

# **DRAFT - Bureau face-to-face and teleconference discussion notes and decisions**

**Monday and Tuesday, 2-3 February 2015, Palais de Nations**

## **Participants:**

**Bureau:** Harm Jan van Burg, Raffaele Fantetti, Stuart Feder (Chair), Anders Grangård, Estelle Igwe (Tuesday)

**Advisers:** Eduardo Gutentag (Monday)

**Secretariat:** Tom Butterly, Maria Rosaria Ceccarelli, Fabrizio Meliado, Antonio Petrella, Yan Zhang (Tuesday afternoon)

**Apologies:** Estelle Igwe (Monday), Tahseen A. Khan, Lance Thompson

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action/Decision</b>
1. Roll-call	Quorum: 4-5 of 7 Bureau members = quorum	
2. Agree Draft Agenda	To include topic under Item “Other” on Tuesday concerning Eurasian Economic Commission	Agreed as revised
3. Priority topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>PREPARATIONS FOR PLENARY</b> All items were reviewed (see attached)</li> <li>• <b>UN/LOCODE</b> Key issues were reviewed (see attached)</li> <li>• <b>PROJECT OFFICE FUNCTIONS</b> Consensus on input for Revision 7 which should be sent to Bureau for possible final review and agreement and to bring to attention of Plenary as MISC document.  As a support function, the project office could collect ideas and advise the Bureau accordingly, without undermining the work of the vice-chairs. The bottom line is to attract input about future work in UN/CEFACT, facilitating the process of collecting new ideas and the participation of new experts.</li> <li>• <b>PROJECT REVIEWS, CONFLUENCE/WEBSITE, INACTIVITY</b> The proposal circulated on 30<sup>th</sup> January for inactive projects was discussed. All references in the proposal relate to the official ODP, and nothing in the official ODP is contradicted.  ODP contains guidance on project termination, but does not set forth any criteria on the issue. Qualifiers such as “substantial change” or “non-trivial change” may be useful but matters related to timetable and timeframe criterion could lead to a more objective exit criterion. It was suggested that the proposal could be implemented as a “standing procedure” for the Bureau. Moreover, the ODP should not be changed with respect to this point. A note should be prepared and then to get input from project teams. It was suggested that the burden of proving that a project is still active could be put on the project team within a defined</li></ul>	

	<p>timeframe, during which the HoDs that supported it could also be informed of the potential for a project to become inactive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>REVIEW OF NEW and OLD PROJECTS</b> an initial review of projects took place (see attached template and initial input in “Status of Projects”)</li> <li><b>POSSIBLE ODP ADJUSTMENTS:</b> discussion focused on B.7 clarifications, as the previous version of the document was clearer, should put together a guidance document, including reference to projects in cooperation with other organizations</li> <li><b>LIAISON POLICY</b> Legal advisor said that for the time being there is no precedent in the UN, so no advice could be given on a potential document but need to clarify situation as domain coordinators currently have informal liaisons, e.g. problem with TC204 scheduled a meeting in conjunction with the Delhi meeting. Perhaps “UN/CEFACT cooperation with other parties” could be the topic rather than “liaison policy”. A meeting with the Office of the Executive Secretary is planned for late on Tuesday afternoon.</li> <li><b>MOUMG CONFORMANCE CONFERENCE</b> Bureau members received agenda and invitations for that conference being held on 18-19 February, which is directly after the plenary, so fully in overlap with the SWI roundtable..</li> <li><b>PDA's and DOMAINS – possible changes being considered</b> ITP: add Single Windows and Trade Facilitation Measures Supply Chain: &gt;add Traceability – a cross-domain area &gt;may suggest removal of Supply Chain Management due to confusion that this domain manages Supply Chain PDA Regulatory: no proposed changes Sectoral: no proposed changes M&amp;T: no proposed changes  Should review domains as necessary and coordinators every two years</li> <li><b>EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION</b> discussed the similarity between this issue and the liaison policy issue. To be taken up in the presence of the full Bureau.</li> </ul>	<p>Complete initial “Status of Projects” as soon as possible</p> <p>Secretariat to send a note to MOUMG communicating that UN/CEFACT will not be able to participate in the conformance conference.</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EURASIAN ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REQUEST</b> asked for the possibility to have a rapporteur for their region of competence, as is currently the case for Africa and Asia. They ask what would be the procedure to establish this new rapporteur. To be taken up.</li> <li>• <b>BUREAU APPROVAL OF MAINTENANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND STANDARDS</b> The Plenary gave the Bureau the right to approve the UN/CEFACT maintained code lists. Maintenance of the list values are to be directed by the vice-chair(s) responsible for Bureau Programme Support. This had formerly been the responsibility of the Information Content Management Group (ICG). (<b>Decision 12-05</b>).</li> <li>• <b>TDED:</b> a broad range of issues were discussed based on a note prepared by the secretariat and a summary of the key points taken up will also be drafted.</li> <li>• <b>SUNDAY 15 February meeting before the Plenary:</b> confirmed – envisaged participation: Ms. Igwe and Messrs. Van Burg, Feder, Fantetti, Khan, Thompson (afternoon)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--