



MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE
Revised Kyoto Convention
17th Session
-
13 – 14 November 2017
-

PO0103E1a

Brussels, 14 November 2017.

**REPORT OF THE 17TH MEETING OF THE REVISED KYOTO CONVENTION
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

Introduction

1. Ms. Hong Nguyen Thi Khanh, from Vietnam Customs, outgoing Chairperson of the Revised Kyoto Convention Management Committee (RKC/MC) opened the meeting and gave the floor to Ms. Ana B. Hinojosa, Director of Compliance and Facilitation, for her opening remarks.
2. In her opening remarks, Ms. Ana B. Hinojosa, welcomed delegates (see list of participants in Annex I) to the 17th Meeting of the RKC/MC.
3. She started by expressing her satisfaction with the increase in the number of Contracting Parties since the last meeting, having risen from 108 to 112 following the accession of Kuwait, Sao Tome and Principe, Burkina Faso and Tunisia. Ms. Hinojosa further elaborated that, for the current calendar year, there had been a total of seven new Contracting Parties and the Secretariat had been informed that other Members were in the process of completing or had already completed their national accession procedures.
4. In the context of a steady growth in the number of accessions to the RKC, Ms. Hinojosa reminded delegates that the RKC/MC was looking at the need to conduct a comprehensive review of the Convention and provided some background information concerning the decisions taken by the RKC/MC at its 15th and 16th Meetings in November 2016 and April 2017 respectively.
5. Turning to the items on the RKC/MC Agenda, the Director hoped for fruitful discussions on the final Report of the Virtual Working Group (RKC/VWG), which had been established at the 15th Meeting of the RKC/MC and had been tasked with mapping out the process and developing a plan, including key objectives, a broad approach, tasks and a roadmap. She further informed delegates that the Secretariat would provide an update concerning a research study on how other international organizations updated/reviewed and monitored the implementation of their Conventions.

6. Other Agenda items would engage delegates in discussions on the challenges faced by Members in their accession processes and the solutions found, through the sharing of national experiences on the implementation of certain RKC provisions and exchanges concerning the delivery, since November 2016, of RKC-related capacity building activities.
7. The Director concluded by encouraging active participation by, and valuable contributions from, delegates while expecting a number of key outcomes including providing guidance on the preparation for accession to as well as implementation of the RKC.
8. After the Director's introductory remarks, the Chairperson asked the Secretariat to provide delegates with some administrative guidance for the meeting.

Conclusion

9. The Management Committee took note of the opening remarks by Ms. Hinojosa, Director of Compliance and Facilitation.

II. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON

Introduction

10. Ms. Hong Nguyen Thi Khanh, the outgoing Chairperson of the RKC/MC, informed delegates that in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 7 of the Convention, the Management Committee is required to elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson. She then called for nominations for the post of Chairperson.
11. Mr. Masanori HIRAKI, Japan Customs, was unanimously elected Chairperson upon a proposal by Burkina Faso, supported by China, Netherlands, Malaysia, India and the European Union (EU).
12. The incoming Chairperson cordially accepted his nomination and thanked delegates for their support. He then expressed his commitment to facilitating the discussion in an effective and efficient manner. After taking up the post of Chairperson, he called for nominations for the post of Vice-Chairperson.
13. Mr. Maurice Emiola ADEFALOU, from Benin Customs, was unanimously elected Vice-Chairperson of the Committee following a proposal by Sweden supported by Vietnam.

Conclusion

14. Mr. Masanori HIRAKI (Japan Customs) and Mr. Maurice Emiola ADEFALOU (Benin Customs) were, respectively, unanimously elected Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Committee.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Doc. PO0098

Introduction

15. The Chairperson presented the draft Agenda as reproduced in Doc. PO0098.
16. In relation to how the draft Agenda had been developed, he highlighted the fact that the Secretariat had received requests from Members on the implementation of certain RKC provisions. In that regard, India had offered to share its national experience in some specific areas, as reflected in the draft Agenda. The other key item was the final Report of the RKC VWG.
17. The Chairperson reminded delegates that at the 16th Meeting of the RKC/MC, the RKC VWG, established during the 15th Meeting of the RKC/MC, had presented an interim Report and was expected to present its final Report during this meeting. The Report of the RKC VWG was appended to Doc. PO0099, together with three Annexes.
18. The Chairperson then indicated that, in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 10 of the RKC, the Committee would adopt a Report before the closure of its session and that this would be transmitted to the Permanent Technical Committee (PTC) and the Council for information, as well as to the Contracting Parties and Observers.
19. He then invited delegates to make comments and suggestions, if any, and to adopt the draft Agenda.
20. The Delegate of Vietnam suggested that the RKC/MC consider the adoption of Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Working Group, the establishment of which was proposed in the final Report of the RKC VWG. This could be dealt with either under Agenda item IV (Report of the RKC VWG) or under Agenda item VIII (Any Other Business).
21. The Delegates of the EU and Sweden were of the opinion that the approval of the final Report of the RKC VWG and the draft ToR of the new Working Group were to be considered separately.

Conclusion

22. The Management Committee adopted the Agenda as set out in Doc. PO0098, taking into account the comments by delegates.

IV. REPORT OF THE REVISED KYOTO CONVENTION VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP (RKC VWG)

Doc. PO0099

- **Presentation by Sweden (Vice-Chair of the RKC VWG)**
- **Interim report by the Secretariat on research study on “how other international Organizations update/review and monitor the implementation of their Conventions.”**

Introduction

23. The Chairperson recalled that at the 15th Meeting of the RKC/MC, delegates had established an RKC Virtual Working Group (RKCVMG), and tasked the Group with mapping out the process and developing a plan including key objectives, a broad approach, tasks and a roadmap. The RKCVMG had also been tasked with examining how other international organizations updated their respective conventions. He indicated that during the 16th Meeting of the RKC/MC held in April 2017, while adopting an interim Report the RKCMC had unanimously endorsed the review of the Convention, in a comprehensive manner (including the Body, the General Annex, the Specific Annexes, and the Guidelines).
24. The Secretariat briefly introduced Doc. PO0099E, thanking the RKCVMG members for the final Report.
25. The Vice-Chair of the RKCVMG presented the final Report, guiding delegates through its content including the Implementation Plan and stakeholder engagement. Going forward, he mentioned some of the key actions with indicative timelines that included addressing fundamental horizontal issues, taking into account the outcomes of the legal study report on 'how other international organisations review/update and monitor the implementation of their respective conventions', as well as carrying out detailed work on the Body and horizontal issues, General Annex and Specific Annexes and Guidelines through three respective Sub-Groups.
26. The Vice-Chair of the RKCVMG concluded by inviting the RKC/MC to examine and endorse the final report and establish a Working Group with Terms of Reference (ToR) for carrying out a revision of the RKC.
27. The Secretariat then provided a brief overview of the progress made to date with regard to the legal study being conducted by the Secretariat through a contractor - Azevedo Sette Advogados Associados, a Brazil based law firm. The contractor had initiated the envisaged work as mandated by the 16th Meeting of the RKCMC. It was expected that the final report would be available in early January 2018.

Summary of discussions

28. The Chairperson said that the new Working Group would take into account the result of the legal study.
29. Speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its Member States, the Delegate of the EU expressed appreciation of the final Report produced by the RKCVMG and supported its content and the suggested way forward. Recognizing the large volume of work ahead, the Delegate of the EU stressed that the revision work should be initiated without any further delay by involving non-Contracting Parties and other stakeholders.
30. Underlining the importance and continued relevance of the RKC from a private sector perspective, the Delegate of the Global Express Association (GEA) noted the lengthy and challenging review process that the RKC/MC was about to embark upon. However, by using corporate knowledge, bearing in mind lessons learned from the past and identifying concrete review proposals, this task could be accomplished. He also suggested that instead of a silo approach to the revision of the Body, General Annex, Specific Annexes and Guidelines through different Sub-Groups, a thematic approach, as indicated the stakeholder engagement plan, could be adopted for the review of the

RKC by identifying specific areas (such as supply chain security, post-clearance audit and risk management) that required some amendment/enhancement.

31. The Vice-Chair of the RKC/VWG added that the Implementation Plan and associated actions were living documents that could be enriched/adjusted based on needs and requirements, going forward. Some of the issues for which amendments were required had already been identified and appended as Annex III to the Report.
32. Concerning the issue of whether the RKC should remain a Convention or become a Framework of Standards (FoS), as mentioned in the RKC/VWG's Final Report under the Implementation Plan, diverse views were expressed by several delegates.
33. The Vice-Chair of the RKC/VWG said that the new Group should be able to discuss the best way forward and that might include changing the present character of the Convention.
34. The Delegate of the EU clarified that the RKC might remain as a Convention. However, there was a need to discuss whether there were ways the Convention could be amended in a more flexible way; all the options could then be presented to the RKC/MC for its consideration and decision.
35. The Delegate of the Russian Federation noted the need to strengthen the RKC and make it a most up-to-date instrument by reflecting new developments, whilst keeping it as a Convention.
36. The Delegate of Spain, though favouring the Convention option, suggested that the future Group examine various options with pros and cons (e.g., Convention or Framework of Standards or both), as some countries might encounter difficulties in acceding to/ratifying the Convention.
37. The Delegate of the United Kingdom said that the whole idea of keeping the RKC as a Convention or converting it into a FoS had come up during the discussion of the RKC/VWG on how to keep the Convention up-to-date on a regular basis, as was the case with the review of the SAFE Framework of Standards every three years. She indicated that this idea could be fleshed out by the new Group, based on the legal study report.
38. The Delegate of the Netherlands noted that if the legal study report suggested a better option for regularly updating the Convention, the RKC could indeed continue as a Convention. He then underlined the fact that the nature of the instrument had a direct bearing on its implementation and the measurement thereof, as a FoS did not provide any legal basis for monitoring implementation. He also noted that there might be a legal issue as regards whether the RKC/MC was competent to turn the Convention into a FoS. Furthermore, it might be a good thing to approach the national parliament with an updated instrument to showcase how Customs was at the forefront of facilitating international trade.
39. In the same vein, the Delegate of Vietnam stressed that within the framework of RKC, the RKC/MC had no mandate to consider and change the character of the Convention.
40. While welcoming the interventions by the previous speakers, the Delegate of the United States underscored the need to keep the Convention updated in terms of evolutions within Customs and other international developments, bearing in mind certain practicalities.

41. The Delegate of Burkina Faso suggested that when updating the RKC and looking into the issue of a Convention or a FoS, the Group should take into account how other WCO Conventions were updated, such as instance the updating of Annex to the Harmonized System (HS) Convention every five years.
42. Highlighting the importance of the RKC as a flagship WCO tool that had also been used extensively during the negotiations on the WTO Agreement on Trade Facilitation (TFA) and the implementation thereof, the Delegate of India noted the need to strengthen some of the key concepts, such as risk management, coordinated border management and stakeholder engagement, thus leading to a balance between control and facilitation. He supported the approach to, and process of, the revision of the RKC to make it a comprehensive and dynamic instrument and indicated his country's interest in joining the new Working Group.
43. Commending the work done by the RKC VWG, the Delegate of Benin stressed the need to look at how other international organizations were managing their conventions. He advocated a comprehensive review of the RKC without completely changing the legal status of the Convention, while retaining some flexibility for addressing new challenges.
44. The Delegate of China raised concerns about the interchangeable use of terms 'review' and 'revision' and drew attention to the report of the 16th Meeting of the RKC/MC which had agreed to a comprehensive review (and not revision) of the RKC. She wished to know whether any legal opinion was sought during the last review process. In addition, she mentioned that it was premature to take a decision on the nature of the RKC (Convention or FoS), as the legal study report and detailed impact analysis were not yet available.
45. Responding to China, the RKC VWG Vice-Chair said that based on the decision by the 16th Meeting of the RKC/MC to carry out a comprehensive review of the RKC, the RKC VWG Report had recommended moving forward and initiating the review work. Additionally, the Secretariat informed delegates that legal advice had been sought on the provisions of the Body, the transformation of the existing Annexes into a General Annex and Specific Annexes, and the terminologies used therein; the said Report would be provided to delegates.
46. The Delegate of Nepal said that like other Conventions, the RKC had to be updated; the focus should not only be on the content but also on the process. He outlined some of the modern concepts that needed to be adequately addressed, such as a Single Window, Authorized Economic Operator (AEO) Programme, Customs automation, and risk management. He added that thought should be given as to what incentives/benefits this review exercise would confer on developing countries and landlocked countries and what capacity building support would be required to accede to/ratify the revised Convention.
47. The Delegate of Japan pointed out that both a Convention and a FoS each presented their own advantages and disadvantages. He noted that it was too early to take a decision on the character of the RKC.
48. The Delegates of Poland and the United Kingdom also felt that it was premature, at this stage, to discuss whether the RKC should remain as a Convention or be turned into an FoS. This could be taken up at a later stage, based on the outcomes of further review work and the legal study report.

49. Recalling the discussions held at the RKC VWG meeting, the Delegate of the EU wished to know how other WCO Conventions were amended/updated and enquired as to the estimated resources needed to carry out the review process.
50. With respect to the revision/update of other WCO Conventions, the Secretariat explained that the HS Convention set out a procedure for the update of its Annex through a four to seven-year review cycle. It was currently being updated every five years. However, as was the case with the RKC and other WCO Conventions, if a Contracting Party raised an objection to any part of the proposed amendment emanating from the HS Committee, the said amendment would be deemed to have not been accepted and would be withdrawn.
51. Furthermore, based on the previous review process and new developments since then, and bearing in mind that the current review process might take three years, the Secretariat provided a rough estimate of the resources required to carry out a comprehensive review of the RKC. This estimated covered the Secretariat's costs of four staff members dedicated to this review, legal advice in addition to the ongoing legal study, and meeting logistics including interpretation and translation into English and French. In addition, there would be cost for Members and stakeholders to participate in the review process, including attending meetings. The estimated cost would also depend on the nature of the Working Group – whether virtual or physical – and the number of face-to-face meetings, noting that there had generally been six face-to-face meetings a year during the last review process.
52. Further discussion followed, during which the Delegates of China, the Netherlands, Vietnam, Poland and the United Kingdom expressed their views on the process adopted during the last review exercise and on how some of the procedures, including the means of interacting and exchanging information/views through various electronic means, had undergone changes and become more efficient, potentially requiring less face-to-face meetings during this review process. Additionally, the WCO had developed a number of tools addressing most of the new topics and these could possibly be used for incorporating them into the RKC. However, it was noted that a structured approach to the review process was required and, as a first step, the 23 issues already identified should be examined. The delegates further noted that the whole exercise would essentially be carried out by Members, with less involvement by the Secretariat this time.
53. The Chairperson concluded the discussion on the Report of the RKC VWG by stating that the RKC/MC approved the Report, noting all the related interventions mentioned therein, and agreed to establish a new virtual Working Group to carry out the review work while taking into account the concerns and suggestions made by delegates. He then invited delegates to reflect on the preliminary draft ToR for the newly established Group, which had been developed by a small group of Members in advance of the RKC MC Meeting.
54. During the ensuing discussion, several delegates provided various suggestions for establishing robust ToR.
55. The Delegate of Spain said that when revising the RKC, the reasons why it was not implemented in its entirety should also be borne in mind. It would not be an achievement to update the current Convention/create a new Convention if it could not be implemented by Members. To that end, he suggested that the ToR for the new Group also provide for examining the underlying issues and challenges in implementation of the RKC and, accordingly, finding solutions during the review process.

56. After listening to the explanations of the WCO Secretariat, the Delegate of Vietnam suggested establishing a formal Working Group rather than a Virtual Working Group and, if required, seeking the approval of the Policy Commission and Council to that end. However, all the working documents and reports should be made available through the WCO CLiKC! Platform to enable all WCO Members and relevant stakeholders to access them and contribute virtually as well.
57. The Delegate of Hungary also supported the idea of using the CLiKC! Platform as it had proven a successful medium for exchanging views in respect of other WCO working groups. He noted that physical meetings, when necessary, could be organized.
58. Returning to the use of the terms 'review' and 'revision', the Delegate of China sought further clarification on the appropriateness of their utilization in the context of their respective meanings and urged their consistent use.
59. There was a view that the term 'review' should be used in the Report of the RKC/VWG while the term 'revision' should be retained in the ToR, as the RKC/MC could always task the new Group to start the actual revision work. However, based on a further discussion among delegates and the explanation concerning the meaning and context of the terms 'review' and 'revision' provided by the Secretariat, the Chairperson concluded that the term 'review' should be used in the ToR, as 'review' included potential revision, where necessary.
60. The Chairperson and the Vice-Chair of the RKC/VWG reiterated that all the proposals concerning amendment/update of the RKC stemming from the new Group would, in any case, be finally considered and decided on by the RKC/MC.
61. The Secretariat sought clarification concerning its role in the whole process, so that it could better assess the resource requirements that would depend on, among other things, the nature of the Working Group – virtual or physical. It also noted that the working languages of the group should be both official languages of the WCO (English and French), since the review process would involve a discussion on the legal texts of the Convention. These issues needed greater clarity to permit a more accurate resource and cost estimation and, where required, seek the approval of the competent WCO bodies. Additionally, the Secretariat informed the meeting that no budget had currently been allocated to the review process.
62. In response, some delegates recognized the importance of the Secretariat's support in moving the review process forward and requested that the necessary resources be made available. Accordingly, the Secretariat's role in terms of providing all the necessary support was mentioned in the ToR. Furthermore, resources should be reallocated, if necessary and where possible, to support the RKC review process.
63. Delegates expressed differing views on the body entitled to establish a new Working Group. The Delegate of the EU stated that the RKC/MC was the competent body to establish the Working Group that should inform the Policy Commission and Council accordingly, whereas the Delegate of Mexico was of the view that, according to a June 2002 Policy Commission/ Council decision, any new group was to be created by the Policy Commission and the Council, though the creation of a virtual working group did not require such approval.

64. The Representatives of GEA and IATA stressed that the ToR should clearly provide for regular participation by private sector representatives in the review process, in line with the WCO's policy of transparent engagement with the private sector.
65. Moving forward, the Delegate of Vietnam made an alternative proposal entailing (i) extending of the mandate of the present RKC/VWG to continue work on the planned RKC review in the interim period, until the legal study report became available and (ii) developing comprehensive ToR for a new formal Working Group for which Policy Commission/Council approval might be required.
66. Based on several suggestions made by delegates, the Chairperson asked delegates to consider the following two options and decide on the way forward:
- i. discuss and finalize the draft ToR for setting up a new Virtual Working Group; or
 - ii. extend the mandate of the existing RKC/VWG for the interim period, in order to carry out the review work, develop comprehensive ToR and seek the necessary approval, as required, for establishing a formal Working Group with the requisite resources.
67. Reflecting on the above proposals by the Chairperson, the Delegate of the EU, speaking on behalf of its Member States and supported by Poland, expressed a preference for the first option.
68. The Delegate of China requested clarification of the wording "adoption of the report". The Secretariat provided a response that adoption means accepting the proposals contained in the report, with the suggestions made by the delegates.
69. Following that, the Chairperson came up with revised ToR reflecting various concerns and suggestions by delegates.
70. In a wide ranging discussion that followed, there were several suggestions and proposals from delegates. After a detailed deliberation and careful consideration of various proposals and counter proposals, the RKC/MC agreed to the ToR as set out in Annex III to this Report.
71. The Delegate of China reiterated her concern of the wording "revision" in the conclusion part of the final report of the RKC/VWG.

Conclusion

72. The RKC/MC :
- approved the Final Report of the RKC Virtual Working Group (Annex II), noting all the related interventions;
 - agreed to establish a new virtual Working Group until the creation of a Working Group for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive review of the RKC, while taking into account the concerns and suggestions made by delegates; and
 - adopted the ToR for the a new virtual Working Group set out in Annex III to this Report.

**V. PRESENTATIONS BY MEMBERS ON THEIR ACCESSION PROCEDURES:
CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS**

Doc. PO0100

Introduction

73. The Chairperson mentioned that since its 10th Session, the RKC/MC had been inviting Members to present and share their experiences on accession procedures.
74. This time, it was the Delegates of Burkina Faso and Nepal who were presenting their national experiences concerning their RKC accession procedures. Their presentations would soon be available on the WCO Members' website.

Summary of discussion

75. During the ensuing discussion, the Chairperson, on behalf of the RKC/MC, congratulated Burkina Faso and Nepal on their successful accession to the RKC.

Conclusion

76. The RKC/MC took note of the presentations by Burkina Faso and Nepal on their accession procedures and encouraged Members to continue sharing their own experiences in this area.

**VI. EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES AND NATIONAL PRACTICES REGARDING THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF:**

Doc. PO0101

- **Chapter 8 of the General Annex : Relationship between Customs and third parties - India**

Doc. PO0101

Introduction

77. The Chairperson informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received informal enquiries from WCO Members on the implementation of Standard 3.27 and Transitional Standards 3.28 and 3.29 (Chapter 3 of the General Annex), as well as on the provisions concerning the relationship between Customs and third parties (Chapter 8 of the General Annex).
78. Bearing in mind that, according to Article 6.1, it is the competence of the RKC/MC to consider the implementation of the Convention and any measures to secure the uniformity of the interpretation and the application thereof, the Secretariat had developed a background document (PO0101) and had invited some Contracting parties to share their national experiences in these areas.
79. The Delegate of India would share his country's national experiences on the relationship between Customs and third parties during this meeting. In addition, delegates were invited to share their national experiences on implementation of the provisions of Standard 3.27 and Transitional Standards 3.28 and 3.29.

Summary of discussion

80. During the ensuing discussion, the Chairperson, on behalf of the RKC/MC thanked India for sharing the successful implementation of RKC provisions.

Conclusion

81. The RKC/MC took note of the explanations provided by the Secretariat and the presentation by India. The RKC/MC recommended that Contracting Parties share their national practices in these areas for the benefit of others.

VII. DELIVERY OF RKC-RELATED ACTIVITIES: DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE 15TH RKC MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Doc. PO0102EIntroduction

82. The Chairperson explained that the WCO regularly conducted a range of support activities related to accession and implementation of the RKC, both at regional and national level. The support requested by WCO Members was provided by accredited experts from Member Customs administrations and by Secretariat staff.
83. The WCO Secretariat presented Doc. PO0102 outlining RKC-related technical assistance and capacity building activities delivered by the WCO since the 15th Meeting of the RKC/MC, as well as support requested by Members.
84. During the presentation, the Secretariat highlighted the fact that these activities were aimed not only at strengthening accession, but also at encouraging implementation of the RKC among WCO Members using two key approaches, namely (i) a gap analysis, to support RKC accession and (ii) the RKC Toolkit to enhance implementation of the Convention. Eleven RKC Workshops had been delivered since November 2016.
85. The Secretariat further informed delegates that the activities delivered and the RKC-related capacity building provided had also enabled the WCO to complete the accreditation of three (3) Technical and Operational Advisers (TOAs) on the RKC and had afforded the Organization an opportunity to address some of the emerging accession issues facing Members.

Summary of discussion

86. A delegate expressed the view that Members should learn from the example of Nepal and Burkina Faso, two countries which had shared their experience in respect of RKC accession at this meeting of the RKC/MC. Both had adopted the General Annex and all the Specific Annexes to the Convention simultaneously.
87. He drew the RKC/MC's attention to the fact that his country had adopted the General Annex to the Convention in 2010 and was currently making additional efforts to accept all the Specific Annexes. In his view, his country could have acceded to the entire Convention in 2010; it had nevertheless failed to do so, and was currently facing a number of challenges as a result, especially due to the fact that the process of accepting Specific Annexes also required parliamentary approval. He felt that these

challenges could have been avoided if his country had adopted both the General and Specific Annexes simultaneously back in 2010.

88. He indicated that in order for Members which were in the process of acceding to the Convention to avoid potential duplication of work by adopting the General and Specific Annexes at different junctures, it would make sense for Members to accede to the entire Convention at once.

Conclusion

89. The RKC/MC:
- took note of the capacity building activities related to RKC implementation delivered prior to this meeting, and of the requests received for the current WCO financial year;
 - noted the challenges faced by Members in terms of accession to and implementation of the RKC, as well as the comments on how to address certain issues and concerns.

VIII. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

90. The following Members volunteered to join the VWG: the EU, Norway, Japan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Poland, the US, the UK, Turkey, the Netherlands, Mexico, Sweden, Libya, Spain, Vietnam, Ireland, France, Malaysia, Kenya, Benin, Bangladesh and China. Other interested Members may like to inform the Secretariat their willingness to join the Group by 15 December 2017.

IX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

91. The RKC/MC approved the Report.

X. CLOSING OF THE MEETING

92. After final remarks by the Secretariat and the Chairperson, the Chairperson closed the meeting.

*

* *

Revised Kyoto Convention Management Committee 17 / Comité de gestion de la Convention de Kyoto révisée 17				
	PARTICIPANTS	TEL	FAX	E-MAIL
CHAIRPERSON / PRESIDENT : Mr. Masanori HIRAKI (Japan)				
CONTRACTING PARTIES/PARTIES CONTRACTANTES - MEMBERS / MEMBRES				
MEMBERS / MEMBRES				
Australia / Australie				
	Mr. Gerard RODRIGUES Counsellor (Europe and Africa) Australian Border Force	+3222860585	+3222302022	gerard.rodrigues@border.gov.au
Bangladesh / Bangladesh				
	Mr. Md masudul KABIR Minister Representative to WCO NATIONAL BOARD OF REVENUE/Embassy of Bangladesh, Brussels			masud3kabar@yahoo.com
Belgium / Belgique				
	Mrs. Sigrid HEYVAERT permanent representative to the WCO			sigrid.heyvaert@minfin.fed.be

	Customs Belgium			
Benin / Bénin				
	Mr. Maurice Emiola ADEFALOU DIRECTEUR DE LA LÉGISLATION ET DES RELATIONS INTERNATIONALES DOUANES BÉNIN	+22997339160		Emiolamaurice@gmail.com
Bulgaria / Bulgarie				
	Ms. Elena CHOLAKOVA Chief expert in International Projects and Multilateral Cooperation Department National Customs Agency			Elena.Cholakova@customs.bg
Burkina Faso / Burkina Faso				
	Mrs. Pulcherie DABIRE CONSEILLER AMBASSADE DU BURKINA FASO EN BELGIQUE			eve2ds@yahoo.fr
	Mr. Adama NANA Directeur de la Legislation et de la Reglementation Direction Générale des Douanes	00226 70 14 25 35		adamou9@hotmail.com
Cameroon / Cameroun				
	Mr. Yves patrick TCHAMI Chargé d'Etudes DIRECTION GENERALE DES DOUANES	00 237 677 88 91 66		patfoe@yahoo.fr
Canada / Canada				
	Mr. Jonathan PAGE	+32 2 741 06 65		Jonathan.Page2@international.gc.ca

	Liaison Officer and First Secretary Canada Border Services Agency			
China / Chine				
	Ms. Ye DING Second Secretary China Mission to the EU			dingye@skynet.be
Dominican Republic / République Dominicaine				
	Ms. Nadia GUILLEN	+1 809 793 7905		n.guillen@dga.gov.do
Egypt / Égypte				
	Mr. Hany mohamed OSMAN Head of Department, the central Directorate for customs polices and procedures Egyptian Customs Authority	00201207480598	00223422280	hany_matrix65@yahoo.com
European Union / Union européenne				
	Ms. Susanne JACOBSEN Head of Sector, European Commission, DG TAXUD European Commission	+32 2 29 60141		susanne.jacobsen@ec.europa.eu
	Ms. Maria VOURNOU Administrator European Commission			maria.vournou@ec.europa.eu
France / France				
	Mr. Etienne POLLET Rédacteur à la sous-direction du Commerce International			etienne.pollet@douane.finances.gouv.fr

	DGDDI			
Hungary / Hongrie				
	Mr. Richárd KONYHÁS senior customs and finance guard chief officer NATIONAL TAX- AND CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATION	+36 1 456 9531	+36 1 210 0201	konyhas.richard@nav.gov.hu
	Dr. Lajos RAJCZY Customs Attaché Permanent Representation of Hungary to the European Union			Lajos.Rajczy@mfa.gov.hu
India / Inde				
	Mr. Hardeep BATRA Additional Commissioner Central Board of Excise and Customs			ss.trade@indembassy.be
	Mr. Debi prasad DASH Director General Central Board of Excise and Customs			ss.trade@indembassy.be
	Mr. Biju thomas THOMAS Deputy Commissioner of Customs Central Board of Excise and Customs	+91-8592048373		bijuthomasvk@gmail.com
	Mr. Aseem NANDA Second Secretary Embassy of India Brussels			ss.trade@indembassy.be
Ireland / Irlande				
	Mr. Joe RYAN Customs Attaché	003222823321		joe.ryan@dfa.ie

	Irish Permanent representation to the EU			
Japan / Japon				
	Mr. Masanori HIRAKI First Secretary Embassy of Japan in Belgium			masanori.hiraki@mofa.go.jp
	Mr. Tetsuo MIZUNUMA Deputy Director, International Cooperation Division, Customs and Tariff Bureau (Japan Customs), Ministry of Finance, JAPAN			wco-japan@mof.go.jp
Kenya / Kenya				
	Mr. James Walter GITHINJI Chief Manager - Customs & Border Control Operations, R/Valley Region KENYA REVENUE AUTHORITY	+254722514934		jimmy.githinji@kra.go.ke
Lithuania / Lituanie				
	Mr. Virginijus LACKUS Chief Inspector Customs Department under the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania	+370 5 266 6059	+370 5 266 6005	virginijus.lackus@lrmuitine.lt
Malaysia / Malaisie				
	Ms. Ab aziz AFIDAH Second Secretary (Customs) Royal Malaysian Customs Department	+3227760356	+3227720026	customsmy@skynet.be
Nepal / Népal				

	Mr. Mukti ram ACHARYA Director Department of Customs	+97714259915	+97714259808	acharyamukti36@gmail.com
	Mr. Shreekrishna NEPAL Deputy Director General Department of Customs	+97714259791	+97714259808	sknepal40@gmail.com
Netherlands / Pays-Bas				
	Mr. Rob VAN KUIK Counselor Tax and Customs Policy Ministry of Finance	+31703428267	+31703427914	j.r.kuik@minfin.nl
	Ms. Jaklien Susan JONG Ministry of Finance The Netherlands	+31 618304564		j.s.jong@minfin.nl
New Zealand / Nouvelle-Zélande				
	Mrs. Chriselda BARRETTO EA to Customs Counsellor New Zealand Customs Services	003225501218		Chriselda.Barretto@mfat.govt.nz
Niger / Niger				
	Mr. Moustapha BALLA Inspecteur Principal des Douanes Direction Générale des Douanes	+227 96 96 44 54	+227 20 72 35 68	moustgoga@yahoo.fr
Nigeria / Nigeria				
	Mr. Ibrahim adamu ALFA Customs Attache Nigeria Customs Service	0466072562		alfazazi@gmail.com

Norway / Norvège				
	Mr. Roy SKÅRSLETTE Senior Customs Representative Norwegian Directorate of Customs	+32473181571		roy.skarslette@gmail.com
Poland / Pologne				
	Mrs. Monika CHUDZIAK CHIEF EXPERT MINISTRY OF FINANCE, POLISH CUSTOMS- FISCAL SERVICE	48 22 6943511	48 22 6944303	monika.chudziak@mf.gov.pl
Portugal / Portugal				
	Mrs. Deolinda reis SIMÕES Technique supérieure AT-Autoridade Tributária e Aduaneira	+351 21 881 43 65		Deolinda.Reis.Simoes@at.gov.pt
Romania / Roumanie				
	Mr. Alexandru MARINESCU expert General Customs Directorate			alexandru.marinescu@customs.ro
Russian Federation / Russie (Fédération de)				
	Mr. Vladimir IVIN Cousellor (Customs) Embassy of the Russian Federation	+32494756170		subochev.customs@mail.ru
	Mr. Dmitry SUBOCHEV Third Secretary (Customs) Embassy of the Russian Federation	+32495262744		subochev.customs@mail.ru
	Mr. Alexey ARTEMIEV	+ 7 225-43-63	+ 7 225-43-63	shirokov.ofc@mail.ru

	the deputy chief of the customs regulation division (the Tax and Customs Policy Department) the Finance Ministry of the Russian Federation			
Saudi Arabia / Arabie Saoudite				
	Dr. Hamad s ALQASOUMI Customs Attache, Permanent Representative to WCO Saudi Customs			conventions@customs.gov.sa
	Mr. Ali ALSHEHRI Customs Specialist Saudi Customs			conventions@customs.gov.sa
Serbia / Serbie				
	Mrs. Dusko MARINKOVIC 1000 Mission of Republic Serbia to rhe EU	+32026498242		marinkovicd@carina.rs
South Africa / Afrique du Sud				
	Mr. Matome MATHOLE COUNSELOR CUSTOMS SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY	+3222854408	+3222800963	sars.brussels@skynet.be
Spain / Espagne				
	Mr. Antonio ALARCON CAÑONES INSPECTOR ASESOR Departamento Aduanas e Impuestos especiales. Agencia Tributaria.	34 917289510		antonio.alarconc@correo.aeat.es
	Mr. Javier CAMPILLO Counsellor	0032473525849		Javier.campillo@reper.maec.es

	Embassy of Kingdom of Spain			
Sri Lanka / Sri Lanka				
	Mr. Vipula MINUWANPITIYA Deputy Director of Customs Sri Lanka Customs	+94777358159	+94112446361	vipulaminu59@gmail.com
	Mr. Wasantha kumara RANDENIYA Director of Customs Sri Lanka Customs	+94714916756	+94112446361	randeniyaw@gmail.com
Sudan / Soudan				
	Mr. Hassan HASSAN OMER HASSAN Director of International Relations for Sudan Customs Authority Sudan Customs Authority	002499123433243	291	abomaany22003@gmail.com
Sweden / Suède				
	Mr. Christopher KRISTENSSON Senior Adviser Swedish Customs			christopher.kristensson@tullverket.se
Switzerland / Suisse				
	Mr. Stephan MEBOLD Head of Free Trade- and Customs Agreements Section Directorate General of Customs	+41 58 462 65 24		stephan.mebold@ezv.admin.ch
Thailand / Thaïlande				
	Mr. Terdsak SUARNAMANI	+3226605759		thai-customs@skynet.be

	Minister Counsellor(Customs) Office of Customs Counsellor, Royal Thai Embassy			
	Mr. Chumpon AROONDECHAWAT Chief of International law sub-division 2 Thai Customs Department			107646@customs.go.th
	Mr. Warasit MUANGKOOM Legal officer Thai Customs Department			107646@customs.go.th
	Ms. Natsuda THAMTHANOM Legal officer Thai Customs Department			107646@customs.go.th
Turkey / Turquie				
	Ms. Damla KESTEL External Relations Expert MINISTRY OF CUSTOMS AND TRADE OF REPUBLIC OF TURKEY	+903124492870		d.kestel@gtb.gov.tr
	Mrs. Ozlem SOYSANLI CUSTOMS COUNSELLOR TURKISH EMBASSY	003225134166	003225134166	o.soyanli@gtb.gov.tr
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni				
	Mrs. Gillian CASTLE Senior Policy Adviser Central and Eastern Europe	0044 30000585816		gillian.castle@hmrc.gsi.gov.uk
	Ms. Zeba CHOWDHURY Customs Officer HMRC	+4403000563738		zeba.chowdhury@hmrc.gsi.gov.uk

United States / États-Unis				
	Ms. Christina BELL CBP Attache U.S. Customs and Border Protection	3228114086		christina.a.bell@cbp.dhs.gov
	Mr. Patrick OTT CBP Attache (The Hague) U.S. Customs and Border Protection	+31 630 98 6226		patrick.p.ott@cbp.dhs.gov
Vietnam / Vietnam				
	Mrs. Thi Khanh Nguyen HONG CUSTOMS COUNSELLOR Mission of Vietnam to the EU	+32494400631		hongntk73@gmail.com
NON CONTRACTING PARTIES/NON-PARTIES CONTRACTANTES - MEMBERS / MEMBRES				
Libya / Libye				
	Mr. Matoug YOUSEF MATOUG 28,1000 Bruxelles Libya Customs	0032484388954		yousefalboashi64@gmail.com
Mexico / Mexique				
	Mr. Daniel RIOS Counsellor Representative to the WCO and the EU SHCP-SAT-Customs			drios@embamex.eu
NON-MEMBERS / NON-MEMBRES				

Chinese Taipei	Mr. Wei-cheng HUANG Executive Officer			huangwc73@gmail.com
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION / ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE				
EEC - Eurasian Economic Commission	Mr. Sergei MOZER Deputy Head of Advanced Customs Technologies Division, Department of Customs Legislation	+79258595222		moser@eecommission.org
EEC - Eurasian Economic Commission	Mr. Petr SHASHAEV Advisor of Risk Analysis and Post-Control Division, Department of Customs Legislation	+749566924005228		shashaev@eecommission.org
IATA - International Air Transport Association	Mr. Beddows SHAWN Manager	+41795214318		beddowss@iata.org
PRIVATE SECTOR / SECTEUR PRIVE				
FIATA	Mr. Ferdinand DESMAZIERES POLICY ADVISER			desmazieres@clecat.org
Global Express Association	Mr. Martin BROWN Advisor			Martin.brown14@btinternet.com
Global Express Association (GEA)	Mr. Dietmar JOST Customs and Security Advisor			dietmar.jost@global-express.org
SECRETARIAT				
Ana HINOJOSA – Director, Compliance and Facilitation				
Luc DE BLIECK - Deputy Director, Compliance and Facilitation				
Samson BILANGNA - Technical Officer				
Pashupati Nath PANDEY - Technical Officer				

Oluimo DA SILVA - Technical Attaché
Vyara FILIPOVA - Technical Attaché
Min HAN - Technical Attaché
Nicolas PIROTTE – Technical Support
INTERPRETERS / INTERPRETES
Susan BLACKWELL
Marie DALCQ
Jean-Christophe PIERRET

*

*

*