

Annex - Port facility information in SSN XML

3.02

Problem statement	2
Proposed solution	4
Implementation	5

Problem statement

The SSN 3.02 specification includes the PortFacility field within the <PreviousCallAtPortFacility> element in the Ship Call Response messages. The field is also present in the <VoyageInformation> element in the PortPlus messages.

The following excerpts are copied from SSN-XMLMessagingRefGuide-03_02.docx. Here is the definition of the <VoyageInformation> element:

				VoyageInformation	1
				ShipCallId	1
				LastPort	0-1
				PortOfCall	1
				PositionInPortOfCall	0-1
				PortFacility	0-1
				ETDfromLastPort	0-1
				ETAToPortOfCall	0-1
				ETDFromPortOfCall	0-1
				NextPort	0-1
				ETAToNextPort	0-1
				BriefCargoDescription	0-1

And the definition of the <PreviousCallAtPortFacility> element:

				PreviousCallAtPortFacility	0-∞
				Port	1
				DateOfArrival	1
				DateOfDeparture	1
				PortFacility	1

And the description of the port facility field:

PortFacility	Text	1-4	Port Facility as defined in ISPS Code The port facility's code as in the IMO GISIS maritime security database	MS2SSN_PortPlus_Not MS2SSN_ShipCall_Res SSN2MS_ShipCall_Res
--------------	------	-----	--	---

Issue: Before raising the problems, the point of view of the “port state controller” must be kept in mind. One of the issues he/she need to know, is if the ship has visited a non-ISPS port during the 10 last port visits.

Problem 1: The **PortFacility** attribute is a string with length 1-4. It has, according to our understanding, been proposed that in cases where a ship has visited a port facility without a GISIS number, the code “0000” should be used. This proposal does not seem to address the fact that the port facility is known to be approved by the appropriate authority. Thus the proposal does not give any value and will be superfluous.

Problem 2: GISIS contains information about ISPS-approved facilities. However member states, with Norway as one example, have a number of port facilities which are not ISPS-approved. These facilities are not, and will not be entered into GISIS. In the current version of the SSN specifications, *these facilities will not be identified*.

Problem 3: In addition to this, GISIS will at times be out of sync with member states’ data about approved port facilities. This will lead to *inaccurate notifications* when reported port facility numbers are out of sync with GISIS.

Proposed solution

The proposed solution is to create a new <PortFacility> element which contains fields and business rules to address all three problems described above.

Name	Type	Occurrence	Business Rules
IsApproved	Enum (Yes, No, Unknown)	1	<i>Yes</i> or <i>No</i> if this facility is known to be approved or not approved according to GISIS or resident member state. <i>Unknown</i> otherwise. Mandatory (must be Yes or No) if the member state is residence of the port facility in question.
PortFacilityNo	Text (1-4)	0-1	Mandatory if IsApproved = Yes
PortFacilityName	Text (1-50)	1	

Problem 1 is addressed by being able to identify a port facility by name even if a port facility does not have a corresponding number in GISIS.

Problem 2 is addressed by being able to identify a port facility by name even though the port facility does not and will not exist in GISIS.

Problem 3 is addressed by being able to identify a port facility by both number and name.

Implementation

This new <PortFacility> element should substitute the PortFacility attribute as shown below.

			VoyageInformation	1
			ShipCallId	1
			LastPort	0-1
			PortOfCall	1
			PositionInPortOfCall	0-1
			PortFacility	0-1
			IsApproved	1
			PortFacilityNo	0-1
			PortFacilityName	0-1
			ETDfromLastPort	0-1
			ETAToPortOfCall	0-1
			ETDFromPortOfCall	0-1
			NextPort	0-1
			ETAToNextPort	0-1
			BriefCargoDescription	0-1

			PreviousCallAtPortFacility	0-∞
			Port	1
			DateOfArrival	1
			DateOfDeparture	1
			PortFacility	0-1
			IsApproved	1
			PortFacilityNo	0-1
			PortFacilityName	0-1