 – 16:00	16.6.1 Pilot projects status report (EMSA)	Information
16:00 – 16:30	16.6.2 Personal Data Protection (EMSA)	Approval/ Information
16:30 – 17:00	**Discussion and summary - End of meeting**	

Other Information papers (distributed not discussed during the meeting)	16.3.4 Waste and Security messages - progress report
	16.3.6 List of SSN technical and operational documentation
	16.4.5 2-way SSL implementation and Digital certificates renewal

(*) Not presented due to time restrictions

Annex 4 – List of action items from the SSN 16 Workshop

Action point	Topic and Action	Resp. / Due date
1	**Incident reports Guidelines:** Document approved with the following changes: • Include in the introduction a statement that the guidelines are a living document to be improved and maintained on a regular basis • Delete the content of Appendix 8 as it is on hold pending COSS validation • Prepare a clarification on section 4.4 and submitted to the SSN group (with the support of Ireland)	EMSA IE Along with minutes
2	**Incident distribution through XML:** Present to the SSN WS 17 a technical proposal and impact assessment on the incident report distribution through XML. The proposal should consider the following: • The management of update messages (update, cancel and provide feedback) • The 2 new queries for IR proposed in the document • The failure management • And 2 solutions for the management of details: all details provided in the notification or using the request/response possibility The IRWG mandate is renewed until SSN 17 therefore this group will work to provide a final proposal.	IRWG SSN 17 May.2012
3	**Identification of the type "Others":** Change the wording for the "VTSinfringement" in the forms	IRWG SSN 17 May.2012
4	**Identification of the type "Others":** The SSN group agrees that the "Others" type needs to be identified. EMSA should work further with the IR working group on defining the optimal solution and the time of implementation (2013 or 2015) and come back with a proposal at SSN 17	IRWG SSN 17 May.2012
5	**Standardise and improve Incident reports:** Include in the SSN workshops a document with the IR best practices and perform regular exercises with MSs	EMSA/MS Recurrent in one WS per year
6	**Correction of XML inconsistencies:** The content of the document was agreed with one correction on the SITREP (section 3.1) the number of POB and Persons at Risks should be optional (occurrence 0-1) but at least one should be provided	IRWG SSN 17 May.2012
7	**Incident reports Forms:** The content of the document was agreed with one correction on the Lost & Found Containers to be replaced by Lost & Found Objects. The changes will be done along with the XML changes (for consistency)	IRWG SSN 17 May.2012

Action point	Topic and Action	Resp. / Due date
8	**Incident reports time plan to implement the changes:** The IR Guidelines and actions to standardise and improve IR to be applied after the SSN workshop 16.	EMSA/MSs
	The improvements on the IR web distribution tool will be launched in production by end 2011.	EMSA
	The timing for implementation of the other technical developments (inconsistencies related to IR, IR XML distribution and type "others") should be reviewed at SSN 17 along with the IR working group reports on the IR XML distribution (2013 or 2015)	IRWG/SSN 17
9	**SSN Group Rules of Procedure:** EMSA to provide the final version following the comments received by the UK and the change for 2 months to announce the meetings dates proposed by Germany	UK/EMSA Nov.2011
10	**IFCD draft:** The SSN group concluded the following: • The IFCD draft chapters 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are agreed with the following open issues: AIS Regional Servers, SSN Graphical Interface and timeframe for request/response • The draft chapter 3 was agreed with a redrafting pending regarding the LRIT information in SSN. A comment made by the UK on the access rights to Incident Reports by ports will be inserted in the IFCD draft. • Chapter 7 should not be included in the IFCD draft to be submitted to the HLSG. EMSA will reflect these open issues and comments in the draft IFCD and in the document related to security study submitted to the HLSG.	EMSA Nov.2011
11	**SSN Handbook review:** MS to provide comments by February 2012 and to present a new draft to SSN 17	ALL Feb.2012
12	**MSs** are invited to provide comments on the security study outcomes.	All Feb 2012
13	**Network and Security Ref Guide:** MS to provide comments (on the parts not relevant to the IFCD chapter 7) to EMSA by end of January 2012. A new draft to be submitted at SSN 17	ALL Jan.2012
14	**SSN Deployment plan:** deployment plan with the following remarks: • Release B: Approved with corrections to refer personal data "consultation" instead of "management" • Release C: Renew the ToR of the IRWG to work on the technical requirements for the IR XML distribution, IR inconsistencies and the type "Others" • Release D: Approved with the changes on the time plan for the business rules for the waste and security (by end of March 2012). Time plan to be reviewed at each workshop	EMSA Recurrent to all WS

Action point	Topic and Action	Resp. / Due date
15	**Weight Gross & Net:** to implement the change on the XSD with an emergency fix available in two weeks on the SSN Training environment	EMSA Nov.2011
16	**MS Commissioning Test Plan:** agreed with the remark from UK on test case 1604-01	EMSA Oct.2011
17	**Phase out of SSN v1 messages:** Agreed to phase out the Port and Hazmat notifications by 14 December 2012 and to phase out the Port and Hazmat requests by 12 December 2013	ALL
18	**Status at national level:** Assembled report with MS feedback to be published on the restricted website for MS validation. Once validated, publish on the EMSA website under SSN 16	EMSA Nov.2011
19	**SSN Data Quality Report:** Include in the XML Ref Guide 2.06 the expiration date of 120 days for the Port Plus notifications	EMSA Nov.2011
20	**SSN Data Quality checks:** The new data quality checks are approved for the following DQ report (except the reports on the non-mandatory fields)	EMSA SSN 17 May.2012
21	**Personal Data Protection:** Further access the content of the detailed part of the Incident Reports as regards the existence of personal data that should be protected	EMSA SSN 17 May.2012
22	**Digital certificates renewal:** Proceed with the planning of digital certificates renewal, including the change proposed by the UK to move 1 month the date for Digital certificate renewal	EMSA Nov.2011