

**Subject:** 57th SMDG, BAPLIE/MOVINS issues  
**From:** Jost Müller <JoM@MplusB.de>  
**Date:** Fri, 29 Apr 2011 17:21:36 +0200  
**To:** g.endenburg@copas.nl  
**CC:** Peter Horstkorte <Peter.Horstkorte@MplusB.de>, Jost Müller <Jost.Mueller@MplusB.de>

Dear Gerry,

besides Jacco's tier-issue and the Limited Quantities and 30'-positions mentioned in previous minutes I propose enhance BAPLIE/MOVINS MIGs by recommendations on how to handle

- limited stacking capabilities This is a security issue. Triggered by recent accidents IMO's circulation 138 of "*HARMONIZED INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR SAFE CONTAINERS*" stipulates special markings of "containers built with limited stacking or racking capacity" (less than 192t stacking or 150kN racking). BAPLIE/MOVINS should be able to indicate such containers and allow to specify the max. allowed stacking weight for such containers. This would be in interest of shipping lines as well as terminals. (Implementation might use the M9 MEA-Segment with an appropriate qualifier 6311.)
- status of equipment There is demand to indicate whether flat racks are collapsed or not. Furthermore height of some flats is adjustable (e.g. 8'6, 9'6, ...). MOVINS should allow to instruct on how the equipment is to be loaded. BAPLIE should indicate its current status. (Implementation using directory D95B might make use of the C9 FTX in group2 with qualifier 4451 = CLR (container loading remark). In this case the MIG needs be enhanced by defining additional codes for c108.e4440.)
- shippers owned containers These are typically containers which do not have a container ID made up from prefix and number (according to ISO 6346). In practice this leads to errors/mis-interpretation of data in EQD's C237.8260. (Implementation could make use C237's data elements 1131 and 3055 (code list identification code and responsible agency). The MIG should describe how to use them for distinguishing "standard" and "shippers owned containers".)

I think above issues would be very helpful by providing a recommendation to users and not to leave them in the field of bilateral agreements. - Use standard-EDI, not bilateral-EDI.

Another issue is, that I think we should actively work on DMRs. Examples are: allow for more than 9999 containers to be specified for a vessel or the structure of BAPLIE/MOVINS DG-group, which does not allow for an appropriate specification of DG. (I'm not proud of above indicated potential implementation in D95B. There would be a much cleaner / more obvious implementation with an appropriate directory.)

I know, using a modified directory will require implementation of a new revision of messages. But I think this is a different discussion. Only when there are drafts for new versions available one will be able to decide whether it's worth implementing it. I'm afraid one would go for (expensive) work-arounds or look for alternatives as long as there is no perspective.

Hopefully there is enough time for discussion of above issues. I know the list comes late. May be we can have some pre-discussions on Monday or Tuesday.

Best regards and a nice weekend,

Jost