

Distr.: General
15 November 2013

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-third session

Brussels, 20-21 November 2013

Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda

Reference Model of the TIR procedure: International declaration mechanisms

Differences between the data contained in message E9 and national data requirements for the TIR procedure

Note by the secretariat

I. Background

1. At its twenty-first session, the Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (GE.1 or Expert Group) noted that, already now, various countries, in their current efforts to computerize the national/regional management of TIR operations, are requesting the electronic submission of TIR Carnet data. Unfortunately, and possibly due to lack of international coordination, the data requested by different countries are not the same (neither in content nor in structure), thus complicating the data submission by TIR Carnet holders and, possibly, endangering the future acceptance by all TIR Contracting Parties of standard declaration messages, i.e. the E9 message. Therefore, the Expert Group requested the secretariat to address an email to eTIR Focal Points. On 8 March 2013, the secretariat sent to eTIR focal points an email asking them to compare the E9 message with their national requirements. On the basis of the first replies received, the secretariat prepared Informal document GE.1 No.5 (2013), which was considered by GE.1 at its twenty-second session. GE.1 requested the secretariat to contact eTIR focal points once more to ask if their country has any specific additional requirements that cannot be included in the E9 message. Therefore, on 11 October 2013, the secretariat sent another email to eTIR focal points, asking them if any of their national requirements for the electronic submission of TIR Carnet data (i.e. the

content of national messages allowing holders to send the TIR Carnet data electronically) could not be sent using the E9 message. The International Road Transport Union (IRU) also agreed to share the experiences it has gained through the implementation of TIR-EPD in various countries.

II. Previous comparisons

2. At the seventeenth session of the GE.1, the Finnish authorities introduced Informal document GE.1 No. 1 (2010), providing a comparison between the eTIR system and the New Computerised Transit System (NCTS) with regard to the design of the E9 and IE15 declaration messages. The comparison highlighted, on the one hand, the many similarities which exist between the two messages but pinpointed, on the other hand, at a few differences which still would need to be addressed before NCTS applications could accommodate eTIR declarations. In doing so, it would also be ensured that NCTS would better reflect the latest versions of the World Customs Organization (WCO) transit data model, which serve as basis for the eTIR messages.

III. Information received from the network of eTIR focal points

3. In addition to the already received comparisons from Hungary and Poland, Austria and Belgium also provided a detailed comparison of their national requirements with the E9 message. Tables 1 presents the detailed information provided by the four countries.

Table 1
Data elements requirements

<i>Class.Attribute</i>	<i>Austria</i>	<i>Belgium</i>	<i>Hungary</i>	<i>Poland</i>
Message.Date	R	R	R	R
Message.Message reference number	-	R	R	R
Message.Type, coded	R	R	R	R
Message.Message function, coded	-	-	-	R
Message.Total gross weight	R	R	R	O
ADDITIONALINFORMATION.Remarks	O	-	-	O
ADDITIONALINFORMATION.Heavy and bulky goods indicator	-	-	-	-
AGENT.Code	-	-	-	R
AGENT.Role, coded	-	-	-	-
AMENDMENT.Amendment code	-	-	-	-
POINTER.Sequence number	-	-	R	R
POINTER.Document/message section, coded	-	-	-	R
POINTER.Tag identifier	-	-	-	-
SUBCONTRACTOR.Name	-	D	-	-
SUBCONTRACTOR.Code	-	O	-	-
ADDRESS.City name	-	D	-	R
ADDRESS.Country, coded	-	D	-	R
ADDRESS.Street and number/P.O. Box	-	D	-	R
ADDRESS.Postcode identification	-	D	-	R
CONSIGNMENT.Sequence number	-	-	R	R
ATTACHEDDOCUMENTS.Issuing date	O	O	R	-
ATTACHEDDOCUMENTS.Number	D	R	R	O
ATTACHEDDOCUMENTS.Type, coded	R	R	R	R
BINARYFILE.Identification	-	-	-	-

BINARYFILE.Title	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Author name	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Version	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.File name	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.URI	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.MIME	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Encoding	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Character set	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Include binary object	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Access	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Description	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Size	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Type	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Hash code	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Hash code algorithm id	-	-	-	-
CONSIGNMENTITEM.Sequence number	R	R	R	R
ADDITIONALINFORMATION.Remarks	O	O	R	O
GOODS.Description	R	R	R	R
CLASSIFICATION.Code	-	-	-	O
CLASSIFICATION.Type	-	-	-	-
CONSIGNEE.Name	D	R	R	D
CONSIGNEE.Code	D	O	R	O
ADDRESS.City name	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Country, coded	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Street and number/P.O. Box	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Postcode identification	D	R	R	R
CONSIGNOR.Name	D	R	R	D
CONSIGNOR.Code	D	O	R	O
ADDRESS.City name	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Country, coded	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Street and number/P.O. Box	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Postcode identification	D	R	R	R
DELIVERYDESTINATION.Name	-	-	R	O
ADDRESS.City name	-	-	R	-
ADDRESS.Country, coded	-	-	R	-
ADDRESS.Street and number/P.O. Box	-	-	R	-
ADDRESS.Postcode identification	-	-	R	-
GOODSMEASURE.Gross weight	R	O	R	O
PACKAGING.Marks and numbers	D	D	R	O
PACKAGING.Number of packages	D	D	R	O
PACKAGING.Type, coded	R	R	R	R
TRANSPORTEQUIPMENT.Identification	-	-	R	O
UCR.Identifier	-	-	-	-
LOADINGLOCATION.Name	-	-	R	O
NOTIFYPARTY.Name	-	-	-	-
NOTIFYPARTY.Code	-	-	-	-
ADDRESS.City name	-	-	-	-
ADDRESS.Country, coded	-	-	-	-
ADDRESS.Street and number/P.O. Box	-	-	-	-
ADDRESS.Postcode identification	-	-	-	-

CUSTOMSOFFICEOFDEPARTURE.Code	R	R	R	R
CUSTOMSOFFICEOFDESTINATION.Code	R	R	R	R
TRANSPORTMEANS.Identification	D	R	R	O
TRANSPORTMEANS.Type, coded	D	R	R	O
TRANSPORTMEANS.Nationality	D	R	R	O
TRANSPORTMEANS.Conveyance reference number	D	D	R	-
COUNTRYOFROUTING.Sequence number	-	R	R	-
COUNTRYOFROUTING.Country, coded	D	D	R	-
CERTIFICATEOFAPPROVAL.Date	-	-	R	-
CERTIFICATEOFAPPROVAL.Number	-	-	R	-
CERTIFICATEOFAPPROVAL.Type, coded	-	-	R	-
BINARYFILE.Identification	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Title	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Author name	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Version	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.File name	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.URI	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.MIME	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Encoding	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Character set	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Include binary object	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Access	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Description	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Size	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Type	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Hash code	-	-	-	-
BINARYFILE.Hash code algorithm id	-	-	-	-
TRANSPORTEQUIPMENT.Sequence number	-	-	-	-
TRANSPORTEQUIPMENT.Size and type identification	-	-	-	-
TRANSPORTEQUIPMENT.Identification	-	R	-	O
SEAL.Sequence number	-	R	R	R
SEAL.Seal number	-	R	R	R
SEAL.Seal type code	-	-	R	-
GUARANTEE.Reference	R	R	R	R
HOLDER.Name	D	R	R	R
HOLDER.Code	D	R	R	O
ADDRESS.City name	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Country, coded	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Street and number/P.O. Box	D	R	R	R
ADDRESS.Postcode identification	D	R	R	R

^a R: required; O: optional; D: dependent/conditional;-(dash): not part of the requirements.

4. With regard to additional requirements, Austria, the Czech Republic and the Netherlands do not require any data which is not contained in the E9 message. Serbia does not require the submission of TIR Carnet data electronically, but accepts data in the TIR-EPD format. Belgium, France and Hungary indicated that their national messages allow for / require the submission of additional information (see table 2). In the case of France, part of it might be due to the fact that the submission and the amendment of the declaration are done by means of the same message. Considering that message E9 also allows for both the submission and the amendment of the declaration, further analysis might be required. Finally, in line with the request of the Expert Group at its previous session, the secretariat

contacted Hungary to check if their additional requirements could not be accommodated into the existing E9 message. In order to help GE.1 assess if the additional data elements could be mapped to E9 existing data elements, Table 2 now contains the definitions of the additional data elements. Belgium also indicated more data element can be included in their transit declaration message in order to allow transport operator to provide security related data.

Table 2
Additional data elements

Class.Attribute	Format	Definition
Belgium		
HEADER .Type of declaration	an..9	
HEADER .Country of destination code	a2	
HEADER .Country of dispatch/export code	a2	
HEADER .Containerised indicator	n1	
HEADER .NCTS accompanying document language code	a2	
HEADER .Total number of items	n..5	
HEADER .Declaration place	an..35	
REPRESENTATIVE .Name	an..35	
France		
HEADER Document/reference number		
HEADER Amendment place		
HEADER Amendment place LNG		
HEADER Date of amendment		
CTL_CONTROL Amendment type flag		
GUARANTEE.Currency		
GUARANTEE.Amount Concerned		
Hungary		
CUSTOMSOFFICEOFTRANSIT.Code	an..8	In NCTS it is optional to fill in box Customs office of transit. E.g. before HR joined to the EU but they have already been the member of the Transit Convention and use NCTS application, HU entry customs office was the transit office itself in NCTS procedure.
REPRESENTATIVE.Name	an..35	Optional. If there is a representative person who handles transit procedure, the data of this person can be registered as well.
REPRESENTATIVE.Capacity	an..35	
UNLOADINGLOCATION.Code	an..35	In NCTS, it is mandatory to fill in box unloading location when safety and security data are registered in

GUARANTEE.Validity limitation	a2	transit declaration as well (based on CCC Annex 30a). Otherwise it is optional. Guarantee data are mandatory in case of starting NCTS transit procedure. In NCTS/TIR, guarantee data are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guarantee code 'B' signs as 'TIR' guarantee• Number of TIR Carnet• Guarantee amount
GOODSMEASURE.Net mass	n..11,3	In NCTS it is mandatory to fill in box <i>Net mass</i> .

5. IRU was not in a position to provide a list of differences between the E9 message and the national implementations of TIR-EPD, but offered to present the information at the session by means of a presentation.

IV. Further considerations

6. GE.1 experts may wish to discuss the necessity to amend the E9 message to accommodate specific national requirements on the basis of their knowledge of their national declaration mechanisms and of the information provided by eTIR focal points.