Recommendation for ensuring legally significant trusted transboundary electronic interaction

Attendance

Present:	Absent:
Aleksandr Sazonov (RU)	Alexey Domrachev (RU)
Anna Nordén (SE)	Anders Tornqvist
Bill Luddy (US)	Andrea Caccia
Ramachandran P. (IN)	Angelo Tosetti (IT)
	Anne Sandretto (FR)
	Antonio Petrella
	Bassil Eid (FIATA)
	Bud P. Bruegger (DE)
	Carlo Salomone (IT)
	Eric E. Cohen (US)
	Jari Salo (FI)
	Jean-Michel Kaliszewski (IATA)
	João Rodrigues Frade (European Commission)
	Lauri Railas (FI)
	Lance Thompson (US)
	Maria Ceccarelli
	Margo Tank (US)
	Moudrick M. Dadashov (SE)
	Prianceu Pandey (IN)
	Richard L. Field (US)
	Susanne Wigard (DE)
	Tom Smedinghoff (US)
	Viky Manaila
	Yuriy Kharakhordin (EAC)

General summary – overview

- **Members welcome**
- **Mandatory and optional attributes of an electronic document**
  - It was preliminary agreed to make mandatory the following attributes: 1) content; 2) document issuer legal status; 3) signature; 4) time.
  - It was suggested to consult with absent experts.
- **Communication with international organizations in different areas of standardization on technical and organizational aspects of forming and functioning transboundary trust space**
  - It was agreed to consider technical and organizational aspects of standardization in different levels of qualification.
- **Summary**
  - It was planned to prepare a final draft for a public review at the 26th UN/CEFACT Forum.

Detailed summary of each agenda item

Topic	Comments
Letter about "Signatory status" attribute	
	<u>Alexander Sazonov:</u> This attribute may not be mandatory, because there is a technology that can be used to verify signatory's status with a third party register system. It is not necessary to put this attribute to document, because there can be a link between signatory's identity and his powers recorded in some register. But still we should wait for our colleagues' opinions. <u>Anna Nordén</u>: Agree, let's wait for them. We shouldn't produce requirements that may not be practically viable, resulting in that a document won't be considered as a legal document. We should provide guidance that will help and won't be a restriction or an obstacle when creating an electronic document.
Communication with standardization organizations	
	<u>Alexander Sazonov:</u> We added two paragraphs to the draft. We should divide technical and technological aspect of standardization on the one hand and organizational aspect on the other. The former is about standardization in the area of technical interoperability: documents and data formats, converting procedures. The latter concerns audit procedures. We should work out audit criteria and types. This Recommendation is addressed to standardization bodies. Should we name these organizations here? For example ISO, ITU. <u>Anna Nordén</u>: We should leave it as it is. Naming the organizations you can miss some or the can change. <u>Ramachandran P.:</u> We should specify the equality of assurance levels of different countries. Unless we specify this format, the interoperability is impossible.

	Alexander Sazonov: I think this aspect can be added to the "Organizational aspect" section. We should draw attention that these provisions can be considered in different levels of qualification. We will add it to the next draft revision.

All comments will be taken into account in the Recommendation for ensuring legally significant trusted trans-boundary electronic interaction draft version 0.93.