



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

Distr.: General
21 November 2017

ENGLISH ONLY

Administrative Committee for the TIR Convention, 1975

TIR Executive Board (TIRExB)

Seventy-fifth session

Geneva, 6 and 7 December 2017

Agenda item 4 (c)

Computerization of the TIR procedure

**Statistical information on the use of the International TIR
Data Bank (ITDB)**

Note by the secretariat

I. Background

1. At its seventy-third session (12 June 2017), the Board commenced considerations on mandatory data submission via the ITDB. During the discussions, the question was raised on the number of Contracting Parties that were currently not using the ITDB. For its deliberations, the Board requested the secretariat to provide statistical information on the number of Contracting Parties that did not use the ITDB, and that still submitted annual lists on paper (see TIRExB/REP/2017/73draft, para. 19).

2. Pursuant to this request, the secretariat has prepared Informal document No. 16 (2017), containing statistical information on the use of the ITDB. In view that the Board did not have time to consider Informal document No. 16 (2017) at its previous session, the secretariat has updated the statistical information on the use of the ITDB (Informal document No. 16/rev.1 (2017)).

II. Statistical information on the use of the ITDB

a. Number of ITDB users (Data as of 21/11/2017)

3. The Board may wish to note that in 19 of the 58 operational Contracting Parties neither the competent authorities nor the national associations are using the ITDB at all, which corresponds to 33%. In 26 of the 58 operational Contracting Parties, the competent authorities do not use the ITDB, which corresponds to 45%.

4. The table below shows the number of users that successfully accessed the new ITDB since its launch on 9 May 2017. The Board may wish to note that competent authorities of 32 Contracting Parties have accessed the ITDB. This means 55% of the Contracting Parties¹ currently use the ITDB. There are seven Contracting Parties, which only have ITDB users

¹ The calculation of percentages for this paper is based on the total number of operational Contracting Parties: 58 (58 countries and the European Union (EU)).

from the national associations. The Board may also wish to note that 39 Contracting Parties have ITDB users from competent authorities, national associations or both, which results in a total 67% of the Contracting Parties using the ITDB.

5. In addition, the Board may wish to note that the table might not reflect the actual number of users per Contracting Party. In some cases, the competent authorities have a generic “Read Only” account, for example France. However, French customs officers working with the TIR system have access to this generic account. Therefore, the table reflects only three French competent authorities as users, whereas the actual number is higher.

6. The United Arab Emirates and Pakistan have already connected to the ITDB. However, the Board may wish to note that they are not yet operational, so they have not been counted in the above percentage. If taken into consideration for the above statistics, the number of Contracting Parties using the ITDB would be even higher.

7. In its consideration of the statistical information, the Board may wish to note that the number of users of the ITDB has been steadily increasing. From 1 January to 8 May 2017, 157 users from 25 Contracting Parties have accessed the ITDB online+ (old ITDB). However, in the first week of the launch of the new ITDB (9 to 15 May 2017), the number of connected users increased already to 218 from 22 Contracting Parties. As of 19 September 2017, 421 users from 37 Contracting Parties have accessed the new ITDB since its launch. As of 21 November 2017, 517 users from 42 Contracting Parties have accessed the new ITDB since its launch.

	<i>Contracting Party</i>	<i>Competent Authorities</i>	<i>National Association</i>	<i>Total</i>
#1	ALB	0	1	1
#2	ARE*	0	1	1
#3	AUT	1	1	2
#4	AZE	2	1	3
#5	BGR	9	4	13
#6	BIH	16	1	17
#7	CHE	1	0	1
#8	CYP	1	0	1
#9	CZE	99	1	100
#10	DEU	81	2	83
#11	DNK	2	2	4
#12	ESP	1	0	1
#13	EST	5	0	5
#14	EU	1	0	1
#15	FIN	31	0	31
#16	FRA	3	1	4
#17	GBR	3	1	4
#18	GRC	2	1	3
#19	HRV	2	1	3
#20	HUN	3	1	4
#21	IRL	2	0	2
#22	IRN	0	1	1
#23	ITA	47	1	48
#24	KAZ	0	1	1
#25	KGZ	0	1	1
#26	LTU	1	1	2

#27	LUX	2	0	2
#28	LVA	12	3	15
#29	MDA	0	1	1
#30	MKD	0	1	1
#31	NLD	1	1	2
#32	NOR	1	0	1
#33	PAK*	0	1	1
#34	POL	123	3	126
#35	PRT	5	0	5
#36	ROU	1	1	2
#37	SVK	2	1	3
#38	SVN	3	1	4
#39	SWE	4	0	4
#40	TUR	9	2	11
#41	UKR	0	1	1
#42	UZB	1	0	1
<i>Total</i>		<i>477</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>517</i>

* Contracting Party not yet operational.

b. Contracting Parties connected to the ITDB Web Service (ITDBWS) (Data as of 21/11/2017)

8. The Board may wish to note that the new ITDBWS seems to attract more interest than the previous version. The higher number of users of ITDBWS confirms this finding. The previous ITDBWS only had one Contracting Party connected, whereas the new ITDBWS has already two and the number is increasing. To illustrate this, the Board may wish to take note of the below table on Contracting Parties connected to the ITDBWS.

9. Thus, the table below provides an overview on the status of Contracting Parties connecting their IT national systems to perform automatic checks against ITDBWS. The first column shows the Contracting Parties that are actually connected. The second column shows the Contracting Parties that are in the testing phase. The third column shows the Contracting Parties that have requested the ITDB Web Service Documentation to check with their IT departments.

<i>Connected</i>	<i>Testing</i>	<i>Requested Documentation</i>
<i>FIN</i>	<i>CZE</i>	<i>AZE</i>
<i>UZB</i>	<i>FRA</i>	<i>BIH</i>
		<i>GRE</i>
		<i>HUN</i>
		<i>TUR</i>

c. Submission of annual list in 2016

10. The table below reflects the submission of annual lists to TIRExB for the year 2016, including the format of submission. The Board may wish to note that 12 Contracting Parties have sent the annual list to TIRExB in 2016, equalling 21% of the Contracting Parties. Seven annual lists were submitted in paper format (58%) and five in electronic format (42%). One annual list submitted in electronic format required translation. This results in a

total of eight of these 12 Contracting Parties (67%) which submitted the annual list in a format that required re-typing by the secretariat of the data into the ITDB. TIRExB may wish to note that re-typing makes the data prone to errors.

<i>Contracting Party</i>	<i>Annual updated list as per 31 December 2016</i>	<i>Format of the Annual list</i>
<i>Afghanistan</i>		
<i>Albania</i>		
<i>Armenia</i>		
<i>Austria</i>	✓	<i>Excel</i>
<i>Azerbaijan</i>		
<i>Belarus</i>	✓	<i>Excel</i>
<i>Belgium/Luxembourg</i>		
<i>Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>		
<i>Bulgaria</i>		
<i>Croatia</i>		
<i>Cyprus</i>		
<i>Czech Republic</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>
<i>Denmark</i>		
<i>Estonia</i>		
<i>Finland</i>		
<i>France</i>		
<i>Georgia</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>
<i>Germany</i>		
<i>Greece</i>		
<i>Hungary</i>		
<i>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</i>		
<i>Ireland</i>		
<i>Israel</i>		
<i>Italy</i>		
<i>Jordan</i>		
<i>Kazakhstan</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>
<i>Kuwait</i>		
<i>Kyrgyzstan</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>
<i>Latvia</i>		
<i>Lebanon</i>		
<i>Lithuania</i>		
<i>Malta</i>		
<i>Moldova</i>		
<i>Mongolia</i>		
<i>Montenegro</i>		
<i>Morocco</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>
<i>Netherlands</i>		
<i>Norway</i>	✓	<i>Word</i>
<i>Poland</i>		
<i>Portugal</i>		
<i>Romania</i>		

<i>Russian Federation</i>	✓	<i>Excel in Russian*</i>
<i>Serbia</i>		
<i>Slovakia</i>		
<i>Slovenia</i>		
<i>Spain</i>		
<i>Sweden</i>		
<i>Switzerland</i>	✓	<i>Excel</i>
<i>Syrian Arab Republic</i>		
<i>Tajikistan</i>		
<i>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>
<i>Tunisia</i>		
<i>Turkey</i>		
<i>Turkmenistan</i>		
<i>Ukraine</i>		
<i>United Kingdom</i>		
<i>Uzbekistan</i>	✓	<i>Paper*</i>

** Format used that requires the secretariat to retype the data into the ITDB, since a copy-paste cannot be performed or a translation is required.*
