



AFACT 2010

Steering Committee Meeting

Draft Minutes

JAPAN

Venue: Miel Parque Yokohama, Yokohama, Japan

November 24, 2010



- Date: November 24, 2010
- Venue: Mielparque Yokohama, Yokohama, Japan
- Chairperson: Mr. Kazumi Hirai
- Attendance

Steering Committee Members

Designation	Name	Country/ Economy	Organization
Chairperson	Mr. K. Hirai	Japan	JASTPRO
Vice Chairperson	Mr. Jyh-Sheng Ke		Institute for Information Industry
Vice Chairperson	Absent		
Elected HoD also AFACT Secretariat	Mr. Mahmood Zargar	Iran	Deputy Ministry for Planning and Economic affairs Ministry of Commerce
Elected HoD	Dr. Nguyen Manh Quyen	Vietnam	Vietnam E-commerce and Information Technology Agency Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT)
AFACT Secretariat	Mr Hemmat Veyci	Iran	Deputy Ministry for Planning and Economic affairs Ministry of Commerce

Other Participants (country wise in alphabetical order):

Please refer to the Appendix – A to this minutes



Meeting Agenda:

1	09:30 – 09:35 “FUJP” Room on 2nd Floor	Inaugural Address Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010 Director JASTPRO Self-introduction by the members attended All the StC members will be asked to make brief self-introduction
2	09: 35 – 09:45	Adoption of the Agenda Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010
3	09:45 – 10:00	Adoption of the 28th Session of StC Midterm meeting held 29th-30th June 2010 in Tokyo Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010
4	10:00 – 10:45	Organizational Matters (Part 1) a) Plan for 29th AFACT Meeting & eASIA Award to be organized by Chinese Taipei in 2011 Dr. Yueh Yi-Yuen, as the Delegate of Chinese Taipei for and on behalf of Chinese Taipei HoD within 10 minutes Note: 1. Dr. Yueh Yi-Yuen Eva will address the revised e-ASIA Award and its implementation. 2. The Secretariat will prepare a draft for the classification on developed economies, developing and transient economies to be applied for candidates, which is subject to ratification by the StC. b) Plan for 30th AFACT Meeting to be organized by Iran in 2012 (within 10 minutes) Dr. Mahmood Zargar, as the Iranian HoD Note: Dr. Zargar will brief his plan within 10 minutes. c) Plan for 31st AFACT Meeting to be organized by Viet Nam in 2013 Note: The Viet Nam HoD will confirm the intent to host the meetings within 5 minutes. Host economies after 2013 Note: The Chairperson will ask the intent to host by other HoDs than above economies.
	10:45 – 11:15	Official Photo Taking + Coffee Break
5	11:15 – 11:35	Organizational Matters (Part 2) d) Revision of AFACT Bylaws Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010 Note: Mr. Hirai will address major points to revise the Bylaws.
6	11:35 – 11:45	e) Election of Elected HoD Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010 Note: As the term of office for current Elected HoD (Iran and Viet Nam) expires, StC need to elect new Elected HoD. f) Recommendation of UN/CEAFCT Rapporteur for Asia to



		<p>UN/CEFACT</p> <p>Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010</p> <p>Note: As UN/CEFACT Rapporteur for Asia is now in vacancy for more than a year, AFACT should recommend the Rapporteur after Mr. Sangwon Lim.</p>
7	11:45 – 11:45	<p>UN/CEFACT Progress Update</p> <p>Mr. Tahseen Khan, Vice Chairperson, UN/CEFACT</p> <p>Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010</p> <p>Note: If Mr. Khan will be able to attend online, he will speak by himself, otherwise Mr. Hirai will address it on his behalf.</p> <p>They will mainly explain about the reform of UN/CEFACT to be adopted by 15th UN/CEFACT Plenary held in December 2010.</p>
8	11:45 – 13:20	<p>AFACT Status Report & Performance review</p> <p>Dr. Mahmood Zargar, AFACT Executive Secretary</p> <p>Note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Executive Secretary will report Asia-Pacific Trade Facilitation Forum (APTFF) 2010 held 5th-6th Oct. in KL, Malaysia to which he attended to propagate AFACT 2. Activities done by the secretariat for the project AFACT as NGO recognized by ECOSOC. The program toward 2011 will also be discussed. 3. The Secretariat will report about the publication of AFACT Yearbook 2010
	13:20 – 14:15	Lunch Break
9	14:15 – 16:00	<p>Strategic Directions and the Way forward (Part I)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Briefing of on the provisional agenda for BDC/CSC/TMC meeting on 25th November by each Convener (5 minutes each) b) Survey of Maturity Level of Trade Facilitation - Dr. Yueh Yi-Yuen, the CSC Convener (10 minutes) c) Survey of the Demand and Supply of Training and Consulting for the Capacity Building - Dr. Yueh Yi-Yuen, the CSC Convener (10 minutes) d) AFACT Single Window - Mr. Mahmood Zargar, Iranian HoD (30 minutes) <p>Note: The mandate, roles and function of BDC/CSC/TMC concerning this project should be reconfirmed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> e) Collaboration with UN/ESCAP and other international organization on Paperless/Single Window (10 minutes) <p>Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010</p> <p>Note: The Chairperson will brief the discussion made by the con calls before the StC meeting</p>
	16:00-16:30	Coffee Break



10	16:30 – 17:30	<p>Strategic Directions and the Way forward (Part II)</p> <p>g) New TFT Note: Finalization of the membership, ToR, and the Program of Works will be discussed.</p> <p>h) Organizing new working group under BDC Moderator: Mr. Eswaran Sankaranarayanan, the Candidate to the BDC Convener</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Presentation of Tourism Group – Mr. Akio Suzuki, the Candidate to the Convener of the Tourism Group Note: Mr. Suzuki will make a proposal to establish a new working group, which has cleared the three country rule under the Bylaws to be revised.● Presentation of e-COO project – Dr. Zargar Iranian HoD Note: Based on the presentation and the document to be submitted by Dr. Zargar, the alignment of this project will be discussed, i.e. to be a new WG or a project directly under BDC or else.● Expression of intent to renew the Financial WG in 2011 Mr. K. Hirai for and on behalf of Mr. Javed Naushahi Pakistan HoD Note: If Javed Naushahi will be able to attend online he will speak by himself about his intent. <p>i) Report on renewal of Transport Group now under planning Note: James Su, ex Chairperson of Transport JWG will brief his plan to reform the working group under the Bylaws to be revised.</p> <p>j) Conclusion on the transition plan of ex JWG Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010 Note: The completion of the restructuring and a way forward will be Discussed.</p>
11	17:30 – 18:25	Review of the 28th Session of AFACT StC minutes
12	18:25-18:30	Closing remarks and housekeeping of 2nd and 3rd day Mr. K. Hirai, Chairperson AFACT StC in 2010



Minutes:

1. Inaugural address

Mr. Kazumi Hirai, Chair of the AFACT StC 2010 welcomed the members to the meeting, and participants introduced themselves.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The provisional agenda was adopted with no comments.

3. Adoption of the 28th Session of StC Midterm meeting held 29th-30th June 2010 in Tokyo

The draft minutes were adopted with no comments.

4. Organizational Matters (Part 1)

4.1 Plan for 29th AFACT Meeting & eASIA Award to be organized by Chinese Taipei in 2011

Dr. Yueh gave a report on the Plan for the 29th AFACT Meeting to be held in Chinese Taipei on 3-4 May 2011 in Kaohsiung Software Technology Park, the largest industrial center in Chinese Taipei and one of the leading harbors in the world. The AFACT Plenary/EDICOM will be held on 11-14 Oct 2011 in Nangang Software Park, Taipei City. During this period, from 11-13 October 2011, the StC/Committee/Plenary AFACT meetings will be held in Nangang Software Park or the ITeS Building.

The 2011 eASIA Award schedule was presented, with steps including finalizing the manual by 31 January 2011, forming the evaluation committee and making the announcement of the awards by 1 March, submission of recommended projects by 20 July 2011, semifinal evaluation by 20 August 2011, announcement of semifinalists by 1 September 2011. The evaluation criteria include innovative application and operations, outstanding performance, and creativity and systematic approach. The sectors include trade facilitation, electronic business in the public sector, comprising government-initiated eIndustry program or G2G, G2B, and G2C programs, electronic business in the private sector, and bridging digital divide.

Korea asked for further explanation of the categories, and also asked whether travel to Kaohsiung required a flight from Taipei. Chinese Taipei pointed out that Kaohsiung has an international airport, but that if a direct flight to Kaohsiung is not available then there is a high-speed rail link from Taipei, and stated that detailed logistical information would be provided for travel to Kaohsiung.

Chinese Taipei then explained that trade facilitation is intended to recognize outstanding performance for simplifying trade procedures. Chinese Taipei explained that for outstanding performance, measurable benefits needed to be supplied to the evaluation committee, or a revolution in simplifying, harmonizing, and automating the procedures, or scalable improvement in reducing documentation and increasing transparency.



For electronic business in the public sector, Chinese Taipei explained that the evaluation criteria would be different from government-initiated e-Industry programs or G2G, G2B, and G2C programs, although some criteria would be the same for both.

For electronic business in the private sector, projects from private companies are eligible, and the evaluation criteria are once again different.

For bridging digital divide, Chinese Taipei explained that projects would be evaluated in terms of increase of popularization of digital applications.

Chinese Taipei explained that there is also the special honorary category for the person, group, organization or governmental unit which makes a major contribution to improving the development of trade facilitation, eBusiness, and international collaboration.

Chinese Taipei noted that in order to improve participation from members who rarely participate, an award for a group of members designated as Group 3 was being considered. Group 3 would include Afghanistan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Mongolia, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and Sri Lanka. For each category there would then be at least two awardees, one from Group 1 and 2, and one from Group 3. Each country would still be able to recommend two projects in each category, but they would be competing with projects from other countries in the same group in order to encourage participation.

Thailand suggested that Group 3 countries could compete with the other groups if different criteria were applied to the countries in different groups. Chinese Taipei said that a handicap points system had also been discussed in the past, but that the StC felt that keeping a separate award for Group 3 would be simpler and cause less conflict during the evaluation process.

Afghanistan suggested that there should be some differentiation in the naming of the two classes of award.

The delegate from Malaysia noted that Australia had been missing from AFACT meetings, and that they should therefore be differentiated in some way. Chinese Taipei explained that when categorizing members two factors were taken into account: level of development, and level of participation in AFACT. On the basis of level of development, Australia belongs in Group 1.

Afghanistan suggested naming Groups 2 and 3 as Emerging Markets and Newly Emerging Markets.

The delegate from Malaysia asked if the StC would decide on applications for new member economies.

Thailand asked if a Group 3 country such as Saudi Arabia had an application or project which they were proud of and felt could compete with the Group 1 and 2 countries, if they would be able to choose to compete at the higher level. It was agreed that countries/economies could choose to compete at the higher level. It was also agreed that there would be only two groups, one combining the Group 1 and 2 countries and tentatively called the eAsia Award Group, and one tentatively called the Newly Emerging Markets Group.



4.2 Plan for 30th AFACT Meeting to be organized by Iran in 2012

Iran presented the plan for AFACT meetings in 2012 in Iran. For the mid-term meetings in May, Iran explained that there were three options. The first, Esfahan, is in central Iran, and the mid-term meeting had been held there in 1998. A second is Shiraz, slightly in the south, about one hour by plane from the capital. The third option is Kish Island, which is a trade free zone and also a popular tourist location, but it may be a little hot during the daytime. The plenary meetings and EDICOM will be held around October in the capital, Tehran.

4.3 Plan for 31st AFACT Meeting to be organized by Viet Nam in 2013

Vietnam stated that approval had been received from the Ministry of Industry and Trade for hosting the meeting in Vietnam in 2013.

4.3 Host economies after 2013

The chair asked other countries to start proactively considering hosting the meetings after 2013.

5 Organizational Matters (Part 2)

5.1 Revision of AFACT Bylaws

The chair explained that the major objectives of the 28th AFACT Annual Meetings were to finalize the pending issues concerning the recommendations by the Roadmap TFT brought forward from the 27th session, such as revision of the Bylaws, restructuring of ex JWG to BDC/CSC/TMC, and to set out a strategic direction to revitalize AFACT.

The chair then explained the changes made to the latest draft of the AFACT Bylaws which had been updated according the latest UN/CEFACT ToR and also to include new details for the organization of Permanent Committees and Working Groups, and to include the assignment of Iran as the permanent secretariat. The chair then opened the floor for comments and questions.

Korea asked if it was true that Saudi Arabia is not an Asian country. Japan explained that Saudi Arabia is not a member of UNESCAP which covers the Asia Pacific region. Korea asked if there was any connection to Saudi Arabia's decision to cancel the hosting of the meeting in the current year. The chair replied that Saudi Arabia had cancelled owing to their organizational problem. Korea suggested that there should be a tool to avoid last minute changes to hosting of meetings. Chinese Taipei suggested changing Article 7.2 to read hosting secretary instead of hosting secretariat. Also, in Article 9.2 Chinese Taipei



noted that to form a WG requires at least three endorsements from different member countries/economies, and that this should be included in the list of items to be submitted.

Thailand asked whether a HoD commits to host the AFACT meetings individually or on behalf of an authority of the country/economy. The Chair stated that adding a clause requiring a commitment by an authority could make the organization of the StC rather inflexible, and suggested instead evaluating the stability of the country/economy by the StC.

Chinese Taipei suggested adding a statement to Article 7.2 stating that hosting member's focal point should obtain permission in writing from a specific authority to assure the commitment of hosting.

Korea stated that the committees in Article 9 should not be referred to as permanent committees because this would make the structure inflexible. The chair stated that he had used the wording of permanent committees to distinguish these committees from other committees formed in the future, and also noted that Article 9.3 highlighted that the permanent committees are subject to the requirement to termination if it is inactive for three years. Dr. Ke suggested to change the wording "permanent committee" to "executive committee." This was agreed.

The delegate from Malaysia stated that in Article 8, the term UN/CEFACT Rapporteur for Asia was used, and asked whether in light of the conversation on geography of the AFACT, this title was correct. Japan explained that there were six rapporteurs covering different regions, and that the title was decided by UN/CEFACT. It was suggested that a recommendation could be made to UN/CEFACT to change the title to UN/CEFACT Rapporteur for AFACT in next year.

6. Election of Elected HoD for StC

The chair asked Mr. Ji of Korea to consider being the Elected HoD to the StC for 2011-2012. It was noted that the term of appointment is for two years, but that Vietnam would be vice chair from 2012 as they would host the AFACT meetings in 2013. It was suggested that a replacement HoD could be elected the following year when Vietnam was required to step down when they become vice chair. The chair explained that there were three nominations for Elected HoD: Vietnam, Korea, and Pakistan. It was suggested that Singapore could also be considered for the role. Singapore stated that they would discuss internally after the meeting and report back on whether they could be more active. Chinese Taipei suggested that the Elected HoD should be decided within the current meeting so that it could be ratified by the plenary. It was suggested that Vietnam and Korea be elected HoDs, and this was unanimously agreed.



Recommendation of UN/CEFACT Rapporteur for Asia to UN/CEFACT

The HoD of Thailand submitted his intent to be Rapporteur for Asia, but there has been no consultation yet with UN/CEFACT on this issue. The chair noted that the StC could make a recommendation, but the UN/CEFACT would not appoint the Rapporteur for Asia according to the recommendation by AFACT, and therefore it is normal to consult with UN/CEFACT in advance of making a recommendation. Thailand stated that he felt it was important that AFACT did not miss out on the right to propose the Rapporteur for Asia. The AFACT Secretariat reported that three calls for recommendations had been issued, but that the only complete candidate application had come from Mr. Ajin from Thailand. The chair pointed out that the Rapporteur for Asia would be required to attend many UN/CEFACT meetings during the year. Korea asked for more details of the required qualifications for the UN/CEFACT Rapporteur for Asia role. The AFACT Secretariat presented the process leading up to the current meeting, noting that three calls for candidates had been made, but that Mr. Ajin had been the only valid candidate proposed for the role. The delegate from Malaysia suggested delaying the decision on this item. The chair suggested asking the plenary meeting to delegate the final decision on this issue to the StC.

7. UN/CEFACT Progress Update

Skipped to be discussed at the plenary meeting.

8. AFACT Status Report & Performance review

The AFACT Secretariat gave an update of the status of the AFACT membership, structure, StC Members, committee chairs, and hosting members. It was noted that Mr. Eswaran is not yet ratified as the chair of the BDC. The AFACT Secretariat then gave an overview of AFACT activities, including conference calls carried out between meetings, applications for registration of AFACT, preparation of the AFACT 2010 Year Book, creation and printing of an AFACT brochure, attending the 17th UN/CEFACT Forum, attending the Asia-Pacific Trade Facilitation Forum 2010, and design and update of the AFACT website.

For the registration with ECOSOC, it was noted that a copy of the most recent financial statement and annual report was required. It is also necessary that the organization cannot be governmental, but can be supported by the government. Members were requested to prepare documents showing that they are non-governmental, but they can be supported by governments. The AFACT Secretariat proposed that they would negotiate with ECOSOC to obtain a template to be distributed to members for them to complete.

At the 17th UN/CEFACT Forum, AFACT attended TBG15 International Trade Procedures, and the chair of TBG15 was asked for cooperation on Single Window Interoperability.



The AFACT Secretariat also reported that at the Asia-Pacific Trade Facilitation Forum 2010, held 5-6 October in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, AFACT had sought collaboration with ADB and UNESCAP for supporting AFACT. AFACT also had a booth at which AFACT brochures and information were shared to promote the brand of AFACT. On 7-8 October there was a workshop organized by WCO on data model, which was very useful for the eCOO project.

The TMC chair reported on the UNNExT meeting held at the same time as the Asia-Pacific Trade Facilitation Forum 2010.

9. Strategic Directions and the Way forward (Part I)

9.1 Briefing of on the provisional agenda for BDC/CSC/TMC meeting on 25th November by each Convener

Mr. Eswaran reported that the BDC would hold a meeting on the following day, and that there were three WGs that had put forward expression of intent, namely travel and tourism, eCOO, and financial WG. The chair explained that there would also be an ad-hoc meeting with UNESCAP on the afternoon of the following day.

The agenda for the CSC meeting and TMC meetings on the following day were then introduced by the CSC chair Taipei and the TMC chair respectively.

9.2 Survey of Maturity Level of Trade Facilitation - Dr. Yueh Yi-Yuen, the CSC Convener (10 minutes)

The chair noted that there are very few members who have exact knowledge about the state of implementation of SW in each member economy, and the lack of common understanding between members eventually prevents AFACT from envisaging its strategy, and therefore the most important issue is to learn about the state of implementation and the issues faced by each economy.

The CSC chair explained that in APEC there had already been a project conducted between Japan and Chinese Taipei because they already have a form to find the status level of implementation of single-window in APEC. The WCO has asked to use the APEC form to carry out a global survey on the status of implementation and operating of national single window, and the CSC chair suggested using the results from APEC and also waiting for the survey by the WCO to be carried out in the early part of the following year. The CSC chair explained that SW comprised paperless trading, cross border, and collaboration and interoperability. She added that many research projects had already been carried out, and AFACT needs to consider what it can do to complement this existing work. The original purpose of the project was to carry out research for the BDC single window project, and the CSC chair therefore



asked whether the purpose of the BDC single window project would be to work on technical interoperability, business process integration, or legal interoperability, as this would affect the direction of the survey. The CSC chair noted that the scope of trade facilitation is too broad to be efficiently evaluated. It was proposed that the survey may be entitled "survey on the practice of single window mechanism carried out in a port", with the aim of finding out best practices on single window in smart ports and to benchmark, as well as developing business opportunities for various types of service vendors.

Thailand asked if WCO would develop only the data format, or whether there would be also implementation guidelines. The CSC Chair stated that there was a plan in the WCO to develop implementation guidelines, but that so far she had not seen any implementation guideline. The CSC Chair stated that TBG15 was calling for participation in a project to study implementation guidelines. Vietnam stated that a few economies had implemented SW or national SW successfully, but that he wished to know more about the results of SW. Vietnam stated that the legal interoperability was perhaps more important than technical interoperability, because this would be the biggest challenge for cross-border systems. He suggested that initial attempts at collaboration should be carried out by small groups rather than a large group. The CSC Chair replied that this could be discussed by BDC, but that the survey needed to know the BDC plan to create the survey to find out appropriate information for the BDC project. Singapore asked how they could participate in TBG15. The CSC Chair stated that this was openly published on the website.

Thailand suggested that CSC could create a knowledge base for sharing by members. Japan noted that recommendation was the bible for implementation of SW, and that when Japan first launched SW three systems were integrated. The second generation system launched in 2008 was more integrated, based on various B2G systems connected to each other. He therefore stated that there could not be a single plan for implementation but that it would depend upon the current status of the country.

The AFACT Secretariat stated that there were two aspects to be considered, one is national SW in each country, and also the SW for cross-border and exchange of documents between countries. He noted that some aspects of exchange between countries required special guidelines for each country. Chinese Taipei suggested sharing the experience on different SW implementations between countries. Japan stated that SW should cover all B2G procedures, including customs clearance, port clearance, and inspection and quarantine, and should not be limited in its scope.

9.3 Survey of the Demand and Supply of Training and Consulting for the Capacity Building - Dr. Yueh Yi-Yuen, the CSC Convener



The CSC Chair presented the results of the status survey of demand and supply of training and consulting for capacity building, carried out from 2 July to 10 August 2010. Unfortunately there were very few responses to the survey, from Thailand and Mongolia for resources needed, and from Chinese Taipei and Iran for resources provided.

Resources provided to AFACT members for capacity building can be from experts from AFACT members, UN/CEFACT, WCO, or UNNExT. In particular, UNNExT has tools, guidelines, and training materials and programs, as well as training-of-trainers programs. However, the survey highlighted funding issues for training programs as experts require compensation for time spent for training. It was therefore suggested that training could be provided online, but that assistance would be required from the AFACT Secretariat to set up online training.

Vietnam explained that they had benefited from a visit by Dr. Zargar, and noted that they also agreed with the proposal for e-learning, but asked about the procedure for contributing to the e-learning and who would be the key person or group responsible for building the content for e-learning. The CSC Chair explained that the website would be the permanent AFACT website provided by the Secretariat, and all experts were encouraged to provide materials for the site, in order to promote their organizations and create business opportunities for the future. The CSC Chair also explained that CSC would support the AFACT Secretariat in editing and aggregating content for the training website. Thailand asked if statistical data would be collected on usage of the training programs by different member countries. The CSC Chair replied that it was still to be discussed whether the training programs would be open to all visitors to the AFACT website or only members. The AFACT Secretariat explained that there was already an effort to include links to all sites with training materials such as UNNExT and UN/CEFACT.

9.4 AFACT Single Window

Dr. Zargar, HoD of Iran, suggested that there should be several subprojects for SW, to be selected by joint meetings of BDC/CSC/TMC. One of these subprojects would be eCOO. For eCOO he suggested that BDC would need to select the document for the first border transaction, as there are many different COOs in use. TMC will provide technical support for data modeling, data flow, procedures, and process and policy of e-Authentication and Security. Meanwhile CSC will carry out training and capacity building programs for eCOO as well as the survey for maturity levels.

Dr. Zargar noted that a representative of Dagang Net in Malaysia was responsible for SW in TBG15 and therefore Mr. Eswaran was asked to obtain information on the status of this project.



The TMC Chair noted that TMC would never originate data models and data flows as they are originated by business, but that technical support could be provided once these have been created.

Korea asked for more information on the eCOO project. It was stated that further explanation of the project would be given on the following day.

The CSC Chair noted that eCOO could be used as a initial project to test for interoperability, but that the scope of these eCOO trials would be small.

The chair suggested that in the sessions on the following day there needed to be some milestones set, based on setting an initial direction.

Chinese Taipei suggested that the name of the project should change back to its original name of Paperless Trade and Single Window Interoperability (PTSWI), as there are wider issues to be addressed.

9.5 Collaboration with UN/ESCAP and other international organization on Paperless/Single Window

The chair skipped this agenda item as it was discussed in the preceding session.

10. Strategic Directions and the Way forward (Part II)

10.1 New TFT

The basic idea of organizing Task Force Teams (TFT) is to invite experts, as the membership of the StC is somewhat fixed. Chinese Taipei suggested that the convener of the TFT should be proposed by the chair of the by AFACT, rather than being the chair. Chinese Taipei proposed that a TFT should only support the AFACT Secretariat in a very specific subject, such as a preliminary study to define the scope for the AFACT project on Single Window. Chinese Taipei proposed Dr. Quyen HoD of Vietnam to lead the TFT, and also suggested that if members of the TFT do not participate in the TFT meetings for three consecutive meetings that their name would be deleted from the TFT list of members. Dr. Zargar and the Chair supported Chinese Taipei's proposals.

10.2 Organizing new working groups under BDC

Mr. Akio Suzuki explained the proposal to form a Travel, Tourism and Leisure WG under the BDC, with the participation of Japan, Korea and Chinese Taipei. He welcomed participants who wished to work with the group to join their meeting on the following day.



10.3 Report on renewal of Transport Working Group now under planning

Chinese Taipei explained that members would be consulted by e-mail and a proposal would be made the following year for the Transport Working Group.

10.4 Conclusion on the transition plan of ex JWGs

The chair noted that the purpose of the reorganization of the JWGs was not to eliminate them but to reactivate their activities. The AFACT Secretariat gave a report on the transition of ex JWGs, noting that new WGs need to prepare ToR and a work plan for the next three years.

The TMC Chair asked what the role of the permanent/executive committee would be once the working groups were created. Chinese Taipei replied that the responsibility of the chairman of the executive committee is to facilitate and supervise the working groups under the committee. The TMC Chair noted that the proposals for WGs were made directly to the plenary and also reported directly to the plenary, so it was not clear what the role of the chairman of the executive committee would be. It was suggested that it should be the role of the executive committee chair to evaluate to ratify the creation of related WGs.

11. Review of the 28th Session of AFACT StC minutes

The minutes of the meeting were reviewed by members

12. Closing remarks and housekeeping of 2nd and 3rd day

The chair outlined the activities for the following day, and closed the meeting at 18:40.
