Bureau teleconference discussion notes and decisions
30 March 2020, GoToMeeting session; 10:00 CET

Agenda item	Discussion	Action/Decision
1a. Roll call	**Bureau present**: Sue Probert, (Chair), Estelle Igwe, Ian Watt, Harm Jan van Burg, Tahseen Khan, Anders Grangård **Bureau absent**: Raffaele Fantetti **Secretariat**: Lance Thompson, Maria Ceccarelli	6 of 7 = Quorum
1b. Presentation of the Agenda	Following additions: • Length of documents (2a) • BRS-RSM-CCBDA alignment (2b) • IoT-TF project Milestone update (3a) • ISO 9735-11 project (3b) • Error-Acknowledgment message project (3c) • Request from AGAT Chair to circulate a questionnaire (6a) • During the call, all outstanding projects were added	Agenda approved with modifications.
1c. Approval of meeting report of 9 March 2020		**Bureau decision 2003084**: The Bureau approved the meeting report of 9 March 2020.
2a. Length of documents	The secretariat reminded that the maximum length of documents should normally be around twenty pages. This length is an absolute maximum for documents for translation. However, the director of the Economic Cooperation and Trade Division of the UNECE has requested that the length should also be kept down (to twenty pages) for all documents. Concern was raised from the secretariat of documents with multiple editors. Concern was also raised that some projects take a good deal of time to deliver which may result in the topic being obsolete by the time we actually publish. It was suggested that we should concentrate on our core area of work: Trade Facilitation – keeping it short and succinct. It was suggested that a mind-map approach could be useful.	
2b. BRS-RSM-CCBDA alignment	A brief update of the approach to check the alignment of BRS to RSMs was provided. It was concluded that we need to move towards the CCBDA approach. The Bureau expressed its appreciation to all domain coordinators in their assistance in completing this analysis.	
3a. eGOV IoT-TF project	The Internet of Things in Trade Facilitation project requested a milestone extension.	**Bureau decision 2003085:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the IoT-TF project.
3b. ISO 9735-11 project	This ISO project concerns the UN/EDIFACT syntax. The current problem is that there are two syntax (version 3 and version 4) which are actually in use today; however, ISO rules is that there can only be one such syntax. The current project	

	is to update the syntax with a profile schema to accommodate the users of version 3. As this is joint-work between ISO and UN/CEFACT, should this be an official project? Until now, we have not published this type of syntax within UN/CEFACT; it was handled only under ISO. It was proposed to follow and contribute to this work within ISO without having an official UN/CEFACT project.	
3c. Electronic Application Error/Acknowledgement project proposal	A project proposal was put forward for an Error-Acknowledgement message. There is already an UNEDIFACT message concerning Error-Acknowledgement, but this does not yet exist in our XML. The milestone dates should be updated; the UN/EDIFACT message should be a background document. Instead of doing an RSM, it should be a CCBDA. There may be an initial contribution from Japan that could be reused. It was suggested that the Milestone dates might be better to be a bit larger in their draft development stage. All projects can finalize earlier, but if they are behind the date, it is necessary to have milestone updates, creating administrative tasks…	
3d. CII BRS Repository	Milestone update of an additional twelve months. Perhaps the need to identify a new, active project leader. And perhaps changing the name to User-Guide Repository.	**Bureau decision 2003086:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the CII-BRS Repository project.
3e. Health Claims project	Milestone update of an additional six months.	**Bureau decision 2003087:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the Health Claims project.
3e. RDM2API project	Milestone update of an additional six months. The secretariat did underline that there are experts and project teams that are waiting on the results of this project in order to advance and this is the third milestone update. It was reminded that the project should deliver on the outputs that were in the project proposal.	**Bureau decision 2003088:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the RDM2API project.
3f. API Town Plan project	Milestone update of an additional six months. The secretariat did underline that there are experts and project teams that are waiting on the results of this project in order to advance and this is the third milestone update. It was reminded that the project should deliver on the outputs that were in the project proposal.	**Bureau decision 2003089:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the API Town Plan project.
3g. Inter-ledger CoO project	Milestone update of an additional six months.	**Bureau decision 2003090:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the Inter-ledger CoO project.
3h. eCert Guide project	Milestone update of an additional six months.	**Bureau decision 2003091:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the eCert Guide project.

3i. Sustainable Tourism project	Milestone update of an additional six months.	**Bureau decision 2003092:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the Sustainable Tourism project.
3j. Experience Program Technical Artefact project	Milestone update of an additional six months.	**Bureau decision 2003093:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the Experience Program Technical Artefact project.
3k. Message construct project	Milestone update of an additional six months.	**Bureau decision 2003094:** The Bureau approved the milestone extension of the Message Construction project.
3x. Pending projects	- HoD support received from Germany and the Russian Federation for the Ship Agent Minimum Standards project - On the IMO eFAL, it was requested that we prepare a press release (or something similar) to announce publicly that this has been completed? There is still an extension which needs to be completed; but it was suggested that this should be perhaps a separate/new project. A call will be put forward with the Project Leader to find a way forward.	
4a. UN/CEFACT Plenary	Secretariat gave a brief update. The date of 4 May is currently still maintained. This may evolve. There is a precedent that some UNECE committee meetings that have taken place as webinars; it may be the case for our meeting. Almost all documents are now on line. We are missing the reports of the Regional Rapporteurs from Asia/Pacific and from Middle-East/North-Africa; there have been many reminders	
4b. UN/CEFACT Plenary – Bureau report	A report was prepared with the information which must be reported to the Plenary (Bureau decisions, representation, project advancement); information has also been put together on progress within each PDA and general information on UN/CEFACT. Some minor modifications were brought to the document.	**Bureau decision 2003095**: The Bureau approved the Bureau Report to the Plenary with minor modifications.
4x. Representation	The UNECE will organize a virtual meeting on eCITE in collaboration with UNCTAD and UNESCAP on 8 April. The UNECE will organize a virtual meeting on Textile traceability project on 27-28 April.	
6a. AGAT questionnaire	The AGAT chair requested to send a questionnaire to the experts of the AGAT with three questions: - What are the specific impacts on international trade of the COVID 19 pandemic in your country and which measures have been taken to specifically address trade disruptions? (Measures that are taken in relation to your country situation). - What is the impact on the logistics of imports and exports in particular? - How can advanced technologies help overcome such disruptions? (Please provide examples, if possible).	

	• Your name, position, organizations, email address. It was suggested that many governmental officials will be reluctant to respond to such a questionnaire since it can be politically sensitive. It was suggested to perhaps ask what innovative approaches they have seen in their country which has been successful, in relation to trade and transport. It was suggested to not send this questionnaire to Heads of Delegations, but to send to UN/CEFACT experts. Perhaps adding a question on "How do you think that UN/CEFACT deliverables are useful to the current situation?"	
7a. HoD Quarterly Report	The next HoD Quarterly Report will be prepared for the next call. Bureau members were asked if they had any topics that should be added.	
9a. Other business		
9x. Next Bureau call	Next Bureau call: Monday, **20 April 2020** from 10:00 CET (Geneva)	