

# UN/LOCODES Maintenance Meeting



María Teresa Chavarri

Interim Convenor

Email: [maite.chavarri@mtcconsulting.es](mailto:maite.chavarri@mtcconsulting.es)

June 2022

# MAINTENANCE MEETING

## DMR Validation - Status & Progress



### APRIL 2022

COUNTRIES	85
SUBMITTERS	55
PENDING REQUESTS	619
EMAIL CONTACTS	68

<i>DPFinalStatus</i>	COUNTA of CodeRequested
	619
Approved	21
Rejected	24
Withdrawn	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>667</b>

### JUNE 2022

COUNTRIES	85
SUBMITTERS	55
PENDING REQUESTS	165
EMAIL CONTACTS	68

<i>DPFinalStatus</i>	COUNTA of CodeRequested
Rejected	358
Postponed	165
Approved	141
Withdrawn	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>667</b>

#### Notes.-

- These DMRs listed are only for online DMRs. We also received requests via the NFP such as:
  - Brazil : 130
  - France: 93
  - Saudi Arabia: 17
  - Israel:10
  - China:10
  - Denmark:2

# MAINTENANCE MEETING

## Countries & Submitters - Status



### TOP 20 COUNTRIES- DP Final Status- June 2022

COUNTA of CodeRPFinalStatus					
Country	Approved	Postponed	Rejected	Withdrawn	Grand Total
FR	38	1	89		128
US	4	27	66		97
ES	1	22	23		46
IT	12		22		34
DE	22		4		26
IN		5	19		24
PL	1	8	10		19
GB	3	7	7	1	18
CA		7	9		16
AU	2	1	9		12
MX		7	4		11
JP	9		2		11
BY	4		7		11
HU	6		4		10
EG		5	5		10
RO	5	2	2		9
NO	1	6	1		8
NL	5		3		8
RU		3	4		7
EE		5	2		7

### TRAINED COUNTRIES SEPARATE MEETINGS

- ✓ INDIA
- ✓ AUSTRALIA
- ✓ MONGOLIA
- ✓ ISRAEL
- ✓ R.D.CONGO
- ✓ BANGLADESH
- ✓ CYPRUS
- ✓ FRANCE
- ✓ NEPAL
- ✓ SAUDI ARABIA

### TOP 20 COUNTRIES WITH NO PRESENCE

Country	COUNTA of CodeRequested
FR	128
US	97
ES	46
IT	34
DE	26
IN	24
PL	19
GB	18
CA	16
AU	12
MX	11
JP	11
BY	11
HU	10
EG	10
RO	9
NO	8
NL	8
RU	7
EE	7

### TOP 20 SUBMITTERS

Submitters	COUNTA of CodeRequested
INTTRA	394
OOCL	41
VOLVO	35
BOLLORE	29
HLAG	24
STOLT	12
CROWLEY	9
PORTINFO	7
DENH	7
SGL	6
RIEGE	6
EXXON	6
BDP	5
YML	4
SCHNER	4
EVERGREEN	4
CARGOSMT	4
GTNEXUS	2
GEODIS	2

# MAINTENANCE MEETING

## Facts & Suggestions



COUNTRIES	85
SUBMITTERS	55
PENDING REQUESTS	619
EMAIL CONTACTS	68

- ✓ We received requests related to 85 countries this 1st round.
- ✓ Not all the countries have a NFP
- ✓ Few people attending the Maintenance meeting
- ✓ Very Little participation
- ✓ Not clear concepts (functions..etc)
- ✓ Requests are done via the web and via email to Yan.
- ✓ These email requests are showned in the other tabs by countries.
- ✓ 1hour ½ meeting does not cover all the requests approvals.
- ✓ Afterwards some requestors are contacting via email to the convenor and need to treat these ones individually.

- ✓ Do we treat the requests by country or by company? .
- ✓ Should we have a separate meetings by country?
- ✓ Should we contact the NFP and send them their requests from the countries in order for them to be prepared to be discussed at the meeting?  
for instance the case of Germany
- ✓ Should we send a recap of the main points/concepts to be educated?  
For instance functions ...etc

# MAINTENANCE MEETING

## Meeting Format



### Pre-Meeting week

- Convenor to analyze the requests to be treated next meeting
- Work on them on the previous week with the different NFPs and Yan.
- Also treat the incoming mails to Yan and to Convenor
- Selection of the countries to be treated

### Meeting Day

- Welcome
- Parties Introduction- Login name convention
- Remind of the rules (Concepts Education)
- Selection of the countries to be treated today
- If any urgent requests, they will go first.
- Q&A

### After Meeting Day

- Send the NFPs involved a thank you for the participation as well as a reminder email to evaluate their requests for next meeting
- Share the minutes of the meeting taken by Yan.
- Remind of the rules (Concepts Education)

# MAINTENANCE MEETING

## ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED



### JUNE 28th- Advisory group meeting

1. **NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS:** Lack of focal points or inactive focal points in many countries.  
Action: The development of the NFP network to be discussed with the ad hoc group.
1. **TRAINING:** Share the experience we had with Australia, Israel and India to highlight the importance of communication training and harmonization to get the national authority on board for implementation of the provision of Rec 16. The purpose should be to prevent as much as possible the creation of codes for places which are not in line with rec 16 basic definition of a location.  
Action: Make a video with the Technical team of the Guidelines presentation
1. **INTTRA :** How to handle relationship with INTTRA. The business they deliver make that they are and will remain a major player, they generate 1/3 to 1/2 of the request every year, we need to have a permanent “private sector” focal point with them.  
Action: support at policy level
2. **DATA QUALITY:** the database quality is not good enough. It is maybe the result of a long term evolution of the concept of locodes over 3 decades.
  - a. So far our policy was : we cannot inform users of changes (cancellation) because we don't know who they are, so we avoid by all mean to cancel codes. “But” we leave to efficient focal points the authority to do it when absolutely necessary (re-groupment of small villages/cities In France for instance).
  - b. The ad hoc group should be given the mission to implement solutions to better handle the global management of the database on the long term.
  - c. The way SMDG and BIC child codes are handled using Github should inspire us, indeed Github may or may not be the factual solution for the UN/Locodes, but something similar is the way forward.

Action: New System needed

### JUNE 29th- Ad hoc maintenance team meeting

5. **Locations with Function “7”**
  - a. Brazil's practice of assigning UN/LOCODEs to offshore platforms in open seas (e.g. FPSO)
  - b. Assistance with IMO for locations in international water (“XZ”)
6. **Geo-coordinates**
  - a. Representative geo-coordinates of a requested area, like a city or a town
  - b. Request for more accuracy than minutes, especially for a location on a border
7. **The issue raised by France**
  - a. Merging of localities into one
  - b. Fishery ports
8. **Function “B”**
  - a. The practice of inputting “Border” in the Column “Remarks” if necessary.
9. **Rejection of DMRs** dumped from users' business systems in absence of the explanation/justification/clarification of the submitter.



Contact:

Maria Teresa Chavarri

Email:  
maite.chavarri@mtcconsulting.e  
s

Thank you

