DRAFT - Bureau Ad-Hoc Forum Meeting
Thursday, 23 April 2015 (14:00-19:00 CET)
Participants:

Bureau present: Harm Jan van Burg, Raffaele Fantetti, Anders Grangård (partially), Estelle Igwe, Tahseen A. Khan, Lance Thompson (Chair)
Bureau apologies: n.a.
Bureau absent: n.a.
Secretariat: Tom Butterly (partially), Gianguglielmo Calvi (partially), Maria Rosaria Ceccarelli, Fabrizio Meliado.

Agenda item	Discussion	Action/Decision
1. Roll-call	Quorum: 6 of 6 Bureau members = quorum	
1a. Agree Draft Agenda	It was proposed to spend some time on: • Annex A MoU/MG (new item 5c)	Agreed with proposed modifications.
1b. Approve notes of previous session(s)	The minutes of the following meetings were reviewed and approved: • Minutes of 14th April 2015 were approved. • Minutes of 30th March 2015 were approved. Notes from discussion: • The Bureau agreed that, unless explicitly requested by a Bureau member, future reports of Bureau meetings would not specify whether an element of the report was added by a specific Bureau member. Comments made by the secretariat would instead be specified as such. • The Bureau discussed presence of Bureau members on regular conference calls, how these should be documented.	In the absence of quorum, Bureau members present at the meeting can discuss all issues at hand, but cannot make decisions. Decisions can be proposed during such meetings. "Bureau absence" will be added to Bureau meetings' reports.
2a. Terms of Reference for Domains / Domain Coordinators	• The draft-document "Terms of Reference for Domains / Domain Coordinators" was discussed and reviewed. • The discussion emphasized that these ToR should not be seen as recreating a TBG structure; this means that the Domains would have no veto power on projects, nor would they have a decisional role on projects. Project approval is clearly a capacity of the Bureau within the current UN/CEFACT ToR. • This project approval capacity was reminded in order to clearly avoid that a valuable idea would be blocked within a Domain. An example was put in from past UN/CEFACT work related to situations were experts' employers have been	**Bureau decision 1504006**: The Bureau approved the document "Terms of Reference for Domains / Domain Coordinators". Secretariat to send the approved document in its final version to the plenary members (HoDs) for information.

- able to block project development activities.
- Another point discussed was that a Domain is a knowledge base of people working together. In particular the Domain coordinators play this role as they have a comprehensive view on what is happening in the given Domain.
- The vision was expressed that having Domain Coordinators mandatorily coming from the Domain expert base could hinder the opportunity to have more participation in UN/CEFACT work. It was advised that the emphasis should be put on knowledge, not on existing affiliation to a given Domain, though knowledge of the functioning of UN/CEFACT would be appreciable.
- It was suggested to work on an intent statement that would make it publicly clear what the real intent of the Bureau is in setting forth the terms of reference for Domains/Domain Coordinators.
- A point was raised about adding a paragraph about the selection process for Domain Coordinators. Domain Coordinators selection should be through a transparent and internationally recognized criteria. This is in line with UN/CEFACT's overall mandate and terms of reference."
- This document would become an Annex to the latest version of the "Mandate and ToRs of UN/CEFACT". The request was also made that the secretariat send this document in its final version to the plenary members (HoDs) for information.
- The view was expressed that the role of project leads and domain coordinators, as well as their relationship, may need to be further clarified. A discussion followed where it was highlighted that project leads should not bypass domain coordinators.
- The current ToR would not be applicable to a few "domains." It was discussed that these areas (mostly in the Methodology and Technology PDA) would instead be considered a "Focal Point." ToR for focal points will need to be established and these should cover not only M&T area, but also those established in ITP.

3a. ITP-PDA – Recommendation 4 to enter Public Review	The project team has completed the project and is ready to enter into a 60 day public review. The project was briefly presented.	Bureau members had no objections to this project entering Public Review. An announcement will be made on the website.
3b. ITP-PDA – Recommendation on PPP-TF to enter Public Review	The project team has completed the project and is ready to enter into a 60 day public review. The project was briefly presented.	Bureau members had no objections to this project entering Public Review. An announcement will be made on the website.
3c. Suspension of a number of projects following Forum Open Bureaus	- P1001 "Open Data Interchange Framework" - P104 "Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restrict…" - P096 "Dangerous Goods Declaration" (integrated in P1023)	Secretariat to prepare a List of projects "active", "inactive", "archived", "tbd", and "3MS support y/n".

	- P097 "Transport Instruction" (integrated in P1023) - P098 "Transport Status Report" (integrated in P1023) - P099 "Transport Waybill" (integrated in P1023) - Projects which have completed the ODP and should be archived: - P042 "Material Safety Data Sheet" - Projects which require actions: - P108 "Cargo Tracing and Tracking"	
4a. Forum closing slides	To be prepared by the Secretariat and the Bureau between 10-11am on Friday 24 April 2015.	
4b. Forum project for a communiqué	Vice-Chairs to send inputs to VC Fantetti for the preparation of a press release.	
4c. Forum and Plenary dates for 2016	- Forum and Plenary back to back 10-11 March 2016 Plenary 12 Bureau meeting 10am-tbdPM 14-18 March 2016 for the Forum	
5a. MOU/MG – ISO Audit letter proposal:	- A draft letter was read during the meeting. - A concern was expressed as to overlaps with other existing standard-setting works; secondly, a reference was suggested to the MoU on e-Business, on which UN/CEFACT would be able to exchange liaison officers. - It was highlighted that formal relationships should ultimately be maintained exclusively by the UNECE Secretariat.	The Bureau suggested that the draft letter be sent to the ISO central Secretariat and the MoU/MG chair on behalf of the UN/CEFACT Bureau.
5b. Report from Secretariat	n.a.	
5c. MOU/MG Annex A:	- It was suggested that the "A4" section of Annex A should be under the UN/CEFACT responsibility. - Comments from two Bureau members were sent in written form. - A further proposed position on this matter: modernization is necessary but the original principles set forth in the MoU should be respected. - The view was expressed that UN/CEFACT should take a clearer position – and a proposal would be to leave it as it is or delete Annex A altogether. There was disagreement in the Bureau about this point. - The Secretariat underlined the need to have a clear position from the Bureau. The position of UN/CEFACT should be clearly formulated before the revision process goes on too far. - The Secretariat suggested that a meeting between UNECE and ISO secretariats could be organized first informally, and later formally, to identify outstanding	

	issues; advice from the relevant VC in the Bureau would be sought. • The secretariat should receive guidance from any concerned Bureau members in written form before the next call on Tuesday 28 April at 3PM (call later cancelled).	
6a. Enquires received	• No new enquires received	
7a. Establishing a date for a Face-to-Face meeting in June/July	• The Bureau decided to hold its next F2F meeting on 22-24 July 2015	Secretariat to book a room for the F2F meeting
7b. Subjects for upcoming Bureau meetings	• ToR for Liaison / Contact Point (Harm Jan) • ToR for Communication Committee (Raffaele) • ToR for Regional Cooperation (Estelle & Tahseen) • ToR for "How To Guides" (Anders & Lance) • Domain Coordinator leadership	