

## Bureau teleconference discussion notes and decisions

Friday, 22 May 2015 GoToMeeting session (14:00-16:00 CEST)

### Participants:

**Bureau present:** Harm Jan van Burg, Raffaele Fantetti, Anders Grangård, Tahseen A. Khan, Lance Thompson (Chair)

**Bureau apologies:** Estelle Igwe

**Bureau absent:**

**Secretariat:** Tom Butterly, Gianguglielmo Calvi, Maria Ceccarelli, Fabrizio Meliado, Markus Pikart (as of 15:36)

Agenda item	Discussion	Action/Decision
1. Roll-call	Quorum: 5 of 6 Bureau members = quorum	
1a. Agree draft agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A communiqué for the HoDs was being prepared and it was proposed as a new point 1c of the meetings' agenda.</li> <li>• The Secretariat commented that, in the case of projects that enter the public review phase of the ODP, it would be advisable to send those projects to HoDs for information, too.</li> <li>• The comment was expressed that it would be important to highlight that such a communication to the HoDs would be for information only, while the possibility to express comments on a project during a Plenary session would remain unchanged.</li> </ul>	
1b. Approval of meeting reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forum Open Bureau meetings:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report was approved with the proposed changes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Forum F2F meeting:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The report was approved with the proposed changes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• May 13<sup>th</sup> Bureau meeting:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report was approved with the proposed changes.</li> <li>• An opinion was expressed as to the desirability of publishing of reports of Bureau minutes where a quorum of Bureau members was not present.</li> <li>• During this meeting there was no quorum therefore no decision could be taken. This report is for information only.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
1c. Communiqué to HoDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A document containing a comprehensive communiqué to HoDs will be circulated within the Bureau for comments by the Secretariat. Comments can be received until May 28<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>	Secretariat to circulate draft communiqué to HoDs within the Bureau for comments. Comments to be received by the Secretariat by May the 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2015. The communiqué should be circulated the following week.
2a. CCTS 3 / CCTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group discussed "Slide 13" ("Future of Core Component Technical</li> </ul>	<b>1505007:</b> The Bureau

2.01	<p>Specification”) of the presentation made at the April 2015 Geneva Forum. This proposition was that all work developed within UN/CEFACT would be developed using CCTS v2, NDR v2, and CCBDA. The CCTS v3 would be maintained for external organizations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comment was expressed that a project in UN/CEFACT that would like to rely on V.3 would no longer be allowed.</li> <li>• In reply, the view was expressed that this could be the case mainly because there would be no capacity to maintain two parallel versions.</li> <li>• The Bureau adopted these two points as the principles at the basis for the official position of the Bureau on this matter. It was then agreed that a statement would be prepared on that basis.</li> <li>• It was suggested, and agreed to, that a paragraph on this matter could be added in the communiqué for HoDs discussed under point 1c.</li> <li>• It was recalled that during the Forum the view was expressed in the Bureau to discuss this matter with the users’ community of Version 3. For the sake of elegance, it would be preferable to share this decision with the known users’ community.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>adopted the official position that work developed within UN/CEFACT will use CCTS v2.01, NDR v2 &amp; CCBDA – CCTS would be maintained for external organizations.</p> <p>A paragraph on this matter shall be sent for information to MoU/MG member organizations. Thereafter, the same language will be added in the communiqué for HoDs discussed under point 1c.</p>
2b. Liaison MoU/MG Annex A position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was recalled that the MoU/MG conference call on Annex A was recently deferred.</li> <li>• The Secretariat reported that the matter would be first discussed between the four signatories, and that it was likely that the matter would be re-opened after the 2015 summer break (most likely, October 2015).</li> <li>• The group discussed the main comments that had been expressed on the Annex A issue, as well as the key implications of the Annex A revision exercise. In particular, it was recalled that some of the matters on the plate, such as “Semantics”, were particularly delicate as they related to the allocation of responsibilities between MoU/MG signatories.</li> <li>• The Secretariat called on the Bureau’s support to propose a formulation of Annex A that would reflect the orientation of UN/CEFACT on this matter.</li> <li>• The Group noted that the main points underlined in the comments converged on the idea that UN/CEFACT should be in charge of Semantic issues.</li> <li>• However, an opinion was expressed on this idea, on the grounds that other organizations in the MoU/MG, might feel to be overpassed. It was stressed that the whole semantic landscape is scattered; still, by claiming such competence, UN/CEFACT risked to disrupt the work being done within the MoU/MG. Within</li> </ul>	<p>It was decided that by 5 June 2015, further comments would be sent to Anders for him to prepare a draft text on proposed changes to Annex A, to be then submitted to the Bureau for approval ideally before or at the F2F Bureau meeting of 22-24 July 2015.</p>

	<p>the standards-setting community, it was added, the CCL would become the mandatory standard for all other MoU/MG members, which would not be realistic nor desirable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat highlighted that opening the discussion to the users' group would be a common decision between the four signatories. It also recalled that it would be important that the points of view being expressed in writing on the topic being discussed.</li> <li>• It was decided that by 5 June 2015, further comments would be sent to Anders for him to prepare a draft text on proposed changes to Annex A, to be then submitted to the Bureau for approval, ideally before or at the F2F Bureau meeting of 22-24 July 2015.</li> </ul>	
3a. M+T Project: Specification Conformance and Interoperability of Standards Requirements Analysis – Feasibility Study v1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further comments have been received by the responsible Vice-Chair. The project team is currently reviewing the comments received.</li> <li>• The view was expressed that there might be a need to clarify the typology of organization that would be interested in making a statement in this context.</li> <li>• Brainstorming went on in relation to the organizations that would have an interest in furthering the discussion on, or participating more formally in this project.</li> <li>• It was suggested that a practical way forward could be to have this as a discussion item in the MoU/MG, to touch base on the interest around this project by other organizations. In this way, some of those organizations could be included in the drafting process. The Secretariat reported that some of those organizations suggested that UN/CEFACT could look into their running projects on the same matter, to avoid overlaps.</li> <li>• It was suggested that the report from the latest MoU/MG meeting could be circulated within the Bureau.</li> <li>• It was recalled that, on 1-2 December 2015, the World Standards Cooperation (WSC) will organize a meeting on Conformity Assessment that would be of interest in the context of this M+T Project.</li> </ul>	Secretariat to circulate report of MoU/MG discussions held before the 25 <sup>th</sup> UN/CEFACT Forum.
3b. M+T Project proposal: Self Conformance Project	Comments are welcome at this point. A project proposal will be submitted once the project in 3a is finalized.	
3c. M+T Project proposal: Conformance Clause Review Project	Comments are welcome at this point. A project proposal will be submitted once the project in 3a is finalized.	
3d. Sec Project proposal: eCrop Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was reported that most comments originally expressed by the Bureau were mostly editorial. The Milestone dates indicated need to be corrected.</li> <li>• The responsible Vice-Chair will submit those proposed changes to the project team,</li> </ul>	Submitter to correct the project proposal.

	with a view for the proposed project team will amend the document in order for it to be presented at the next Bureau call.	
4a. Events – prep for Marseille Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat reported that no updates were available on the Host Country Agreement (HCA). The Secretariat reported that the Host government will have until the end of May 2015 to react on the HCA.</li> </ul>	
5a. Report from Liaison	Nothing to report.	
5b. Report from Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat presented an idea for a new project on a Handbook on the use of electronic business standards in Agriculture, to help policymakers identify trade facilitation areas at the national level that would be specifically relevant to facilitate trade in Agricultural projects. This, it was highlighted, would not result in a technical document, but rather in a general guidance related to the exchange of messages (e.g. eLabs) to facilitate and streamline trade in agricultural products.</li> <li>The Secretariat added that UN/CEFACT support was necessary to advance work in the context of this project, which would be carried out by UNECE and UNESCAP.</li> <li>A comment was expressed that the Agricultural Domain within UN/CEFACT could be interested in documents and projects of a more technical nature. This will not be the subject of the proposed Handbook.</li> <li>The Bureau decided to support the principle of this project proposal. Comments on the language of the draft project proposal were also expressed.</li> <li>It was also suggested that UNECE WP.7 could be able to suggest additional resources to advance this project.</li> </ul>	<b>1505008:</b> The Bureau decided to support this UNECE-lead project proposal
6a. Enquiries received		
7a. Other business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
8a. Topics for next Bureau call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval of e-Crop project</li> <li>Procedure for selection and making call for candidature for Domain Coordinators</li> </ul>	