



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

Distr.: General
4 February 2019
ENGLISH ONLY

Administrative Committee for the TIR Convention, 1975

TIR Executive Board (TIRExB)

Seventy-ninth session

Geneva, 6-7 December 2018

Report of the seventy-ninth session of the TIR Executive Board (TIRExB)

I. Attendance

1. The TIR Executive Board (TIRExB) held its seventy-ninth session on 6-7 December 2018 in Geneva.
2. The following members of TIRExB were present: Mr. G. Andrieu (France), Mr. S. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation), Mr. M. Ayati (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), Ms. D. Dirlik Songür (Turkey), Ms. B. Gajda (Poland), Ms. L. Jelínková (European Commission) and Ms. E. Takova (Bulgaria). Mr. S. Fedorov (Belarus) and Mr. S. Somka (Ukraine) were excused.
3. The International Road Transport Union (IRU) attended the session as observer and was represented by Mr. Y. Guenkov.
4. At the invitation of the Chair, Ms. Lidiya Grigoreva and Ms. Nicole Maguire, Gender Focal Points of United Nations Office in Geneva (UNOG) participated in the session (related to item 10 of the agenda).

II. Adoption of the agenda (agenda item 1)

Documentation: Informal document TIRExB/AGE/2018/79

5. TIRExB adopted the agenda of the session as contained in Informal document TIRExB/AGE/2018/79, with the addition that TIRExB decided to discuss two documents by IRU, namely Informal document No. 25 (2018) under item 4/c (Amendment proposals by the international organization), and Informal document No. 26 (2018) under item 5 (Adaptation of the TIR procedure to modern business requirements).

III. Adoption of the report of the seventy-eighth session of TIRExB (agenda item 2)

Documentation: Informal document TIRExB/REP/2018/78draft

6. TIRExB adopted the draft report of its seventy-eighth session as in Informal document TIRExB/REP/2018/78draft.

IV. Application of specific provisions of the TIR Convention (agenda item 3)

Consideration of amendment proposals

Proposals to introduce more flexibility in the guarantee system

7. TIRExB reiterated its decision to commence considerations of the matter only subsequent to the deliberations of the Administrative Committee (AC.2) (TIRExB/REP/2017/75final, para. 7).

V. Computerization of the TIR procedure (agenda item 4)

A. eTIR project and eTIR pilot projects

8. The Board took note that, while progress was made on all ongoing eTIR pilot projects, including continuous improvements of the eTIR international system, no new development has been reported since the last meeting of the Board.

9. The Board also noted that Pakistan and Tajikistan addressed ECE and IRU to express interest in taking part in eTIR projects. Mr. Ayati (Iran (Islamic Republic of)) informed the Board that the Iranian authorities were looking forward to expanding the eTIR pilot project between Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Turkey and were interested to consider an eTIR project with Pakistan to ultimately enable eTIR on the Islamabad-Tehran-Istanbul (ITI) corridor.

B. International TIR Data Bank

Documentation: Informal document No. 19 (2018)

10. The Board continued its consideration of the data requirements for the new module of the International TIR Data Bank (ITDB) on customs offices on the basis of the Informal document No. 19 (2018).

11. The Board recalled that, at its last session, it decided to set the following classes related to customs offices as mandatory: name, office identification number (office ID), country, city and roles. The Board decided that the rest of the classes in Table 1 of Informal document No. 19 (2018) were set as optional. In consideration of the matter, the Board took into account the proposal from Mr. Guenkov (IRU) to include the latitude and longitude coordinates of customs offices within data requirements. However, considering the fact that currently the location of the customs offices were not kept in this format by the national authorities in most countries, the Board decided not to include it in the data set for the time being. The secretariat informed the Board that producing an online map displaying the customs offices available for the TIR procedure was assessed during the development of the module and was not included in the work for the same reason. The Board took note that ECE was conducting the International Transport Infrastructure Observatory Project funded by the Islamic Development Bank which also aims at accommodating transport infrastructure information, including customs offices, in a geographical information system (GIS) environment and that there could be an interaction with that project in the future for this purpose.

12. The Board decided that it would be appropriate to launch the module with minimum necessary data to avail the contracting parties keeping it up-to-date, hence providing a reliable database for the beneficiaries. The Board noted that, nevertheless, it

was important to enter data both in the mandatory and optional fields, to the extent possible.

13. Moreover, the Board concluded that it would be appropriate to consider an amendment to Article 45 of the TIR Convention to include data submission to the ITDB on customs offices once the work on the module was completed. Following a preliminary analysis, the Board agreed that an explanatory note was warranted under this article. In this connection, the Board also highlighted the need to remind once again all contracting parties of their obligation under Article 45 to publish and update the list of customs offices available for the TIR procedure and requested the Chair to report this conclusion at the next session of AC.2.

14. The Board requested the secretariat to submit the data requirements to AC.2 for consideration and approval. The Board, taking note of the ongoing work of the secretariat to eliminate discrepancies with data imported from existing data bases of contracting parties, reiterated its position to make the data public once the work is completed.

C. Amendment proposals by the international organization related to the International TIR Data Bank

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 22 and 25 (2018)

15. TIRExB recalled that, at its previous session, it took note of the information in Informal document No. 22 (2018) submitted by IRU with regard to amendment proposals submitted by TIRExB to AC.2. The Board noted that the document had also been submitted to the sixty-eighth session of AC.2 (Informal document WP.30/AC.2 (2018) No. 7). The Board took note of the conclusion of AC.2 that there would be merit in further consideration of the problems encountered during the TIR procedure in relation to data verification against the ITDB, and the request of AC.2 for TIRExB to consider the issue and report its findings to the next session of the Committee. Moreover, the Board noted that AC.2 requested the secretariat to grant IRU access to the ITDB (see ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/139, paras. 47-51). The Board also took note of an additional document, i.e. Informal document No. 25 (2018) by IRU on the subject matter which included the results of a survey conducted by IRU among its member associations regarding the current and future use of the ITDB.

16. The Board drew attention to the object of the amendment proposals it had submitted to AC.2 which aims at eliminating the paper-based submission to TIRExB in connection with Annex 9, Part II, paras. 4 and 5 and Article 38, para. 2. Mr. Guenkov (IRU) stated that already some contracting parties started data verification from the ITDB during actual TIR transports and that, due to missing or out-of-date data in the ITDB, there occurred delays in TIR transports. He added that some contracting parties currently did not submit data to the ITDB and would only be willing to consider reviewing their processes after the entry into force of the amendments to the Convention drafted by TIRExB about data submission to the ITDB. He also noted that the survey indicated that a limited number of countries had a web service connection to the ITDB.

17. The Board underlined the relevance of the elimination of paper-based submissions to keeping the data in the ITDB up-to-date. Additionally, the Board noted that the problems raised by IRU were caused by the fact that not all contracting parties respect their obligation under Annex 9, Part II for the submission of the Model Authorization Form (MAF) and annual lists to TIRExB. The secretariat informed the Board that forty-five countries had access to the ITDB either to enter or check data, fifty-three out of sixty-two operational countries had data in the ITDB, although some needed to be updated, and that the remaining countries were mostly newly operational or not an active user of the TIR system. The secretariat also stated that following the seminar held in June 2018 to raise awareness about the ITDB, some contracting parties started entering or updating

data directly in the ITDB. The Board welcomed the statistical information by the secretariat and the progress achieved following the awareness-raising activities.

18. The Board noted that the survey presented in Informal document No. 25 (2018) did not fully reflect the use of the ITDB by contracting parties, included solely negative views on the ITDB, focused on issues as web service connection done by only few countries and neglected the fact that the roles of the customs authorities and the associations in the ITDB were grounded in the authorization process. The Board members from the European Union Member States also clarified that the mandatory use of the ITDB was introduced in the European Union for data entry only but not for the data verification.

19. The Board concluded that, as part of the computerization of the TIR system, the ITDB should be kept as a reliable database with data-entry by the contracting parties, hence not relying on external sources of information. The Board, considering the start of eTIR operations in near future, emphasized the importance of keeping the ITDB up-to-date and invited contracting parties to put every effort to that end even before the entry-into force of the amendment proposals drafted by TIRExB. In terms of verification of the status of the TIR Carnet holder during a TIR transport, the Board concluded that alternative proofs of authorization provided by transporters should be taken into account by customs authorities. The Board decided to continue encouraging the use of the ITDB and to sustain efforts to solve the problems in implementation.

20. Further, the Board considered the amendment proposal submitted by IRU in Informal document No. 22 (2018) to add a new text to Explanatory Note to Article 38, para. 2 of the TIR Convention (E.N. 0.38.2) and the claim that sharing information on the exclusions with stakeholders other than those referred to in Article 38, para. 2 would be a violation of the Convention. Mr. Guenkov (IRU) stated that they had concerns about possible blockages of transporters in other contracting parties based on an infringement in one country since, via the ITDB, a contracting party had access to the information on decisions of exclusion by another contracting party. Additionally, he noted that data on exclusions was not kept up-to-date all the time and that there had been one instance that the authorities acted on a decision of exclusion not valid anymore.

21. The secretariat informed the Board that this practice was not newly introduced and that information on exclusions was shared in the previous versions of the ITDB as well. The Board indicated that the provision of Article 38, para. 1 was clear that a decision on exclusion was applicable in the territory of the contracting party where a serious offence against the customs laws and regulations was committed and that this had been the common understanding among all TIR contracting parties for a long time. The Board also noted that, despite the availability of this information in previous versions of the ITDB, there was no incident identified reflecting an improper application of this provision. With that, the Board found it groundless to be concerned that contracting parties would use this information to block transporters entering their territory hereinafter.

22. In terms of sharing this information with other contracting parties, the Board clarified that Article 38, para. 2 related to the obligation for notification by the contracting party taking a decision, whereas TIRExB shared this information with other contracting parties according to its mandate to coordinate the exchange of information and intelligence among competent authorities (Annex 8, Article 10) and its mandate to establish the ITDB to avail all contracting parties access information on holders, including excluded operators (Terms of Reference of TIRExB, Article 8). The Board underlined the value of this information for the customs authorities for assessment of risk and countering violations in the TIR system. With regard to keeping data on exclusions up-to-date, the Board reiterated its invitation to contracting parties to put every effort to update the data in the ITDB.

23. The Board also considered the practical aspects of granting IRU access to the ITDB as mandated by AC.2. The secretariat informed the Board that in parallel with the

authorization of transporters according to Annex 9, Part II of the Convention, the access to the Holders Module of ITDB had been granted only to competent authorities and associations. It was added that the access was granted under specific features assigned to each role such as associations' having writing permission and having access to only its own data. Therefore, the secretariat requested guidance from the Board on the features of new profile to be developed for the international organization.

24. The Board members stated that in order to be able to decide about the issue, it was necessary to clarify which information, for which purposes and under which rights would be accessed by IRU. The Board was of the view that, in assessing the scope of access, it should be taken into account that the international organization was not part of the authorization process as regulated in Annex 9, Part II. Additionally, the Board concluded that any granting of access should be accompanied with a responsibility to take steps to contribute establishing the accuracy of the data in the ITDB. The Board also pointed out that, considering the Annex 9, Part II provisions, in case such a contribution is going to be made, it should be via communication between the international organization and the national associations, and not between the international organization and competent authorities. Mr. Guenkov (IRU) stated that they would accept any responsibility only on the condition that a web service connection allowing automatic queries was set between IRU's systems and the ITDB, and not by granting an account to IRU for access to the ITDB application. The Board, noting this remark, concluded that the technical aspects of the issue needed to be clarified by AC.2 before taking further steps. The Board requested the secretariat to submit the issue to AC.2 with a supporting document that elaborates various options.

VI. Adaptation of the TIR procedure to modern business, logistics and transport requirements (agenda item 5)

Implementation of the intermodal aspects of the TIR procedure

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 16 and 26 (2018)

25. The Board continued its consideration of the intermodal use of the TIR procedure. The secretariat informed the Board that the Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics (WP.24) held its sixty-first session on 19-21 November 2018 in Geneva and that the secretariat, together with IRU, had presented information on the intermodal use of the TIR procedure and the pilots conducted to that end. The secretariat also stated that the preliminary work for a study on the intermodal use of TIR procedure revealed that such a study should include a market analysis, cross-cutting issues, requisites of different modes of transport and opportunities of cooperation with other organizations, and that it would require a timeline of up to one year. The Board welcomed the considerations of the secretariat and requested conducting such comprehensive study during 2019.

26. TIRExB took note of the information provided by IRU in Informal document No. 26 (2018) about a pilot intermodal transport between the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and the Czech Republic involving road, sea and rail legs. The Board also took note of information presented by Mr. Guenkov (IRU) about the initiative for a new pilot between India and Turkey.

27. With regard to the use of a subcontractor in the pilot between UAE and Czech Republic, Mr. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation) stated that the subcontractor mechanism was currently not provided for by the TIR Convention. The secretariat stated that whereas the subcontractor concept was not referred in the current text of the Convention, there was no provision eliminating the application of this concept either. The secretariat also reminded of the decision of TIRExB at its thirty-eight session in December 2008, i.e. the Board agreed that, for the time being, it did not seem to make sense to propose changes to the TIR Convention and rather recommended that, once the customs authorities in the country of departure have accepted a TIR Carnet from another

person than the authorized TIR Carnet holder, such TIR Carnet be accepted by the customs authorities of other countries involved in a TIR transport without further requirements (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2009/4, para. 9). It was noted that, nevertheless, a comment highlighting the practical aspects of the use of concept was already under consideration at Working Party on Customs Questions affecting Transport (WP.30).

VII. Settlement of disputes between contracting parties, associations, insurance companies and international organizations and the IRU external audit report (agenda item 6)

A. Settlement of disputes between contracting parties, associations, insurance companies and international organizations

Draft new Explanatory Note to Article 6, paragraph 2 of the TIR Convention

28. Further to the mandate by AC.2 to assess whether and to which extent it would be possible to include provisions on the relation between the international organization and its national associations in the text of the TIR Convention (see ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/137, paras. 16 and 39), the Board recalled its previous findings that the contract between the international organization and its national associations was primarily a contractual relation under private law and that any involvement from governments in the drafting of new provisions should be limited to customs-related issues only. The Board also recalled that it had concluded, in order to address the issues raised by the Romanian customs authorities or similar cases, that it seemed more appropriate to develop some type of early warning mechanism, in which all stakeholders (international organization, national associations and customs authorities) would be urged to inform each other as well as TIRExB well in advance of any change in circumstance that could run the risk of leading, potentially, to the termination of the relation between the international organization and a national association on the one hand, and the termination of the agreement between the customs authorities and the national association on the other hand (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2019/2, para. 29).

29. Mr. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation) mentioned that he could not agree with the conclusions of the Board from previous sessions. He did not consider an early warning mechanism sufficient to prevent instances similar to what the Republic of Moldova and Romania had experienced from happening in the future. Additionally, he stated that he would not agree with the conclusion that the relationship between the international organization and the association was private in nature as these two were actors regulated in the Convention with their roles and responsibilities. Therefore, he was of the view that an amendment to Article 6 of the Convention should be made to assure that an association could be excluded by the international organization only based on a violation of the agreement between the international organization and the national association on the functioning of the international guarantee system as required by Explanatory Note 0.6.2 bis-1 to Article 6, para. 2, but not a violation of the internal documents of IRU which were not referred to in the Convention. He was of the view that drafting an example agreement would also be considered as already done for the agreement between competent authorities and national associations.

30. The Board clarified that, at all times, the international organization and the associations should have a cooperative relationship and in case a problem with an impact on the functioning of the guarantee system emerges, TIRExB and other TIR bodies should be immediately informed. The Chair also recalled that the Board concluded to provide

guidance to the international organization and the associations in dealing with such situations by drafting a best practice or guiding principles.

31. The Board requested the secretariat to draft a document for its next session summarizing the discussions and the options for action put forth by the Board so far. The Board members were requested to share their comments and suggestions for inclusion in the document.

B. The IRU external audit report

32. TIRExB recalled its previous discussions to further look into the IRU external audit report and assess if, on the basis of its budget provisions, it would be possible to engage an expert or a consultant to review the full report on behalf of AC.2. The Board recalled its conclusion that the disproportionality between the considerable costs (which could easily go up to US\$ 50,000) as compared to the potential small chance of anything viable coming from such second audit report did not justify such act and, therefore, decided not to pursue the matter, requesting the Chair to report these findings to AC.2.

33. The Board noted that, at the sixty-eighth session of AC.2, further to the statement made by the Chair of TIRExB when reporting on the activities of the Board at its seventy-eighth session, the representative of European Commission proposed that TIRExB explore the possibility of inviting external experts from the audit services of the customs administrations of TIRExB members to support the Board in further assessing the IRU external audit report. The delegation of Turkey did not support this proposal at that stage and expressed that it would like to hear the opinion of other contracting parties before taking a decision (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/139, para. 59).

34. Ms. Jelínková (European Commission) stated that rather than focusing in how to assess the external audit report, the data and information to be audited need to be considered to understand the value of auditing a report prepared by an audit company. Mr. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation) stated that, considering the scope of allegations which led to such discussions, he would not agree with the conclusion that disproportionality between the considerable costs as compared to the potential small chance of anything viable coming from such second audit report did not justify such act. He added that the consideration of this matter should be maintained and that requesting support from national authorities for an examination of the audit report by national experts could also be considered as an option.

35. Mr. Guenkov (IRU) informed the Board that the Federal Court had decided that the persons who filed the allegations against two members of the IRU management were not recognized as plaintiffs and, therefore, were not party to the procedure.

36. Various members of the Board, pointing out the resource consuming nature of such an activity, stated that it would be difficult for them to make such a request in their administrations to support the work of the Board and make their audit services engage in this activity. The Board was also of the view that, even if such a request was going to be made to contracting parties by the Board, it would be more appropriate to make it on behalf of AC.2 as the Board members act in their own capacity, not representing a particular contracting party.

37. The Chair clarified that during discussions at AC.2, she mentioned that TIRExB was not in a position to make a request to contracting parties to provide an expert and that AC.2 could make such a request or any contracting party willing to provide experts could at any time make suggestions to that end. She added that the delegation of Turkey wished to hear the opinion of other contracting parties before taking a decision and with that AC.2 would continue consideration of the matter at its next session in February 2019.

38. The Board concluded that it would be more appropriate that the representatives of contracting parties participating at AC.2 sessions express their views on such contribution

and that the Board would continue consideration of the matter further to the decision at AC.2.

VIII. Prices of TIR Carnets (agenda item 7)

A. Analysis of the prices of TIR Carnets

Documentation: Informal document No. 23 (2018)

39. The Board took note that, at its request, the secretariat addressed the heads of customs administrations in countries where associations had not sent TIRExB the 2018 prices and requested their assistance in reminding their associations of their obligations. TIRExB welcomed Informal document No. 23 (2018), containing an update of the TIR Carnet prices and analysis, including the latest data received from Ukraine and Tajikistan. The Board requested the secretariat to update the prices on the TIR website and transmit the prices and the analysis to AC.2.

40. The Board also welcomed the updated TIR Carnet prices online survey for 2019 and mandated the secretariat to send it to the associations TIR focal points with copy to customs TIR focal points before the end of 2018. IRU stressed that associations would like to receive copies of the replies they submitted by means of the online survey. The Board, noting that the current survey tool used by the ECE secretariat did not allow to automatically send copies of their replies to respondents, requested the secretariat to consider for future surveys an alternative tool providing such functionality and, for the 2019 survey, requested the secretariat to send out manually copies of the replies to all respondents.

B. Distribution prices

41. The Board recalled that, at its previous session, further to a request from the Russian Federation to clarify the application of Article 7, it concluded that the meaning of the article was clear in that the provision explicitly stipulates that TIR Carnet forms shall not be subjected to import and export duties and taxes and be free of other import and export prohibitions and restrictions and that, thus, there was no need to adjust or amend the provision (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2019/2, para. 34).

42. Mr. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation) considered that the conclusion did not correspond to the substance of the request since Russian customs authorities had concerns on the accuracy of the current practice where the exemption of import duties and taxes was based on the IRU distribution price, which included many components as guarantee, insurance, IT services etc., rather than on the production price which related to the value of the form (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2018/4, para. 43).

43. The Chair reminded that the consideration of the matter had been completed and that the understanding of the Board was that the TIR Carnet form referred to in Article 7 meant the TIR Carnet sent to associations by IRU including all components of its price, meaning not only the TIR Carnet as paper. It was added that the Board members confirmed the implementation as such in their respective countries. The Chair also reminded the Board that, at its seventy-sixth session, she had asked whether IRU could try to better understand the need of the Russian Federation and whether the request by the Russian Federation could be formulated in a different way, but no reflections were made further to this suggestion (ECE/TRANS/WP.30/AC.2/2018/5, para. 47). Majority of the Board members reaffirmed that TIR Carnet form within the meaning of Article 7, sent by IRU to national associations, covered all components.

44. Mr. Amelyanovich (Russian Federation) did not agree with the conclusion of the Board and requested it to be noted that the TIR Carnet became a guarantee document only

once the transporter submitted it as a guarantee document to the competent authorities. He requested IRU to provide a calculation of the TIR Carnet price with all of its components.

45. The Board reiterated its assessment of the issue that the wording of Article 7 was clear and did not require further clarification. The Board concluded its assessment of the issue and decided to submit its conclusion and assessment to AC.2.

IX. Problems reported by transport companies from the Republic of Moldova in Ukraine (agenda item 8)

Documentation: Informal documents Nos. 37 (2014) and 8 (2015)

46. TIRExB noted that there was no new information on the agenda item.

X. Self-evaluation (agenda item 9)

Documentation: Informal document No. 26 (2018)

47. TIRExB took note of Informal document No. 26 (2018) including a review of its main activities and achievements during its term of office and the consolidated replies of the survey on self-evaluation.

48. The Board welcomed the document and requested the secretariat to submit to AC.2 for consideration with the following modifications:

- add the number of articles drafted by TIRExB to Annex I,
- clarify in Annex II that the suggestion for a different language regime for TIRExB meetings was supported only by some members of the Board.

XI. Activities of the secretariat (agenda item 10)

General activities of the secretariat

49. The Board welcomed the participation of UNOG Gender Focal Points Ms. Lidiya Grigoreva and Ms. Nicole Maguire in consideration of the activities of the secretariat on gender policy. The experts informed the Board about the United Nations Gender Policy and the activities of UNOG and other Geneva-based organizations to increase the representation of women at all levels and to achieve gender equality. The Board was also informed that gender equality and women's empowerment constituted one of Sustainable Development Goals (Goal 5) and that it required adopting and strengthening sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women at all levels. The experts underlined the importance of commitment and practical steps in achieving the goal and gave examples of measures taken by international organizations to establish gender balance in intergovernmental governing bodies, such as setting quotas for the representation of women in delegations and funding the participation of women.

50. The Board was also informed about the representation of women in TIR activities. The statistics produced by the secretariat covering the last three terms of the Board showed that only 14 per cent of the participants to the seminars held outside Geneva in this period were women. It was also noted that in the same period the participation of women to AC.2 and WP.30 meetings and also membership to TIRExB reflected an average of 35 per cent. The Board finally noted that the representation of women at the chairmanship of AC.2 and WP.30 was remarkably low.

51. The Board emphasized the importance of having more women specialized in TIR to improve the gender balance in TIR activities. The Board also pointed out the need for raising awareness and maintaining the discourse to improve the situation in forthcoming decades. The Board decided to consider the gender dimension in its activities especially with regard to supporting the specialization of women in TIR. In this regard, the Board recommended, particularly the newly acceded countries, to take into account the gender dimension in training programs and while allocating staff to TIR departments. The Board also invited IRU to consider putting efforts to increase the participation of women in TIR activities both at its member associations and in the transport industry. Mr. Guenkov (IRU) stated that IRU considered gender equality as a priority and that it had almost achieved a 50:50 ratio among its own staff. He added that IRU also pursued the policy for the transport industry and that it was encouraging women as drivers.

52. The Board also took note of the information by the secretariat of follow-up actions to previous decisions, as:

(a) sending letters to the administrations of Board members who did not participate in last two sessions of the Board;

(b) submission of the budget documents to AC.2 for approval.

53. Finally, the Board was informed that, since its previous session, the TIR secretariat had participated in the European Union Electronic Customs Coordination Group meeting (Brussels, 23 November 2018).

XII. Other matters (agenda item 11)

54. TIRExB did not consider any other matter.

XIII. Restriction in the distribution of documents (agenda item 12)

55. TIRExB decided to keep Informal documents Nos. 23, 24, 25 and 26 (2018), issued in relation to the current session, restricted.

XIV. Date and place of next session (agenda item 13)

56. The Board decided to conduct its eightieth session on 4 February 2019 in Geneva and requested the secretariat to make the appropriate arrangements.
