

CAREC e-CERT Hub

Pilot Project on Electronic Exchange and Mutual Recognition
of Product Conformity Certificates / Test Reports
in the CAREC Region

Kickoff Workshop

1–2 June 2026 · Incheon, Republic of Korea · TA-10730 REG



ESCAP
Economic and Social Commission
for Asia and the Pacific



Session 3

Preliminary Analysis of Pilot Countries' Readiness

S3-1. Diagnostic Objectives and Methodology

The diagnostic approach identifies each country’s starting point and feasible pilot participation modes based on questionnaire responses and the preparatory meeting. This is preliminary mapping for M1–M5 validation, not a country evaluation.

Diagnostic Objectives	Methodology (pre-workshop stage)
<p>① Map the current position of each NSB / CAB</p> <p>Approximate position of each participating standards/customs authority on the 5-stage model (pre-workshop stage)</p> <p>② Identify country-specific conditions for validation</p> <p>Legal, technical, and institutional gaps affecting Hub participation mode</p> <p>③ Provide tailored design inputs</p> <p>Track A (API-first) · Track B (Portal/API Hybrid) · Track C (Portal-based participation / onboarding support)</p> <p>④ Set priorities for follow-up validation</p> <p>Identify items requiring remote/on-site/hybrid validation during M1–M5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pre-workshop preparatory meeting outcomes <p>Project objectives, 5-stage model, and key issues confirmed at the 21 Apr meeting</p> ● Pre-workshop questionnaire response analysis <p>Distributed 21 Apr; responses received and analyzed from AZ·KG·PK (5.07), UZ (5.08), TJ (5.18)</p> ● Public reference materials <p>UN/ISO/IEC publications, public legislation, and institutional materials reviewed</p> ● Working-hypothesis approach <p>Response-based preliminary mapping; final determination after M1–M5 validation</p>

Note: This analysis is preliminary design input for M1–M5 validation, not a country ranking or evaluation.

S3-2. Readiness Mapping Framework

Institutional, technical, operational, and collaboration readiness are mapped together to tailor API, Portal, and Hybrid participation paths to each country’s starting point. Readiness differences are design inputs, not deficiencies or grades.

<p>① Institutional Readiness</p> <p>Responsible Authority · Signing Authority · CAB Designation/Authorization Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating entities and in-country responsible authority structure • Entity holding signing authority for the Operational Arrangement / SOP • Designated CABs and legal basis for accepting CAB documents • Role relationships among standards body, accreditation body, and CABs 	<p>② Technical Readiness</p> <p>e-Signature · API / Portal · Public Key Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing e-certificate / TR systems • e-Signature and PKI experience • API integration capability vs. portal-only mode • Security and audit log operations
<p>③ Operational Readiness</p> <p>Focal Point · Workflow · Document Samples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of institutional coordination and technical Focal Points • Current CoC / TR issuance workflow • Feasibility of providing sample documents for design review • Internal operational capacity to handle pilot exchanges 	<p>④ Collaboration Readiness</p> <p>Follow-up Materials · Validation Meetings · Operational Arrangement Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of follow-up materials and cooperation on Q&A • Participation in M1–M5 remote/on-site validation meetings • Internal coordination mechanism for cross-border cooperation • Consultation on pilot Operational Arrangement / SOP and intent to participate

Note: Readiness differences are design inputs for participation modes, not deficiencies or grades.

S3-3. Pre-Workshop Questionnaire Structure

The pre-workshop questionnaire is the key input for pilot design - it structures information on participating entities, systems, CABs, product items, legal framework, and technical integration.

Part A	Part B	Part C	Part D
<p>Institutional Information</p> <p>Entity name · Respondent information · Contact details · Response date</p>	<p>Digitalization Level Self-Assessment</p> <p>e-CoC issuance · DB management · Online portal · Customs linkage · Digital signature (5-stage self-assessment)</p>	<p>Key Systems Status</p> <p>CoC/TR issuance · Acceptance of foreign TRs · QR authenticity verification · ISO/IEC 17065/17025 accreditation status</p>	<p>CAB Information (designated)</p> <p>CAB list · Digital signature capability · Unique ID scheme · Document retention</p>
Part E	Part F	Part G	Part H
<p>HS Codes · Trade Data</p> <p>Top 5 imports/exports (among participating countries) · 6-digit HS codes · Whether CoC/TR is required for customs clearance · Candidate item proposals</p>	<p>Legal & Regulatory Follow-up (optional)</p> <p>Verification of key legislation · e-Signature Act · National root CA · Recognition of foreign signatures · Views on public key/certificate registration and verification</p>	<p>Technical Integration Readiness (optional)</p> <p>International network connectivity · REST API development experience · Feasibility of Hub portal participation · Preferred participation mode</p>	<p>Kickoff Workshop Participation</p> <p>Mode (In Person / Online) · Attendee information · Visa support needed · Agenda items to raise</p>

S3-4. Response Status and Key Response Highlights

All five countries submitted questionnaire responses, providing baseline information for pilot design on responding entities, digital systems, CAB/accreditation status, and document-trust mechanisms.

Country	Response Status	Responding Entity	Key Response Highlights
UZ Uzbekistan	Received (5.08)	Ministry of Investment, Industry and Trade + Uzbek Center for Testing & Quality Control	TRIS.uz · OneID · QR 400 e-CoC/day / 100K CoC · 1M TR per year 90+ CB · 400+ Lab
AZ Azerbaijan	Received (5.07)	State Customs Committee + Antimonopoly & Consumer Market Service (data input)	Level 4 self-assessment · e-keyfiyyet Customs linkage · ASAN/Sima · QR ISO 17065/17025 info available
KG Kyrgyz Republic	Received (5.07)	Ministry of Economy and Commerce	ISEO Single Window · Tunduk linkage 37 CB · 94 Lab · Rutoken e-CoC not issued · Registry verification
PK Pakistan	Received (5.07)	Pakistan Single Window (PSW)	PSW e-CoC · QR · API capability PSQCA CoC issuance 278 ISO 17025 Labs
TJ Tajikistan	Received (5.18)	Tajikstandart	Registry · Portal · Customs linkage TR issuance · e-Signature Act · root CA e-CoC/CoC not issued · authentication to be strengthened

Note: Response levels and scopes differ by country; details should be reconfirmed during M1–M5.

S3-5. Tentative Track Rationale and M1–M5 Validation Items

Tentative tracks are set based on current responses and will be confirmed and adjusted through M1–M5 validation. These tracks are working hypotheses, not final decisions.

Country	Tentative Track & Rationale	M1–M5 Validation Items
UZ Uzbekistan	Track A candidate — API-ready base with TRIS/OneID and large CoC/TR volume	Foreign e-signature recognition Final API/Portal mode Suitability of construction-material candidate items
AZ Azerbaijan	Track B — Customs-linked digital platform exists, but foreign TR acceptance remains pending	Pilot-level acceptance of foreign TRs Customs HS scope of CoC/TR Practical e-Cert Hub linkage mode
KG Kyrgyz Republic	Track B — Registry and national integration base exist, but e-CoC/QR gaps require hybrid participation	e-CoC non-issuance response QR alternative / Registry-based authentication Alignment between EAEU TRs and pilot items
PK Pakistan	Track A candidate — PSW API/e-CoC base exists, but SCORE/legal verification layer needs confirmation	Legal-framework gap (e-Signature Act / root CA / foreign signature recognition) SCORE verification layer Role separation among PSW · PSQCA · CABs
TJ Tajikistan	Track B — Registry/Portal and legal framework exist, but e-CoC and document authentication need strengthening	e-CoC/CoC issuance role CAB digital signature and QR gap Public-key sharing and API/Portal parallel feasibility

Note: Tracks are not final and may be adjusted based on CABs, items, document types, and legal or operational conditions.

S3-6. M1–M5 Analysis, Design, and Validation Roadmap

During M1–M5, response-based analysis will be progressively refined to confirm tracks, CABs, items, and legal/technical conditions, leading to a validated baseline at M5.

Phase	Status / Current Position	Validation Activities · Priority Items
Response Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses received from all 5 countries AZ·KG·PK (5.07), UZ (5.08), TJ (5.18) Country readiness, tentative tracks, track rationale and validation items derived from S3-4~S3-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping of domestic digitalization base, CAB/accreditation status, and document trust/authentication base completed Tentative track classification (A/B/C) and identification of track rationale and validation items Scope of M1–M5 analysis and validation defined
M1–M2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First-round analysis, design, and on-site/remote checks 1:1 validation meetings with each country · detailed CAB list verification · collection of sample CoC/TR documents Refinement of preliminary analysis and design results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UZ: TRIS-OneID linkage mode · foreign signature recognition AZ: Customs–Antimonopoly linkage structure · HS customs scope KG: reflection of legislative amendments · alignment with 48 EAEU TRs / PK: SCORE application consultation / TJ: response to e-CoC non-issuance · CAB digital signature validation
M3–M5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed validation and gap closure Consultation to address response-based gaps Consultation on Hub Registry enrollment procedures, Operational Arrangement principles, API/Portal modes, and legal/technical conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equivalence review based on ILAC/IAF accreditation (across all 5 countries) Designated Authority designation procedures (including regulator-driven cases - notably PK PSQCA) Consultation on document-type flexibility (CoC/TR/Both - at bilateral level) · agreement on non-prejudgment principle
M5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final baseline confirmed Tentative agreement on Operational Arrangement · tracks finalized Tentative agreement(~M4) / item longlist confirmed / track classification confirmed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating Committee review · 5 countries’ proposed commitments reviewed (participation track · CABs · items · legal basis) Operational Arrangement draft (reflecting M1–M4 consultation and validation outcomes) Track A/B classification confirmed, where applicable

Note: The M5 baseline will be confirmed through country-level validation and Operational Arrangement discussions, not by questionnaire responses alone.

S3-7. Country-specific Items for Confirmation (preliminary)

Country-specific confirmation items are reorganized by readiness area to support M1–M5 validation and design responses. These items are design issues for the OA/SOP, Hub linkage, and validation meetings, not indicators of weakness.

UZ Uzbekistan	AZ Azerbaijan	KG Kyrgyz Republic	PK Pakistan	TJ Tajikistan
<p>#1 Confirm conditions for foreign e-signature recognition</p>	<p>#1 Confirm HS scope where CoC/TR applies at customs</p>	<p>#1 Confirm Portal/Registry-based participation where e-CoC is not yet issued</p>	<p>#1 Consult on alternative verification where e-signature, root CA, or foreign-signature recognition is not confirmed.</p>	<p>#1 Confirm CoC issuance role where e-CoC is not yet issued</p>
<p>#2 Determine final API/Portal participation mode</p>	<p>#2 Consult on pilot-level acceptance despite reported non-acceptance of foreign TRs, subject to validation</p>	<p>#2 Define Registry-based authentication procedures in the absence of QR</p>	<p>#2 Clarify the relationship between role-based ID and the SCORE verification layer</p>	<p>#2 Design a document authentication method where CAB digital signature and QR are absent</p>
<p>#3 Verify pilot suitability of UZ-proposed candidate items, including construction materials where applicable</p>	<p>#3 Decide the interface between e-keyfiyyet /customs linkage and e-Cert Hub</p>	<p>#3 Check alignment between 48 EAEU TRs and pilot items</p>	<p>#3 Clarify roles of PSW, PSQCA, and CABs in issuance, verification, and acceptance</p>	<p>#3 Confirm parallel API/Portal feasibility and the outcome of internal review on public-key sharing</p>

Design Response Summary

<p>① Institutional & accreditation</p>	Specify responsible entities and CAB acceptance scope in the Operational Arrangement/SOP	<p>② Document trust</p>	Use Hub Registry, SCORE/PDF verification, and QR/Registry checks in parallel
<p>③ Digitalization</p>	Use Portal or Hybrid entry where API integration is limited	<p>④ Operational collaboration</p>	Set procedures for Focal Points, submitted materials, validation meetings, and issue handling

Note: These items are inputs for OA/SOP, Hub linkage, and validation meetings, not country evaluation results.

S3-8. Domestic Digitalization Base — API · Portal Participation Feasibility

Domestic digitalization bases differ across the 5 countries; this is a key input for designing the API · Portal · Hybrid participation mode.

● Three participation paths based on domestic digitalization level

Tentative API-first candidates	Portal/API Hybrid candidates	Portal-based reserve path
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UZ (TRIS · OneID · ~400/day) ▪ PK (PSW e-CoC · QR · API capability) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AZ (e-keyfiyyet · Customs linkage) • KG (Single Window · Tunduk) • TJ (Registry · Portal · Customs linkage) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No country is currently assigned to this path - reserve path for later joiners or minimum-readiness cases

● Items to confirm for participation-path decisions

- REST API development experience and system security conditions by country
- Metadata entry method for Portal-based participation
- Feasibility of linking Single Window · DB · Registry with e-Cert Hub
- Feasibility of stepwise transition between Track A and B (progressive digitalization path)

S3-9. CAB and Accreditation Status — Digitally Verifiable Scope

CAB and accreditation bases are categorized to review the potential CoC/TR scope for digital verification in the pilot. Differences in CAB scale and accreditation bases are design inputs for identifying issuance authority and verification scope by candidate item, not country evaluation results.

Broad CAB Base	Institution/System Linkage-Based Verification	Searchable Official Accreditation Information
<p>UZ / KG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UZ: 90+ CBs / 400+ Labs (TRIS operational base) • KG: 37 CBs / 94 Labs (Single Window · Tunduk linkage) • Broad potential CoC/TR issuance base identified • Common: Detailed CAB list for each candidate item to be verified 	<p>PK / TJ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK: 278 ISO/IEC 17025 labs; roles of PSQCA, PSW, and PNAC to be confirmed • TJ: ISO/IEC 17065/17025-related base identified through the Conformity Assessment Department and Testing Center • CoC issuance authority and role to be confirmed • Common <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - candidate item scope of CABs to be confirmed - Where accreditation scope is not yet confirmed, designated CABs and document-acceptance scope should be specified in the SOP and managed as follow-up improvement items. 	<p>AZ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AZ: ISO/IEC 17065/17025 accreditation information is publicly searchable through e-keyfiyyet • The national accreditation body’s participation in the ILAC MRA / IAF MLA needs to be further confirmed • Acceptance of foreign CABs or foreign TRs to be further discussed • HS codes by candidate item and whether CoC/TR is required at customs should be confirmed

Note: This is not intended to rank CAB capacity by country; pilot items, CABs, and CoC/TR scope will be reconfirmed during M1–M5 validation.

S3-10. Document Trust & Authentication Base - Signature · QR · Registry Verification

Document-trust mechanisms such as signatures, QR, and registries are classified to review potential linkage into common verification through the e-Cert Hub Registry. These mechanisms may serve as alternative verification methods, and the pilot should not assume a single approach.

e-Signature + QR base	Registry base
<p>UZ (OneID + QR) / AZ (ASAN/Sima + QR)</p> <p>➔ digital signature infrastructure in place; recognition of foreign signatures to be validated</p>	<p>KG (Rutoken + Registry verification)</p> <p>➔ no QR; Registry-based authentication procedure to be defined</p>
System ID + QR base	Unique ID / Watermark + legal basis indicated
<p>PK (QR + role-based ID + SCORE)</p> <p>➔ alternative verification approach to be considered where legal-framework or trust-service gaps are reported, subject to validation</p>	<p>TJ (Registry · Portal · e-Signature Act · root CA noted)</p> <p>➔ authentication method to be designed given absence of CAB digital signature and QR</p>

Note: E-signature, QR, Registry, and SCORE may serve as alternative trust mechanisms; the pilot should not assume a single verification method.

S3-11. Validation Frame by Readiness Axis

The three readiness axes are validated together to support finalization of participation modes and the scope of the Operational Arrangement. This is a validation framework, not a readiness scorecard.

3 readiness axes · M1 (today) → M1–M5 remote/on-site validation → M5 finalization

Axis 1 : Domestic Digitalization · Technical Integration	Axis 2 : CAB · Accreditation · Item Authority	Axis 3 : Document Trust · Legal / Operational Acceptance
<p>Validation of API · Portal · Hybrid participation feasibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● UZ / PK API-first candidates - UZ to be reviewed based on TRIS · OneID, and PK on PSW API · SCORE verification ● AZ / KG / TJ Portal/API Hybrid candidates — system linkage modes to be validated ● Common Metadata exchange · Single Window · DB linkage modes to be confirmed ● Common Portal-based reserve path — stepwise digitalization 	<p>Validation of CABs, accreditation scope, and issuance authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All participating countries Whether ISO/IEC 17065 certification bodies and 17025 testing laboratories are in place ● All participating countries CAB list and issuance authority by item ● All participating countries Role relationships between designated CABs and participating entities ● All participating countries Feasibility of CoC/TR issuance per candidate item 	<p>Validation of acceptance of signatures, QR, Registry, legal framework, and Operational Arrangement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All participating countries Authentication based on e-signature, QR, Registry, unique ID, and watermark ● All participating countries Feasibility of accepting foreign e-signatures and foreign CoC/TR ● Common Signing authority for the Operational Arrangement / SOP and CAB authority to issue electronic CoC/TR ● All participating countries Constraints on data exchange, storage, and hosting to be confirmed

Note: This is a validation framework to support participation-mode finalization, not a readiness scorecard.

S3-12. Annex 1 — Domestic Digitalization · Technical Integration

These questions are readiness mapping, not country grading — they are technical confirmation items to set the API · Portal · Hybrid participation mode.

Checklist for participation-mode design

- 1 Are e-CoC / e-TR or related electronic documents currently issued?
- 2 Can existing Portal · Registry · Single Window · DB be linked with the e-Cert Hub?
- 3 Is there experience with REST API or other system integrations?
- 4 If API integration is not feasible, is Portal-based participation possible?
- 5 How can document metadata be provided?
- 6 Are there constraints on security, access rights, or networking for system integration?

S3-13. Annex 2 — CAB · Accreditation · Item Authority

These questions are readiness mapping, not CAB grading — they identify the CoC/TR scope actually verifiable in the pilot and the candidate items.

Checklist for item / CAB design

- 1 Is there a CAB that can be designated for each pilot candidate item?
- 2 Does that CAB hold ISO/IEC 17065 or ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation?
- 3 Does the CAB's accreditation scope match the candidate items?
- 4 Where does the authority to issue CoC / TR lie — CAB, standards body, or regulator?
- 5 Is there a regulatory basis to accept foreign CABs or foreign TRs?
- 6 Can HS codes per candidate item and whether CoC/TR is required at customs be confirmed?

S3-14. Annex 3 — Document Trust · Legal / Operational Acceptance

These questions are readiness mapping, not legal-framework grading — they form a checklist of document-trust, legal, and operational conditions to reflect in the Operational Arrangement / SOP.

Checklist to finalize the Operational Arrangement scope

- 1 Are e-signatures legally recognized for CoC / TR documents?
- 2 Under current regulations, can CABs lawfully issue e-signed CoC / TR?
- 3 Are there constraints on cross-border exchange of conformity-related data?
- 4 Who holds the legal authority to sign the pilot Operational Arrangement?
- 5 Are there mandatory certification or import regulations by item?
- 6 Are there data protection or hosting requirements that affect e-Cert Hub participation?

S3-15. Remote / On-site Validation Plan

Remote, on-site, and hybrid validation modes are execution options to be finalized based on each country’s situation and ADB coordination. Visit sequence and mode may be adjusted based on Focal Point coordination and validation needs.

- **Tentative schedule (M1 – M5)**

M1–M2 Analysis · Design	M3–M4 Remote / On-site Validation	M5 Finalization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consolidate kickoff outcomes ▪ Follow-up response analysis ▪ 1:1 remote checks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct remote / on-site / hybrid validation ▪ Check CAB · systems · legal framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consolidate validation results ▪ Finalize track · items · CABs · operating conditions

- **Country-specific cooperation modes (preliminary)**

Validation mode	On-site / remote / hybrid mode to be coordinated with each country and ADB
Visit sequence	Country grouping and visit sequence to be finalized after Focal Point coordination
Visit mode	Individual or grouped visits to be considered, factoring in validation needs and travel conditions per country

Note: The schedule and visit mode are tentative and may be adjusted based on Focal Point coordination, validation needs, and travel conditions.

S3-16. Items to be Provided / Confirmed by Each Country before M3

Required inputs on CABs, sample documents, legal conditions, integration modes, and candidate items should be supplemented before M3 to prepare follow-up design and validation. Initial Focal Point/contact confirmation is the starting point for coordination, not finalization of operating conditions.

<p>1 Initial Focal Point/contact arrangements are in place Institutional coordinator + technical lead — KG designated a Contact by official letter</p>	<p>2 Questionnaire responses received from all 5 countries AZ · KG · PK, UZ, TJ</p>
<p>3 Candidate CAB list ISO/IEC 17025 / 17065 status and item scope of designated CABs</p>	<p>4 Sample CoC / TR documents Representative samples for design and validation reference</p>
<p>5 Legal / regulatory constraints Applicable legislation · e-signature recognition · cross-border data rules</p>	<p>6 API / Portal / Hybrid participation mode to be confirmed Track A (API-first) / Track B (Portal/API Hybrid) / Track C (Portal-based participation / onboarding support)</p>
<p>7 Candidate items and trade flows HS-code-based candidates and supporting trade-flow evidence</p>	

Note: Focal Point confirmation is only the starting point for coordination and does not mean that detailed operating conditions are finalized.

S3-17. Participating Entities and Focal Point Status

Responding entities have been confirmed for all 5 countries; UZ · AZ · PK · TJ submitted the Focal Point Form, and KG designated a Contact Person by official letter.

Summary of responding entities and Focal Points across the 5 countries

- UZ** Uzbekistan : Ministry of Investment, Industry and Trade + Uzbek Center for Testing & Quality Control
Primary: Mukhammadjon Karim ugli Ruziev
Technical: Muzaffar Khamidovich Khayridinov
- AZ** Azerbaijan : State Customs Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan
Primary: Elshan Mammadov
Technical: Tunjay Alibayli
- KG** Kyrgyz Republic : Ministry of Economy and Commerce
Focal Point Form not yet confirmed
Contact Person designated by official letter: Zair Konurbaev
- PK** Pakistan : Pakistan Single Window (PSW)
Primary: Muhammad Asim Awan
Technical: Bisma Nawaz
- TJ** Tajikistan : Agency for Standardization, Metrology, Certification and Trade Inspection (Tajikstandart)
Primary: Saifuddinza Azimjon Saifuddin
Technical: Maraimov Fakhriddin Tojiddinovich

S3 Key Messages

The conclusion of S3 is not to align all countries to a single standard, but to design participation paths from each country's starting point and finalize operating conditions through M1–M5. The responses provide baseline information for designing participation paths, not full confirmation of participation feasibility.

S3. Preliminary Readiness Analysis

1

All 5 countries responded — baseline information is sufficient to design participation paths

Each country's domestic digitalization base, CAB / accreditation status, and document trust / authentication base can now be preliminarily mapped; all 5 provided baseline information sufficient to design an e-Cert Hub participation path.

2

Gaps are design information, not grades

Differences across countries are not deficiency grades but design information for setting the API · Portal · Hybrid participation mode and the scope of follow-up confirmation.

3

M1–M5 validation finalizes track · items · CABs · operating conditions

Validating the three axes — domestic digitalization / technical integration, CAB / accreditation / item authority, and document trust / legal / operational acceptance — finalizes the participation track, candidate items, designated CABs, and Operational Arrangement / SOP conditions.

Note: The message is that baseline information is sufficient to design participation paths, not that participation feasibility has been fully confirmed.

→ Next session (S4): Selection Criteria for Pilot Products

Thank You · 감사합니다 · Rahmat · Спасибо · شكراً

— With participation and cooperation of 5 countries, opening a new chapter in CAREC digital trade together —



ESCAP
Economic and Social Commission
for Asia and the Pacific

25
CAREC
Central Asia Regional
Economic Cooperation




KOREA
e-Asia Fund