



TIR EXECUTIVE BOARD (TIRExB)
COMMISSION DE CONTROLE TIR (TIRExB)
ИСПОЛНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ СОВЕТ МДП (ИСМДП)

Distr.: General
13 February 2017
ENGLISH ONLY

Administrative Committee for the TIR Convention, 1975

TIR Executive Board (TIRExB)

Seventieth session

Geneva, 5-6 December 2016

**Report of the seventieth session of the TIR Executive Board
(TIRExB)**

I. Attendance

1. The TIR Executive Board (TIRExB) held its seventieth session on 5-6 December 2016 in Geneva.
2. The following members of TIRExB were present: Mr. S. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation), Mr. G. Andrieu (France), Mr. M. Ciampi (Italy), Mrs. D. Dirlik Songür (Turkey), Mr. S. Fedorov (Belarus), Mrs. B. Gajda (Poland), Mrs. L. Jelínková (European Commission), Mr. V. Milošević (Serbia) and Mr. S. Somka (Ukraine).
3. The International Road Transport Union (IRU) attended the session as observer and was represented by Mr. Youlian Guenkov.

II. Adoption of the agenda

Documentation: Informal document TIRExB/AGE/2016/70

4. TIRExB adopted the agenda of the session as contained in Informal document TIRExB/AGE/2016/70, with the additions that TIRExB decided, under item XIV (Other matters) to discuss Informal document No. 30 (2016) by the Government of Germany on issues with the consecutive use of two TIR Carnets for one TIR transport. TIRExB further decided to discuss, under the same agenda item, the recent allegations against IRU and its management.
5. With reference to the restricted status of the draft agenda, TIRExB recalled its previous decisions, taken at its first, second, seventh and thirteenth session, that, unless decided otherwise, only approved reports of sessions of the TIRExB were subject to general distribution (see TRANS/WP.30/AC/2/2002/6, para. 38).

III. Adoption of the report of the sixty-ninth session of TIRExB

Documentation: Informal document TIRExB/REP/2016/69 draft with comments

6. The Board adopted the draft report of its sixty-ninth session (Informal document TIRExB/REP/2016/69draft with comments), subject to some minor amendments.

IV. Application of specific provisions of the TIR Convention

Consideration of amendment proposals

a. Proposals to introduce more flexibility in the guarantee system

Documentation: Informal document No. 26 (2016)

7. The Board recalled that, at the previous session (October 2016), it had concluded its discussions on introducing more flexibility in the TIR guarantee system, considering that for now, insufficient unequivocal justification can be found to support the Russian proposal not to set a maximum guarantee amount and decided to report to AC.2 that its assessment is inconclusive to the extent that it is not possible for TIRExB to judge the quality and the consequences of any change in the current practice, other than raising the recommended maximum guarantee amount from 60,000 to 100,000 euros (see ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/131, para. 16).

8. The Board welcomed Informal document No. 26 (2016), prepared by the secretariat and containing an overview of the ATA¹ and CPD² Carnet systems. The Board appreciated the quality of the assessment, elaborating the main elements of the respective Conventions and the guarantee mechanisms in place. The Board was of the general view that, although similar to the TIR guarantee system, both the ATA and CPD guarantee mechanisms present notable differences compared to TIR. Some examples mentioned were that: (i) the ATA Carnet is significantly more expensive than the TIR Carnet (up to three times more expensive); (ii) in most cases of temporary importation under cover of ATA Carnets the goods are of low value (iii) notably, the risks associated with ATA use are deemed manageable to the extent that there is no international insurer in the system and, in fact, a number of associations do not even deem it necessary to establish a national insurance backing; (iv) ATA Carnets are primarily used by the owners of the goods and not by the transporter/carrier; (v) CPD Carnets are used for vehicles only and (v) each ATA Carnet issued is calculated individually on the basis of the goods declared for temporary importation, with the additional requirement that the ATA Carnet user procures an individual insurance policy.

9. At the same time, some Board members pointed out that, despite such differences, there are positive elements relating to the attribution of liability and the payment mechanisms that could be used as a basis for further consideration of possible amendments to the TIR Convention. Against this background, Mr. S. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation) reiterated to the Board that the ATA and CPD practice, allowing for direct appeal to the guaranteeing association, i.e. consideration of the guarantor as directly liable for the debt, would merit further consideration by TIRExB. The secretariat clarified, on this point, that the issue of liability is linked to the level of risk involved and that, ultimately, any consideration on liability could not be isolated from the corresponding financial considerations. In the context of this discussion, the secretariat offered to recirculate document TRANS/WP.30/2005/15 on the distinction between surety and guarantee, for consideration by the Board at its next session. As a final point on this issue the Board – pursuant to a request by Mr. S. Amelyanovich – requested the secretariat to transmit, for the next session, information on the guarantee management system of the Common Transit Convention as this, in the view of Mr. S. Amelyanovich, would allow the Board to review additional practices that may be of use for the considerations of the Board.

b. Proposals to introduce authorized consignor

Documentation: ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2017/6

¹ Admission Temporaire.

² Carnet de Passage en Douane

10. The Board took note of document ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2017/6, containing proposals for an Explanatory Note and comment to Article 49 of the Convention to introduce greater facilitations in the TIR Convention, such as, but not limited to, authorized consignor and consignee. The Board noted that, as yet, it still seems that not all aspects have been settled to the satisfaction of all members of the Board. In particular, there continued to be diverging opinions as to which issues should be strictly stipulated in the text of the Convention and what could be settled by legislation at the national level. On the understanding, that the issue is a 'work in progress' which will require further discussions both by the Board and in the TIR Administrative Committee (AC.2), members were encouraged to actively support the proposals.

V. Computerization of the TIR procedure

a. Current status of the eTIR Project

11. The Board was informed that the secretariat is organizing the twenty-sixth session of the Informal Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (GE.1) on 18-19 May 2017, in conjunction with the fourth session of the Group of Experts on Legal Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure (GE.2).

12. The Board took note that Step 2 of the UNECE-IRU eTIR pilot project between Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Turkey is currently taking place and will run until the end of February 2017. In order to ensure the continuation of the progress already made during the pilot project and to continue collaboration towards the complete computerization of the TIR procedure, UNECE and IRU are preparing a questionnaire to gather the views of all stakeholders for the final report of the project and have started discussions on concluding a new Memorandum of Understanding.

13. Furthermore, the Board took note that the eTIR pilot project between Georgia and Turkey is ongoing and that technical work is continuing to ensure the seamless and secure exchange of TIR transport data.

14. Further to concerns raised by IRU on the progress of the computerization process, the Board reconfirmed its strong support of the computerization of the TIR Convention, in particular the eTIR Reference Model, and recalled the active involvement of various TIRExB members in the work of the bodies dedicated to this work, i.e. GE.1 and GE.2. The Board also confirmed the usefulness of both pilot projects currently undertaken as well as its interest in receiving the results thereof as soon as they will be available.

b. Activities of the Group of Experts on Legal Aspects of Computerization of the TIR procedure

15. TIRExB recalled that GE.2, at its second session (April 2016) had, inter alia, decided to conduct a survey on electronic methods of authentication, including electronic signatures, which was launched in September 2016, with a deadline for replies set for 1 November 2016. The secretariat informed the Board that thirty-three Contracting Parties had replied to the survey and that the preliminary results would be considered by GE.2 at its third session, on 12-13 December 2016. Furthermore, the Board noted that, despite the high number of replies to the survey, there were, still, major users of the TIR system that had not yet replied to the survey. TIRExB also noted that GE.2 would, at its next session, review the draft legal text in two formats namely as a possible optional Annex to the TIR Convention or as a Protocol to the TIR Convention. The secretariat highlighted that, in view of the limited remaining time for GE.2 to complete its work by the end of 2017, it would be important for Contracting Parties to take a definitive decision on the issue of format to allow the group to focus its attention in one direction. As such, GE.2 intends to finalize its considerations on 12-13 December 2016 on this issue and submit them to WP.30 at its next session for further guidance.

c. ITDB / Central database on certificates of approval / Central database on customs offices

Documentation: Informal document No. 20 (2016)

16. TIRExB was informed about the progress in implementing the new ITDB and other Information Technology (IT) projects managed by the TIR secretariat. In particular, it noted that (a) the new ITDB is ready and that currently the migration of data from the old database to the new one is taking place; (b) a security audit will be conducted in December 2016 or January 2017, prior to the introduction of the new ITDB for all Contracting Parties as of February 2017; (c) the ITDB web service has been redesigned and modernized and that it is now being tested by the customs administration of Finland. Once ready, Contracting Parties are encouraged to link up to the webservice; (d) the secretariat envisages a comparison between the ITDB and the IRU databases, in order to assess divergences, which will then be submitted to customs authorities for further verification.

17. In the context of the introduction of the new ITDB and its web service, the secretariat raised the issue of the Model Authorization Form (MAF), contained in Annex 9, Part II, which still allows countries to submit ITDB data on paper. In the view of the secretariat, such practice, which is resource consuming for countries as well as the secretariat, leading to delays in keeping ITDB up to date, should be phased out and be replaced by electronic submission only. TIRExB requested the secretariat to present the new ITDB and its web service to WP.30 and AC.2 in order to promote their functionalities and practicalities. Further, TIRExB reiterated the requirement for countries to send any data or update related to authorized TIR Carnet holders to the TIR secretariat, preferably by means of the proper use of electronic applications developed to this end by the TIR secretariat under the supervision of the TIR Executive Board, as stipulated by Explanatory Note 9.II.4 and within the deadlines imposed by Annex 9, Part II.

VI. Adaptation of the TIR procedure to modern business, logistics and transport requirements

Implementation of the intermodal aspects of the TIR procedure

Documentation: Informal document No. 21 (2016)

18. TIRExB discussed the scenario of an intermodal container transport between two inland customs offices with a sea leg, as elaborated in Informal document No. 21 (2016) by the secretariat, in close consultation with IRU. A number of TIRExB members expressed their consent with the gist of the example, however wished to see more reference to the suspension of the TIR transport during the sea leg. Also the issue of the transfer of the TIR Carnet should be mentioned. Mr. S. Fedorov (Belarus), supported by Mr. S. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation), expressed the clear view that the example, in its current form, left too many issues, such as, but not limited to subcontracting, unaddressed for the document to be transferred to AC.2 for further consideration. They wished the example to contain more references to applicable provisions of the Convention, because they had doubt that the description, although taken from a practical example of an intermodal TIR transport, was in line with the provisions of the Convention. In addition, Mr. S. Fedorov wished to see clearly recorded that he was against the example as it could not be applied in practice in Belarus. In conclusion, the Board requested the secretariat to prepare an amended version of the example, reflecting, as far as possible, all considerations or reservations expressed at the current session and in the exact format as to how the final text of the example would be submitted to AC.2 for its consideration.

VII. Settlement of disputes between Contracting Parties, associations, insurance companies and international organizations

19. Under this agenda item, the Board, at the request of the Chair of WP.30, addressed the issue of application of the TIR Convention on the territory of Belarus. In this context, Mr. S. Fedorov (Belarus), stated that the TIR Convention is applied in Belarus, as in some other States, including Member States of the Eurasian Economic Union, without any limitations, meaning that TIR transports with a level of customs duties and taxes up to 60,000 euros were accepted for transit. In case of an excess, such transports were refused. In his view, supported by Mr. S. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation), this approach was justified by the fact that, in line with the provisions of the Convention, in particular Article 3 (b), national associations only provide guarantee up to the recommended maximum amount. Other TIRExB members stated not to share this view, as it seriously impacted the relevance of the TIR Convention, to the detriment of the transport industry and recommended Belarus to stop these restrictions. They further stated that, in their view, countries should accept TIR Carnets for transit, irrespective of the level of customs duties and taxes, because, first of all, as a rule such level was not calculated for transit transports and, secondly, because the TIR Carnet holder, as primary debtor would be charged for the full amount. The international insurance chain would only be called upon in cases where the person(s) directly liable was unable to pay the amount due. Mr. S. Fedorov noted that the Convention does not provide for partial guarantee, in connection to which an assessment of the guarantee amount was carried out. Otherwise, there would not be a need to increase the amount of the guarantee from \$US 50,000 to 60,000 euros and, in the future, 100,000 euros. In reply to a comment from TIRExB members and IRU, pointing at the possibility for competent authorities to raise the recommended maximum guarantee amount, Mr. S. Fedorov informed the Board that this currently was under consideration. TIRExB requested the secretariat to prepare, for discussion at its next session, a document providing its considerations with regard to the issue.

VIII. Problems reported by transport companies from the Republic of Moldova in Ukraine

20. Mr. S. Somka (Ukraine) informed the Board that the Parliamentary Committee for Tax and Customs Policy of Ukraine had approved a draft new law, lifting restrictions for the transport of alcohol and tobacco products on the territory of Ukraine under cover of TIR Carnets, but that this law was still waiting for adoption by the Parliament. Mr. S. Somka promised to keep the Board informed about any further development in this field.

IX. Functioning of the TIR international guarantee system

Survey on customs claims

Documentation: Informal document No.27 (2016)

21. The Board recalled that, at its previous session, it took note of the results of the survey on customs claims and on the guarantee level for the period 2011-2014, as contained in Informal document No. 12 (2016)/Rev.2. and had requested the secretariat and IRU to look into the possible reasons for the increase in the number and amounts of claims from 2013 to 2014 in some Contracting Parties. Against this background, the Board considered Informal document No. 27 (2016). The Board was of the view that, in the light of the information provided, the 2014 increase was due to a set of specific events, including new patterns of serial fraud, to which the concerned customs administrations had reacted by improving controls. Despite the fact that the situation appears to have returned to normal in

2015 and 2016, the Board was of the view that customs administrations should take specific measures to prevent serial fraud by dishonest transport operators.

X. Price of TIR Carnets

Documentation: Informal document No. 22 (2016)/Rev. 1

22. The Board recalled that, at its previous session, it took note of Informal document No. 22 (2016) containing the data received from national issuing associations on the prices of TIR Carnets and mandated the secretariat to issue a revision of the document including an analysis of the prices. The Board welcomed Informal document No. 22 (2016)/Rev.1, in particular the analysis part, which shows that (i) TIR Carnet prices had gone down in a majority of Contracting Parties, (ii) the principle of economies of scale is generally respected in the price setting for TIR Carnets and (iii) there is no statistical evidence that associations in countries with higher Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita charge higher premiums.

23. The Board requested the secretariat to transmit the prices to AC.2 and to publish them on the TIRExB website. Furthermore, the Board was of the view that, due to the general nature of the requirement of Annex 9, Part I, para. 3 (vi), stipulating that national associations provide TIRExB, annually, before 1 March with ‘the price’ of each type of TIR Carnet it issues, the prices as reported by national associations might vary in composition (including, for example, or not, Value Added Tax (VAT), insurance fees, etc.). As a consequence, the Board agreed with the draft disclaimer contained in Informal document No. 22 (2016)/Rev.1. and requested the secretariat to include it on the web page where prices are reproduced as well as in future AC.2 documents with TIR Carnet prices. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare, for the next session, a draft survey aimed at collecting data on the composition of TIR Carnet prices, which would further harmonize the prices reported and ensure a timely provision of TIR Carnet prices by national associations.

XI. Example agreement

Documentation: Informal document No. 28 (2016)

24. The Board welcomed Informal document No. 28 (2016), prepared by the secretariat and containing an updated example agreement for inclusion in Chapter 6.2 of the TIR Handbook. TIRExB generally agreed that the updated example agreement should incorporate the requirements stemming from the provisions of the TIR Convention. Furthermore, the Board agreed with the comments of Mrs. B. Gajda that (i) it is not necessary to include a reference to the implementation of Annex 10; (ii) the alternative formulation on the non-coverage of tobacco and alcohol products should be excluded as long as it does not reflect the current provisions of the TIR Convention but an acquired practice on account of the decision of the international guarantee chain; (iii) the example agreement could also include the obligations of customs vis-à-vis associations and not exclusively focus on the sole responsibilities of the association and (iv) the paragraph referring to the acceptance, by the association, of a dispute settlement procedure should include the entire sentence as is currently contained in the TIR Convention, namely by adding the phrase “whenever possible without recourse to courts”. The Board took note of a proposal by IRU to include, as Annex to the example agreement, a recommended procedure for settling disputes and handling claims and agreed to review such draft Annex at the next session. Concerning the maximum guarantee amount per TIR Carnet, the Board agreed that the example agreement should, in the end, reflect the amount as indicated in the corresponding provision of the Convention, while noting that AC.2, at its next session, would be considering the amendment to E.N. 0.8.3 to increase the amount from 50,000 USD to 100,000 euros per TIR Carnet. As a conclusion, TIRExB requested the secretariat

to take note of all the comments received and to use them as a basis for the preparation of a revised draft for further consideration at its next session.

XII. Example of best practice of authorized consignee in the European Union

Documentation: Informal document No. 25 (2016)

25. The Board took note of Informal document No. 25 (2016), containing an example of best practice of authorized consignee under the TIR procedure in the European Union. The Board agreed that the document could be sent to AC.2 for endorsement and be inserted into the next edition of the TIR Handbook as, tentatively, new Chapter 5.13.

XIII. Self-evaluation

Documentation: Informal document No. 24 (2016)/Rev. 1, Informal document No. 30 (2016)

26. The Board took note of Informal document No. 24 (2016)/Rev. 1 and agreed with the approach that the secretariat would amend it with the draft outcome of its current session, so that it could be submitted as Informal document to AC.2 for consideration at its February 2017 session.

27. The Board considered Informal document No. 30 (2016), containing the responses of individual TIRExB members to a self-evaluation survey. The Board agreed that the outcome document of the survey together with recommendations for the work of future compositions of the Board be attached as Annex I to the draft report. Members were requested to provide the secretariat with their comments, if any, not later than by 15 January 2017, so that the secretariat could submit the survey overview and recommendations to AC.2 for consideration at its February 2017 session.

XIV. Activities of the secretariat

a. General activities of the secretariat

28. The Board was informed about further activities of the TIR secretariat that have been carried out in accordance with its mandate, in particular:

- follow-up actions to previous decisions by TIRExB;
- maintenance of the ITDB and of the UNECE Register of Customs Sealing Devices and Customs Stamps;
- IT-projects managed by the secretariat;
- the organization of TIR related events.

29. The Board was informed that the TIR secretariat had participated in the following events: International Conference on laying the foundation in the UNECE region for economic integration and sustainable development towards 2030 (Minsk, 26-27 October 2016); workshop on the World Customs Organization (WCO) transit guidelines (Lusaka, 31 October-4 November 2016); WCO ATA/Istanbul Convention Administrative Committee (Brussels, 14 November 2016); International Logistics Forum for the Americas (Mexico City, 22-23 November 2016); Global Sustainable Transport Conference, Ashgabat (26-27 November 2016)

b. United Nations Development Account

30. The Board took note that the United Nations Development Account (UNDA) project “Strengthening the capacities of developing countries and countries with economies in transition to facilitate legitimate border crossing, regional cooperation and integration” was successfully concluded and that all relevant documentation about the project would be made available on the UNECE website. Therefore, the Board decided that this agenda item will be taken out future agendas.

XV. Other matters

Documentation: Informal document No. 30 (2016)

31. TIRExB decided to postpone consideration of this document until its next session.

32. Under this agenda item, IRU informed the Board of the outcome of the independent external audit. The text of a press release on the issue is attached as Annex II to this report, for information of the Board. The Board reminded IRU of its commitment to share more extensive information on the final results of the audit with TIR governing bodies (see ECE/TRANS/WP.30/2016/289, Annex). IRU replied that it will do so, but that the final form of the report is still under preparation.

XVI Restriction in the distribution of documents

33. TIRExB decided to keep Informal documents No. 22/Rev. 1, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 (2016), issued in relation to the current session, restricted.

XVII. Date and place of next session

34. The Board decided to conduct its seventy-first session on 13 February 2017 in Geneva and requested the secretariat to make the appropriate arrangements.

Annex I

Results of the self-evaluation survey

Question 1

If you could highlight individual activities, what would you consider the major achievements of the TIRExB during its 2015-2016 term of office (please, indicate max. 3)?

Consolidated reply:

All TIRExB members considered the assessment to introduce more flexibility in the guarantee system as the most important activity of the current term of office, followed by progress made in the discussions on authorized consignor/consignee and on the intermodal use of the TIR Carnet.

Question 2

In your view, what are the areas of strength of the TIRExB and which areas could benefit from improvement?

Areas of strength:

Consolidated reply:

Members all agree that the possibility of having in-depth discussions between experts [in a small setting] to discuss major current issues and future challenges constitutes the main asset of TIRExB as a body.

Areas for improvement:

Consolidated reply

Members agree that more efforts should be undertaken to avoid repeating discussions and to achieve tangible, but well-balanced results.

Question 3

Are you satisfied with the support and assistance provided by the TIR secretariat to the TIRExB? If not please indicate in which areas you would like to see improvement.

Consolidated reply:

Members are fully satisfied with the support of and assistance by the TIR secretariat.

Question 4

Do you think the TIRExB resources are sufficient to fulfil its functions? If not please provide information which additional resources would be required.

Consolidated reply:

TIRExB is satisfied with the current level of resources, but would welcome if more funds could be allocated to promoting of the TIR system and supporting eTIR.

Question 5

Taking account of the fact that, in accordance with the provision of Explanatory Note 8.13.1-2, the respective government should finance the work of their TIRExB member:

Consolidated reply:

The Board is satisfied with the current DSA procedure (DSA for all TIRExB sessions).

Question 6

In your view, are there any changes required which would improve the effectiveness of TIRExB?

Consolidated reply:

TIRExB should only focus on technical issues, leaving politically sensitive issues to AC.2. Better mechanisms should be found to, either, find a compromise between dissenting options or, alternatively, report dissenting views clearly to WP.30 and AC.2.

Question 7

In your view, does TIRExB communicate well with the other parties in the TIR system, and, in particular, with IRU, which participates in TIRExB sessions as observer? Please elaborate your answer.

Consolidated reply:

In general, TIRExB is satisfied with the way it communicates with other fora as well as with IRU. However, there is some reservation with regard of the quality of the information provided by IRU, spontaneously or per request. TIRExB would like to be better informed about the intersessional joint activities of the TIR secretariat and IRU.

Question 8

In your view, which goals would be interesting for the next TIRExB to work towards?

Consolidated reply:

TIRExB recommends the next composition to continue focussing on issues such as, but not limited to, the introduction of simplifications (in particular authorized consignor), the intermodal use of the TIR procedure and activities towards computerization. In order to be able to closely follow all TIR related issues, TIRExB recommends that members attend, to the extent possible, sessions of WP.30, AC.2, GE.1 and GE.2.

Question 9

In general, how would you rate the TIRExB at its current term of office?

Consolidated reply:

Most TIRExB members are satisfied with the current term of office of TIRExB. A few are somewhat satisfied.

Annex II



IRU NEWS

Independent audit finds no evidence for allegations against IRU management

25 Nov 2016 Geneva

Statement from Christian Labrot, IRU President

An independent audit has dismissed allegations made against current IRU management by a former employee last April.

The allegations related to IRU's TIR insurance scheme, dating back to 1995, and the financial model used to calculate IRU's reserves.

The comprehensive audit, conducted over five months by leading international firm Ernst & Young, was commissioned by IRU's Board (Presidential Executive) after IRU's General Assembly in April 2016.

The audit investigated the specific allegations, tracked money flows related to the IRU insurance scheme, and reviewed IRU's organisational structure, governance mechanisms and compliance with ethical standards and best practice.

In summary, the audit found:

- All funds are accounted for; no money was stolen or hidden
- IRU constitutional and governance rules were respected
- Current management had no involvement in the creation of the insurance scheme; rather, the former employee who made the allegations was responsible for the department supervising the TIR insurance scheme
- Significant progress in transparency, internal controls and risk management since new management took over in 2013

- Governance and ethical practices in line with general standards; no major issues identified.

The audit was overseen directly by IRU's Board and IRU's internal auditor, independent of management. The auditors evaluated more than 2,800 documents dating back to 1995, including documents provided by the former employee who made the allegations. The auditors interviewed all relevant parties, including the former employee.

No major governance or ethical issues

In terms of governance mechanisms and processes, and compliance with general ethical standards and practice, the audit found no major issues in IRU.

The audit further noted that a code of ethics and business conduct was implemented in 2014 by current IRU management, Secretary General Umberto de Pretto and Chief Operations Officer Boris Blanche, shortly after taking over their current roles in 2013.

Significant improvement in transparency since 2013

The audit found that since June 2013, IRU management had made significant steps to improve and increase transparency, and enhance internal control systems and risk management.

The Board notes clearly that Umberto de Pretto and Boris Blanche assumed their current roles in 2013, and that it has been their effort to reform and modernise IRU, from that time on.

This significant progress is recognised by the audit, and IRU management is committed to continue on this path with the support of IRU members and the Board.

The audit identified further improvements and the Board will drive action on these suggestions with all IRU members in the coming months.

Overwhelming support of members

Ernst & Young first presented their overall findings to IRU members at the IRU General Assembly on 4 November 2016, with members overwhelmingly backing its findings and supporting IRU management.

The Board has clearly noted the strong desire of almost all IRU members to accept the audit's findings, allowing the organisation to move on and continue its important role in supporting sustainable global transport, trade and tourism.
