Distr.: General
31 August 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

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

Twenty-fifth session
Geneva, 19–20 September 2016
Item 6(a) of the provisional agenda
Reference Model of the TIR Procedure
Contributions of the network of eTIR focal points

Summary of the activities of the network of eTIR focal points

Note by the secretariat

I. Background

1. At its 124th session (February 2010), the Working Party on Customs Questions affecting Transport (WP.30) supported the call of the secretariat to organize activities of the Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (GE.1 or Expert Group) at long distance, by means of a network of focal points for eTIR (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/248, para. 22). At its 125th session, WP.30 stressed the importance for every Contracting Party to nominate a focal point for the eTIR project and to inform the secretariat accordingly (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/250, para. 19). This document presents the status of the network of eTIR focal points and summarizes its activities since the twenty-fourth session of GE.1.

II. Members of the network of eTIR focal points

2. The following thirty-two Contracting Parties to the TIR Convention have nominated at least one eTIR focal point: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lebanon, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom and Uzbekistan. The e-mail

addresses of the focal points are available on the eTIR website (www.unece.org/trans/bcf/etir/focals.html).

III. Information received from the network of eTIR focal points

3. Since the twenty-forth session of the Expert Group, eTIR focal points have not communicated to the secretariat any issue or input to be brought to the attention of GE.1.

IV. Queries and information to the network of eTIR focal points

1. eTIR Reference Model version 4.1a

4. On 21 October 2014, the secretariat sent to eTIR focal points the email reproduced in Annex I, asking them if they had any comments on the eTIR Reference Model, version 4.1a.

5. eTIR focal points not having any comments, the secretariat prepared, at the request of the Expert Group, document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/2011/4/Rev.1 for the 139th session of WP.30. Due to the unavailability of all language versions at that session, WP.30 could only provide its support for the eTIR Reference Model at its 140th session (June 2015).

2. Turkish proposal to amend the eTIR Reference Model

6. On 21 October 2014, the secretariat sent to eTIR focal points the email reproduced in Annex II, asking them for comments on a Turkish proposal to amend the eTIR Reference Model.

7. The focal points from the Netherlands and the United Kingdom responded as follows.

Country	*Reply*
Netherlands	Regarding the amendment of the E9 message by: making total gross weight, consignee (name), consignor (name) and HS code mandatory: For eTIR we have to follow the TIR Convention. As long as the TIR Convention does not require this information, the European Union (EU) cannot add this TIR obligation in its legislation. If the status of those data elements should be changed to mandatory then the TIR Convention should be amended. Especially for the HS code the Netherlands follows the coordinated EU position: no mandatory HS code. The Netherlands can change its position in agreement with other EU Member States. Therefore, the Netherlands will start a discussion on this Turkish proposal during the WP.30 and AC.2 EU coordination meeting in February 2015. The Netherlands also opposes the inclusion of the driver details (first and last name, nationality) to the E9 message. The TIR Carnet holder is admitted because of the criteria in Annex 9

	of the TIR Convention and screened by authorities like customs. The TIR Carnet holder is responsible for his drivers and knows that using TIR Carnets can have financial consequences. The addition of these data elements is not necessary for TIR.
United Kingdom	Most of the proposals look perfectly sensible, however we would not be able to risk assess lorry drivers under our current profiling arrangements. This would probably be within the domain of the Home Office or Security Services and I am not sure how that would work.

3. Mutual recognition of electronic signatures - UN/EDIFACT

8. On 31 March 2015, the secretariat sent to eTIR focal points the email reproduced in Annex III, asking them for comments on the mutual recognition of electronic signatures and on the necessity to keep the UN/EDIFACT format.

9. The focal points from Croatia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Serbia and Sweden responded as follows.

Country	*Reply*
Croatia	1.a Yes 1.b. Croatian customs already use electronic signatures in communication with our traders through our G2B service. All traders registered in Croatia that use customs applications first need to obtain a certificate from our Certifying Authority (CA), then apply for the G2B service. This service is used for the EU, as well as for national electronic applications. We recognize messages sent through the common domain from other EU Member States, regardless of the system they are using for certification. TIR is registered in NCTS, where traders are using electronic signatures. Any system similar to this one is acceptable for the Croatian customs directorate. 2. No, but only if EU Member States are sending messages E9 and E10 directly from their transit systems. EDIFACT needs another XML -> EDIFACT conversion, which is one more step, and not necessary. If the messaging system will be centralized through Brussels, the answer is not in our domain.
Hungary	1.a. Yes 1.b Considering the fact that in all countries one of the main efforts is to create and maintain a safe and secure method for electronic communication, the concept should be explained in a separate part of the eTIR Reference Model. It can be presented as not mandatory but as a strongly recommended technology in eTIR communication. 2. No
Netherlands	1. In 2012 the European Commission (EC) started the Uniform User Management & Digital Signature Project. This project has been initiated with the goal to provide direct unified access for traders to a number of central EU-services, therefore effectively addressing the

	lack of harmonized interfaces for trade and redundant implementations at Member State level for services of common functionality. The first phase of the project will be to provide direct access for traders to a number of central EU-services. In the future, also interoperable Authentication and Authorization Infrastructure (also referred to as Identity Access Management (IAM) for system to system interactions is foreseen. Member States of the EU and traders are involved in this project, which is still ongoing. I recommend to get in contact with this EU project to get a good (architecture) overview of the activities going on within the Member States of EU together with the EC. As a Member State, we follow and support these developments. 2. No. As far as it seems now, it is only Belgium using EDIFACT. Although the Netherlands supports XML and EDIFACT, we propose to use XML for eTIR only. Using only one technical message is less complicated and can save money (translation, maintenance) Our suggestion is to discuss this issue with Belgium.
Serbia	1. The document on ensuring mutual recognition of electronic signatures is very good and it reflects very clearly and concisely the current state of play in this area. At the same tme, it presents a lot of constraints (both legal and technical) for the implementation of the eTIR project. To simplify, if one needs documentation (eTIR Reference Model) for the implementation start (tomorrow or in one year), this information would not provide practical guidelines for development. In this sense, there is no place for (fast changing) concepts like this. If, until the moment of implementation, a significant change occurs in this field for the benefit of all parties, I believe it would not be a problem to incorporate such a change. But, if we consider the eTIR Reference Model as a living document, we can add the section like „Improvements in area of...“ or „Current state of play...“ or „Recent developments in...“. This section could contain updated document(s) in the fields of interest. Also, a good idea is to put the concepts to the test (or at least consider it) in a future pilot project. 2. we do not use and we do not plan to use messages in UN/EDIFACT format
Sweden	There is an ongoing project about this called UUM&DS (Unified User Management & Digital Signatures), which will come with solutions for these questions. Therefore, we are not able to answer these questions now.

4. Metadata class and core data types

10. On 1 April 2015, the secretariat sent to eTIR focal points the email reproduced in Annex IV, asking them for comments.

11. The focal points from the Serbia and the United Kingdom responded as follows.

Country	*Reply*
Serbia	At this point of eTIR system development, the proposed routing information really looks sufficient. Also, it could make the transition from EDIFACT > XML messages (for administration which have plan to do so) easier. I agree with the second proposal too.
United Kingdom	We have studied these proposals and I can report that we have no issues to report. The only point we might raise was that the attached 'MetaData' document was 3.40. Should this be 3.50?

V. Further considerations

12. GE.1 may wish to take into account in its discussions the outcome of the consultations with the network of eTIR focal points as presented in this document.

Annexes Emails sent to eTIR focal points

I. NeTIRFP Q.9 - eTIR Reference Model version 4.1a

Date: 21 October 2014

Dear eTIR focal points,

For you information, the draft report of the twenty-fourth session of the Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (GE.1), which took place on 25 and 26 September 2014 in Antalya (Turkey) at the kind invitation of the Ministry of Customs and Trade of the Republic of Turkey, is now available on the UNECE and eTIR websites (etir.unece.org).

At the session, GE.1 approved version 4.1a of the eTIR Reference Model. It took note that the new eTIR messages, as well as the new XSDs are now in line with version 3.5 of the WCO data model. The Expert Group expressed its great appreciation for the extensive contributions by Mr. Hans Greven (Netherlands) in preparing the descriptions of the new eTIR messages. The Expert Group requested the secretariat to circulate version 4.1a of the eTIR Reference Model and the new XSDs among eTIR focal points before submitting them to WP.30.

Version 4.1a of the eTIR Reference Model is available at

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/bcf/adhoc/conc_tech/documents/id14-04e.pdf

a version in track changes is also available at

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/bcf/adhoc/conc_tech/documents/id14-04e_TC.pdf

XML schemas can be downloaded at

http://www.unece.org/trans/bcf/etir/xml_schemas.html

Please provide your comments, if any, to the secretariat at your earliest convenience but not later than 15 November 2014.

Would you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact the secretariat.

Kind regards,

André

CC: participants of the 24th session of GE.1

II. NeTIRFP Q.10- Turkish proposal to amend the eTIR Reference Model

Date: 21 October 2014

Dear eTIR focal points,

At its 24th session, GE.1 considered a proposal by Turkey to amend the E9 message by: (a) making total gross weight, consignee (name), consignor (name) and HS code mandatory and (b) including driver information (first and last name, nationality) as optional. It was of the view that since the Turkish request partly changes the current TIR data requirements, it should be considered both from a technical and conceptual perspective. Therefore, GE.1 requested the secretariat to circulate the proposals to eTIR focal points for the sake of seeking their technical opinion. The views of eTIR focal points will then be transmitted to WP.30, which will consider if the eTIR data requirements should be changed in line with the Turkish proposal.

You will find attached a document prepared by the Turkish Customs administration that explains the rationale behind the requested amendments.

On the basis of this document and the comments received from you before 15 November 2014, the secretariat will prepare a document for WP.30 .

Would you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact the secretariat.

Kind regards,

André

CC: participants of the 24th session of GE.1

Attachment

eTIR REFERENCE MODEL DATA SET

Message I7: Record Advance Cargo Information
(same goes with E9)

Proposals for consideration to insert as “mandatory” data:

Total Gross Weight: In the eTIR Reference Model, gross weight for each item of the goods is required, but total gross weight is optional.

For the paper-based TIR Carnet, gross weight for each item of the goods is mandatory to declare and it is written in box 11 of the TIR Carnet. In case of partial loading, total gross weight is mostly indicated in the same box.

Besides, if vehicles are weighed at border crossings, total gross weight of the goods is taken into consideration when assessing the results.

We are of the opinion that these data should be required and we propose that total gross weight should be filled in automatically by the eTIR system, summing the weights of each item of the goods.

- Name of the consignee: Though there exists no space in the TIR Carnet showing the information on the consignee, such information is actually covered by the CMR consignment note, which is attached to the TIR Carnet, as required by the relevant provisions of the CMR Convention

It is mandatory to declare the consignee information at NCTS.

On the other hand, the declaration of the information relating to the consignor, consignee, original consignor, final consignee is compulsory in TIR-EPD for each commodity item.

- Name of the consignor: No space exists in the TIR Carnet, relating to the information on the consignor. Yet, such information may be found in the CMR, attached to the TIR Carnet.

It is mandatory to declare the consignor information in NCTS.
On the other hand, the declaration of the information relating to the consignor, consignee, original consignor, final consignee is compulsory in TIR-EPD for each commodity item.

- Classification: In the eTIR Reference Model, classification is optional. For the paper-based TIR Carnet, there is not a specific box to declare HS code and in Turkey, the national transport operators do not indicate the HS Code in the TIR Carnet.

HS Code is subject to discussions at the AC.2 meetings.

There also exists a Recommendation at the UNECE level about the HS Code.

It may be the time to look into the matter with all its aspects.

In Turkey, tariff heading is required for the summary declaration and 6 digits tariff classification code (HS) is required for the national transit.

For TIR-EPD, 8 digits tariff classification code is mandatory to declare. Such a requirement was introduced for the advance electronic declaration for some parts of the EurAsEC Customs Union.

From the customs point of view, 6 digits tariff classification code (HS Code) is needed for all kinds of assessments. Turkey encourages the experts to consider inclusion of the HS as mandatory data once again.

National Safety and Security Requirement

- Information on the driver (first and last name, nationality): For risk assessment purposes, info related to the driver is asked by Turkish customs. Such info is not mentioned in the eTIR Reference Model, and actually falls into the safety and security data set, rather than the TIR procedural data. This information could be added to the eTIR Reference Model as optional data.

III. NeTIRFP Q.11- Mutual recognition of electronic signatures - UN/EDIFACT

Date: 31 March 2015

Dear eTIR focal points,

At its 24th session, GE.1 took note of Informal document GE.1 (2014) No. 7 (http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/bcf/adhoc/conc_tech/documents/id14-07e.pdf) as well as the presentation on the mutual recognition of electronic signatures delivered at distance by Mr. Aleksandr Sazonov (Deputy Director, Russian National Certification Authority). It noted that the use of trusted third party (TTP) services could allow circumventing the absence of recognition of certification authorities (CA) across borders.

Furthermore, GE.1 discussed the use of a hash code to secure the integrity of the declaration data from the time it is sent to the country of departure until it is used by the office of final destination. The purpose of the hash code is to ensure that the data submitted by the holder is not altered when forwarded from the country of departure to all countries involved in the TIR transport. Taking into account that the declaration can be sent in both UN/EDIFACT and XML formats, but that later exchanges between customs administrations are in XML only, the hash code cannot be calculated on the basis of the complete declaration message. Therefore, GE.1, acknowledging that an algorithm calculating a hash code solely on the data content is required, requested the secretariat to prepare a document proposing a format neutral hash code algorithm. Finally, GE.1 requested the secretariat to seek the advice of eTIR focal points on the various issues related to the declaration mechanisms, i.e. the mutual recognition of electronic signatures, the hash code algorithm as well as the confirmation that some countries still need the UN/EDIFACT format for the E9 and E10 messages.

The secretariat prepared the following questions in order to facilitated the collection of the opinions of eTIR focal points on the various issues at stake.

The secretariat will prepare and circulate a proposal for an algorithm to calculate a hash code, once it will be clarified if it would not be preferable to remove the possibility to send the E9 and E10 messages in UN/EDIFACT format.

1.a In your opinion, should the concepts of mutual recognition of electronic signatures explained in Informal document GE.1 (2014) No. 7 be integrated in the eTIR Reference Model and how.

____ Yes

____ No

1.b. If yes, how?

.....

2. Taking into account the current customs IT systems and there development in the coming years, is it still be required that the E9 and E10 messages are defined in the UN/EDIFACT format?

____ Yes

____ No

Please reply to the above questions at your earliest convenience but not later than 30 April 2015 .

Would you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact the secretariat.

Kind regards,

André

CC: participants of the 24th session of GE.1

IV. NeTIRFP Q.12 - Metadata class and core data types

Date: 1 April 2015

Dear eTIR focal points,

At its 24th session, GE.1 discussed the inclusion of a metadata class for the XML messages that would encompass all the required XML message routing information, equivalent to the UN/EDIFACT UNB (Interchange header) and UNH (Message header) segments. The Expert Group requested the secretariat to make a proposal for a sub-set of the attributes contained in the WCO Data Model Metadata class and circulate it among eTIR focal points for comments. The full set of possible WCO metadata data elements is attached.

Furthermore, the Expert Group considered the need to select which attributes should be used from the core data types (CDT) used in the eTIR data model. It mandated the secretariat to prepare a proposal to that extent and circulate it among eTIR focal points for comments.

With the assistance of Dutch customs, the secretariat has now prepared the following two proposals.

1. Metadata

The following metadata structure should be sufficient to route eTIR messages.

Metadata

- preparation date-time
- AgencyAssignedCustomization
- AgencyAssignedCustomizationVersion (used to provide the version of the eTIR messages/ XSDs)

CommunicationMetadata

- Application Reference
- test indicator (indicating if the messages is a test message)

Recipient

- Recipient identification

Sender

- Sender identification

The file below contains all possible data elements usable as metadata, as well as their definitions.

(If UN/EDIFACT will be used, additional metadata data elements might be required and included in the EDIFACT message guidelines - with fixed values)

2. Attributes of core data types

The following CDT attributes (in bold) should be added to the XSDs and could be also mentioned in the messages descriptions in the documentation. The code lists for most of these attributes are already included in the eTIR Reference Model.

- AMOUNT. TYPE
- Amount. Content
- **Amount. Currency. Identifier**

- DATE TIME. TYPE
- Date Time. Content
- **Date Time. Format. Code**
  codes limited to 304 (CCYYMMDDHHMMSSZZZ) and 102 (CCYYMMDD)

- MEASURE. TYPE
- Measure. Content
- **Measure Unit. Code**

- QUANTITY. TYPE
- Quantity. Content
- **Quantity Unit. Code**

- TEXT. TYPE
- Text. Content
- **Language. Identifier**

Please provide your comments, if any, to the secretariat at your earliest convenience but not later than 30 April 2015.

Would you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact the secretariat.

Kind regards,

André

CC: participants of the 24th session of GE.1

Attachement

MetaData			
ID	**Name**	**Definition**	**Format**
N/A	WCO Data Model version, coded	The version of the WCO Data Model, e.g. 3.40	an..6
N/A	WCO category, coded	The category within the WCO Data Model	
N/A	WCO type, coded		an..6
N/A	WCO type		
N/A	Responsible country, coded	Code to identify the country controlling the specification, maintenance and publication of the message type	a2
N/A	Responsible agency, coded	Code to identify the agency controlling the specification, maintenance and publication of the message type	an..2
N/A	Responsible agency	Name to identify the agency controlling the specification, maintenance and publication of the message type	an..70
N/A	Agency assigned customization, coded	A code assigned by the association responsible for the design and maintenance of the message type concerned, which further identifies the message	an..6
N/A	Agency assigned customization version	Identification of the version of the agency assigned customization, coded	an..3
N/A	Functional definition	Textual description of the functional definition of the message	
M001	Binary File Identifier	A unique identifier for this binary file	an..256
M002	Binary File Title	A title, expressed as text, for this binary file	an..256
M003	Binary File Author Name	An author name, expressed as text, of this binary file	an..70
M004	Binary File Version	A unique version identifier for this binary file	an..17
M005	Binary File Name	A file name, expressed as text, of this binary file	an..256
M006	Binary File URI	A unique Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) for this binary file	an..2048
M007	Binary File MIME, coded	A code specifying the Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) type for this binary file	an..70
M008	Binary File Encoding, coded	A code specifying the encoding of this binary file	an..17
M009	Binary File Character Set, coded	A code specifying the character set for this binary file	n..17
M010	Binary File Included Binary Object	An included binary object for this binary file	N/A
M011	Binary File Access Information	Access information, expressed as text, for this binary file such as security and download parameters	an..256
M012	Binary File Description	A textual description of this binary file	an..256
M013	Binary File Size	A measure of the size of this binary file	n..16,6
M014	Binary File Type, coded	The code specifying the type of binary file, such as photo, spreadsheet	an..6
M015	Hash Code	Hash code of the linked document	an..256
M016	Hash Code Algorithm ID, coded	Code indicating the algorithm used to calculate the hash code (e.g. MD5, ..)	an..6
N/A	Acknowledgement request	Code determined by the sender for acknowledgement of the interchange	n1
N/A	Application reference	Identification of the application area assigned by the sender, to which the messages in the interchange relate e.g. the message identifier if all the messages in the interchange are of the same type	an..14
N/A	Communications agreement ID	Identification by name or code of the type of agreement under which the interchange takes place	an..35
N/A	Preparation date and time	Local date and time when an interchange or a functional group was prepared	an..17
N/A	Syntax identification, coded	Coded identification of the agency controlling a syntax and syntax level used in an interchange	a4

N/A	Syntax version, coded	Version number of the syntax identified in the syntax identifier (0001)	n1
N/A	Test indicator	Indication that the interchange is a test	n1
N/A	Recipient, coded	Coded representation of the (message) recipient	an..17
R005	Role code	Code giving specific meaning to a party	an..3
240	Communication number	To identify a communication address	an..50
253	Communication number type	To identify the type of communication address	an..3
N/A	Sender, coded	Coded representation of the (message) sender	an..17
R005	Role code	Code giving specific meaning to a party	an..3
240	Communication number	To identify a communication address	an..50
253	Communication number type	To identify the type of communication address	an..3
N/A	Business Process Context	Identify the interaction between Trading partners to achieve a given business objective	
N/A	Product Classification Context	Determine the goods or services concerned in the collaboration	
N/A	Industry Classification Context	Determine the relevant trading partner industries	
N/A	Geopolitical Context	Determine where the Business Process is to be conducted	
N/A	Official Constraints Context	Determine any legal restrictions or requirements on this Business Process	
N/A	Business Process Role Context	Identify the roles played by the trading partners. These can be derived from the Business Process	
N/A	Supporting Role Context	Determine what other significant parties will be using the data in the messages. Determine their role in the overall process	
N/A	System Capabilities Context	Determine any major restrictions derived from system, a class of systems or standard in the business situation. Identify the type of system	