

# **Maintenance Team**

**UN/LOCODE Advisory Group meeting  
November 2020**

# **The Maintenance team**

## **The Maintenance Team started its work in September 2019**

The Maintenance Team had from the time of its creation determined that the future Recommendation 16 provisions should be used to analyse and accept or reject UN/Locodes' creations modifications and cancellations requests.

It turns out that it was not always easy to justify decisions taken on the basis of a non existing official document.

Eventually, revised Recommendation 16 was made public beginning of 2020.

## FOCAL POINTS

**The Maintenance Team has to process 1.000 to 2.000 DMR's per half year round**

The DMR's review cannot be properly achieved by the Maintenance Team without the support of available and efficient Focal Points in ALL major countries.

**FPs have to be considered as the core experts** of the Maintenance Team, their participation on a regular basis should be taken for granted, this strategic position is implemented in the new system under development.

**This is by very far not the case currently**

The Secretariat should challenge ALL Delegations to create an FP position in their country, occupied by a competent and dedicated person, who has received a clear mission to support the Maintenance Team work and handle all DMRs received for his area of responsibility.

## REQUESTERS – processing of DMRs

The attendance of requesters to Maintenance team weekly meeting is a permanent issue faced by the Maintenance Team.

We know that the present set up is not properly designed to implement and efficient interaction with requesters and to provide them with a gratifying experience.

Basically, the present solution based on a google sheet is only a source of frustration for everybody.

We, the Maintenance Team, accept it as **the best which could be done at the time it is done.**

The new system under development should be designed to draw the attention of requesters, at the time of creating a DMR, that they may receive questions about their request at a later stage when the times come to analyse it, and that lack of feed back from them could lead to delay or even rejection of their request.

## REQUESTERS – not processed DMRs

### **Question for the Advisory group :**

A number of DMRs happened to have not been processed at the end of each round, (shame for the Maintenance Team), this can be both because of the lack of attendance by the requester, or either because of the absence of, or inefficiency of, the National Focal Points.

The Advisory Group is consulted to advise on the follow up which should be given to these DMRs.

The Maintenance Team proposes that they are archived without further processing.

### *Note*

*It must be noted that as per the current processing system, the initial requester is never formally advised of the final decision which have been taken regarding his/her request. One could imagined he/she has in the meantime move forward and get back to his/her working duties, considering that his/her request has been simply validated because he/she needs it, (and probably starts using it).*

*With the new system under development this should change and allow an efficient interaction with requesters, and possibly reactivation of archived requests.*

# Advisory Group requested arbitration

## 1. Special Economic Zone – SEZ - (function A)

### ISSUE RAISED BY FP INDIA

This question is raised by India which seems to be a country where this kind of areas are developed on a large scale.

India requests that a UN/Locode is attributed to each SEZ they create.

These requests were not accepted by the Maintenance Team.

On purpose, the new Rec 16 has reverse the need for a UN/Locode:

> In the previous edition, it was understood that when you had a function you should have a code for this function, the resulting messy multiplication of UN/Locodes was one of the main reason to launch a review of Rec 16.

> In the new recommendation 16, UN/Locodes are attributed to cities, and the various facilities available in the area of the city are identified with functions.

THEN, these facilities can be identified and coded by the newly adopted child code systems.

As a matter of fact, the SEZ are not associated today to any child code system.

# Advisory Group requested arbitration

## 1. Special Economic Zone – SEZ - (function A)

### QUESTION TO THIS ASSEMBLY

- is the SEZ concept specific to India?
- do we find this concept in many countries?
- are these areas used exclusively for national administrative purpose ?

**If** answer to questions above is yes, then , we could propose that the coding of these zones is handled at a local level, without impact on UN/Locode management.

**If** global and used for international trade, then we should think of and find a child code system able to deliver codes to SEZ globally.

# Advisory Group requested arbitration

## 2. Sea port function on far upstream inland ports

### QUESTION RAISED BY FP FRANCE

The city of Genevilliers, FRGVS, is a city located in the near suburb of Paris, France, on the Seine river, 200km from the Seine estuary and one main river port of Paris.

The French administration in charge of waterways asks that the function 1 is attributed to FRGVS because fluvio-maritime vessels involved in Channel and North Sea coastal transports are reaching Genevilliers. Meaning that sea going vessels are regularly calling at this port.

According to national and international laws, one can find many inland maritime border definitions, but in this particular case, all are far downstream from this place.

# Advisory Group requested arbitration

## 2. Sea port function on far downstream inland ports

### QUESTION TO THIS ASSEMBLY

- Should we attribute a seaport function to far upstream waterway ports to indicate to the Trade they are accessible by seagoing ships, even when we cannot mention it has to be specific fluvio maritime vessels ?

# Advisory Group requested arbitration

## 3. Accuracy of geocoordinates

*Question raised by French FP*

Current geocoordinates standard implemented in the Rec 16 stipulates that coordinates are expressed in degrees minutes (or their equivalent in degrees decimal in the new system under development)

France is a small country by the size of the metropole. Some cities with a code are small enough so that the rounding of their geocoordinates down or up to nearest minutes places the point outside of the actual area of the place.

QUESTION TO THIS ASSEMBLY

It should be validated that the new system should maintain a more accurate geocoordinates system, say down to the second, with equivalence in degree decimal.

**Thank You**

*Bertrand Geoffray (BIC)*

*Maintenance Team co-chair representing the private sector*