Bureau F2F Meeting discussion notes and decisions
Monday 02 – Tuesday 03 May 2018, F2F Meeting

Participants:

Bureau present: Sue Probert (Chair), Harm Jan van Burg, Ian Watt, Anders Grangård, Tahseen Khan, Estelle Igwe
Bureau excused: Raffaele Fantetti,
Secretariat: Lance Thompson, Maria Ceccarelli, Rutendo Tavengerwei, Tomas Malik, Yan Zhang

Agenda item	Discussion	Action/Decision
1a. Roll call	Attendance = 6 of 7 (Quorum)	
1b. Approval of the Agenda	Items to be added: • Deliverables (white paper/briefing note) • Code of Conduct • Increase Plenary Attendance • Envelope project	Approved with minor modifications
1c. Approval of meeting report of 16 April 2018		Approved
1d. Other Bureau meeting	The Bureau met during the Forum on 26 April in order to approve the closing session slides of the Forum.	
2a. Bureau structure and distribution of tasks	Suggestion from the chair to have a minimum change in the PDA distribution. • One PDA for International Supply Chain (regrouping the former Buy/Pay and Ship and part of Harmonization) with shared responsibility by two VC (Ian and Raffaele). • The BRS-RSM Harmonization to be retargeting Project Review and Support as per the existing guidelines on the subject, with eventually some additional future points under M+T. Validation Focal Point also to move under M+T. • The TFIG Focal Point to be reactivated under ITP-PDA. • All other PDAs to remain the same. • Communication Team will be considered at a later stage (where this will fit into the Bureau organization). Until that time, it is directly under the Chair. Some concerns were raised about creating a single BSP-RSM.	**Bureau decision 1805001**: The Bureau agreed on the proposed structure of PDA responsibilities. 5 PDAs: • ITP-PDA (VC Igwe) with ITPD, SWD, TFIG, TFA • International Supply Chain PDA (VCs Watt and Fantetti) with ISC Orchestration, SC+P, T+L, A+A, F+P, INS • Regulatory PDA (VC Khan) with CBM, eGOV, ENV • Sectoral PDA (VC Van Burg) with AGRI, T+T, UTIL

	Concerns were also raised about the involvement of the secretariat in the "Agriculture, Fisheries and Agri-food Domain" and the lack of inclusion of the corresponding VC.	• M+T PDA (VC Grangard) with SPEC, LibMaint, Syntax, Validation, Project Review & Support • Communication Focal Point under the Chair
2b. Communication Team ToR update?	It was questioned if a Communication function is still pertinent or if this is a function of the Bureau. There had been in the past some miscomprehension of paragraph 4 of document …CEFACT/2016/15, but it was considered that there is no incomprehension as everything is clearly under the remit of ECE. There is perhaps a misunderstanding with the word "ultimate". But it was considered that as the Bureau recognizes that all communications must go through the UNECE secretariat it must follow that it is really the secretariat who has the ultimate responsibility.	
2c. HoD support to projects & relations with HoDs / Missions in Geneva in general	A question was raised on how project support is sought. A bureau member suggested that all HoDs should get a request to support projects (not targeting countries), that it would be good to remind HoDs to their responsibilities through regular communications. It was suggested to either send requests for support on each project as they are brought forward (through a standard email sent as soon as the project is provisionally approved by the Bureau) or to provide new project details in the quarterly report. Perhaps having a monthly report (briefer) that would cover only these outstanding points. A VC reminded that the current procedure has been functional until now, with the secretariat assisting with finding HoD support. Furthermore, a number of project proposals often have some countries in mind for support when they submit their proposal. It was also questioned how long we should keep a project on the list of pending projects when it does not receive HoD support. A concern was also raised on what the HoD support implies (just a signature or if this implies bringing experts or resources to the project). Other organizations require countries that support projects to bring experts to participate; it was suggested that UN/CEFACT also try this practice. We could ask each HoD	**Bureau decision 1805002**: The Bureau requests that the secretariat send a standard email to all HoDs for requests of support for each project provisionally approved by the Bureau.
2d. TFIG updates	Deadline for requests: 30 May 2018 • Update already planned for the WTO TFA and SW itinerary	

	• A new itinerary is planned concerning MSMEs It was suggested that the Bureau take a moment to look at all of the pages of TFIG to see if anything needs to be updated. The secretariat reminded that the updates of TFIG pages are done by the secretariat and is dependent on donor contributions. The current update will have a deadline of 30 May; the next update will depend on future donations.	
2e. Management of information on CUE	Content on CUE New functionality for overview structure for Bureau. There was a suggestion that for archived projects it would be preferable to distinguish "completed" / "abandoned." There was a suggestion to have a session on "CUE" at the same time as the Newcomer session at the next Forum and also during the next Plenary. Propose to have a list of all active projects on the Quarterly Report with links.	
2f. Topics that UN/CEFACT are covering (and not covering, given the activities of other organizations)	It was suggested that as certain topics might be out of scope of UN/CEFACT such as some of the technical aspects of blockchain or internet of things; we should try to capitalize on the work done in other organizations. The project teams are currently exploring new technologies and will establish what we could do and to what extent. There are always grey zones when we approach a new technology. Even these new technologies (like IoT) are not just computer to computer communication; there can also be communications towards other actors on the supply chain. It was explained that the Program of Work provides the scope of the topics that UN/CEFACT should be covering; no further limitations are necessary.	
2g. Harmonization discussion	Compliance of BRSs to the UMM was discussed as well as the need to update most of the BRSs and eventually do this with the use of a tool.	
2h. e-Commerce and the B2B aspects of platforms for e-Commerce	The secretariat requested a clear working definition of e-Commerce for UN/CEFACT and suggest to use the one under development by the WCO: *"Cross-border e-Commerce is characterized by: online initiation; cross-border transaction/shipment; physical goods; and destined to consumers (commercial and non-commercial)."* A VC questioned the pertinence of limiting to physical goods for UN/CEFACT; it might be better to omit "*physical goods*." For many e-Commerce transactions even if initiated through an online platform, a traditional B2B e-Business transaction will often follow (in order to initiate the transport process, the billing process or other).	**Bureau decision 1805003**: The Bureau endorses the initial definition of cross-border e-Commerce for UN/CEFACT as follows: "*online-initiation; cross-border transaction/ shipment; and destined to consumers (commercial and non-commercial)*"

2i. Semantics versus Ontologies	The secretariat requested clarity on the difference between semantics and ontologies and the relationship between the two. A definition of ontologies was requested. The original version of the 2018 Plenary INF.2 document used the word ontology; however, this is not yet in UN/CEFACT vocabulary. Ontology, as defined in the original version of the INF.2 document, is meant as relationships between information (Shiraz is a type of wine which has XXX customs code, so if Shiraz is written, it is automatically associated to XXX customs code). The ISO TC 154 project on the subject aimed to enable multiple libraries to be connected. Ontology remains rather theoretical as it defines how concepts can be modelled. Semantics, for UN/CEFACT, is clearly the "meaning of data" and how each piece of data relates to each other. We should concentrate within UN/CEFACT deliverables (including the blockchain project) on semantics which define data exchanges. It would be interesting to have UN/CEFACT definitions of "ontologies" and "semantics" to be further discussed in a future Bureau meeting.	**Bureau decision 1805004**: UN/CEFACT deliverables should, at this time, concentrate on semantics.
2j. Liaison representatives	The secretariat presented the official liaisons which had been put in place at the request of the Bureau. Only one of these liaisons has been covered by a Bureau-approved representative (Liliana Fratini Passi); the other liaisons have not been covered by a Bureau-approved representative. The secretariat requested that the Bureau propose representatives for each of the groups to ensure the liaison content-based relationship under the guidance of the secretariat. Several other groups of potential liaison were suggested (ISO TC 12, ETSI, CEN, JTC1). It was also suggested that these liaison need to be bilateral and not just unilateral.	
2k. Procedures for joint projects with other organizations	If within the context of JWG there are projects, what are then the procedures to conduct these projects? What will be the IPR policies? Who can participate within a project? Who can vote on the deliverables? UNECE has established several joint working groups with ISO TCs. Questions were raised specifically about the UNTDED JMA, the proposed ToR and an eventual update of the directory. It is one of the basis for the position of information on UNLK documents. It was suggested that UN/CEFACT launch a project to update the UNTDED and once this work is completed, we could eventually propose it to ISO if they want to republish it. A project proposal is to be presented to the Bureau shortly.	

	There is a question on an alignment project through JWG1, to be checked. The JWG8 will be put out for ballot shortly and it will be followed up.	
2l. Proposals on publication methods	There are five potential methods for publishing deliverables proposed, two of which that are automated (xsd file and Excel spreadsheet) and three that are visual (UML diagram, structure report and an excel spreadsheet). Another publication method is a navigable HTML file. A comment was made that some governments oblige to publish in ODF (open document file) or PDF-A. A comment was made that we should avoid using PDA/domain names on deliverables as these may change.	
2m. Deliverables (White Papers, Briefing Notes)	A question was raised on the function of white papers. It was explained that these are expressly mentioned in the ODP in paragraph 16d as a deliverable for information. The Bureau can, at their discretion, put such deliverables forward for approval to the Plenary or request a Public Review. Briefing notes are prepared and presented by the secretariat.	
2n. Code of Conduct	The question was raised by the Plenary and was clearly responded to during the Plenary itself; i.e. the secretariat ensures the good application of all procedures.	
2o. Increase Plenary Attendance	Suggestion to have an event in between the Forum and Plenary that might attract experts and Plenary members. Perhaps on the Monday with a Plenary on Tuesday-Wednesday. Another suggestion was to actively engage other regional commissions.	
3a. UN/CEFACT Schema D.18A	The schema is ready for publication and will be published on the website shortly.	
3b. M+T Envelope Project	The document has been updated during the Forum and there was a request to go to Public Review. The updated document will be circulated so that it can be put on the next Bureau call.	

3x. Projects	Approved Projects Pending 3 HoD support:
	   • T+L – TDEM (received JP, AT, missing 1)
	   • INS – Health Claims (received ES; missing 2)
	Currently in Public Review:
	   • T+L – MMT-RDM (ends 05 May)
		Bureau decision 1805005: Bureau decide to modify the Project Proposal template to put a limit of six month from the provisional approval date for the reception of three HoD support.

4a. China Forum, Hangzhou	Programs will need to be circulated early (projects and side conferences) to inform the local Chinese audience.	**Bureau decision 1805006**: The Bureau

					decided to have the next Forum's opening session on Sunday afternoon October 14th 2018.
	Proposal to start the Forum on Sunday afternoon (for the official launch with dignitary speeches) followed by a welcome drink. Perhaps ending on Thursday evening or Friday morning. It was not yet decided where/how to do a Newcomer's session. Registrations must be done before end of September. (for visa reasons). [There is a visa-free policy for six days maximum in Hangzhou.] We should try to attract/recruit more experts. Conferences – there are two types of conferences: ones that attract all of the experts across multiple domains and ones that affect only a single domain. It was suggested that the multiple-domain conferences should be limited.				
4x. Representations	14-16 May	Brussels	WCO DMPT (FAL meetings)	Chair Probert	
	14-16 May	Brussels	WCO DMPT	VC Grangard	
	23 May	Brussels	EU DG MOVE DTLF	Chair Probert	
	29 May	Brussels	EU e-Invoicing conference	VC Van Burg	
	01 June	Odessa	SW Conference	Chair Probert	
	5-8 June	London	IMO FAL 42	Chair Probert	
	14 June	Brussels	DG MOVE DTLF	Chair Probert	
	14 June	Sofia, BG	SEMIC 2018	VC Van Burg	
	18-20 June	Brussels	WCO e-Commerce	VC Van Burg	
	XXX Nov	India	Cyber Security	VC Van Burg	
6a. Report from Secretariat	• Kirgizstan training on SCM, SW, May 21-24 2018 • UNESCAP Dry Ports meeting (UN/LOCODE), 23-24 May, Bangkok (via conf call) • UNESCAP Dry Ports meeting, 30 May - 1 June, Astana				
9. Other business	Distribution email lists and the need for experts to send emails to each other. Officially, only UN-controlled services should be used for UN/CEFACT related business. PDA VC and secretariat should be in copy of all relevant communications. Email addresses of experts are sometimes also not up to date. Perhaps add a line to the next HoD quarterly report to encourage HoDs to ensure that their respective list of experts is up to date. For information, experts can be deleted at their own request or at the request of the HoD. Perhaps we should allow alternative emails on CUE and indicate on the registration form that an active email is necessary to have a CUE account. For information, the secretariat's emails are being migrated from …@unece.org to …@un.org				

9. Other business	A question was raised on the attendance and activity of domain coordinators (or absence of activity). Such non-activity can be potentially detrimental as we are not necessarily aware of what they may be communicating behind the scenes in their capacity as DC. Suggest to add a few lines to the Domain ToR on how to remove a DC when they are not performing the functions satisfactorily. It was suggested to do a call for candidates for the vacant DC roles with a deadline of end of May for a vote in June.	The Bureau requested that the secretariat send an email to all UN/CEFACT experts with: • Bureau structure • Invitation for DC. And another email on the forum.
	Next Bureau call: Tuesday, May 22 from 10:00 CET Potential topics: • M+T Envelope project	

UN/CEFACT Bureau From 05/2018

Sue PROBERT — Chair

Communicat° Focal Point

Anders GRANGÅRD

Estelle IGWE — ITP PDA

| ITPD | Int'l Trade Procedures | SWD | Single Window | TFIG Focal Point | TFA Focal Point |

M+T PDA

| SPEC | Specificat° |

Ian WATT

Raffaele FANTETTI

International Supply Chain PDA

| ISC Orchestrat° Focal Point | SC+P | Supply-Chain & Procuremt | T+L | Transport & Logistics |
| A+A | Accounting / Audit | F+P | Finance & Payment | INS | Insurance |

Library Maintenance Focal Point

Syntax Focal Point

Tahseen KHAN — Regulatory PDA

| CBM | Cross-Border Mgmt | EGOV | e-Governmt | ENV | Environmt Mgmt |

Validation Focal Point

Harm Jan VAN BURG — Sectoral PDA

| AGRI | Agriculture Fisheries & Agri food | T+T | Travel & Tourism | UTIL | Utilities |

Project Review & Support Focal Point