



# 1<sup>st</sup> SSN LRIT Group Meeting

## List of errors and warnings in SSN receipt messages

Agenda item 1.4.3

Lukasz Ziolkowski / MSS Duty Officer  
Department C: Operations/Unit C.2.2

Lisbon / 17 May 2017

# Background



- In November 2006 (SSN WS 6), the SSN Group decided to set up a working group (WG) on “data quality.”
- EMSA Maritime Support Services (MSS) was set up (June 2007) and, among other things, was given a specific task related to data quality.
- At SSN WS9 (May 2008), at which time Member States (MSs) agreed that, in order to maintain appropriate data quality and consistency, information exchanged within SSN should comply with the structure, format and specific business rules developed by the group.
- The business rules (BRs) were implemented, following which invalid messages began to be rejected by the central SSN system.

# Reporting of rejected messages and follow up



- With respect to rejected messages, the MSS carries out regular checks and provides detailed figures to MSs.
- MSs are invited to rectify reported quality problems in order to eliminate rejected messages.
- As a result of this regular system evaluation, MSs began to correct the systematic errors in compliance with the IFCD, which requires that invalid messages should be less than 0.1% of the total number of messages sent.



- The overall percentage of rejected PortPlus notifications messages is normally between 0.6% and 2%. , although this normally increases when a new version of SSN is implemented
- It should be noted that SSN is used more and more to support other messages and applications (e.g. Thetis), and that the number of BRs will continue to increase whenever further messages and applications are linked to SSN.
- Also, it is of note that the rejection messages provided by central SSN in many cases are unclear or even misleading.



## The following actions are proposed:

1. Revise the text provided in SSN\_Receipt in order to better describe the reason for a rejection, or the provision of warnings (e.g. to make it more understandable).
2. Group the list of rejections as follows (depending on the reason for rejection):
  - Group 1: "Time" not respected (comparing the timeliness between ETAs and ETDs, etc.).
  - Group 2: Missing "mandatory" information (element or attribute).
  - Group 3: Invalid values or references (IMO, MMSIs, LOCODES, ShipCallIds, etc.).



4. Assign a rule number to each reason for rejection. The first number after the letter “R” should correspond to the group (i.e. R11 is the rejection from Group 1; R21 is the rejection from Group 2).
5. For those rejections where the text provided in SSN\_Receipt may not be clear, additional text should be provided in the XML RG
6. Include in the XML RG the list of possible rejections, together with the rule number and additional details as proposed above.



**Member States are invited to review and approve the proposal**





[emsa.europa.eu](http://emsa.europa.eu)

 [twitter.com/emsa\\_lisbon](https://twitter.com/emsa_lisbon)

 [facebook.com/emsa.lisbon](https://facebook.com/emsa.lisbon)

 **EMSA**  
European Maritime Safety Agency