

**Bureau F2F Paris meeting discussion notes and decisions**  
**Monday-Wednesday 1-3 July 2019**

| Agenda item  | Discussion  | Action/Decision  |
|--|---|--|
| 1a. Attendance and roll call                                     | <p><b>Bureau present:</b> Sue Probert (Chair), Anders Grangård, Estelle Igwe, Harm Jan van Burg, Ian Watt, Tahseen Khan (on-line)</p> <p><b>Bureau absent:</b> Raffaele Fantetti</p> <p><b>Secretariat:</b> Lance Thompson, Maria Ceccarelli</p>  | The meeting had quorum.  |
| 1b. Approval of the agenda                                       | Addition of two topics under other topics   | Agenda agreed with small modifications.  |
| 1c. Approval of the minutes of 27 May 2019                       | <p>Question raison on how to record “Quorum”</p> <p>Should we document the number of Bureau members or just indicate that there is a quorum? It was suggested that we just indicate “The meeting had quorum” from now on.</p>   | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907010:</b> The Bureau approved the meeting report of 27 May 2019.</p>  |
| 1d. Approval of the minutes of 24 June 2019 Extended Bureau call |   | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907011:</b> The Bureau approved the Extended Bureau meeting report of 27 May 2019.</p>  |
| 1e. Schedule of Bureau meetings                                  | <p>The secretariat explained the time constraints of the organization of each Bureau call (preparation of documentation, taking the minutes, follow-up on points raised during the meetings...). There are also recurring points on each bi-weekly call which take a good deal of time which don’t necessarily need to be discussed this often (project topics, liaison, etc.)</p> <p>The Bureau members felt that reducing the number of meetings may not facilitate the secretariat’s work since written procedure and other topics might require a good deal of work as well. Monthly meetings might bring additional work as there will be more topics on the table. Perhaps every three weeks could be a solution.</p> <p>Concern was raised to use written procedure as we would lack discussion prior to the approval. It might be possible to change the priority of points discussed and reserve certain topics like overdue projects and liaison to dedicated calls. It was underlined that we will likely have more work in the future as the attendance of Forums is increasing yearly. The Bureau should perhaps be working more on the business instead of in the business – i.e., the Bureau should depend more on the Domain Coordinators for the day-to-day management. More frequent Extended Bureau meetings would be necessary – quarterly? – keeping in mind the responsibilities of Bureau members. This may lead, in term, to modifications in UN/CEFACT procedural documents.</p> | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907012:</b> The Bureau decided to have meetings every three weeks from July onward.</p> <p>The Bureau also proposed quarterly extended Bureau calls with the Domain Coordinators and Project Leaders.</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>Though concern was raised that this would be tending back to a former structure with TBGs, it was reminded that controls have been put in place to avoid what have been considered the more detrimental aspects of the former organisation (i.e. nomination from Bureau, limited action power...). There have not been any incidents in the recent past; but if these arise, they should be brought to the attention of the Chair and the secretariat.</p>   |  |
| 2a. Clarity on diff. between Domains and Focal Points | <p>Following discussions during Bureau calls, a request for clarity on the difference between Domains and Focal Points was requested.</p> <p>Domains are a group of experts who will provide the resources for projects on UN/CEFACT deliverables.</p> <p>Focal Points are a group of experts working to support the work of UN/CEFACT.</p> <p>It was reminded that project proposals come from three sources: HoDs, Bureau member or Project team.</p> <p>There was a discussion to explore if other Focal Points should be considered, such as a codes working group (See also 3g below).</p>   |  |
| 2b. Role of domains and cross-domain collaboration    | <p>Following discussions during Bureau calls, a question was raised on how to best encourage cross-domain collaboration. Each PDA plays an essential role in encouraging cross-domain work and experts, once registered, can participate in any project.</p>  |  |
| 2c. Future of the ISCO Domain                         | <p>A canonical model project was established to explore moving our standards towards formats that would be easier for web developers to implement. This has resulted in an informal website disseminating UN/CEFACT deliverables as APIs. Several comments were raised concerning this website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links will need to be made for the contextualization of such APIs and the business needs.</li> <li>• UN/CEFACT doesn't use UML for its internal development, but our CCTS can help to standardize the UML view. This has been the case, using the CCTS naming convention and the Aggregate Core Components.</li> <li>• The maintenance of the new informal website which is outside of the control of the Bureau and secretariat.</li> <li>• Work in progress within UN/CEFACT or not engaged yet within UN/CEFACT may be presented on this alternative website.</li> </ul> <p>It was reminded that UN/CEFACT deliverables are available free of charge and the secretariat cannot control this. As long as the website is not using the logo and is not using the UN/CEFACT name in a way that could be considered as a commercial endorsement, we normally do not intervene.</p> <p>It was considered that there is great value in what has been done and that this is a useful reuse of our work.</p> <p>Question was raised why this work is being conducted in the ISCO Domain. As there is great momentum among experts in this area, it was requested to allow the ISCO Domain to</p> | <p>The Bureau requested the secretariat to study the possibilities of creating a UNECE-controlled github website for project development in this collaborative environment.</p> <p>The Bureau renewed its support of the ISCO domain and its work for the coming year.</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | continue its work for another year in order to finalize the new projects (RDM-2-API and the Town Plan) and the way forward proposed through these.   |  |
| 2d. Use of generic names for projects; relationships between projects and domains | The Bureau agreed that care must be taken when proposals come forward in order to ensure that generic names are not used by domain-specific work.  |  |
| 2e. T+L deliverables at executionable level                                       | <p>Following discussion within Bureau calls, a question was raised on the individual T+L messages at the transactional level as well as the quality assurance control which is done through the BRS at a transactional level.</p> <p>The history of the CCL was reminded, that when it was founded in collaboration of multiple domain-areas before the BRS-RSM procedure was created, utilizing the experience from UN/EDIFACT. Harmonization of procedures between these multiple domain-areas resulted in the 2008 version of the initial CCL. The Freight Forwarding and Transport BRS as well as the MMT-RDM are representations of this.</p> <p>Moving forward, the T+L domain plans to continue developing transactional level BRSs – perhaps grouped in types of transactions. This will be linked through to an API approach. The quality control should be ensured when these new projects are put forward, keeping in mind the need to ensure a backwards compatibility.</p> <p>Concern was raised on the level of detail necessary for each transaction based BRS that these should be compliant with the BRS methodology.</p> | Attention has been brought to quality assurance and will continue to be a focus as more transaction-level projects are put forward for T+L deliverables. |
| 2f. Submission for CCL of XHE project   | <p>Work had been done to help contribute core components to the XHE project and these proposed core component structures are now included as the UN/CEFACT contribution to the joint technical specification. There are requests that these core components should be submitted to the CCL so that they can be reused.</p> <p>It was pointed out that technical specifications have not until now made submissions to the CCL. However, the procedure outlines that there must be a BRS or equivalent for library submission and most other technical specifications do not have this level of detail.</p> <p>Concern was raised that a submission to the library may take a certain amount of time, especially since this is a joint project with OASIS. It was pointed out though, that OASIS has published a schema already.</p>  | A new project will need to be proposed in order to create a submission to the CCL and a UN/CEFACT schema for the XHE project.                            |
| 2g. New technology references in projects   | <p>Question had been raised concerning on how technology should be referenced within projects. It was stated that BRSs should not be influenced by technology.</p> <p>Concern was raised that many teams make reference to IoT and Blockchain, even though this should not be integrated into any BRS unless it is the main topic of the deliverable (i.e. Smart Containers).</p>  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| 2h. HoD support for projects                 | <p>The secretariat raised the issue that some HoDs are not responding very quickly for expert registration and project support. This can be for justifiable reasons. It was suggested to provide a deadline for responses.</p> <p>It was suggested that we should perhaps request resources (people) for each project that they support. If they don't have those resources, then they shouldn't support.</p> <p>However, it was noted that this may drastically reduce the amount of support that projects will receive; currently, they are only asked to support work which is within the scope of the PoW.</p> <p>The secretariat has tested sending requests for new project support to all registered HoDs ; this has resulted in a large number of positive responses. It was suggested to respond to all HoDs once the three have been received to let them know that the project has started.</p> | <p>It was decided to send the HoD request for project support to all HoDs. Once three have been received, a second email to announce that the project is launched. A larger discussion on how to get resources for the work should be continued at a later time.</p> |
| 2i. Update of streamlined standards project  | <p>The Secretariat presented the UNECE webpage which targets helping implementers to use the standards. However, this reorganization has brought to light some deliverables which are not present on the website and some which need to be updated. This is especially the case in the Agriculture domain. Some deliverables are missing BRS, some are missing the XSD schema. Some require updating. This also brought to light diverging methods of using the base templates. It will be necessary to update these with the working groups. The secretariat did send two emails to domain coordinators to provide input on this.</p> <p>All of the deliverables are still presented on the website in the former presentation (separate pages for BRS, RSM, CCL, schema...). This may be reorganized in a future version of the website, but with the intention to continue to publish all archives.</p> | <p>Domains and project teams will be requested to assist with updating and controlling the quality of the deliverables on these pages.</p>   |
| 2j. Establishment of publication focal point | <p>The deliverables which are put on the streamlined page could benefit from a review from the project teams prior to the actual publication for quality assurance.</p> <p>It was suggested that this might be through a new Focal Point on the subject. It was also suggested that this might better be performed through the Domains and Project Teams.</p>  |  |
| 2k. Role of UMM and BRS                      | <p>The Bureau thanked the secretariat for preparing a presentation on the UMM and BRS. This underlined the minimum requirements of aspects which must be present in a BRS: business requirement view (domain view, partner view, entity view) and business choreography view (transaction view, collaboration view, realization view).</p> <p>The RDMs have developed BRS which do not cover all of these views and have been labelled "high level BRS." A further discussion is needed to formalize this approach and to validate the relevant label name.</p> <p>All other deliverables should ensure that all of the above views are present in a BRS and should be on a specific business process area or transactional level.</p>   |  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>Concern was raised that some BRS provide detail about individual data elements. It was globally agreed that these types of technical expressions should not be present in a BRS. The RSM should provide this detail. However, the information in an RSM is ready for syntax, but is missing the structure of the data which can be provided through a CCBDA.</p> <p>Further discussion between Bureau members concerning tools and procedures on the subject will follow.</p>  |  |
| <p>2l. RSM versus CCBDA or equivalent</p>                   | <p>The RSM development seems to have been resource intensive which has at times required several back and forth with library harmonization.</p> <p>Some teams have tested a replacement of the RSM with a class diagram of UML.</p> <p>Perhaps a project needs to be developed in order to decide the way forward in order to ensure that the BRS, the CCL and the mapping is consistent and harmonized.</p> <p>Could this be related back to a DMR process for the CCL?</p>  |  |
| <p>2m. Entries into the CCL – move towards DMR process?</p> | <p>The CCL is mature today and almost all data requirements in a business transaction should be present in the library. The project-based procedure to modify or add information to existing messages (when the changes would be considered substantial) can be long and resource intensive. It was suggested that library maintenance could move towards a DMR process (or CAR UN/CEFACT Activity Request process).</p> <p>Such a process would oblige the Entry Point function to verify the information before it is processed for further consideration. A more developed peer-review could also be useful. It would be necessary to check if requested changes may affect the BRS.</p> <p>Concern was raised that such a process could allow things to come through a back door; however such abuses should be stopped as soon as they are detected and such abuses could happen in the current process as well.</p> <p>It was suggested to further study these options and put forward a proposal to the Bureau in the near future.</p> |  |
| <p>2n. Use of non-proprietary tools</p>                     | <p>The use of tools in our work is inevitable. Some well established tools have already been used, but perhaps some other tools may be necessary, notably to standardize the elements of the BRS.</p> <p>It was also underlined that a good deal of work has been brought to GitHub, allowing programmers and developers to access our deliverables. It was pointed out that some inception of projects have been shared through GitHub as well as some project development work. It was felt that the latter should be controlled through normal procedures, i.e. shared only on UN controlled websites.</p> <p>It might be possible to use GitHub in a closed environment to develop UN/CEFACT work (but accessible only to UN/CEFACT registered experts) to continue such work in an environment with which the experts are comfortable.</p>   | <p>Bureau to prepare a report to the UNECE secretariat on the use of tools; several Bureau members will work together on a first draft at a Forum half-day.</p> <p>The Bureau requests the secretariat to consider creating a closed GitHub website where development of projects can be done.</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>The Bureau agreed that they would further discuss the use of tools, taking care to avoid proprietary tools which would come at a cost to experts and to consider other tools that may be necessary, such as Smart Sheets. A request will be prepared and submitted to the UNECE secretariat for consideration.</p>   |  |
| <p>2o. Preparation of training material reflecting UN/CEFACT work</p> | <p>The UNECE secretariat prepared training material presentations which were commented on during the Plenary. In order to ensure that this does not happen again, such material will be presented to the Bureau for comments in advance.</p> <p>The Bureau welcomed this initiative and are ready to support such work.</p> <p>The secretariat also requested assistance to update the Glossary of trade terms developed by our Regional Advisor.</p>   |  |
| <p>2p. Communication of countries/ companies related to UN/CEFACT</p> | <p>Some countries and companies make communications on the theme of UN/CEFACT.</p> <p>Some countries in particular have become a bit aggressive in their presence in international standards which may not be in the interest of the UN/CEFACT image in general. There has been notably one article which made it appear that a specific country has brought UN/CEFACT under their control...</p> <p>After a brief discussion, it was agreed that as UN/CEFACT is a global organization with good representation from all regions of the world, we are well equipped to deal with these types of challenges.</p>  |  |
| <p>2q. Emails from project leaders, DC...</p>                         | <p>The distribution of emails for domain related information or project related information is currently being done manually since the UNECE discontinued its distribution list service. Concern was raised that some email exchanges include the names of all experts in visible copy which may not be compatible with the Code of Conduct article 2c. An alternative distribution list service needs to be found.</p>   | <p>The Bureau requested the secretariat to find a means to distribute emails to project teams and domains.</p>   |
| <p>2r. Conference during the Forum</p>                                | <p>Conferences during the UN/CEFACT Forums have been met with a great deal of success and have allowed to attract new experts. However, concern was raised that some conferences are pertinent to multiple domains and disrupt the regular meetings of project teams. There are really two types of conferences: those which are project or domain specific which should help to attract new experts into the regular work and others which are of cross-domain pertinence and could potentially spark exchanges among all experts. The latter should be kept down to a minimum.</p> <p>All topics for conferences should be considered in light of what they bring to UN/CEFACT and its work.</p> <p>The secretariat announced its intention to have meetings of the Advisory Groups and Teams of Specialists during the Forum. Concern was raised that this might be considered cross-UN/CEFACT and disruptive of other groups.</p> | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907013:</b> The Bureau agreed that there should only be one conference that is cross-UN/CEFACT. All other conferences should be domain-based and minimize impact on other working groups.</p> |
| <p>3a. ISCO RDM &amp; API project</p>                                 | <p>Approved by written procedure on 20 June 2019</p>  | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907014:</b> The Bureau</p>  |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | Project leader: Steve Capell; coleaders: Andreas Pelekies & Nis Jespersen; supporting VC: VC Watt  | approved the ISCO RDM2API project by written procedure with Project leader Steve Capell and co-leaders Andreas Pelekies and Nis Jespersen and Supporting VC Watt. |
| 3b. ISCO API Town Plan                        | Approved by written procedure on 20 June 2019<br>Project leader: Steve Capell; supporting VC: VC Watt  | <b>Bureau decision 1907015:</b> The Bureau approved the ISCO API Town Plan project by written procedure with Project leader Steve Capell and Supporting VC Watt.  |
| 3c. T+L Rec16 rev                             | Approved by written procedure to go to Public Review on 20 June 2019   | <b>Bureau decision 1907016:</b> The Bureau approved the launch of the Public Review of the T+L Rec16rev project by written procedure for a 60-day public review.  |
| 3d. INS Healthcare                            | Request to change the project leadership   | <b>Bureau decision 1907017:</b> The Bureau approved the change of leadership of the INS Healthcare project. The new project leader is Michel Bormans.             |
| 3e. ENV Waste Mgmt                            | Request to change milestone dates  | <b>Bureau decision 1907018:</b> The Bureau approved milestone update of the ENV Waste Management project with slight modification.                                |
| 3f. eGOV IoT for TF                           | Request to change milestone dates  | <b>Bureau decision 1907019:</b> The Bureau approved milestone update of the eGOV Internet of Things project with slight modification.                             |
| 3g. Publication of Recommendation 21, Annex V | It was reported that the annex V of Recommendation 21 has been updated and published. A discussion followed on how these updates should be handled. In a former structure (more than 20 years ago), there was a code-working group. Then it was divided into the recommendations dealt with by M+T |   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>and UN/EDIFACT code lists which were sent to the specific TBGs.</p> <p>It was suggested that UN/CEFACT should work on code list content. But this is currently supported by the Syntax Focal Point – we might need to consider how the business requirements (content) are taken into consideration within this process.</p> <p>Further discussions are planned to follow</p>  |   |
| 3x. ISCO Canonical Model project               |   | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907020:</b> The Bureau decided to archive the ISCO Canonical Models project. It has been replaced by two other ISCO projects.</p>  |
| 3x. AGRI FLUX project                          |   | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907021:</b> The Bureau moved the AGRI FLUX project to Project Exit. All deliverables in the project proposal have been produced.</p>   |
| 3x. T+T Destination Travel Information project |   | <p><b>Bureau decision 1907022:</b> The Bureau decided to archive the Destination Travel Information project.</p>  |
| 3x. Status of projects                         | <p>HoD support received for INS HealthClaim from GR, RU, SI</p> <p>HoD support received for SCMP Track/Trace from DE, ES, GR, RU, SE, CG, FI, IT</p>  |   |
| 4a. Events information                         | <p>It was suggested that there could also be lunchtime presentations during the Forum.</p> <p>A suggestion was made to announce during the Opening session the meetings of each working group during the Forum (as a brief presentation).</p> <p>There is a possibility that the Spring Forum dates may change because of a conflict of calendars with UNCTAD and IMO. If the date should change, a preference was pronounced for the weeks of 16 March or 23 March.</p>              |   |
| 4b. 34 <sup>th</sup> Forum London conferences  | <p>The following proposals have been received so far:</p> <p>SWD – Single Window use cases and exchange of experience</p> <p>eGOV – Use of advanced technologies in facilitating secure, digital cross border trade</p> <p>ISCO – joint meeting with other Domains on APIs</p> <p>The ISCO and eGOV topics are both considered to be of interest to all of UN/CEFACT experts. However, the Bureau has decided that there should only be one cross-UN/CEFACT conference per Forum.</p> | <p>The initial conferences (SWD use cases and ISCO on APIs) and room distributions were agreed by the Bureau. This should be circulated to the DC and project teams in order to request their detailed schedules.</p> |



|                             |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
|                             |  | The Bureau also requested to circulate the decision on having only one UN/CEFACT wide conf theme per Forum. |
| 4x. Representation          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27-28 Aug. VC Watt, CAREC, Trading to share prosperity conference, Xi'an</li> <li>• 4-5 Sept. Chair Probert, UNECE Balkan SW conf, Skopje.</li> <li>• 10-11 Sept. Chair Probert, Women in Shipping Summit, London, UK.</li> <li>• 17-19 Sept. VC Igwe, AAEC SW conf, Yaoundé</li> <li>• 17-19 Sept. Chair Probert, Global Liner Shipping Asia, Singapore</li> <li>• 7-8 Oct. VC Van Burg, Taxation</li> <li>• 27-29 Nov. VC Van Burg, Sustainable Tourism conf., Taipei.</li> </ul>   |   |
| 5a. Liaison information     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ITU FG DLT, Geneva, 29 July to 1 August</li> <li>• ISO TC204 Plenary, Singapore, 14-18 October</li> <li>• ISO TC154 Plenary, Luxembourg, 14-18 October</li> </ul> <p>There may be a future consideration with the ISO TC154 JWG1 as the project lead will no longer be sponsored to participate in ISO TC154 activities.</p>  |   |
| 6a. Secretariat information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSCE, event on Green Port and streamlining procedures, Baku, 21 June</li> <li>• UN Governance Forum, Baku (via web-link), 25 June</li> <li>• G-Nexid Conference, Geneva, 26 June</li> <li>• UNECE &amp; Regional Commissions presentation of 2019 report on trade facilitation at the WTO Aid For Trade, Geneva, 4 July</li> <li>• UNECE SPECA conference at the WTO Aid For Trade, Geneva, 4 July</li> <li>• Disaster Recovery project meeting, Geneva, 9 July</li> <li>• WTO Public Forum, Geneva, 8-11 October</li> <li>• IMO eFAL Expert Group, London, 4-8 November</li> <li>• UN/LOCODE Advisory Group, 2nd, 3rd or 4th week of November, Xiamen (China)</li> </ul> <p>UNCTAD has asked if their Multi-Stakeholder Forum could become a joint meeting. (this could be positive to do this in conjunction with our Plenary).</p> |   |
| 6b. Use of UN/CEFACT titles | <p>An initial ToR on the use of UN/CEFACT titles was circulated. Question was raised if a private-sector title could be used in conjunction with the UN/CEFACT title; it will need to be taken back to the legal advisor for review. It was pointed out that reference to the Focal Points was missing from the document.</p>  |   |
| 9a. Fund raising            | <p>It might be necessary to plan fund-raising to help finance travel obligations for secretariat and Bureau members. We need to establish a budget and approach some countries – perhaps Sweden, UK and/or Netherlands?</p>  |   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   |  |
| 9b. Information for Project leaders on use of CUE | It was suggested to have a lunch and learn during the Forum on the use of CUE.  |  |
| 9c. University support                            | We should try to encourage universities to provide resources (participants) into our work and get exposure to our standards setting work. The idea of developing a kind of UN/CEFACT Academy approach across interested universities similar to the existing Customs Academy network was discussed. |  |
| 9d. Future Vice Chair elections in 2020           | It was suggested to discuss this in the Bureau and approach this in a harmonized manner.  |  |
|   | <p>Next meetings proposed 10am CET:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 July</li> <li>• Tuesday 13 August (12 is a UN Holiday)</li> <li>• 9 September</li> <li>• 30 September</li> <li>• 21 October</li> </ul>  |  |