

UN/LOCODE AD HOC MAINTENANCE POLICY MEETING

UN/LOCODE

Location: Hybrid meeting, H-307-2, Palais des Nations, Geneva
and via WebEx

Date: 29 June 2022

Time: 14:00-17:00 (Geneva Time)

Mediator: Maria Teresa Chavarri

List of Participants

- Yan Zhang (Secretariat)
- Maria Teresa (Maite) Chavarri (UN/LOCODE Maintenance Team Convenor)
- Sue Probert (UN/LOCODE Advisory Group Chair)
- Bertrand Geoffray (BIC)
- David Roff (Domain Coordinator of UN/CEFACT)
- Tiago Spengler (NFP for Brazil)
- Jean-Baptiste Receveur (Representative of NFP for France)
- Yinfen Zhang (NFP for China)
- Mohammed Aqueel (UK)
- Heng Yeong Chiam (Hapag-Lloyd AG)
- Wenfeng Sun (China)
- Attila Osztrogoancz (European Commission)
- Alper Keceli (NFP for Turkey)
- Khulan Gabat (Mongolia)
- Radu Ion (European Commission)
- Ariana Nouri (Iran)

Agenda:

- LOCATIONS WITH FUNCTION “7”
- GEO-COORDINATES OF A REQUESTED AREA
- THE ISSUES RAISED BY FRANCE
 - MERGING OF LOCALITIES INTO ONE
 - FISHERY PORTS
- FUNCTION “B”
- AOB

Actions:

- ➔ The team didn't reach an agreement on how to process the assigned UN/LOCODEs after an FPSO is dysfunctional or moved. The NFP for Brazil to analyse further to share with the team later on.
- ➔ The secretariat to organize a separate meeting with IMO to discuss whether it is enough to identify a location in the international waters with an ISM Code.
- ➔ The team agreed to pin the centre of a requested area as representative geo-coordinates.
 - The team discussed the utility of using UN/LOCODEs for a subdivision location and for cross-reference and that child codes are especially useful in locating containers, i.e., hyper precision.
- ➔ The team encouraged the representative of the NFP for France to deal with merged localities with the capacity of the NFP.
- ➔ The secretariat to organize a separate meeting with the representative of the NFP for France based on further information.
- ➔ The secretariat agreed not to bring function "B" back to Recommendation No. 16 and continue to type "Border" in the column "remarks" to indicate a location on the border.
- ➔ The secretariat to organize workshops and training sessions for NFPs, especially newly nominated NFPs, including the best practices shared by Brazil to review the existing code list for a country.
- ➔ The secretariat to follow up with FAO to clarify if fishery ports are included in the FAO Global Record.
- ➔ The secretariat to schedule for the next ad hoc maintenance policy meeting on issues pending for a policy.
- ➔ The secretariat to organize a meeting with the interested members, such as the representatives from Hapag-Lloyd and the EC to present the proof of concept of using GitHub for UN/LOCODE, proposed by David Roff (Domain Coordinator for UN/CEFACT).
- ➔ The secretariat to confirm with the Office of Information and Communications Technology (OICT) on the UN's ICT policy on GitHub before deciding on using GitHub for UN/LOCODE.

Minutes

1. LOCATIONS WITH FUNCTION "7"

- Tiago presented his practice to assign a UN/LOCODE to distinguish each FPSO in an Exclusive Economic Zone. He used two case studies to exemplify the reality of this issue: *Petrobas 31* and *Petrojarl 1*.
- **Yan:** asked about Brazil's policy with UN/LOCODES once these platforms are deactivated.
- **Tiago:** explained that Brazil currently deletes UN/LOCODES for the floating facilities that are not operating anymore. He reiterated the importance of establishing one explicit policy for the scenario in which a floating platform (FPSO) is no longer in function. He stressed that IMO has a child code and it is important to determine the parent code for these facilities, seeing that they are hundreds

of km. away from a city or coastal area. He reminded of the exceptions made to Rec. 16 for airports and that this exception could be extended to FPSOs. He also raised the question of whether to assign these facilities artificially to a continent to declare where the oil is being exported or with an unspecific UN/LOCODE.

- **Bertrand:** Expressed his discomfort in using UN/LOCODE with those facilities, based on Recommendation 16 definition and that this would need to be extended to fixed platforms too. Mentioned the breadth of information and data on IMO's website for these facilities but that there remain discrepancies between countries. There is the possibility of defining these facilities as ships receiving and discharging oil.
- **H-Y:** Inquired after the necessity of a UN/LOCODE for a fixed anchor. Singapore uses IMO Ship ID number to report the position. As there may be several platforms in one area, it would be difficult to use multiple UN/LOCODES. Suggested assigning a UN/LOCODE for the area of the sea to inform how much oil is extracted from that area and to use an IMO Ship ID number for the exact facility.
- **Mohammed:** Expressed that if these oils located offshore are for the movement of good for trade, outside of the country and used just for extraction, there is no need for a UN/LOCODE.
- **Wenfeng:** Suggested removing the geocoordinates for FPSOs as they are confusing to the users since they are always changing, and instead using only the UN/LOCODE.
- **Attila:** Suggested including the IMO Ship ID number to the "remarks" column, similar to windmill farms and other drilling platforms.
- **Maite:** Concluded that it is essential to have a separate meeting with IMO representative to get their perspective and agree on one policy.

2. GEO-COORDINATES OF A REQUESTED AREA

- Maite gave a short presentation on a harmonized policy for representative coordinates in a requested area and strongly recommended using a PGC conversion table to apply a Degrees Decimal Minutes (DDM) format. The results can then be pasted onto Google Maps, until the new system is implemented.
- **Bertrand:** Flagged the unreliability of MapLandia for geocoordinates.
- **J-B:** Agreed that Google Maps is more efficient than MapLandia, as per his experience with France.
 - The team to decide which software is best to be used: Google Maps or MapLandia.
- **Maite:** In the case of a larger area, suggested pinning the location for UN/LOCODE on the centre of town, where most of the activity takes place.
- **Wenfeng:** Raised attention to a discrepancy in Recommendation No. 16, as per its new definition, geocoordinates are attributes for an area location but the requirements in the standards have caused inconsistencies, including FPSOs. He recommended the relationship between an area and representative coordinates be defined in Recommendation No.16. He also raised attention to the risk of using private sector services such as Google Maps, MapLandia etc.
- **Attila:** In a location with several warehouses, the customs need hyper precision and detail, but UN/LOCODE does not serve that purpose.
- **Yan:** Inquired how often are geo-coordinates needed from the business community and which pin should be positioned.
- **H-Y:** Responded that representative geo-coordinates avoid confusion in customs, especially if one country has cities of similar names, the geo-coordinates inform on the subdivision location and for cross-referencing. Child codes of the BIC Facility Codes are used for each container.
- **Yinfen:** Suggested to distinguish the uses of coordinates for cities in two: 1. Coordinates used for the city centre or town centre and 2. Others for coastal city or border port based on their port activity.

3. THE ISSUES RAISED BY FRANCE: MERGING OF LOCALITIES INTO ONE

- The representative of NFP for France presented his question on how to deal with merged localities since 2010 with the following options in a scenario of three merged municipalities:
 1. Delete two UN/LOCODEs and assign the third pre-existing UN/LOCODE for the new merged municipality.
 2. Delete all three UN/LOCODEs and create a new code.
 3. Keep all pre-existing UN/LOCODEs and create a new one for the merged municipality.
 - In option 1, there is a question concerning which UN/LOCODE to keep either based on municipality size or historical precedence.
 - In option 2 and 3, the issue of limited capacity for UN/LOCODEs, especially in France remains.
- **Bertrand:** Suggested reusing the pre-existing ones, seeing that this situation of merging municipalities will last for decades.
- **J-B:** With a new UN/LOCODE, delivery providers do not check if the merged locality already has a UN/LOCODE. Mentioned that there is substantial work to be done in France: cleaning of UN/LOCODEs and corrections. Need to minimize the number of UN/LOCODEs we keep, especially in merging of localities, picking one locality and keeping one UN/LOCODE and its functions should be the solution for France. Asked the team if he has their approval to delete existing UN/LOCODEs.
- **Sue:** Stressed the “golden rule” whereby no UN/LOCODEs for main trade areas are modified.
- **J-B:** Replied that most issues occur outside of main trade areas, as usually the big municipality absorbs the smaller ones. In the case of a merged locality, codes will be deleted and a comment in “remarks” will be added but to avoid in other cases. Also suggested to be more restrictive in the creation of new UN/LOCODEs with a criterion of distance, if there are 10 UN/LOCODEs in 10km circle, new codes should be rejected.
- **Bertrand:** In view of France’s situation, Jean-Baptiste must decide which is the best way of handling this issue. This will differ with each country.
- **Yan:** Suggested making use of the “remarks” column to inform of merging.
- **Maite:** Raised the problem of international trade and the mess it may create for companies if we change all the codes in France.
- **H-Y:** Recommended the use of a translation table and to advise Customs of the change. Companies have two years to make the transition when a UN/LOCODE is replaced with a Function “O” and then deleted. If the customs make the update, businesses need to update as they are the ones in control. If there is no BIC facility code, suggested grouping by postal code, linked to UN/LOCODE, to tailor the level of detail desired.

4. FUNCTION “B”

- **Yan:** Based upon Nepal’s request, there is a need to identify locations on the border, but the team does not think it a good idea to bring Function “B” back to Rec. 16, instead suggested using remarks column to identify location on border. Clarified that during the discussion of revising Rec. 16, the team agreed for function, referred to in Rec 19., which does not have B for border but 6, for multiple transport facilities.
- **Bertrand:** Suggests that function 6 is to be considered for something more state of the art but supports avoiding using function B.
- **H-Y:** Explained that in border crossing, containers may need to be in a facility for vetting, usually identified by BIC so there is no need for a UN/LOCODE. Suggested using UN/LOCODE for the city and then BIC for the facility.

5. AOB

- **Yan:** Flagged the problem from the online DMR system, and of two recent incidents of data loss from the Google Sheets. Reiterated that for the next maintenance cycle we could have something to replace the Google Sheet.
- **Wenfeng:** Inquired after the next meeting date for this ad hoc group.
- **Yan:** Replied that there is no limit to the number of ad hoc meetings, there could be a following one to the current ad hoc meeting.
- **Maite:** Provided a debriefing of the main actions and issues remaining to be resolved, see above for listed actions.
- **Yan:** Suggested inviting a colleague from FAO to give an update on FAO Global Record as fishery ports should be included with a roadmap for covering this kind of record.

5.1. David PROOF OF CONCEPT OF GITBHUB FOR UN/LOCODE

- David pulled his data from the official release from the UN/LOCODE website
 - Asked if he should pull all of these in as port requests or port requests by country. He suggested creating port requests per UN log number, meaning we order them by date, and work through the oldest and then reject or approve those accordingly.
 - Also suggested to pull all of these requests in GitHub one by one so we can show to the maintenance team for potential interest in using GitHub.
 - Has collected six pages of process condensed into a diagram. He shared a link which shows how it could work on GitHub.
- **Yan:** Raised two issues: 1. Being between two maintenance cycles, we need the meeting to be ad hoc and 2. The UN/LOCODE system is categorized as type 2, all applications must pass UN ICT security audit before being launched. Need to verify whether GitHub can pass the OICT security audit.
- **Volunteers** for the meeting: Sue, Maite, Heng Yong, Attila (He is interested but wants to receive specifications to discuss with experts, what are the requirements etc.).
- **Maite:** Explained the following steps to take 1st smaller meeting to make sure if it's helpful, if we agree 2nd to get OICT approval 3rd broadcast to the user community 4th Inform specific countries for support.