



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
20 February 2011

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

###### Eighteenth session

Geneva, 9–10 March 2011

Item 3(a) of the provisional agenda

###### Reference Model of the TIR procedure - 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 in February 2010, the Working Party on Customs Questions Affecting Transport (WP.30) supported the secretariat's call to organize activities of the Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (GE.1) at long distance, by means of a network of focal points for eTIR (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/248, para. 22). At its 125th session, it 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 in 2010.

#### II. Members of the network of eTIR focal points

2. The following eighteen Contracting Parties to the TIR Convention have nominated at least one eTIR focal point: Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The

---

\* This document was submitted late due to the timing of the session.

email addresses of the focal points are available on the eTIR website (see [www.unece.org/trans/bcf/eTIR/focals.html](http://www.unece.org/trans/bcf/eTIR/focals.html)).

### III. Information received from the network of eTIR focal points

3. In the course of 2010, eTIR focal points did not communicate to the secretariat any issue or input to be brought to the attention of GE.1.

### IV. Queries to the network of eTIR focal points

4. On 19 August 2010, the secretariat sent an e-mail to the eTIR focal points with a query, as reproduced in the annex. In brief, the question was whether eTIR messages other than those exchanged with the holder (i.e. E9 and E10) could be defined in XML only. Table 1 shows that no eTIR focal point was opposed to limiting the internal eTIR message exchange to the XML format.

Table 1  
**Replies to the secretariat queries**

	<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>
Query 1	Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Serbia and United Kingdom.	-

### V. Further considerations

5. First, the GE.1 may wish to confirm the replies obtained by the secretariat from the eTIR focal points, i.e. that messages other than E9 and E10 would only be defined as XML messages. Then, taking into consideration the status and the activities of the network of eTIR focal points in 2010, GE.1 may wish to recommend that WP.30 request Contracting Parties that have not yet nominated an eTIR Focal Point to do so and to encourage focal points to provide inputs for GE.1 meetings also at their own initiative.

**Annex**

**Email sent on 19 August 2010 to eTIR focal points**

**XML and UN/EDIFACT**

According to the content of Chapter 4, as presented in document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/GE.1/2009/4, eTIR messages should be defined and mapped using both UN/EDIFACT and XML standards. To the extent possible, these mappings (or message implementation guidelines – MIGs) should follow those contained in the WCO Data Model (DM) v.3. At the same time, as many of you will know, the WCO DM has been mainly developed for Business to Customs (B2C) messages and Customs to Business (C2B) response messages. Consequently, only the so-called E9 and E10 messages can be fully mapped in line with the WCO DM MIGs. With regard to all other messages, eTIR standards will have to be developed. This should not really pose a problem, because the remaining messages are limited to the exchanges between Customs and between Customs and the guarantee chain.

Bearing in mind the above, the question was raised whether it would make any sense to map all messages in both XML and UN/EDIFACT? The recommendation from the secretariat would be that all messages exchanged between Customs systems and with the guarantee chains would have XML MIGs and that only the E9 and E10 messages would have both XML and UN/EDIFACT mapping.

The secretariat would like to know if you can support this recommendation. If not, we would welcome your comments or other proposals.

\_\_\_ "Yes, I support",

\_\_\_ "No, I do not support for the following reason :

.....

Further comments, if any

.....

\_\_\_\_\_