

POSTAL OPERATIONS COUNCIL
Committee 1 (Supply Chain Integration)
Report by the Chairman of the Postal Security Group
(Agenda item 9)

1 Subject	References/paragraphs
Report to Committee 1 on the work of the Postal Security Group.	§§ 1 to 14
2 Decision expected Committee 1 is asked to take note of this report.	

I. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda
(POC C 1 PSG 2013.1–Doc 1.Rev 4)

1 The Postal Security Group (PSG) met on 17 April 2013, under the chairmanship of Mr Guy Cottrell, Chief Postal Inspector, United States Postal Service. Before adopting the agenda, the Chair noted that the PSG's work had grown steadily over the years, and suggested that it was high time the Group had a Vice-Chair. He proposed that Ecuador take on this role. Canada and Denmark endorsed his recommendation, and the PSG approved the proposal that Ecuador serve as Vice-Chair of the PSG for the 2013–2016 cycle.

II. Terms of reference for the Postal Security Group
(POC C 1 PSG 2013.1–Doc 2)

2 The International Bureau presented the draft terms of reference for the PSG. These would serve as guidelines for the Group's work in the 2013–2016 cycle. Barbados noted that participation in the PSG was currently limited to members of the POC. It was further noted that when the Group had initially been formed, participation was open to all members of the UPU. Barbados said that given the important role of security, the Group should consider opening up participation to all member countries. Denmark commented that in section 4, "Coordination", there should be a reference to coordination with all international organizations. These remarks were noted, and the Group adopted the terms of reference.

III. UPU security standards for the postal sector
(POC C 1 PSG 2013.1–Doc 3)

3 The International Bureau (IB) made a presentation on the current status of the postal security standards. It was noted that, following the adoption of the amendment to Convention article 9, compliance with the UPU postal security standards was now a requirement for all member countries and their designated operators. The presentation recognized the pilot that had been completed in Ghana and the recent review conducted in Pakistan. Those results showed that compliance with the security standards required effort and

commitment, but it could be achieved. The Group was also shown a draft assessment tool to assist member countries in their compliance efforts. It was noted that creating the standards and amending the Convention were just the first steps. The work would now focus on moving the standards to status 2 by the end of 2013, and on training and implementation. It was acknowledged that there was still a lot of work to be done, and a Security Standards Working Group would be created to address this work. It was also pointed out that some of the information requested in the assessment tool could be considered confidential, and it would be necessary to consider who would have access to these reports, and where this data would be stored. The Group took note of the report and endorsed the strategy outlined in the document.

IV. Dangerous goods training update

4 Denmark updated the PSG on the current status of dangerous goods in the mail and the dangerous goods training initiative. With the 2013–2015 ICAO Technical Instructions now in force, it was important to update the PSG on the requirements that impacted designated operators. The presentation discussed the elements that the civil aviation authorities would be using to assess a designated postal operator's processes for controlling the introduction of dangerous goods into mail and ultimately onto air transport. Denmark noted that eight UPU circular letters had been issued to assist member countries in their discussions with local civil aviation authorities (CAAs). There was review of the requirements for dangerous goods training for staff of designated operators. Denmark reported that in January a meeting was held in Washington D.C. to discuss the development of dangerous goods training. The meeting was attended by the IB, designated operators, civil aviation authorities, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Air Transport Association (IATA). As a result of the meeting, a draft training course had been developed. This draft would be made available to the PSG to enable comments and suggestions to be provided. It would also be forwarded to CAAs, ICAO and IATA for further comments. Japan expressed gratitude for the work that had been done with lithium batteries, and referred to the opportunity that lithium batteries presented for increasing business. It was also noted that this effort had refocused the Post on the importance of compliance with the rules controlling the introduction of dangerous goods into mail. It was noted that discussions with some CAAs had shown that there still seemed to be confusion regarding the interpretation of the new technical instructions. Continued communication with ICAO on these issues was thus to be encouraged. There were also concerns about the clarity of the technical instructions, especially when dealing with transit issues and returned items.

V. Incident reporting

5 Great Britain gave a presentation on its dangerous goods programme, and the associated incident reporting and auditing mechanisms. Key to the success of the programme in Great Britain had been the ongoing dialogue with that country's civil aviation authority. It was pointed out that, whether intentionally or unintentionally, postal customers were shipping items that were considered dangerous, and Posts needed to demonstrate due diligence in addressing this problem. Great Britain used a multi-layer approach including customer awareness, staff training and awareness, acceptance point procedures, aviation security screening, and response procedures. Communication was a key element in this process. As part of its programme it periodically tested its processes to ensure that staff were complying with the rules and that its messages were getting through to customers. As part of the cooperation with its local CAA, Royal Mail had also established reporting protocols for dangerous goods discovered in the mail.

VI. Alarm resolution

6 The PSG was updated on the current work with regard to alarm resolution. It was acknowledged that this was largely a transport issue, but the PSG would have a role to play in moving this forward. During the last cycle, the PSG had been able to establish the screening standards contained in S59, put together a model alarm resolution process flow, and examine the existing Parcel and Letter Post Regulations. This was an ongoing issue, and while some progress had been made, there was still much work to be done within the UPU membership and with external partners.

VII. Global awareness-raising campaign on dangerous and prohibited items in the international mail stream
(POC C 1 PSG 2013.1–Doc 7)

7 The International Bureau gave an update on a proposed awareness-raising campaign on prohibited items and dangerous goods in the mail. This aimed to take a new approach to the issues outlined in document POC PSG 2010.1–Doc 6, discussed during the last cycle, in relation to counterfeit and pirated items. Owing to other priorities, it had not been possible to move that initiative forward. This updated initiative would focus on informing customers about items that were considered dangerous and were prohibited in the postal network and transport. The essence of this campaign was for Posts to be viewed as caring and concerned to provide good quality service to their customers, while safeguarding the security and safety of those involved in the global supply chain. The idea was that member countries would be provided with a communication toolbox with a variety of materials that Posts could use to inform customers of common items that they might not know posed certain dangers. The tentative plan was to have this material ready by the autumn of 2013, in time to enable Posts to share this information with customers prior to the holiday mailing season. The group took note of the report, and also recognized that this type of awareness was one of the elements that civil aviation authorities took note of when reviewing Posts' efforts to control the introduction of dangerous goods into the mail network and onto air transport.

VIII. IATA–ICAO presentation

8 IATA provided an update on ongoing issues that impacted air transport and the mail. Information was provided on dangerous goods training recommendations, Dangerous Goods Panel working papers that were being discussed within ICAO, and updates of IATA security issues. Training recommendations focused on record keeping, recurrent training timelines, and ensuring that that training was kept up to date to reflect the latest incidents. There was discussion on the cargo and mail issue. In IATA's view, the current trend in the world of security was for cargo and mail to be viewed as one and the same thing, which should be held to the same security standards. An update was provided on the independent validator programme. While this programme was directed at airline operators, Posts, as customers of those airlines, would also be subjected to this validation process. It was observed that although there were treaties that distinguished between mail and cargo, in the world of security they were treated the same; however, it was recognized that it was sometimes national legislation which dictated the rules relating to mail.

IX. Report of the Interim Group on Advance Information Requirements (IGAIR)

9 Canada provided the PSG with an update on the work of the IGAIR. This presentation had been made to the Transport and Customs Groups earlier in the week. The PSG was brought up to date on the testing and deployment of CDS, the Customs Declaration System. Advance data was yet another way to ensure the security and safety of the global postal network, by getting critical information to the necessary authorities to enable them to make risk assessments and take appropriate actions.

X. Revenue protection
(Resolution C 61/2012)

10 Congress resolution C 61/2012 called for the POC, in consultation with the Consultative Committee, to continue revenue protection activities. The International Bureau gave a presentation on the work accomplished in the last cycle and the plan for continuing its revenue protection work in 2013–2016. During the Nairobi cycle, a survey was carried out, with participation by 120 designated postal operators. Based on the results of that survey, three regional revenue protection workshops were organized (Bangkok, Cairo and Arusha). The group acknowledged the participation of several member countries that provided resources during the workshops. There was a postal revenue protection session organized during POST-EXPO 2011. The main goals for moving resolution C 61/2012 forward were to strengthen regional and online training activities that raised awareness, look to initiate an audit and certification programme, and encourage members to share best practices relative to revenue protection activities.

XI. Organization of the work of the Postal Security Group
(POC C 1 PSG 2013.1–Doc 11 and POC 2013.1–Doc 6.Add 1)

11 These documents were presented by the International Bureau. The PSG took note of the reports and endorsed the work plan for the next cycle.

XII. Security at Correos del Ecuador

12 Ecuador gave a presentation on recent security efforts and enhancements at Correos del Ecuador. The presentation outlined the efforts to remove illegal currency, weapons and illegal narcotics from the mail stream. In the past five years, Ecuador had increased its CCTV system from 28 cameras to a total of 312 cameras in 2012. It had also incorporated advanced security systems during new construction and it had increased the mobility of its postal security personnel so that they could conduct on-site security inspections.

XIII. Formation of the ICAO–UPU Contact Committee
(POC C 1 PSG 2013.1–Doc 13)

13 This document was presented by the United States of America. The PSG was updated on the countries under consideration for this Contact Committee. To date there had been no official word from ICAO, so all information was tentative until that response was received.

XIV. Examination of proposals referred by POC Committee 1
(25.130.1 and 35.118.1.Rev 1)

14 Committee 1 had referred two proposals to the PSG for further review. The PSG reviewed proposal 25.130.1 and agreed on an updated text. Proposal 35.118.1.Rev 1 was also reviewed, but it was decided that more study and research was needed on this latter proposal.

Berne 18 April 2013

Guy Cottrell
Chairman of the Postal Security Group