



**POSTAL OPERATIONS COUNCIL**

**Committee 1 (Supply Chain Integration)**

**Issues relating to electronic advance data (EAD)**

**Report of EAD roadmap steering committee**

**Report by the Chair**  
(Agenda item 6b)

<b>1 Subject</b>	<b>References/paragraphs</b>
Recast of the EAD roadmap implementation plan, update on progress made so far, and suggestions for tasks and activities on which to focus during the interim period between POC sessions S2 and S3.	§§ 1 to 9
<b>2 Decision expected</b>  Approve the recast of the EAD roadmap implementation plan.	Annex 1

**I. Introduction**

1 At its February 2016 session, the POC approved the first draft of the roadmap for electronic advance data (EAD). The details of this document are given in POC 2016.1–Doc 10m. Subsequently, the newly constituted POC following the Istanbul Congress endorsed the continuation of the EAD roadmap steering committee to ensure that the future work of the POC groups would benefit from high-level, transversal coordination, and decided to take action on recasting the EAD implementation plan (POC 2016.2–Doc 5.Add 3).

2 At its March 2017 session, the POC agreed to the EAD roadmap steering committee's recommendation to advance the implementation of the Global Postal Model during this cycle. Tasks included recasting the original roadmap deliverables into new categories in order to facilitate the monitoring of the work and the development of transversal action plans and to clearly demarcate the way in which EAD elements might be coordinated through an expanded transversal monitoring function. The POC also agreed to the expansion of the roadmap steering committee (RSC) so that it would be better able to transversally monitor interlinked EAD projects and coordinate EAD work deliverables.

3 The EAD roadmap steering committee comprises the following members: EAD RSC Chair (United States of America as C 1 Co-Chair), the Chairs of the CG (France), TG (Russian Federation), SB (Italy), PSG (United States), a representative from the PSDEIG, and a representative from the International Bureau (IB) secretariat working with CA C 5 (Cooperation and Development) or from the DCDEV. The EAD RSC observers are: Japan (representing the POC Chair), Canada (CG Vice-Chair) and India (as C 1 Co-Chair).

## II. Recast of the EAD roadmap implementation plan

4 In its report to POC S1 session (POC C 1 2017.1–Doc 7b) the EAD roadmap steering committee presented a thorough analysis of the implementation of the EAD roadmap and suggested the recasting of the EAD implementation plan into the following four categories:

- Category 1 – Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements
- Category 2 – Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the requirements
- Category 3 – Raising members' awareness of the need to meet the requirements and building their capacity to do so
- Category 4 – Integration of commercial and product opportunities with the expanded capabilities of designated operators that are implementing Global Postal Model protocols and requirements

5 Following the POC S1 session, the EAD RSC met physically at the IB on 26 June, and subsequently through WebEx sessions, to review the implementation of the EAD roadmap and to recast the implementation plan. During the exercise, as well as examining the original roadmap deliverables, the committee took into consideration the POC deliverables and the work plan of each of the relevant standing groups.

6 The proposed EAD roadmap implementation plan is a living document that endeavours, as far as possible, to give a clear-cut indication of who does what, with timelines. The whole idea is to develop a strategy to provide UPU members and stakeholders with a definitive implementation plan, i.e. to find a way to implement the EAD – Global Postal Model with the flexibility to add new items.

## III. Achievements so far

7 As can be seen from the implementation plan, the following actions have been undertaken since the last POC:

- ITMATT V1 M33-11 expected to achieve status 2 during this session.
- Work is under way to get CUSITM to Status 1 next year.
- Work is under way to get CUSRSP to Status 1 in early 2019.
- Work proposal P58 for flow 4 has been examined by the Standards Board and is now being examined by the CG.
- The laboratory test with IATA for the conversion of flow 7 to flow 8 was successful, and work is now under way to start field testing with the participation of Posts and airlines.
- Elements of EAD have been built into the ORE project and project workshops have already started.
- WCO–UPU regional workshops with Customs held in Sydney for the Asia-Pacific region attracted many participants; more such workshops are proposed.
- There has been active engagement with key stakeholders, namely the WCO, IATA, ICAO, the EU and others.

8 Many of the elements needed to progress the Global Postal Model have been worked on, but the requirements of others need further clarification. Consequently, in the interim between POC S2 and POC S3 it is recommended that the following 2017–2018 activities be given priority:

- The CG and the IB to seek formal clarification on unresolved questions associated with EAD requirements (and timelines) from the European Commission, the WCO and other national or international regulatory authorities involved in shaping them.
- The CG to work with Committee 2 PSDEIG on resolving definitional questions concerned with determining when certain content in a UPU product means that it needs to be categorized as a "Goods" item requiring a customs declaration barcode and EAD.

- The CG/PSG to progress the work associated with flow 3 to clarify referral requirements and protocols, (what Customs is willing to provide, timing protocols, principles concerning referrals, referral thresholds of urgency, etc.) so as to guide the CG/PSG work on flow 4. (CG to provide flow 3 messaging requirements for SB to consider in any response messages.)
- The CG and the PSG to work on conceptual proposals for roles, requirements, procedures, communications, and responsibilities expected from the parties concerned in the origin country in response to DNL and other urgent referral messages received in a flow 4 response message. (Provide requirements for the SB to consider in any response messages.)
- IATA–UPU to continue to develop strategies to promote the wider adoption of CARDIT 2.1 as well as the airlines' provision of RESDIT response messages.
- The TG to continue the EAD TF work on flow 7 conversions of CARDIT information into the format needed for airlines' manifesting requirements, and also to resolve business issues concerning roles and responsibilities.
- The TG to research the requirements needed for the e-CSD and determine how (or if) they might affect the Global Postal Model. If so, develop requirements for the SB to consider in its work on messaging standards.
- The expanded EAD RSC to continue to coordinate with DCDEV on requirements for the second phase of the ORE outreach programme to help UPU members build their technical capability to capture and exchange EAD.

9 In view of the above, it is recommended that the POC take note of the progress made so far and approve the proposed recast of the EAD roadmap implementation plan with its updated work elements.

Berne, 7 September 2017

Peter Chandler  
Chair EAD roadmap steering committee

## Recast EAD roadmap implementation plan



<i>Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1	POC Customs Group	EAD RSC, CG, SB, IB and PTC		
a	Continue to follow/examine global regulatory measures concerning EAD requirements that might affect the flow of mail across the single global postal territory	CG	<p>Participate in the relevant meetings</p> <p>Monitoring of legislative/regulatory developments occurring at national/regional levels with potential impact to the scope and nature of EAD requirements or to timing of when they might come into effect</p> <p>(For example, the EC's current view on phased-in compliance with the UCC needs clarification and updating. (CG may also wish to consider whether the proposed amendments to EC Directives 2006/112/EC and Directive 2009/132/EC might have potential implications as to when EAD provision might be needed – as EAD may serve fiscal purposes)</p> <p>CG should also monitor other, similar regions or countries (for example, United States, China, Russian Federation, possibly Canada, Brazil and others) for developments affecting the UPU Global Postal Model solution for EAD requirements</p>	Ongoing
b	Develop regulations that identify mail items for which EAD is to be provided	CG, EAD RSC, IB	This is a continuing process. Questions being raised by C 2 PSDEIG to clarify which contents would qualify an item (or class of UPU products) as requiring EAD as a "Goods" category item	CG to coordinate with PSDEIG on questions needing clarification

*Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1 (cont.)	c Develop additional implementing provisions for providing EAD if necessary	CG, EAD RSC, IB	This is a continuing process. Inputs on timing rules to be determined	Ongoing
	d Identify required operational protocols and sort out ambiguous areas especially as to impact on acceptance to land in country of destination.	CG, TG, IB, PSG, JP, and the relevant CCs	<p>Work out the requirements for the following (operational protocols listed below) and prepare and send a questionnaire to all relevant parties, if necessary, to address unresolved operational questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Referral messages or lack thereof/time frame for referrals</li> <li>– Required operations in the DO/country of origin regarding referrals</li> <li>– Required communications from origin Post to destination Customs (probably through destination Post) as a response to referrals, if necessary, and subsequent confirmation of "assessment completed" by destination Customs</li> <li>– What happens if postal items arrive without EAD?</li> </ul> <p>Pre-landing information to be provided to the border agencies/Customs (this would depend on the results of the study by the task force on EAD flows – or the results of IATA–UPU workshop)</p>	Questions being worked on
	e Set KPIs for EAD and report results against these KPIs	CG/IB	Report periodically to the POC. KPIs to be reviewed after the results of the EAD readiness questionnaire sent out have been compiled. Perhaps KPIs can be boosted, mindful of the desired goal of readying UPU members for EAD requirements by 2020	Pending review of data from questionnaire

<i>Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1 (cont.)	f Ensure the development of standards in order to complete the global Postal Model data flows	CG/SB/IB/ EAD RSC	Provide Standards Board with input from CG on elements of these data flows from the operational point of view  Development of business requirements (including timing) for flows 3 and 4 once clarification has been obtained on unresolved operational questions (see 1f above, 2c below)	SB has requested clarification regarding these flows, e.g. "business requirement", and has drafted a timetable for development – (until such time as they receive information on requirements)
	g Develop multilateral Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) that clarifies provisions relating to data privacy, keeping generally accepted and available privacy principles in mind	CG/IB/	This will secure the EDI exchanges from the data protection point of view  Creation of an expert group within the Customs Group to propose a way forward (see report of CG meeting on 28 June 2017)	E-mail discussions have commenced
	h Oversee the development of a monitoring tool that will show which DOs send and receive ITMATT and for which postal products	IB/PTC/CG	Review the results of development by PTC	Ongoing – pending review
	i Oversee the implementation of interface between CDS and ASYCUDA	PTC/IB/CG (WCO)	Review the results of development by PTC  CG to work with WCO on raising awareness of this interface	Ongoing
2	WCO–UPU Contact Committee	EAD RSC, CG, WCO–UPU CC, PSG, SB, PTC and IB		
	a Send out a joint questionnaire to UPU DOs and to customs administrations and examine results of the questionnaire		The questionnaire is to be periodically updated to see who is where on the data exchange map. Use findings to re-adjust and update originally developed KPIs on DOs' provision of EAD	The joint questionnaire has already been sent out and the results are being examined with a view to being incorporated in CG KPIs

*Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
2 (cont.)	b Develop guidelines on setting up an interface between Customs and Posts	CG/IB and WCO–UPU	Draft completed by CG working team; draft shared with secretariats of both UPU and WCO	Work is ongoing (see remarks)
	c Confirmation of core principles of data exchange and of stakeholder roles and responsibilities through participation in WCO meetings and forums	CG/TG WCO–UPU CC	Roles and responsibilities of airlines, ground handlers, Posts and customs/border agencies in each of the Global Postal Model activities	Associated with Category 1, task 1d and other areas
	d Establish interface between postal and customs systems – Work out common standards and update if and when required – Posts and Customs Committee at national, regional and operational levels	WCO–UPU CC	– WCO–UPU CC to work with SB on standards; – WCO–UPU CC to work with WCO secretariat and IB to encourage the national Customs and the DOs to establish CC	Ongoing
	e Ensure that EAD Global Postal Model is referenced in the WCO SAFE framework of standards	CG/IB	CG with inputs from PSG to continue to work on the item in conjunction with WCO–UPU CC	
	f Joint Posts-Customs workshops	CG, IB, WCO, DCDEV, Reg. Coordinators	WCO–UPU CC and under the UPU ORE project 2017: workshop planned for Arab region under ORE project 2018: workshop for the Caribbean/Americas region planned	Successful WCO–UPU ORE workshop organized in Australia in May
	g Participate in WCO meeting and forums	CG, IB, DOP	Ongoing	IB to develop list of upcoming forums/opportunities for UPU with WCO
	h Update WCO–UPU Customs Guide	CG, IB WCO	To be finalized by the end of 2017	

*Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
3	POC Transport Group	EAD RSC, TG, ICAO-UPU CC, PSG and IB		
	a Clarify the EAD requirements for airmail	TG, IB, WCO, IATA, ICAO	<p>Focus here would be on when data has to be provided to airlines (flow 7) in order for them to meet their PLACI requirements</p> <p>As regards any pre-landing information – a dialogue could take place with airlines on whether post-loading EAD was acceptable; however, the UPU has already been alerted of impending border security requirements that are PLACI in nature, not pre-landing</p>	Ongoing
	b Follow up the work relating to the Global Postal Model to ensure that operational input is given for the development of standards	TG, IB, EAD RSC	This will be essential for the different scenarios for converting CARDIT 2.1 information into the types of messages that airlines' electronic manifesting systems can provide	Task force set up for the purpose by POC in December 2016 is submitting its report to POC S2. The laboratory testing of the proposed EDI flow has been successful and now work is under way to live test with the active participation of Posts and airlines
	c Investigate/research possible requirements need for e-CSD.	TG, PSG, SB	<p>If requirements are deemed to be applicable – develop business and operational requirements for SB to consider in modification of existing messaging standards</p> <p>Clarify roles in provision of e-CSD and possible impacts on EAD messaging flows</p>	Still in discussion in Transport Group. It needs to be determined whether these requirements mean that CARDIT 2.1 messages will need to be adjusted



*Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
4	IATA–UPU Contact Committee	EAD RSC, TG, IATA–UPU CC, SB, PTC and IB		
	a Work out the modalities for the exchange of EDI messages between Posts and airlines to ensure that EAD requirements are met	EAD–TF, TG, SB, CG, IB, PTC, IATA–UPU	The EAD flows task force has been working on this matter and will be reporting to Committee 1 (S2) session. Findings of work, and handover of testing scenarios to TG oversight, and SB work. Still need confirmation on the exact information to be provided in Code List 108 as supplementary information accompanying IMPC code. (An IATA–UPU Workshop planned to flesh out these details, and also the mapping of alternative scenarios	Report to Committee 1 (S 2)
	b Continue to work with IATA to update the security requirements for the air carriage of mail	TG and PSG	Transversal coordination needed between TG work with IATA and PSG work with ICAO	
	c Ensure the updating of the EDI brochure – <i>"Providing end-to-end airmail visibility with IATA and IPC"</i>	IPC, IATA–UPU	Potentially a good training aid for the ORE projects	Discussions held within IATA–UPU CC on this point and agreement reached on format and updated information required in the brochure
5	POC Postal Security Group	EAD RSC, PSG and IB		
	a Keep updated on the security-related regulatory requirements for EAD	EAD RSC, PSG and IB		
	b Liaison with civil aviation authorities, border authorities and other regulatory bodies and authorities to maintain an open dialogue on EAD issues	PSG, CG, TG and IB	Work through their Contact Committees and joint workshops with their respective international organizations CG with WCO; TG with IATA; and PSG with ICAO	

*Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
5 (cont.)			In some cases, however, these UPU groups have to work in tandem or with transversal coordination in their liaisons with these different categories of "regulatory border authorities"	
	c Researching best practices on security of global postal IT network		Of interest going forward, however this has to keep within the mandated instructions of Congress resolution C 17/2016	
	d Assist in developing response and operational protocols (and roles/responsibilities) from parties concerned in the origin country in the event that DNL is received via EAD Flow 4	PSG and CG (and possibly TG)	This can also be considered for other "referral" messages developed via Flow 3 and Flow 4. However, operational and communication procedures need to be developed at least for DNL incident	Discussed at standing group meetings in December 2017 Still at concept stage
6	ICAO–UPU Contact Committee	EAD RSC, ICAO–UPU CC and IB		
	a Continue to work with ICAO to update the security requirements for the air carriage of mail where EAD is required		In the process of setting up the ICAO–UPU CC	IB working with ICAO to arrange the first meeting
7	Standards Board	EAD RSC, SB, CG, TG, PSG, PTC and IB		
	a Proactively engage in the development of standards relating to EAD and accord it high priority	SB	An example of this is Standards Board proposing the adoption of ITMATT v1 at Status 2 at the S2 session of the POC	Plans have been developed for advancement of other EAD-related standards and a rough timeline provided, however, it is contingent on timely provision of business requirements from CG, TG, and possibly PSG

<i>Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
8	POC bodies other than those reporting to POC C1	EAD RSC, PSDEIG, QSG and IB		
	a Proactively engage with the work of C 2 Physical Services Group on developments involving preparations for the provision of EAD to ensure that future UPU products can meet their EAD requirements, to the level they have been mandated to achieve		It is important that UPU products meet EAD regulatory requirements. Definitions are needed to better determine if the content in a UPU product requires it be categorized as an item requiring a barcode and EAD. (For example, some contents might be deemed "merchandise" rather than "non-dutiable document" or "printed matter" and may no longer be eligible for inclusion in UPU product categories not requiring barcodes, customs declarations and EAD. WCO clarification on these kinds of definitions is needed	Ongoing
	b Measure independently the quality of service provided by designated operators with regard to physical postal items, and generate information systems that help improve the interoperability of the network infrastructure – end-to-end performance reports for all products by UPU member countries	QSG, CG, IB	There are many potential benefits of EAD implementation, such as enabling faster customs clearance	Still to be developed
9	POC and EAD RSC			
	a EAD RSC Chair to report to CA through POC Chair on important issues concerning EAD where the engagement of the Council of Administration (CA) is required	EAD RSC, POC MC	EAD RSC will need to coordinate with POC MC on reporting function to CA (when this is needed), and on how developing events might be affecting issues of importance to CA	To date, most reports have been to POC MC, POC Committee 1 and standing groups from Committee 1 and Committee 2

*Category 1: Outreach activities to identify the exact nature of the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
9 (cont.)	b EAD RSC Chair thorough CG, TG, PSG to engage with DCDEV on capacity-building activities	EAD RSC, CG, TG, PSG, DCDEV	Active involvement with the ORE project is required	ORE project has required input on EAD. To date, there has been some participation in joint UPU–WCO ORE workshops
	c Establish review and monitoring mechanism for coordinating the individual POC groups' components of EAD roadmap goals in order to ensure efficient transversal coordination	EAD RSC, IB	<p>Many EAD roadmap tasks are dependent on completion of earlier tasks – requires coordination and monitoring</p> <p>EAD RSC with IB to develop a monitoring mechanism for these ongoing tasks – such as results and cumulative achievements in terms of KPI, deliverable dates, etc. – then monitor/adjust accordingly.</p> <p>This "transversal monitoring" of these interrelated tasks will allow EAD roadmap stakeholders to continue to prioritize and fine-tune their tasks and work plans accordingly</p> <p>Report to POC (as needed); Report to C 1 (each POC session)</p>	<p>IB updating an MS project</p> <p>However, this is still at the development stage as it needed a recast work plan broken down into individual work categories and groups' workplans, tasks, deliverables and time lines</p> <p>This is being presented at S2</p>

*Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1	Flow-related tasks required	EAD RSC, CG, WCO-UPU CC, SB, TG, IATA-UPU CC, PTC and IB		
	a Flow "0" – Capture of ITMATT data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Collection and dissemination of best practices for capture of ITMATT data</li> <li>– Explore the development of newer methods of ITMATT data capture</li> </ul>	CG, PTC, IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Use of CDS kiosk</li> <li>– Use of Application Programming Interface (API) for capture of data, especially from e-commerce customers</li> <li>– Use of mobile application.</li> <li>– Documentation of data capture best practices (usually occurring around the acceptance/EMA event). Data capture can also occur at EMB (intermediate depot) or at outward office of exchange (EMC)</li> </ul>	CG has been conducting a study on best practices in data capture. Presentation given at CG meeting in June 2017
	b Flow "1" – origin Post to destination Post <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– ITMATT V1 M33-11 to status 2</li> <li>– Work out operational procedures to ensure that ITMATT data is sent to the destination DO at the earliest opportunity</li> </ul>	CG, SB, PTC, IB EAD RSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Status 2 likely by POC S2</li> <li>– Encourage the capture and transmission of ITMATT data with EMSEVT A</li> </ul>	ITMATT v1 has been undergoing testing for a while now. It has been exchanged successfully at "production level" with a number of DOs. As per SB procedures, meeting the above-mentioned criteria indicates it is a stable message and eligible for Status 2 (To be decided at POC S2 session)

*Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1 (cont.)	<p>c Flow "2" – destination Post to destination Customs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– CUSITM (M43) to status 2</li> <li>– Work out operational procedures</li> </ul>	<p>CG, SB, PTC UPU–WCO CC</p>	<p>M43 is currently at status 0</p> <p>Expectations:</p> <p>M43 status 0 → status 1: Q2 2018 M43 status 1 → status 2: S5 2019</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Approved by WCO in April 2017</li> <li>– Awaiting feedback on technical implementation (PTC)</li> <li>– CG to encourage implementation among DOs</li> <li>– CG to follow up with SB</li> </ul>	Ongoing
	<p>d Flow "3" – destination Customs to destination Post</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Work out the requirements for referral codes in consultation with WCO</li> <li>– Work out the operational procedures</li> <li>– CUSRSP (M44) to status 2</li> </ul>	<p>CG, SB, PSG  EAD RSC  PTC, UPU–WCO CC</p>	<p>M44 is currently at status 0</p> <p>Expectations:</p> <p>M44 status 0 → status 1: Q1 2019 M43 status 1 → status 2: ?</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Updated by SB 2016.3 – Approved by WCO in April 2017</li> <li>– Awaiting feedback on technical implementation (PTC)</li> <li>– CG to work with PSG on referrals and the corresponding operational requirements</li> <li>– CG to encourage implementation among DOs</li> </ul>	Ongoing

*Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1 (cont.)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CG to provide business requirements to SB: draft paper to be drafted by the Customs group and discussed at the next WCO-UPU contact committee in November 2017, especially to clarify some of the operational ambiguities (see 1d above)</li> <li>- CG to follow up with SB</li> </ul>	
	<p>e Flow "4" – destination Post to origin Post</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work out the business requirements with CG (P 58)</li> <li>- Once requirements (and timing rules) have been clarified, SB needs to work on the standard and testing plans needed to advance the standard to Status 2. SB to coordinate with EAD RSC and other groups to promote pilot tests</li> </ul>	<p>CG, SB, PSG PTC</p> <p>EAD RSC, UPU-WCO CC</p>	<p>New EDI message to be developed (P58)</p> <p>Expectations:</p> <p>Requirements from Customs Group on the information that is to be carried in the message, as originally stated in the document requesting the P work item (POC C 1 SB 2015.2-Doc 5b)</p> <p>Remark:</p> <p>Current thinking is that this could be a subset of the CUSRSP message standards, once consensus on referral code requirements as mentioned in flow 3 above has been reached. Timing protocols must also be addressed</p>	<p>Ongoing – concepts were reviewed by EAD flows task force – still need requirements from CG</p>

*Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1 (cont.)	<p>f Flow "5" – origin Post to destination Post</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Work out the business requirements with CG, TG and PSG – start a new work item (if required)</li> <li>– Once requirements (and timing rules) have been clarified, SB needs to work on the standard and testing plans needed to advance the standard to Status 2. SB to coordinate with EAD RSC and other groups to promote pilot tests</li> </ul>	PSG, CG, SB, PTC, UPU–WCO CC	<p>Concept and needs to be defined/refined</p> <p>Expectations:</p> <p>Business requirements from CG and TG for Q3 2018</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Business requirements to be defined by Customs and Transport Groups</li> <li>– Make a request to POC to open a P work item (if required)</li> <li>– SB supports and assists with eliciting requirements and filling out the template</li> </ul> <p>Remark:</p> <p>The three categories of referrals under consideration, namely RFI, RFS and DNL, would require an associated response protocol from origin DO via destination DO to destination border agency/Customs</p> <p>Current thinking is to explore possibilities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– modifying PREDES to insert a flag to indicate the response protocol, or</li> <li>– using PREDES as it is now, with the operational condition that only the items with assessment completed are included in the dispatch, and developing a new message that fulfils the referrals response protocol requirement</li> <li>– possibly leveraging other existing messages</li> </ul>	Pending results of work on flows 3 and 4



*Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
1 (cont.)	<p>g Flow "6" – destination Post to destination Customs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Work out the business requirements with TG</li> <li>– Start a new work item, if required</li> <li>– Once requirements (and timing rules) have been clarified, SB needs to work on the standard and testing plans needed to advance the standard to Status 2. SB to coordinate with EAD RSC and other groups to promote pilot tests</li> </ul>	<p>CG, SB</p> <p>UPU–WCO CC</p> <p>PTC</p>	<p>Concept and needs to be defined/refined</p> <p>Expectations:</p> <p>Business requirements from CG and TG for Q3 2018</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Business requirements to be defined by customs and transport groups</li> <li>– Submit a request to POC to open a P work item (if required)</li> <li>– SB supports and assists with eliciting requirements and filling out the template</li> </ul> <p>Remark:</p> <p>Action on this flow will depend on the results of flow 5. Also need to determine if all customs authorities will require this of their designated operators</p>	Pending requirements

Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements

Ser. No.	Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished	Lead/Monitoring	Remarks/Recommendations	Results
	<p>h Flow "7" – origin Post to origin carrier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Work with IATA to ensure conversion of CARDIT to cargo messages</li> <li>• New supplements to code list 108 may be required, to assist with conversion</li> <li>• Ensure that accepted solution(s) comply with DOs' operational and business requirements as determined by TG</li> <li>– Consignment data including EAD flag</li> </ul>	<p>EAD-Flows TF TG, IATA–UPU</p> <p>SB, PTC And possibly, CG may be consulted</p>	<p>M48 is currently at status 0 M49 is currently at status 0</p> <p>Expectations: M48 status 0 → status 1: Q4 2017 M48 status 1 → status 2: ? M49 status 0 → status 1: Q4 2017 M49 status 1 → status 2: ?</p> <p>Follow-up: Expected from EAD task force: validation of the technical concept designed with IATA</p> <p>TG and CG to confirm requirements for additional IMPC-related information to assist with CARDIT-to-cargo messages</p> <p>Expectations: – Business requirements from Transport Group for a new code list – Make a request to POC to open a P work item (if required) for supplementary issues</p>	<p>Results: Have identified issues around IMPC code supplementary issues – different scenarios for "conversion chain" of CARDIT information into airlines' cargo-messaging systems. Technical solutions (for translation of messages) have been developed. However, business/operational roles need to be defined by TG</p> <p>Note: Business decisions on the role of a "conversion" software "plug-in" still need to be made. Any production by the UPU (PTC) would not be available until late 2017 or early 2018</p>
	<p>i Flow "8" – origin carrier to destination border agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ensure (through discussions with WCO/IATA/ICAO) that the flow meets the EAD requirements of the destination border agency</li> </ul>	<p>TG</p> <p>IATA–UPU, CG, PSG</p>	<p>Awareness-raising needed on airlines' responsibilities, data elements and operational timing of transmissions to meet requirements of border security authorities. Use this to determine how – and when – Posts must provide the information needed</p>	

<i>Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
2	Testing of the EAD Global Postal Model	EAD RSC + PTC + IB  CG  TG  SB		
	a Implementation of the SECUREX Project	IB		Commencing project management and outreach to EAD testing partners
	b Implementation of CDS and similar systems in non-SECUREX DOs	PTC DCDEV QSF (?)		See above
	c Quality of data and compliance issues	EAD RSC, PTC, IB	To be discussed and developed by EAD RSC S3 session	Pending
	d Published database of EDI trading partners and DOs willing to pilot (with DSAs)	PTC, IB, IPC	With information from WCO–UPU questionnaire on EAD readiness, plus technical monitoring of EAD messaging by PTC and IPC, assemble list of EDI partners, as well as contacts to commence piloting  Need to determine if this is to be just on UPU website or on WCO website also	Ongoing
3	TRANSIT and EAD: Develop a micro view and policy approach through study on handling of transit and transhipped mail and establish an ad hoc group to develop recommended approach(es)	EAD RSC + PTC + IB  CG  TG  SB	This is a very complex topic which covers three types of handling:  i simple transhipment (primarily on airlines)  ii closed transit  iii open transit	Current thinking has been to prioritize finalizing the EAD model for direct exchanges between Posts and build on that for transit and transhipment

<i>Category 2: Testing and building the Global Postal Model to meet the EAD requirements</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
3 (cont.)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is viewed as an urgent deliverable by the airlines, which have already stated their difficulties with non-EAD types of transit</li> <li>- Task force required (but this is a second-phase task, as it will be based on direct exchange principles and longer-term requirement clarifications)</li> <li>- As a solution, may involve WCO Customs-to-Customs pillar; CG will need to engage WCO-UPU Contact Committee</li> <li>- Need for a group (workshop) to develop a concept piece for this issue</li> </ul>	
<i>Category 3: Raising awareness among members of the need to meet the EAD requirements and building their capacity to do so</i>				
1	<p>Communications with member countries about the benefits of EAD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Faster customs clearance</li> <li>- Better revenue realization</li> <li>- Enhanced security</li> <li>- Meeting e-commerce requirements</li> </ul> <p>Meeting national legislations of many countries</p>	EAD RSC, CG, WCO-UPU CC, TG, IATA-UPU CC, PSG, ICAO-UPU CC and IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ORE outreach (Phase 1)</li> <li>- SECUREX outreach</li> <li>- Regional postal unions outreach</li> <li>- Regional coordinator workshops</li> <li>- Joint WCO-UPU forums and workshops</li> <li>- Other forums</li> <li>- EAD booth at Extraordinary Congress (Addis Ababa)</li> <li>- E-commerce events at POC or CA</li> </ul> <p>Note: ORE needs to weigh up what it will need from POC, CG, TG, PSG, as well as IB and PTC for their "Phase 2" outreach under ORE</p> <p>Other possible means under consideration: SECUREX and ORE rates of successfully "on-boarding" UPU members for EAD capacity-building projects</p>	Ongoing. ORE Phase 1 outreach has been well received and more workshops are scheduled, as presented to Committee 1 in March 2017

<i>Category 3: Raising awareness among members of the need to meet the EAD requirements and building their capacity to do so</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
2	Monitoring the readiness of DOs/member countries  Through KPIs of CG and TG	EAD RSC, CG, WCO–UPU CC, TG, IATA–UPU CC, PSG, and IB	PTC, IPC reports monitoring EAD messaging from DOs  PTC to develop deployment schedule for IPS/CDS modules  Review findings from WCO–UPU questionnaire on EAD readiness  Work with WCO to obtain additional information on EDI bridges being built between destination DOs and their national customs authorities	Ongoing
3	Implement projects with DOs	EAD RSC input  IB, PTC and DCDEV	SECUREX, ORE, PTC, and regional coordinators  PTC to develop deployment schedule for IPS/CDS modules  Additional possible means under consideration: SECUREX and ORE rates of successfully "on-boarding" UPU members for EAD capacity-building projects	Ongoing
4	Publishing vital information about EDI exchanges involved in EAD	IB, CG, SB, WCO–UPU	Making information on countries able to exchange ITMATT, CARDIT–RESBIT, PREDES, CUSITM/ CUSRSP (or equivalent local messaging) available on UPU and WCO websites	Ongoing
5	Training and training material	IB, DCDEV, CG, DOP SB (possibly)	Inventory on training material currently available, as well as requirements for the projects envisioned by SECUREX ORE Phase 2, regional coordinator workshops, etc.  Develop timeline for joint Posts–Customs material (guidelines for electronic exchange, MoU, template for data-sharing agreements in line with DSAs between Posts)	IB has developed training workshop schedule and joint WCO–UPU workshops

<i>Category 3: Raising awareness among members of the need to meet the EAD requirements and building their capacity to do so</i>				
<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Responsible bodies and the task to be accomplished</i>	<i>Lead/Monitoring</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendations</i>	<i>Results</i>
6	QSF projects/funding	DCDEV, QSF Board, Sec. EAD RSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Other funding to be explored – following up on WCO Columbus Programme and WCO Capacity Building Trends and Patterns Report to assess opportunities for DOs to build an electronic EDI bridge with their national customs authorities</li> <li>– EAD RSC to be part of the prioritization process for the use of the QSF Fund for EAD activities</li> </ul>	Money from the QSF Common Fund will be available
7	Publish booklet on EAD and how to implement it	EAD RSC, IB	This material needed for training workshops. It could build on the existing booklet for CDS	Ongoing
8	Develop a written version of the UPU Global Postal Model	IB and reviewed by EAD RSC	IB could start with text in POC 2016.1–Doc 10m and new RKC guidelines	On hold: development of final written version will require more answers from Category 1
<i>Category 4: Integration of commercial and product opportunities with the expanded capabilities of designated operators that are implementing Global Postal Model protocols and requirements</i>				
1	Begin exploring possible business reasons, incentives and product enhancement opportunities for provision of ITMATT (M33-11)	EAD RSC, POC C 1, POC C 2, EMS Cooperative and IB	<p>C 2 PSDEIG and EMS Cooperative initiate exploration of possible business reasons, incentives and product enhancement opportunities for provision of ITMATT v1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– ECOMPRO</li> <li>– Parcels minimum specifications</li> <li>– EMS incentives</li> <li>– Tracked goods</li> </ul> <p>Develop plans (phased in?) for incentivizing provision of ITMATT, as part of taking advantage of the benefits of facilitated customs clearance processes associated with an electronic customs interface between Posts and Customs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Currently, ECOMPRO needs ITMATT v1 to be approved to status 2</p> <p>Explore methods for assessing quality of service and level of compliance with provision of ITMATT, as well as ways of creating incentives for the provision of this information</p>

*Category 4: Integration of commercial and product opportunities with the expanded capabilities of designated operators that are implementing Global Postal Model protocols and requirements*

<i>Ser. No.</i>	<i>Task</i>	<i>Lead</i>	<i>Remarks/Recommendation</i>	<i>Results</i>
2	Coordinating timeline for provision of EAD with IPP	EAD RSC, C 1 CG and SB C 2, EMS Cooperative and IB	C 1 stakeholders continue to inform C 2 timeline of required provision of EAD within goods category of IPP  CG to explore definitions of contents which qualify UPU items as "goods", and thus subject to EAD requirements – this is to help clarify what letter post elements might have to be migrated from documents category to goods category	Ongoing  Impact study being drafted  Questions for Customs Group being compiled
3	Coordinate EAD issues with C 2 on their e-commerce and IPP outreach communications	C 2 EAD RSC, IB, DCDEV, PTC	Coordinate on which products might be considered marketworthy, to be developed by leveraging the fact that EAD would need to be provided. Can EAD be integrated into the new array of "supplementary services"?  Also, obtain feedback from C 2 outreaches and surveys on potential impact, opportunities, etc.	Ongoing