UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

TRADE/CEFACT/2002/34
22 April 2002

ENGLISH ONLY

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

COMMITTEE FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT
Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT)
Item 4 of the provisional agenda
Eighth session, 27-30 May 2002

Comments on the Proposal for Future Structure and Organization of the UN/CEFACT Permanent Working Group from the Republic of Korea

Submitted by the Head of Delegation of the Republic of Korea *

The present report is being submitted to the Plenary for information.

* The present document is reproduced in the form in which it was received by the secretariat.

GE.02-

Generally, the proposal is well prepared and well structured with great efforts having been made by many people. However, there are some issues to be resolved and here I make some comments to the proposal.

I would like to express my concern on the development procedure of the proposal. I think the proposal could have been more productive if the HoDs have been given a chance to see the progress of development of the proposal. As we know, we first received the eBWG proposal of CSG last June. Since then, about eight months have passed and we received only the final version of the proposal to be submitted to the UN/CEFACT Plenary. Each HoD has a large pool of local eBusiness experts. Using these experts, HoDs could contribute to the proposal significantly. In the development process of this proposal, HoDs were not given an appropriate chance to contribute, to the disadvantage of UN/CEFACT Restructuring, in my opinion.

First, there is one concern on FMT and independence of each group. FMT is necessary but it should have clearly different roles than those of CSG. To guarantee the clear role division between FMT and CSG, the Group Chairs should not be ex officio members of the CSG. If CSG and FMT membership is mixed, the role division between CSG and FMT cannot be guaranteed. CSG should focus on the policy and strategy for the management and operation of UN/CEFACT. On the other hand, FMT should concentrate on the development and management of standards for trade facilitation and electronic business.

Second, the division of work among the groups is wrong in some cases. For example, currently, the work of Core Component definition is under ATG. I think it is misplaced. The work of Core Component definition should be the work of ICG. In the division of work among the Groups, all the related people should be involved for correct placement of the various types of work.

Third, in Annex B, migration of current project teams is wrongly represented in the case of some projects. As we can see, almost all the current eBTWG projects were placed under TMG. Some should go to TBG, ATG or ICG. If not, the migration will be simple migration of EWG to TBG and eBTWG to TMG. In other words, EDI work of EWG and ebXML work of eBTWG should be harmonized in the new structure.

The change I propose is as follows:

Project Name	**Current Working Goup**	**Proposed Group**
Accounting and Auditing Core Components	EWG (P7)	TBG
Business Collaboration Patterns and Monitored Commitments Specification	eBTWG	TMG
Business Collaboration Protocol Specification	eBTWG	TMG
Business Neutral Core Component Library	EWG (P1)	ICG
Business Entity Library	eBTWG	TBG and/or ICG
Business Process Information Model Exchange Schema	eBTWG	ATG and/or TMG
Business Process Specification Schema	eBTWG	TMG
Common Business Process Catalogue Specification	eBTWG	TBG and/or ICG
Common Business Process Catalogue Definitions	EBTWG/BPAWG	TBG and/or ICG

Core Component Realization Schema	eBTWG	TMG
Core Component Specification	eBTWG	ICG and/or TMG
Core Components Supplements	eBTWG	TBG and/or ICG
e-Business Architecture Specification	eBTWG	TMG
Finance Business Process Modelling	EWG (P4)	TBG
Finance Core Components	EWG (P3)	TBG
Harmonization Documentation	EWG (P2)	TBG
Insurance Core Components	EWG (P6)	TBG
Travel, Tourism and Leisure Core Components	EWG (P5)	TBG
UML to XML Design Rules	eBTWG	ATG

As I indicated, many projects cannot be clearly put into only one group because they need coordination and harmonization among multiple groups. There should be a strong mechanism to harmonize the various projects.

Regarding the next step, since we have time to modify the proposal until the UN/CEFACT Plenary, why do we not modify this proposal and submit a new one to the Plenary instead of submitting this one to the Plenary? If this version is submitted to the Plenary, there is a high possibility that this proposal is not passed due to the time constraint of the Plenary meeting. I sincerely hope to see that this UN/CEFACT restructuring process is well progressed and the new structure is well designed to realize the objective of UN/CEFACT.