**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**
INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE
Working Party on Customs Questions
affecting Transport

Informal ad hoc Expert Group on the
Computerization of the TIR procedure
(Third session, 1 and 2 September 2003)

**CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS**
**UNDER COVER OF TIR CARNETS (TIR CONVENTION, 1975)**

**Report of the third session of the Informal ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual**
**and Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure**

**(Budapest, 1 and 2 September 2003)**

**A.     ATTENDANCE**

1.     The Informal ad hoc Expert Group held its third session on 1 and 2 September 2003 in Budapest.

2.     The session was attended by experts from the following countries: Czech Republic; Finland; Hungary; Italy; Netherlands; Poland; Romania; Russian Federation; Slovak Republic; Ukraine. Experts from the International Road Transport Union (IRU) were also present.

3.     Mr. J. Ille (Czech Republic) acted as Chairman of the Informal ad hoc Expert Group.

## B.      ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documentation: ExG/COMP/2003/3.

4.      The Informal ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR procedure (further referred to as: "the Expert Group") adopted the provisional agenda, prepared by the secretariat (ExG/COMP/2003/3) after having agreed on a number of procedural changes, mainly in order to ensure alignment with the table of contents of the Reference Model. The Expert Group also took note that no documentation had been prepared for discussion on agenda item 3, but that oral information would be given by the secretariat instead.

## C.      ACTIVITIES OF THE INFORMAL AD HOC EXPERT GROUP

### (a)      The introduction of the UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) into the work of the Expert Group

5.      The Expert Group was informed by Mr. Jean Kubler of the UNECE Trade Division of the use of the UN/CEFACT's Modelling Methodology (UMM) for the computerization of the TIR procedure. As he explained, UMM offered the Expert Group tools to describe the business processes and exchanges of information within the TIR system in a commonly understood and clearly documented way. He further explained the various steps or 'milestones', proposed by UMM in order to obtain the objective of achieving a complete description of the project. These milestones are also reflected in the Reference Model, prepared by the secretariat, which would be discussed under Agenda item 2 (c).

6.      The presentation by Mr. Kubler is available electronically on the UNECE Border Crossing Facilitation Section's website (border.unece.org).

### (b)      Report of the special working session of the IT Experts (3 July 2003)

Documentation: ExG/COMP/2003/3

7.      At the request of the Expert Group at its second session, the secretariat had convened a meeting of IT specialists, to discuss the suitability of data models for the work of the group. This meeting had taken place on 3 July 2003 in Geneva.

8.      The IT specialists had dedicated part of their meeting to discussing the use of a methodology to provide the project to computerize the TIR procedure with a standardized framework and stressed that, as a communication tool, it would facilitate the exchange of information among stakeholders.

9.      The IT specialists agreed that the UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) offered the necessary tools to describe the TIR business process, provided a uniform approach for the work of the Expert Group and constituted a valuable basis for future improvements in the TIR procedure. Furthermore, there was agreement that the activities, undertaken by the Expert Group so far, fitted well into UMM and that the approach endorsed by the Expert Group in the project overview was in line with it. Therefore, the IT specialists invited the secretariat to prepare a first draft document, limited to the first step in UMM, the Business Domain Modelling.

10.     With regard to the use of models and diagrams, the IT specialists decided that those proposed in UMM were appropriate. The IT specialists emphasized that the Expert Group's difficulty in understanding the models was mainly due to the lack of textual description. As UMM contained many textual parts, such as the use case descriptions, the requirements list and the glossary, it should be able to address the problems encountered by the Expert Group. Furthermore, they emphasized the necessity to adapt UMM to the particularities of the TIR Business process. However, the IT specialists decided not to give up the hierarchical data models, as presented in document ExG/COMP/2002/7, because of the importance attached to them by some of the members of the Expert Group.

11.     The Expert Group endorsed the report of the meeting of the IT specialists, contained in document ExG/COMP/2003/3, noting that regretfully no IT specialists from Customs authorities had taken part in the meeting.

**(c)      Reference Model of the TIR procedure**

Documentation: ExG/COMP/2003/1 Draft, Version 1.0 b

12.     By way of introduction, the secretariat explained the approach it had taken in drafting the aforementioned document. The Reference Model is intended as a tool to achieve a dynamic and interactive way of documenting all relevant information on the project to computerize the TIR procedure. The secretariat had drafted a first version of the document (mainly reproducing information already available), but for the future it was intended that the Expert Group should act as its owner, deciding on how to fill-in and complete all parts of the document. Because of the interactive nature of the document, delegates were invited to submit ideas, comments and contributions at any time. The secretariat would act as editor, keeping track of the issues raised and the decisions taken by the Expert Group, so that the status of any part of the Reference Model would be clear at any time. The secretariat would draft separate documents on the issues under discussion and would create a new version of the Reference Model, reflecting all decisions taken, whenever it would be appropriate. The review and validation status table of chapter 0.2.3 of the Reference Model as updated after the session, is presented in Annex 1 to this report.

13.     It should be noted that, with regard to the Reference Model, the report only reflects the general topics discussed at the session. The complete list of all issues raised during the meeting and the decisions taken are listed respectively in <u>Annex 2</u> and <u>Annex 3</u> to the report.

**(i)     Introduction**

**(i) (a)   <u>Background to document</u>**

14.     In part 0.1 of the Reference Model, the secretariat has reproduced excerpts from reports relating to the background of the computerization of the TIR procedure and the mandate of the Expert Group. The Expert Group endorsed part 0.1, recognizing that it only contains historical references, but nevertheless felt that the use of the term "computerization of the TIR procedure", as it has been used by the WP.30 since it formulated the scope of Phase III of the TIR revision process, needed further clarification. The Expert Group realized that at that time the WP.30 had no intention of further defining the scope of the project, as it wanted to accommodate all possible technological solutions likely to be implemented in the years ahead. However, knowing that the political and technical climates had evolved considerably since 2000, the WP.30 might wish to give more concrete and detailed instructions to the Expert Group how to give shape to the computerization project, indicating its boundaries and the approach to be taken. In addition, the Expert Group felt that the terms "TIR procedure", "TIR transport", "TIR system" and "TIR regime" were in need of further clarification and precise definitions. The secretariat was mandated to prepare a document on the issue, for discussion at the WP.30 spring 2004 session. The chairman of the WP.30, present at the meeting, indicated that he would support such a document, acknowledging the importance of clear guidance from WP.30 for the future of the computerization project.

**(i) (b)   <u>Introduction to the Reference Model</u>**

15.     The Expert Group welcomed the presentation made by the secretariat to explain part 0.2 of the Reference Model. The presentation focused first on the necessity of modeling in order to computerize a complex system such as the TIR procedure. The Expert Group requested the secretariat to amend this part with references to an article on architecture artistry, written by Mr. G. Gage of the IRU. The secretariat gave a detailed description of the phases and the workflows identified by the UMM, as well as the deliverables of every phase followed by an explanations of the various parts of the Reference Model.

16.     With regard to the deliverables, the Expert Group questioned the usefulness of the inclusion of sequence diagrams in the first stages of the work in order to complement or even replace the current activity diagrams. It decided to revert to this matter at a later stage when studying the activity diagrams and to include sequence diagrams only if problems in understanding the activity diagrams would be encountered.

**(ii)     Business Domain Modelling**

17     As a general introductory remark to this part of the Reference Model, the chairman referred to the NCTS-project of the European Commission, for which a number of similar documents had been prepared. The Expert Group stressed again the importance it attached to close cooperation with the European Commission in order to ensure full compatibility between both projects. The secretariat informed the meeting that, in spite of the absence of the European Commission at the IT specialists' and at the current meeting, the European Commission had expressed its ongoing commitment to the program to computerize the TIR procedure. The Expert Group recommended that the secretariat would visit the European Commission in the near future to discuss outstanding issues and to find an adequate approach how to strengthen the cooperation in the future.

**(ii) (a)  Vision**

**(ii) (b)  TIR procedure domain**

**(ii) (c)  TIR Carnet use cases**

**(ii) (d)  Elaboration of use cases**

18.     All issues raised and decisions taken under these agenda items are reflected respectively in Annex 2 and Annex 3 of this report.

**(ii) (e)  Entity classes**

19.     The Expert Group, not expressing any particular comment, validated part 1.5 of the Reference Model.

**(ii) (f)  High level class diagram**

20.     All issues raised and decisions taken under this agenda item are reflected respectively in Annex 2 and Annex 3 of this report.

**(d)     Future projects for the Reference Model of the TIR Procedure**

21.     Not discussed, due to lack of time.

## D. OTHER ACTIVITIES OF INTEREST TO THE EXPERT GROUP

22.     The Expert Group was informed that the secretariat had established contact with the ISO 7273 Maintenance Agency to ensure that the TIR data elements identified by the Expert Group at its Prague meeting would be harmonized with and/or introduced into the UN Trade Date Elements Directories (UN/TDED). The secretariat would report to the Expert group whenever progress was made in this field.

## D. DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

23.     The Expert Group requested the secretariat to convene a next session of the group preferably in the beginning of 2004, depending on the availability of meeting facilities in Geneva.

24.     The chairman of the Expert Group informed the meeting that, as a result of changed responsibilities within his national administration, he no longer would be in a position to take part in and chair the Expert Group's meetings. The Expert Group regretted this decision, for which it had full understanding, and expressed its thanks to the chairman for his engagement in the work of the group over a last years.

25.     The list of participants of the present session is contained in <u>Annex 4</u> to the report.

**Annex 1**
**Review and validation status**

| | Version | Validated by … on …[1] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | COMP[2] | LEGAL[3] | WP.30[4] | AC.2[5] |
| REFERENCE MODEL | 1.0b | | | | |
| 1. Business domain modelling | 1.0b | | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 1.1 Vision | 1.0b | | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 1.2 TIR Procedure domain | 1.0b | | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 1.3 TIR Carnet life cycle use cases | 1.0b | | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 1.4 Elaborate the use cases | 1.0b | | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 1.5 Entity classes | 1.0b | 2/9/2003 | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 1.6 High level class diagram | 1.0b | | (grey) | | (grey) |
| 2. e-Business requirements | | | | | (grey) |
| 3. Analysis workflow | | | | | (grey) |
| 4. Design workflow | | | | | (grey) |
| Annex 1 - Requirements list | 1.0b | | | | (grey) |
| Annex 2 - TIR glossary | 1.0b | | | | (grey) |

[1] This table contains the dates on which the various versions of parts of the reference model have been validated (endorsed) by the different groups. The cells in grey indicate that endorsement by that specific group is not required.
[2] Informal ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure
[3] Informal ad hoc Expert Group on Legal Aspects of Computerization of the TIR Procedure
[4] Working Party on Customs Questions affecting Transport
[5] Administrative Committee for the TIR Convention, 1975

## Annex 2 – Issues

| No | Subject | Description | Date | Source | Related decision(s) | Solved |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Whole document | At times, document refers to the computerization of the "TIR Convention", whereas at other places it refers to the computerization of the "TIR Procedure". | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1 | ✓ |
| 2 | 0.1 Background to the document | The Expert Group (ExG) feels that clarification of its mandate is required. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 2 | |
| 3 | 0.2 Introduction to the Reference Model | ExG proposes to make reference to the article by Mr. G. Gage. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 3 | ✓ |
| 4 | 0.2.1 Phases and workflow | With regard to the deliverables, ExG questions the usefulness of the inclusion of sequence diagrams in the first stages of the work to complement or even replace the current activity diagrams. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 4 | |
| 5 | 1.1 Vision | ExG proposes to include a Business opportunity statement. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 5 | |
| 6 | 1.1.1 Project title and abreviation | ExG poins out that the abbreviated project title: "eTIR"could be misleading. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 6 | |
| 7 | 1.1.2 Objectives | ExG thinks that the objectives need further precision, as a number of them are too general or too vague. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 7 | |
| 8 | 1.1.3 Boundaries | This part needs further elaboration. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 8 | |

| No | Subject | Description | Date | Source | Related decision(s) | Solved |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 1.1.3 Boundaries | Figure 1.1, "stakeholders and actors" needs to be updated as follows:<br>- Add "Contracting parties" in the list of stakeholders inside the boundaries;<br>- Replace insurance by Guarantee providers;<br>- Replace "Asycuda" by "Asycuda++";<br>- Add "National computer systems" in the list of stakeholders outside the boundaries;<br>- Replace UNTDED by "UNTDED-ISO7372 Maintenance Agency";<br>- Delete "Consultants" and "Quality consultants" from the figure. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 9 | ✓ |
| 10 | 1.1.3 Boundaries | Figure 1.2, "stakeholders reponsability" charts needs to be updated as follow:<br>- "Consultants" and "quality consultants" should be removed from the Figure;<br>- The transport industry should be indicated as observer in the AC.2. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 10 | ✓ |
| 11 | 1.1.4 References | Lack of references to decisions taken in the past by WP.30. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 11 | ✓ |
| 12 | 1.1.5 Scope | References to related decisions by WP.30 should be added. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 12 | ✓ |
| 13 | 1.1.5 Scope | Project activities and TIR activities are mixed. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 13 | |
| 14 | 1.1.6 Constraints | The term 'constraints' may need further clarification. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 14 | |
| 15 | 1.2.1 TIR procedure package diagram (pd) | ExG questions the inclusion of the Risk Analysis package in the TIR Carnet package since the Business Domain Modelling refers only to the "as-is" situation. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 15 | ✓ |

| No | Subject | Description | Date | Source | Related decision(s) | Solved |
|----|---------|-------------|------|--------|---------------------|--------|
| 16 | 1.2.1 TIR procedure pd | The relationship between the dependency arrows and the requirements is not visible in Figure 1.3. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 16 | ✓ |
| 17 | Requirements list | Requirement 25 is not precise enough. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 17 | |
| 18 | 1.2.2 TIR procedure pd description | In the list of "actors", the term "insurance" has to be replaced by "Guarantee chain". | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 18 | ✓ |
| 19 | 1.2.2 TIR procedure pd description | In the "performance goal", add "of goods" after "international transport". | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 19 | ✓ |
| 20 | 1.2.2 TIR procedure pd description | According to ExG, the implementations of the TIR system (associations, insurance contracts, …) should also be regarded as a precondition to the procedure. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 20 | ✓ |
| 21 | 1.3 TIR Carnet System uc | The term "TIR Carnet system" is not clear. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 21 | ✓ |
| 22 | 1.3.1 Actors | The roles of the actors are not clearly defined. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 22 | |
| 23 | 1.3.1 Actors | Figure 1.4 should be updated as follows: <br> - Replace "Consignee" by "Authorized Consignee"; <br> - Add brackets around the authorised Consignee to indicate that this subject is still under discussion and not yet part of the Convention. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 23 | |
| 24 | 1.3.1 Actors | Figure 1.5 needs further elaboration in view of the roles played by the national associations. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 24 | |
| 25 | 1.3.1 Actors | The term "Transport operator (Driver)" used in Figure 1.6 is missing from the Glossary. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 25 | |
| 26 | 1.3.1 Actors | Consignee is missing in Figure 1.6. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 26 | ✓ |
| 27 | 1.3.1 Actors | Only the holder should be mentioned in Figure 1.6. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 27 | ✓ |

| No | Subject | Description | Date | Source | Related decision(s) | Solved |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28 | 1.3.2 TIR Carnet ucd | In accordance with decision 15, the risk analysis use case should be removed from Figure 1.7. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 28 | ✓ |
| 29 | 1.3.2 TIR Carnet ucd | ExG questions the role of Customs authorities in the issuance and return use cases. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 29 | ✓ |
| 30 | 1.3.2 TIR Carnet ucd | ExG questions the inclusion of a use case on risk analysis by the issuing association prior to issuance of the TIR Carnet. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 30 | ✓ |
| 31 | 1.3.2 TIR Carnet ucd | "Authorities along the way" should be included in the TIR Transport use case. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 31 | ✓ |
| 32 | 1.3.2 TIR Carnet ucd desciption | In accordance with resolution 31, "Authorities along the way" should be added to the "actors" list. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 32 | ✓ |
| 33 | 1.3.2 TIR Carnet ucd desciption | In the scenario, any reference to risk analysis should be removed. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 33 | ✓ |
| 34 | 1.4 Elaboration of uc | The risk analysis use case diagram and description should be deleted and a new diagram and description on the discharge of a TIR operation should be added. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 35 | ✓ |

## **Annex 3 – Decisions**

| Decision. No | Issue No[1] | Description | Date | Source | Version[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **1** | The references made to the computerization of the "TIR Convention", will be replaced by computerization of the "TIR Procedure" in the whole Reference Model. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 2 | 2 | ExG requests the secretariat to prepare a document for the Febuary 2004 meeting of WP30. | 1-2.Sep.03 | | |
| 3 | **3** | Reference to the article " IS architecture artistry. G. Gage, IDG Communication Publication, July 1991" will be made. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 4 | 4 | Possible inclusion of sequence diagrams will be discussed when studying the activity diagrams and will be included only if ExG encounter problems in understanding the activity diagrams. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 5 | 5 | ExG requests the secretariat, in collaboration with the IRU, to draft a proposal for a "Business opportunity statement" for the forthcomming session of ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 6 | 6 | ExG requests the secretariat to prepare a document for the Febuary 2004 meeting of WP30 (see decision 2). | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 7 | 7 | ExG is requested to submit concrete proposals to the secretariat in order to amend the objectives chapter. The secretariat will present the revised version at the forthcoming meeting. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 8 | 8 | ExG is requested to submit concrete proposals to the secretariat in order to amend the boundaries chapter. The secretariat will present the revised version at the forthcoming meeting. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 9 | **9** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 10 | **10** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 11 | **11** | References to relevant reports should be added in the reference chapter. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |

---

[1] The issue number is in bold when the resolution solves the issue.

[2] This column indicated in which version the results of the decision will be included for the first time.

| Decision. No | Issue No[1] | Description | Date | Source | Version[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | **12** | The tasks identified in the scope of the project should be complemented with theWP.30 decisions concerned. | | | 1.1a |
| 13 | 13 | The secretariat is mandated to redraft the scope chapter distinguishing between TIR-related and project-related activities. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 14 | 14 | ExG requests the secretariat to draft a clarification of the term 'constraints'. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 15 | **15** | ExG decides to keep the Risk analysis package but to place it outside of the TIR Carnet System package. It requests the secretariat to harmonize the dependency arrows accordingly | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 16 | **16** | ExG requests the secretariat to add the requirement number to the dependency arrows in order to increase the readability of Figure 1.3. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 17 | 17 | ExG requests the secretariat to draft a  more detailed wording of Requirement 25. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 18 | **18** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 19 | **19** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 20 | **20** | ExG decides to add "Implementation of the TIR system" as a precondition. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 21 | **21** | ExG decides to replace the term "TIR Carnet system" by the "TIR Carnet life cycle" in the whole document. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 22 | 22 | ExG requests the secretariat to redraft chapter 1.3.1, identifying differences between the actors and the roles and drafting clear definitions. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 23 | **23** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 24 | 24 | ExG requeststhe secretariat, in collaboration with IRU, to draft a revised Figure 1.5 for the forthcoming session. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |
| 25 | 25 | ExG requests the secretariat to insert the term "Transport operator (driver)", together with a draft definition, in the glossary. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | |

| Decision. No | Issue No[1] | Description | Date | Source | Version[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | **26** | ExG decides not to integrate the "Consignee" in Figure 1.6 because he does not act on behalf of the holder. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 27 | **27** | ExG decides not to change the list of actors as mentioned in Figure 1.6. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 28 | **28** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 29 | **29** | ExG decides that Customs authorities are not directly involved in the use cases, because the issuance uses case finishes and the return use case starts with the holder. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 30 | **30** | ExG feels that the term "risk analysis" used in issue no. 30 is not appropriate, because, at the moment of issuance, the issuing association is actually performing a "risk assessement". It decides not to include this in the use case. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 31 | **31** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 32 | **32** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 33 | **33** | The proposal is accepted by ExG. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 34 | - | In order to verify and complement the use cases in part 1.4, ExG requests secretariat to organize working groups which should report to the secretariat not later than 17 October 2003. The secretariat is requested to compile the work of the working groups. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | - |
| 35 | **34** | The proposal is accepted by the group. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | 1.1a |
| 36 | - | ExG validates chapter 1.5. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | - |
| 37 | - | ExG decides that the secretariat should be provided with comments on part 1.6 before 17 October 2003 for compilation in preparation of the forthcoming session. | 1-2.Sep.03 | ExG (Budapest) | - |

**Annex 4**

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**Working Party on Customs Question affecting Transport**

**Ad hoc Expert Group on Conceptual and Technical Aspects of the Computerization of the TIR Procedure**

**(Third session, 1-2 September 2003)**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Chairman: Mr. Jaroslav **ILLE** (Czech Republic)

**CZECH REPUBLIC**

Mr. Jaroslav **ILLE**                         General Directorate of Customs
Tel : +420-2-61 33 21 35          Division of Customs Supervision
Fax : +420-2-61 33 22 20         Head of Transit Department
E-mail: ille@cs.mfcr.cz

Mr. Radovan **ŠMÍDL**                    General Directorate of Customs
Tel : +420-2-61 33 21 17          Division of Customs Supervision
Fax : +420-2-61 33 22 20
E-mail: Smidl@cs.mfcr.cz

**FINLAND**

Mr. Kari **MARJAMÄKI**                 Senior Customs Enforcement Officer
Tel : +358-20-492 2459            National Board of Customs
Fax : +358-20-492 2744
E-mail: kari.marjamaki@tulli.fi

Mr. Markku **LAINE**                        Senior Customs Enforcement Officer
Tel: +358-40-332 4071              National Board of Customs
Fax: +358-20-492 4013
E-mail: markku.laine@tulli.fi

## HUNGARY

Mr. Csaba **TORDA**                     Deputy Customs Director
Tel: +36-1-456 9528                     Customs and Finance Guard
Fax: + 36-1-456 9508
E-mail: torda.csaba@mail.vpop.hu


Mr. István **KÁLMÁN**                   Assistant
Tel: +36-1-456 9528                     Customs and Finance Guard
Fax: + 36-1-456 9508
E-mail: kalman.istvan@mail.vpop.hu


Mr. Tamás **GAIZER**                    Senior Information Technology Consultant
Tel : +36-30-9 325 620                  (ATRH)
Fax : +36-1-9 363 5226
E-mail: gaizer.tamas@regens.hu


## ITALY

Mr. Marco **CIAMPI**                    Italian Customs Agency
Tel: +39-06-5024 5330                   Customs Officer
Fax: +39-06-5095 7307
E-mail: dogane.tributi.supporto@agenziadogane.it


Mr. Antonio **ROMANO**                  Italian Customs Agency
Tel: +39-06-5024 3056                   Project Manager
Fax: +39-06-5095 7032
E-mail: antonio.romano@agenziadogane.it


## NETHERLANDS

Mr. Guus **JACOBS**                     Policy Advisor
Tel: +31-70-342 8123                    Customs Policy and Legislation Directorate
Fax: +31-70-342 7938                    Ministry of Finance
E-mail: a.h.m.jacobs@minfin.nl          Chairman WP. 30


Mr. Bert **TIMMER**                     Director
Tel: +31-70-319 9528                    Service Carnet TIR. B.V. (SCT)
Fax: +31-70-319 9545
E-mail: btimmer@scttir.nl

**POLAND**

Mrs. Ewa **SUSZYŃSKA**                    Head of TIR Department
Tel: +48-22-536 1030                  Association des transporteurs routiers
Fax: +48-22-536 1035                 internationaux (Z.M.P.D.)
E-mail: ewa.suszynska@zmpd.pl

Mrs. Anita **RUSZTECKA**                Specialist in TIR Department
Tel: +48-22-536 1071                 Association des transporteurs routiers
Fax: +48-22-536 1035                 internationaux (Z.M.P.D.)
E-mail: anita.rusztecka@zmpd.pl

**ROMANIA**

Mr. Ion **MATEI**                          Information Technology Manager
Tel: +40-21-224 4137                 Asociatia Romana Pentru Transportati Rutiere
Fax: +40-21-224 3599                 Internationale (ARTRI)
E-mail: matei@artri.ro

Mr. Nicolae **TENDER**                Information Technology Engineer
Tel: +40-21-224 4137                 Asociatia Romana Pentru Transportati Rutiere
Fax: +40-21-224 3599                 Internationale (ARTRI)
E-mail: nicu@artri.ro

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Mr. Mikhail **VALENTSOV**           Information Technology Manager
Tel: +7-095-232 66 27                 Association of International Road Carriers
Fax: +7-095-232 66 28                 (ASMAP)
E-mail: valentsov@asmap.ru

**SLOVAK REPUBLIC**

Ms. Zuzana **MAGDOLENOVAC**      Customs Directorate of the Slovak Republic
Tel : + 421-2-4827 3233              Customs specialist
Fax : + 421-2-4342 1226
E-mail: zmagdolenova@colnasprava.sk

Mr. Valeriy **NETREBA**
Tel: +380-44-201 5460
Fax: +380-44-201 0230
E-mail: well@asmap.org.ua

Head of Information Technology Department
Association of International Road Carriers of
Ukraine (AIRCU)


Mr. Aleksander **OVCHARENKO**
Tel: + 380-44-201 5467
Fax: + 380-44-201 0230
E-mail: ovcharenko@asmap.org.ua

Head of Customs Affairs Department
Association of International Road Carriers of
Ukraine (AIRCU)


## NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS


### INTERNATIONAL ROAD TRANSPORT UNION (IRU)

Mr. Jean **ACRI**
Tel: +41-22-918 2770
Fax: +41-22-918 2739
E-mail: jean.acri@iru.org

Head of TIR system


Mr. Glen **GAGE**
Tel: + 41-22-918 2750
Fax: + 41-22-918 2799
E-mail: glen.gage@iru.org

Information Technology Department


Mr. Raphael **HIRT**
Tel: +41-22-918 2730
Fax: +41-22-918 27 94
E-mail: raphael.hirt@iru.org

Head TIR Carnet Management


\*     \*     \*

## UNECE SECRETARIAT

Mr. Jean **KUBLER**                                  Trade Division
Tel: +41-22-917.27.74                          Economic Affairs Officer
Fax: +41-22-917.00.37
E-mail: jean.kubler@unece.org


Mr. Artur **BOUTEN**                              Customs Expert
Tel: +41-22-917.24.33
Fax: +41-22-917.06.14
E-mail: artur.bouten@unece.org


Mr. Konstantin **GLUKHENKIY**              Customs Expert
Tel: +41-22-917.15.31
Fax: +41-22-917.06.14
E-mail: konstantin.glukhenkiy@unece.org


Mr. André **SCEIA**                                Information Technology Expert
Tel: +41-22-917.13.13
Fax: +41-22-917.06.14
E-mail: andre.sceia@unece.org

_____