

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General  
1 November 2011

Original: English

---

**Economic Commission for Europe**

Committee on Trade

**Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business**

Seventeenth session

Geneva, 7-8 July 2011

Item 9 of the provisional agenda

**Adoption of decisions and report of the seventeenth session****Report of the Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business on its seventeenth session****I. Attendance**

1. The United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) held its seventeenth session in Geneva on 7 and 8 July 2011.
2. The following countries were represented: Australia, Austria, Belarus, China, Finland, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States of America.
3. The following non-governmental organizations participated in the meeting: GS1, International Organization for Standardization (ISO).
4. The Chair opened the meeting. The Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) welcomed delegates and underlined the key role of UN/CEFACT in supporting economic integration. He mentioned the international interest in the work and expressed his appreciation of the increased transparency and openness. He considered that the election of new vice-chairs should provide an opportunity for increased cooperation between UN/CEFACT and the secretariat, which would help to address member States' needs in a timely and transparent manner. He said that the five regional commissions of the United Nations had launched a joint approach to trade facilitation. The forthcoming global conference on Single Window in December 2011 would be the first initiative.

**II. Adoption of the agenda (agenda item 1)**

Documentation:

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/1 - Annotated provisional Agenda

5. The Chair provided an update on the available documents, indicating which were for noting, approval or discussion. Regarding agenda item 8, he noted that there had been nine candidates nominated for the posts of vice-chair and, after enquiring whether any more candidates wished to nominate themselves, noted there were none.

6. The delegation of the Russian Federation, expressing concerns about the quality of the agenda, particularly the inaccurate annotations under agenda item 5, requested that the provisional agenda for future meetings include more accurate and complete information on the status of submitted documents. It should include details of the sequence of preparation, (e.g. who requested the document; who prepared them) and what is expected from delegations (e.g. suggested decisions to be taken, approval of the document, noting of information presented). The delegation of France, requesting greater clarity about the conditions of work of delegations, enquired how it would be possible to discuss the 15 June Bureau communication to HoDs, entitled "Next Steps", as this was not an official document. He also noted that the relatively small number of participants might raise issues with respect to voting.

7. The Chair responded that the goal was to form a document as soon as possible that would integrate all the information and this would be mentioned under each agenda item. The "Next Steps" paper would be made available to the Plenary as a conference room paper (ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/CRP.1) to facilitate discussion and referencing. Regarding voting, the goal was to reach consensus but a vote would be held if necessary. It was agreed to amend agenda item 10 to read Adoption of decisions of the seventeenth session. **The Plenary adopted the amended agenda (Decision 11-01).**

### III. Matters arising since the sixteenth session (agenda item 2)

8. The UNECE secretariat informed participants that, in keeping with the plan of the 2005 UNECE Reform, and in order to focus on priorities and in the context of budget cuts, the Executive Committee (EXCOM) would review the work of all UNECE subsidiary bodies. Consequently, the Committee on Trade would review the work of its three working parties, focusing on transparency, impact and effectiveness of their programmes of work, and their relevance to the needs of member States.

9. UN/CEFACT should therefore prepare (a) statistics on implementation of its output, and (b) a strategically focused programme of work based on wide consultations with member States. Heads of delegation would need to consult with their capitals so that national policy requirements could be integrated into the work plan.

10. The secretariat said that EXCOM, for its September 2011 session, had requested another progress report on UN/CEFACT's implementation of EXCOM recommendations and the outcome of the restructuring process.

11. The secretariat also reported that the Committee on Trade, at its fourth session in June 2011, had taken note of document ECE/TRADE/C/2009/15/Rev.2 and had agreed to sending it for intersessional consideration once it received a paper from the UN/CEFACT Bureau containing an assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed restructuring.

12. The Committee had also requested the secretariat to respond directly to enquiries from member States to the greatest extent possible. The secretariat would be cooperating with the Bureau in this regard. **The Plenary took note of the presentation by the secretariat on Matters arising since the sixteenth session (Decision 11-02).**

#### IV. Bureau overview of developments (agenda item 3)

13. The Chair stated that the programme of work was driven by the Plenary, the heads of delegation and member States, thus ensuring accountability to stakeholders and member States. Within this context, UN/CEFACT adopted recommendations and standards in the field of trade facilitation and e-Business. Its efforts were always focused on responding to member States' needs, with particular attention to those articulated by EXCOM, with a view to identifying and achieving needed deliverables more efficiently. UN/CEFACT also considered it important to respond to heads of delegation, experts and stakeholders, including organizations involved in developing standards.

14. The Chair informed delegations that, under the UN/CEFACT restructuring, the deliverables in the programme of work would be achieved through programme development areas (PDAs), with project teams (PTs) who would do the work, supported by Bureau programme support (BPS), a roster of experts, and a register of 20-25 domains that would have domain coordinators.

15. The new structure would be simple:

- the Plenary and its Bureau
- regional rapporteurs
- programme development areas
- project teams.

16. This structure would form the basis for the next Forum in September and the restructuring process should be completed by December. The drivers for change were as follows:

- EXCOM recommendations
- need for more timely availability of deliverables through a strengthened Open Development Process
- more effective identification of stakeholder needs
- expanding opportunities for greater stakeholder collaboration
- outreach to stakeholders
- gap analysis
- maturity of experience.

17. The key next steps were: to approve the restructuring documents, to elect vice-chairs and to build a roster of experts and a registry of domains. To help implement the transition, the Bureau had formed an Implementation Transition Team (ITT).

18. The representative of Switzerland enquired about how many of EXCOM's 15 recommendations concerning UN/CEFACT had been implemented, why there was no reference to PDAs in the documents on the restructuring and how PDAs were related to the Open Development Process and to the regular UN/CEFACT procedures for approval of projects.

19. The representative of France expressed disappointment over the following: (a) the lack of understanding of experts' concerns relating to UN/CEFACT's work, (b) the lack of details about how the work would be carried out in practice, and (c) the lack of terms of reference for the ITT. He said that all of this failed to provide a clear and credible

framework for the September Forum. His delegation took note of the Bureau's proposals for more discussion. It did not consider the new structure to be simpler than the earlier one.

20. The delegation of the Netherlands expressed support for the effort to place greater focus on projects, while expressing concern about transparency and communication. It considered that it did not currently have the tools and information to clarify how the restructuring would be undertaken. It recommended that there be two vice-chairs responsible for communication.

21. The Chair responded that the PDAs would not do the work, only the PTs, which would follow the Open Development Process. He informed participants that the Implementation Transition Team had been created to assist the Bureau and that terms of reference and an invitation to participate in the Team had been included in the 15 June Bureau note to HoDs "Next Steps". He said the Bureau was making every effort to prepare more detailed and formal documentation, possibly transforming the above-mentioned paper into a formal document for consideration at the December Plenary. The Implementation Transition Team worked under the guidance of the Bureau, which remained accountable for the transition. **The Plenary took note of the Plenary Bureau's overview of developments (Decision 11-03).**

## V. Activities of the Forum Management Group and Permanent Groups (agenda item 4)

Documentation:

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/3 - Activities of the FMG and the Permanent Groups: Activities since the sixteenth session

22. Referring to document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/3, the Chair of the Forum Management Group (FMG), the Vice-Chair of the Applied Technologies Group and the chairs of the other UN/CEFACT permanent groups reviewed activities undertaken since the last Plenary session. The FMG Chair paid tribute to Mr. Gösta Roos, recently deceased, the Swedish expert who had initiated, and for many years was the guardian of, the UNLOCODE and the UN Layout Key.

23. The FMG Chair recalled that it had been agreed at the sixteenth UN/CEFACT Plenary in December 2010 that a Forum session would need to be held in the first quarter of 2011 to further develop the proposals for the reorganization of UN/CEFACT. It had also been agreed that the Forum's project work, under the approved programme of work, should continue unhindered during the discussions about the reorganization. In the case of the Forum session that was due to take place in the United States in McLean, Virginia, in March 2011, a host country agreement could not be signed. He stated that, as a result, UNECE would not agree to a Forum being held, but rather to a Global Meeting of Experts, which would involve an informal meeting without the normal support provided by the secretariat. The Global Meeting of Experts had been very well organized and UN/CEFACT wished to record its sincere thanks to the United States delegation and the Logistics Management Institute for their efforts in making the meeting a success. Concerning the intersessional approval of document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev.1, he said that the secretariat considered that, with the approval of this document, the UN/CEFACT Forum and the FMG had ceased to exist and that this interpretation meant that the FMG was unable to function properly during the period until the situation was corrected following the intervention of a number of Plenary HoDs.

24. Regarding host country agreements, the Director of the UNECE Trade and Sustainable Land Management Division responded that the secretariat was following

United Nations requirements and practice aimed at safeguarding privileges and immunities for Forum participants. With respect to the FMG, she said that the secretariat had highlighted and found solutions ensuring ongoing validity for project approvals and processing.

25. The delegation of France enquired why TBG3's queries about the restructuring process and TBG 18's concerns (which had led it to stop proposing new projects) had not been covered in the presentations. He expressed concern that the production mechanism would be blocked. The FMG Chair responded that the FMG/Permanent Groups' report was about the progress of the UN/CEFACT programme of work and that the concerns of TBG3 and TBG18 over the restructuring process had been discussed at great length both prior to and during the meeting in McLean, and then considered in the context of the work of the TBG transition team. Experts from all the TBG working groups involved had been invited but had not always participated in the meetings.

26. The Bureau Chair confirmed having worked with delegations towards achieving a critical mass of continuity to meet expectations and requirements in a neutral way. The changes would be implemented with an eye towards the priorities in terms of recommendations and standards to be produced.

27. The representative of GS1 requested investigation into the possibility of the secretariat taking over work on XML, given available tools and resources. The Bureau Chair indicated this would be looked into. **The Plenary took note of the presentations on the activities of the FMG and permanent groups (Decision 11-04).**

## VI. New and revised standards and recommendations (agenda item 5)

Documentation:

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/4 - Recommendation 12: Measures to facilitate Maritime Transport Documents

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/5 - Recommendation No. 5: Abbreviations of Incoterms

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/6 - Recommendation 23, Freight Cost Code– FCC, Harmonization of the Description of PDFight Costs and Other Charges

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/14 - Recommendation N°. 37: Signed Digital Evidence Interoperability Recommendation

28. The FMG chair introduced changes to the agenda item, namely that Recommendation 37 (document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/14) had been submitted for discussion and not for approval, and that a new revision of Recommendation 5 (document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/5) had been prepared. He then introduced recommendations 5, 12, 23 and 37, which had been submitted to the Plenary for noting, approval or discussion. He highlighted in particular the history, nature, status of and future options relating to draft recommendation 37 (including withdrawing it, extending the ODP comment period until 12 September, or widening the scope of the project in a second phase).

29. The delegation of Japan said that it had decided to support the revised recommendation 12, while pointing out the importance of effective implementation of the recommendation. In their opinion, such implementations should be undertaken through a process of extensive consultations with the relevant stakeholders, particularly trade operators, bankers, carriers and Governments, so as to avoid any disruption to trade finance procedures based upon the use of bills of lading as collateral for trade finance,

which could not be replaced by sea waybills (which could not be used for trade finance purposes).

30. The Chair of the Information Management Group (ICG) raised some points about the revised Recommendation 5 submitted for noting—its submission by the ITPWG, the trademark sign, the French term for CIF. The secretariat, noting that the International Chamber of Commerce had expressed no objection to the recommendation, undertook to take these suggestions into account in a revised version.

31. The delegation of the United States favoured withdrawal of recommendation 37, which was not considered to fall within UN/CEFACT's technical expertise and programme of work. His delegation could not accept the option of widening the scope of the recommendation but, if there was no consensus on withdrawal, would accept extension of the comment period and work with the Project Team.

32. The delegation of the Netherlands noted that it was in the interest of UN/CEFACT to issue recommendations of value, expressed surprise that the recommendation was still on the agenda after the Global Meeting of Experts, and suggested that, if the United States would submit comments, the process could be restarted.

33. The delegation of France urged that, in view of the length of time spent on the draft recommendation, a final decision should be reached on it soon after the 12 September deadline in time for the eighteenth Plenary.

34. The delegation of the Russian Federation accepted the extension of the comment period, with the revised text to be sent to delegations well in advance and with the proposed revisions clearly identified.

35. The representative of ISO expressed preferences for extending the comment period (so as to allow for comprehensive reference to ISO standards) or for widening the project scope.

36. The secretariat undertook to send out guidance to HoDs on the procedures for providing and responding to comments under the ODP.

**37. The Plenary approved revised recommendation 12 (Decision 11-05). The Plenary took note of revised recommendation 5 and requested the secretariat to republish it with minor changes (Decision 11-06). The Plenary took note of revised recommendation 23 (Decision 11-07). The Plenary decided to extend the review period for recommendation 37 within the Open Development Process until 12 September 2011. It invited delegations to send comments on recommendation 37 to the Project Team, which will be responded to them with the objective of having a revised version submitted to the next Plenary. (Decision 11-8)**

## **VII. The way forward and UN/CEFACT's structure, mandate, terms of reference and procedures (agenda item 6)**

Documentation:

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7 - UN/CEFACT country heads of delegation: Guidance on responsibilities, duties and procedures - submitted by the Russian delegation for discussion and approval

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1 - UN/CEFACT country heads of delegation: Guidance on responsibilities, duties and procedures - submitted by the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway and the United Kingdom for discussion and approval

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1/Rev.1 - UN/CEFACT country heads of delegation: Guidance on responsibilities, duties and procedures - submitted by the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway, Russian Federation and the United Kingdom for discussion and approval

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.2 - Proposals relevant to documents: ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1 and ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1 - Submitted by the delegation of the Russian Federation for discussion and approval

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev.2 - Revised mandate, terms of reference and procedures for UN/CEFACT

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/16/Rev.1 - Overview of proposed changes to R.650 REV 4 and related documents

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1 - Draft revised rules of procedure for the UN/CEFACT Bureau

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/18/Rev.1 - Draft revised Code of Conduct

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/20/Rev.1 - Draft revised UN/CEFACT Intellectual Property Rights Policy

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/20/Rev.1/Corr.1

ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1 - Draft revised open development process

38. Bureau members made presentations and provided background information on the documents for approval under this agenda item for restructuring UN/CEFACT. After a review of the history relating to the establishment of an International Trade and Business Processes Group (TBG) transition team and of the ITT, a Bureau member explained the four different phases of the restructuring process:

- Phase 1: in which contributors had been invited for the restructuring and nominations for vice-chairs.
- Phase 2: for reviewing developments, exchanging views and agreeing on the way forward.
- Phase 3: for step-by-step implementation, in which a project plan with contact points for communication would be established.
- Phase 4: for the submission of the work programme and proposals for adjustments over the following year.

39. The role and operation of Programme Development Areas (PDAs), Project Domains, Project Teams (PTs), experts and Bureau Programme Support (BPS) were explained, as were the main changes to the Open Development Process (ODP) and the need to review the UN/CEFACT website and the project confluence site and process.

40. Discussions were then held on these documents, in the light of the statements made under agenda item 3. The representative of ISO called for changes to paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 of document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev. 2 to clarify rights of participation in decision-making and Bureau membership, particularly for non-UNECE member countries, while suggesting that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with consultative status would have neither right.

41. The secretariat suggested specific changes to paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 to clarify that, in view of the global character of UN/CEFACT work, any Member State of the United Nations could participate on an equal footing. The secretariat further suggested a change to paragraph 28 to clarify that Bureau members act in their personal capacity and noted that

the above suggestions had been discussed with and approved by the UN Legal Adviser. The secretariat clarified that NGOs and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) would not have voting rights, but there was no bar to their being Bureau members.

42. The delegation of the Russian Federation suggested that decisions on the changes proposed by the secretariat to the Rev. 2 document be postponed until the 18th Plenary session, when these could be addressed together with other changes that the delegation had given or would be proposing in revising the document. This was agreed.

43. The secretariat informed delegations that the first revision of that document had been approved intersessionally on 28 March 2011; the second revision had been presented to the Plenary under this item for information only; and the revision incorporated just one editorial change to paragraph 16 reflecting a comment by the delegation of the Russian Federation during the intersessional approval process.

44. The delegation of the Russian Federation asked the secretariat and the Bureau to submit document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev. 2 for approval at the next Plenary, taking into account comments received from delegations.

45. The delegation of Switzerland stated that it had not been consulted at the time of the intersessional approval of the first revision of this document. Regarding the second revision, it was therefore reserving its position on issues such as the roles of HoDs, how EXCOM recommendations had been reflected, the dissolution of the TBGs or the role of the secretariat and its relations with the Bureau, in which it should participate ex-officio. It proposed that a text be added to the decision on Rev. 2, requesting the Bureau to consult with HoDs to accommodate concerns raised by delegations during the July Plenary, and that the revision be submitted to the 18th Plenary.

46. The delegation of the Russian Federation expressed support for the text proposed by Switzerland. It requested the secretariat to inform the Committee on Trade, which would be considering document 15/Rev. 2 for intersessional approval, that this document would now be revised.

47. The delegation of Switzerland said that it was not trying to block the Plenary from taking decisions but wished to avoid rushing into unsatisfactory decisions without having held proper discussions. He called for discussions on a way to enable more involvement of HoDs in strategic decision-making, as he was concerned about the Plenary rubber-stamping Bureau decisions. He proposed that the secretariat send out a communication about this. He also urged better liaison between the Bureau and the secretariat.

48. The delegation of France, expressing appreciation for the open discussion and the comments made by the delegation of Switzerland, stated that the intentions expressed at the 16th Plenary had not been fulfilled and UN/CEFACT's work had slowed down. It accepted that there was a need to act and not to postpone decisions. The delegation therefore approved document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev.2, expected the newly elected vice-chairs to quickly clarify their mission and tasks and to organize the September forum. It regarded any transition team as unnecessary.

49. The delegation of Switzerland also considered that documents ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1, ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/20/Rev.1 and ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1/Rev.1 might need updating, while the following documents should be discussed in a holistic manner: ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/16/Rev.1, ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1, ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/18/Rev.1 and ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1. The delegation had initiated the EXCOM discussions and did not consider that all the proposals had been made in the spirit of the EXCOM recommendations.

50. The delegation of the Russian Federation presented document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1/Rev.1. This was a revised document prepared by HoDs based on ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7 and ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Rev. 1. The delegation clarified that the document was intended to apply only to HoDs of countries and not to those of international organizations. The delegation of Denmark confirmed that the document was in line with the discussions held, in which it had participated.
51. The representative of ISO asked what the difference was between a country HoD and an organization's HoD and proposed the deletion of the reference to international organizations in the third line of document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1/Rev.1. The Chair suggested that ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1/Rev.1 be adopted with a view to making it applicable, in conjunction with a supplementary document, to HoDs in general.
52. Regarding document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1, the delegation of France proposed that a sentence be inserted in paragraph 9 to clarify the responsibilities of vice-chairs.
53. The delegation of the Russian Federation referred to the substantive proposals it had made in this regard in document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7 and suggested that document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1 be approved intersessionally.
54. The secretariat explained some minor (primarily terminological) changes reflected in ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/20/Rev. 1, to bring it into line with the new procedures.
55. Regarding document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1, the delegation of Switzerland asked for clarification about the exit criteria for projects.
56. The delegation of France stated that the way in which the Plenary would intervene in the approval of recommendations during the Open Development Process had not been addressed in the presentations, and asked for provisions to be introduced in document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.1 clarifying the role of the vice-chairs in the organization of Forums and their obligations relating to attendance at meetings.
57. The delegation of China stated that the public review stage had not been mentioned in the document.
58. The delegation of the Netherlands queried where procedures with respect to Memoranda of Understanding would be dealt with.
59. The Chair responded that the exit criteria for projects would be specified on a case-by-case basis when submitted to the Bureau; one of those criteria would be the conduct of public reviews; all projects would be submitted to the Plenary for noting; Plenary approval was part of the project exit phase; the control process would be in the programme of work; and everything apart from internal procedures would go through the Open Development Process. The secretariat indicated it would be setting up a database on the approval and progress of projects, as had been requested by delegations.
60. The delegation of the Russian Federation recalled the three questions it had previously submitted on document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1, and requested that translations of recommendations be made available at the public review stage. The delegation enquired about the stage at which countries' objections to proposed projects they considered to be outside UN/CEFACT's mandate would be addressed.
61. The representative of GS1 responded that the points made by that delegation relating to the Open Development Process and communication to HoDs were already being covered within the existing procedures.

62. The Chair said that document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev. 1 had been approved and that the additional documents had now to be approved. Further fine-tuning could be done for the next revision for the December Plenary. He indicated that he would be inviting HoDs to join the revision process and that this would be open to all interested HoDs.
63. The delegation of Norway, while recognizing that issues remained to be resolved, said that it was urgent to make decisions and expressed support for making progress on the Bureau's proposals, while reflecting changes proposed to the documents in future.
64. The delegation of Sweden said that there was a need to end the uncertainty of transition and to complete the restructuring, which would provide a better chance to develop the programme of work. A focus on projects would enable better participation.
65. The delegation of Austria expressed support for the Norway's approach of approving the documents now and improving them in future to avoid stretching the uncertainty.
66. The representative of Italy, recalling the wide approval of UN/CEFACT reform at the sixteenth Plenary, expressed support for the new structure and the proposed way forward and said it was important to involve more countries. She then described the situation of trade facilitation and the Single Window in Italy.
67. The delegation of the United States expressed strong approval for the reorganization.
68. The delegation of the Netherlands stated that all delegations were in favour of reorganization, but that views differed on how to do this. He therefore proposed approving the documents as a package and having further discussions on them afterwards. He believed in a strong group of vice-chairs.
69. The delegation of the Russian Federation called for the Russian translations of essential documents to be available well in advance of the related discussions.
70. The representative of GS1 stated that it was for the Plenary to decide on the periods for translation, and a balanced approach needed to be adopted to avoid unduly slowing down developments, particularly concerning public review in multiple iterations.
71. The secretariat pointed out that translations were only possible for session documents and publications, and extrabudgetary funds would need to be found for other translations. The delegation of France stated that it wished to have translated documentation, while expressing understanding of the financial situation. Document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1 was already well defined. Rules needed to be imposed for documents processing. The delegation of the Russian Federation reiterated the importance of providing full information to HoDs about projects, which they could comment upon in English.
72. **The Plenary took note of and expressed appreciation for the presentation by Bureau members on the way forward and UN/CEFACT's structure, mandate, terms of reference and procedures, as well as the explanation by the secretariat of the minor, primarily terminological, changes that had been made to the Intellectual Property Rights Policy document (ECE/TRADE/C7CEFACT/2010/20/Rev. 1) (Decision 11-09).**
73. **The Plenary took note of the document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/15/Rev.2 - "Revised mandate, terms of reference and procedures for UN/CEFACT". Concerning the next revision of Rev.2, further consultation with heads of delegation should be conducted by the Plenary Bureau in a timely manner to accommodate issues and concerns raised by delegations at the July 2011 Plenary. This next revision should be submitted for consideration at the next Plenary meeting (Decision 11-10).**

74. **The Plenary approved document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/7/Add.1/Rev.1 - "UN/CEFACT country heads of delegation: Guidance on responsibilities, duties and procedures", with agreed changes (Decision 11-11).**

75. **The Plenary agreed that the document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/17/Rev.2 - Revised rules of procedure for the UN/CEFACT Bureau should be sent out for intersessional approval with agreed changes (Decision 11-12).**

76. **The Plenary approved the document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/18/Rev.1 – Draft revised Code of Conduct (Decision 11-13).**

77. **The Plenary approved the document ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2010/24/Rev.1 – Draft revised Open Development Process, comments upon which will be taken into account in a new version to be submitted to the 18th Plenary (Decision 11-14).**

### **VIII. Other business (agenda item 7)**

78. The secretariat made a presentation on its capacity-building activities (see the Plenary website). The delegation of the Russian Federation expressed appreciation for the secretariat's capacity-building work and stated that it proposed the results of the study on the Single Window in the Russian Federation to be considered by the 18th Plenary, when it would be requesting comments on its national experiences in this area. The delegation of ISO provided an update on management changes<sup>1</sup> and on forthcoming meetings with respect to ISO/TC154 and the UNTDED - ISO7372 Joint Maintenance Agency.

**The Plenary took note of the presentation by the secretariat on its capacity-building activities (Decision 11-15).**

### **IX. Election of Plenary Bureau and regional rapporteurs (agenda item 8)**

79. So as to provide additional resources in the period up to December when the status of the vice-chairs could be reviewed in the light of lessons learned, the Chair suggested that the Plenary might like to consider: (a) electing all nine candidates for the vice-chair posts and (b) on the recommendation of the Chair, inviting the vice-chairs to take responsibility for particular PDAs or Bureau Support Areas.

80. The delegations of Australia, Belarus, France, India, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States spoke in favour of the candidatures of the nationals of their countries for vice-chairs. The delegation of France nominated Mr. Bruno Prépın for a PDA with responsibility for agriculture-related work, which represented an important consideration for the constitution of the Bureau.

81. The delegation of Japan, referring to a message by Mr. McGrath expressing preference for OASIS UBL over the Cross Industry Invoice, queried how he would perform as Vice-Chair and requested an explanation from him<sup>2</sup>.

82. The Bureau Chair, recalling his opening remarks, suggested that as nine vice-chairs had been nominated by their HoDs, all those nominated be elected by consensus. The delegation of France expressed deep concern that the Plenary had by consensus agreed to

<sup>1</sup> ISO has appointed Mr. K.D. Naujok as Chair of ISO/TC154.

<sup>2</sup> The explanation provided by Mr. McGrath has been transmitted to the Japanese delegation, which has indicated that it would like to see (a) future election procedures provide for more time to review information concerning nominated candidates and (b) the Bureau ensure its work is conformant with the Plenary-approved programme of work and abide by its new Code of Conduct and other rules and procedures, as appropriate.

elect all candidates rather than only seven, as could be interpreted from the available documents before the Plenary meeting.

83. The representative of India, in his capacity as vice-Chair of AFACT, nominated Dr. Ajin Jirachiefpattana as Rapporteur for Asia. The nomination was seconded by the delegation of Japan and supported by the delegation of Viet Nam.

84. The delegation of the United States indicated that it should be noted in the Plenary's decisions and/or its report, under this item, that the Chair would invite the vice-chairs to take on certain PDAs.

85. **The Plenary elected Mr. Peter Amstutz (United States), Mr. Pier Alberto Cucino (Italy), Mr. Mike Doran (United Kingdom), Mr. Viktor Dravitsa (Belarus), Mr. Tim McGrath (Australia), Mr. Tahseen A. Khan (India), Mr. Bruno Prépin (France), Mr. Harm Jan van Burg (Netherlands) and Mr. Mats Wicktor (Sweden) as vice-chairpersons of UN/CEFACT for a three-year term of office. It was duly noted that the delegation of France raised its deep concerns that the Plenary had by consensus agreed to elect all candidates rather than only seven, as could be interpreted from the available documents before the Plenary meeting. (Decision 11-16).**

86. **The Plenary elected Dr. Ajin Jirachiefpattana as Rapporteur for Asia (Decision 11-17).**

#### **X. Adoption of decisions of the seventeenth session (agenda item 9)**

87. **The Plenary adopted the decisions made at the seventeenth Plenary session and requested that the secretariat include these in the draft report of the session (ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2011/10), which should be sent out for intersessional approval by 31 July 2011, following which the final report as approved should be prepared in all languages and placed on the website (Decision 11-18).**

---