

Bertrand Geoffray

UN/LOCODE Maintenance Team (co-chair)

BG-Consult representing the BIC (Bureau International des Containers - France)

The Maintenance Team work:

One meeting a week, each Thursday, 1h30 long...

January to June, September to December

1,500 plus requests to process each half year round

100's of requesters

Our work :

Share and disseminate the provisions of the REC 16 2020

Check the consistency of UN/LOCODE requests for validation, correction, rejection.

Questions to the Advisory group ../..

NATIONAL FOCAL POINT NETWORK

1.

It must be said that most of currently nominated FP's are not highly active in supporting the Maintenance Team work.

2.

I must warmly thank those who proactively fulfil their mission and support the work of this Maintenance Team.

3.

We must advise that, even with the new, expected, state of the art, UN/LOCODE management system developed by UNECE with the support of CNIS, this Maintenance Team will not be able to fulfil efficiently its task without a global, efficient, pro-active, FP Network.

4.

This assembly is asked to consider the absolute necessity to develop a efficient, global National Focal Point Network to support the work done by this Maintenance Team.

5.

The Advisory Group is invited to consider the foregoing and take action, as appropriate.

Recurrent requests for a UN/LOCODE for facilities.

1.

This Maintenance team receives recurrent requests for a UN/Locode for various facilities.

2.

Essentially, this is based on old habits which prevailed before the publication of the latest edition of REC 16 in 2020.

This is contradictory with this last revision of REC 16, and we suggest we should put an end to the misunderstanding coming from the old versions of REC 16, and support the current work of the Maintenance Team.

3.

The revision of REC 16 has implemented the child codes system concept.

This set-up must be supported by the Secretariat to maintain for the future new coherence in UN/LOCODE management, as implemented by the REC 16, 2020.

4.

Consequently, I suggest it must be clearly established that all requests for a UN/LOCODE for a facility are not receivable, should they come from the public sector or the private sector.

5.

The Advisory Group is invited to consider the foregoing and take action, as appropriate.

Function 1 for far inland ports reached by adapted sea going and inland water ships

1.

This Maintenance team receives requests to affect a function 1 for inland water ports, far inland, which can be reached by sea going ships adapted for inland waters .

2.

The question is, should we affect function 1 (Sea Port) to these locations when it is known that normal sea ships cannot reach them.

3.

Our opinion is that affecting a function 1 to such inland ports could be misleading as they can only be reached by seagoing ships when adapted to an inland water configuration, the max size of each being different from one port to the other .

4.

However, the information that they can be reached by such vessels, is an interesting information for the Trade.

5.

The Maintenance Team is looking for guidance on this issue.

6.

The Advisory Group is invited to consider the foregoing and take action, as appropriate.

Offshore riggs

1.

This group is asked to consider the necessity to deliver a UN/LOCODE to offshore platforms, should they be deep-grounded, anchored, or floating, in territorial or international waters. Some of them keeping the ability to be moved from one operation area to another.

2.

We suggest this comes in contradiction with the new definition of UN/LOCODE.

3.

IMO as a child code delivers a code to these plants, but the standard GISIS code is based on an existing UN/LOCODE, consequently a GISIS code cannot be delivered without an existing UN/LOCODE carrying a function 1, should it be in territorial or international waters.

4.

This is a stumbling block which should be circumvented, maybe in considering these objects as vessels and attributing them a vessel code, which could bring in other drawbacks.

5.

So without prejudice on the issue, we consider a different set-up should be studied between UNECE and IMO.

6.

The Advisory group is invited to consider the foregoing and take action, as appropriate.

Co-chairing

1.

I, personally, should advise this committee that I have decided to step down from the position of co-chair of the UN/LOCODE Maintenance Team at the end of the current 2nd HF2021 round.

2.

I have been honoured to be asked to take over this task, even if I had not anticipated it was not so honorific and was in fact a really demanding task.

3.

As a matter of fact, with the creation of this Maintenance Team, together with Yan and Wenfeng, that I will not thank ever enough for their support and “kind” understanding, we had to face the challenge of inventing a new way of processing UN/LOCODE requests at the same time of, and even before, the implementation of the revision of the REC 16-2020. Indeed this has been a real challenge.

4.

The time has come for me to leave the floor.

5.

The Advisory Group is invited to consider the foregoing and take action, as appropriate.

Thanks

Bertrand