



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2008/3
5 May 2008

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Customs Questions affecting Transport

Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and
Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure

**REPORT OF THE INFORMAL AD HOC EXPERT GROUP ON
CONCEPTUAL AND TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF COMPUTERIZATION
OF THE TIR PROCEDURE ON ITS FOURTEENTH SESSION
(10-11 April 2008)**

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. ATTENDANCE	1-2	3
II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1)	3	3
III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (Agenda item 2)	4	3
IV. REFERENCE MODEL OF THE TIR PROCEDURE (Agenda item 3)	5-9	3
A. Chapter 1 and 2	5	3
B. Pending issues	6-7	3
C. Chapter 3 – Analysis	8-9	4

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

V.	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF eTIR (Agenda item 4).....	10	4
VI.	OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 5).....	11-13	4
A.	WCO transit data model	11	4
B.	Other activities of interest.....	12	5
C.	Date and place of next session.....	13	5

Page

Annexes

I.	Open and discussed issues	6
II.	Decisions	9

I. ATTENDANCE

1. The Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (further referred to as “the Expert Group”) held its fourteenth session on 10-11 April 2008 in Geneva.

2. The session was attended by experts from Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey and Ukraine. Experts from the European Community (EC) and the International Road Transport Union (IRU) also attended.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1)

Documentation: ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2007/12

3. The Expert Group adopted its provisional agenda, contained in document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2007/12. The Expert Group decided to include document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/2008/8 into agenda item 3(b) and Informal Document GE.1 No.1 (2008) into agenda item 3(c) and took note that document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2007/14Rev.1 (Agenda item 3(a)) was replaced by Informal Document GE.1 No.2 (2008).

III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (Agenda item 2)

4. The Expert Group reelected Ms. Nurcan ÖZYAZICI (Turkey) and Mr. Predrag ARSIC (Serbia) as chairperson, respectively vice-chairperson, for the year 2008.

IV. REFERENCE MODEL OF THE TIR PROCEDURE (Agenda item 3)

A. Chapters 1 and 2

Documentation: Informal Document GE.1 No.2 (2008)

5. The Expert Group took note of Informal Document GE.1 No.2 (2008), containing the latest version of the eTIR Reference model (version 2.1a), including the updates requested by the Expert Group at its thirteenth session.

B. Pending issues

Documentation: ECE/TRANS/WP.30/2008/8

6. The Expert Group discussed document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/2008/8 containing a description of the declaration mechanism in eTIR as requested by the Working Party. The Expert Group was of the view that the description was in line with the text of Chapter 2 of the Reference Model and that the envisaged solution for the declaration mechanism could be recommended from a technical and conceptual perspective. Indeed, the Expert Group highlighted that the proposed solution provided not only greater facilitation for TIR holders but also more security to

Customs authorities as compared to the mechanism proposed by Turkey in WP.30 Informal Document No. 3 (2008).

7. The Expert Group underlined that the eTIR project could not wait until agreement on an international standard on electronic signatures had been reached. Moreover, in view of the requirement that holders should be able to submit declarations to Customs authorities in other countries than their own country of residence without having to make use of the (paid) services of third parties, the Expert Group proposed that the TIR declaration should not contain the declarant's electronic signature. However, it recommended the use of an electronic encoding of documents (hash codes) to ensure the integrity of the declaration.

C. Chapter 3 – Analysis

Documentation: ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2007/13 Rev.1 ; Informal Document GE.1 No.2 (2008)

8. The Expert Group welcomed the revised Chapter 3 of the Reference Model, contained in document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2007/13 Rev.1 as well as the proposals for additional security elements in Informal Document GE.1 No.2 (2008). It reviewed the draft fallback scenarios and the messages. All issues identified by the Expert Group in the course of the meeting, as well as the related decisions thereto, are presented in Annex I and II to this report, respectively.

9. The Expert Group mandated the secretariat to align Chapter 3 with its findings, to propose code lists for the messages and to amend class diagrams and messages with security data elements in a revised Chapter 3, for consideration at its next meeting.

III. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF eTIR (Agenda item 4)

Documentation: ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2008/2

10. The Expert Group welcomed the draft questionnaire contained in document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2008/2. Considering its well-outlined mandate, the Expert Group felt that there was no need to seek guidance from the Working Party prior to the distribution of the questionnaire. Thus, it requested the secretariat to amend the questionnaire in line with the Group's findings and to circulate it by email among the participants in the Expert Group before sending it out to Customs administrations.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 5)

A. WCO transit data model

11. The Expert Group took note of the latest developments regarding the WCO data model and, in particular, the outcome of the Data Model Project Team meeting, which had taken place in March 2008.

B. Other activities of interest

12. No other activities were discussed.

C. Date and place of next session

13. The Expert Group requested the secretariat to propose tentative date(s) for its next session, possibly in the course of September 2008. In view of the increasingly technical nature of the discussions, the Expert Group reiterated its doubts regarding the necessity of having interpretation available at its future session. Therefore, it requested the secretariat to raise this issue at the forthcoming meeting of the Working Party, keeping in mind that the agendas and reports of its sessions as well as the eTIR Reference Model would be translated in all official languages when submitted for endorsement to the Working Party.

Annex I – Open and discussed issues

Issue No	Subject	Description	Date	Source	Related decision(s)	Solved
66	Intro to Chapter 2	Is it necessary to have digital signatures as data elements?	7-8 Mar. 06	ExG (Bratislava)	115, 163	✓
68	Intro to Chapter 2	An efficient and cost-effective procedure for the submission of the declaration is necessary	7-8 Mar. 06	ExG (Bratislava)	112, 113, 160	✓
82	3.1.1.5	Is the 'Get holder information' web service required?	26-27 Nov. 2007	GE.1 (13th)	162	✓
106	3.	Include security data element.	26-27 Nov. 2007	GE.1 (13th)	149, 161	✓
107	3.1.4. Fallback scenarios	A TIR operation starting under a fallback procedure (using paper) should continue as a fallback.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	156	✓
108	3.1.4. Fallback scenarios	The use of a website could help solving some of the potential problems.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	157	✓
109	3.1.4. Fallback scenarios	In view of the potential difficulty to identify and authenticate each and every Customs office and the risk of high workload in case of the establishment of a centralized helpdesk, the Expert Group envisaged the creation of additional national helpdesks.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	158	✓
110	3.1.4. Fallback scenarios	The Expert Group proposed to remove the phone from the fallback scenarios.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	159	✓
111	3.1.4. Fallback scenarios	After an interruption of the eTIR system, the helpdesk should not manually update information which is available elsewhere in electronic form.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	164	✓
112	3.1.4.1.4. Get holder information	The GE.1 proposed to use a replica of the ITDB, in case the ITDB or the connections to the ITDB would have a problem.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	165	✓

Issue No	Subject	Description	Date	Source	Related decision(s)	Solved
113	3.1.4.2.2. Start of TIR operation	The GE.1 proposed to differentiate between the fallbacks at the office of departure and those at the office of entry.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	166	✓
114	Figure 3.15	The cardinality between the declaration and the guarantee classes seems wrong.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	168	✓
115	Figure 3.15	The declaration class has no ID.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	169	✓
116	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	The cardinality of the guarantee class in various messages is 0:n.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	170	✓
117	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	In case a subcontractor is used, his status might also have to be provided (same as for the holder).	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	171	✓
118	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	All textual information should be accompanied with a language code.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	167	✓
119	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	The name of the Customs office is not necessary considering that coded information is provided and that one of the deliverables of the project is the establishment of a Customs offices database.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	172	✓
120	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	All response messages should have at least one results code.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	173	✓
121	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	The validity and status of the guarantee should not be provided by Customs in the Start, Termination and Discharge message but as replies to those messages by the eTIR international system.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	174	✓
122	3.2.5. Code lists	Only one code list for all response messages should be used.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	175	✓

Issue No	Subject	Description	Date	Source	Related decision(s)	Solved
123	3.2.4. Electronic messages data elements	A reason code should be added to the 'record declaration results' and 'update declaration results' messages in order to provide the potential reasons of rejection.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	176	✓
124	National financial implications questionnaire	SafeTIR information should be referred to as Annex 10 information.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	177	✓
125	National financial implications questionnaire	The exchange of information with the eTIR international system is missing from the development costs table.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	178	✓
126	Declaration mechanism	If the Customs office of departure is very close to the border, the forwarding by Customs offices of the accepted declaration might not meet the advance information requirement of the following country.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	179	✓

Annex II – Decisions

Decision No.	Issue No.	Description	Date	Source	Version ¹
156	107	The Expert Group accepted the proposal and requested the secretariat to amend Chapter 3 accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
157	108	The Expert Group requested the secretariat to include a website as an element of the fallback scenarios.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
158	109	The Expert Group requested the updated Chapter 3, including national helpdesks in the fallback procedures and to include the national helpdesks in the financial implications questionnaire.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
159	110	The Expert Group decided to remove the phone from the fallback scenarios considering that the use of fax was more adequate.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
160	68	The Expert Group considered that the description of the declaration mechanism, contained in document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/2008/8, is in line with the text of Chapter 2 of the Reference Model and that the envisaged solution can be recommended from a technical and conceptual perspective.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	
161	106	The GE.1 requested the secretariat to include the security elements listed in Informal document GE.1 No. 1 (2008) in an updated version of Chapter 3.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
162	82	The GE.1 no longer questioned the usefulness of the 'Get holder information' web service.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	
163	66	The GE.1 felt that, in view of the lack of an internationally accepted certification authority for holders' digital signatures, the electronic signature in the declaration should be restricted to a document electronic encoding that could nevertheless ensure the integrity of the declaration.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	
164	111	The GE.1 recommended to update the fallback scenarios and use whenever possible electronic information available to Customs authorities or to the guarantee chain systems.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3

¹ This column indicates in which version the results of the decision will be included for the first time.

Decision No.	Issue No.	Description	Date	Source	Version ¹
165	112	The GE.1 requested the secretariat to update the document accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
166	113	The GE.1 requested to amend Chapter 3 accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
167	118	The GE.1 requested to amend Chapter 3 accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
168	114	The GE.1 requested to change the cardinality between the declaration and the guarantee classes to 0:n;1.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
169	115	The GE.1 requested to include an ID to the declaration class.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
170	116	The GE.1 requested to change the cardinality of the guarantee class to 1:n.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
171	117	The GE.1 requested to add a status attribute to the subcontractor class.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
172	119	The GE.1 requested to remove the 'name' attribute from the Customs office class.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
173	120	The GE.1 requested to ensure that all results code cardinalities are 1:n.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
174	121	The GE.1 requested to amend Chapter 3 accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	
175	122	The GE.1 requested to amend Chapter 3 accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
176	123	The GE.1 requested to amend Chapter 3 accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	3
177	124	The GE.1 requested to amend the questionnaire accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	
178	125	The GE.1 requested to amend the questionnaire accordingly.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	
179	126	The GE.1 considered that Customs offices could forward the declaration as soon as it had been received (i.e. before accepting it), but, in the end, decided that this was not an appropriate solution. In those cases, the holder should provide advance information to the following country, if so required. This information would then be compared with the forwarded accepted declarations when passing the border.	10- 11 April 2008	GE.1 (14th)	

- - - - -