

GENERAL
CEFACT/EWG-MT/98N002
4 June 1998

UN/EDIFACT

REPORT
FROM THE UN/EDIFACT WORKING GROUP (EWG)
MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING

Miami, 1 May 1998

SOURCE: EWG
STATUS: COMMITTEE REPORT
ACTION: FOR GENERAL CIRCULATION

**REPORT
UN/EDIFACT WORKING GROUP (EWG)
MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**

1998, May 1 in Miami, USA

Members Present:

Barry Keogh, Chair
Pierre Georget, Vice Chair
Irvin Chmielewski
David Dobbing
Mounir El Khoury
Harry Featherstone
Kenji Itoh
John Kemble
Klaus Naujok
Christina Wallen-Rahlen

Virginia Cram-Martos

Invited Participants:

Rory Power

INTRODUCTORY NOTE:

1. The UN/EDIFACT Working Group Management Team (EWG-MT) is responsible for managing the process for developing UN/EDIFACT standards between EWG meetings and in accordance with the decisions made by the EWG Steering Committee.
2. To encourage the greatest possible openness in the process and input into its recommendations, the EWG encourages wide circulation of its reports.
3. Mr. Power participated as the past West European EDIFACT Rapporteur in order to contribute to discussions on the organization of the Brussels EWG meeting in September 1998.

Agenda

4. This was the first meeting and there was no agenda since members had been elected on the previous day. Discussions are recorded below according to the topic covered.

EWG Meetings

5. It was agreed that having EWG meetings less than 6 months was disruptive to the maintenance process and, therefore, it was agreed to try to keep the meetings in March and September of each year.

6. P. Georget was requested to take the lead for organization of the Brussels JRT.
7. After a discussion with R. Power on the finances and probable sponsorship for the Brussels JRT, it was agreed that the meeting fee would be set at 150 British pounds.
8. The EWG decided to accept the offer by the Electronic Commerce Association of South Africa to host the Spring 1999 EWG meeting, provided that they could confirm within 60 days that they would be able to obtain the funding to do so. The UN/ECE secretariat was requested to send an invitation to them confirming this decision and supplying them with budget information from prior meetings.
9. B. Keogh informed the meeting that he was investigating whether Tradegate might be able to offer to sponsor the autumn 1999 meeting in Australia.

Directories

10. It was agreed that since the directory contents were approved by the EWG meetings, after the EWG-MT had received a clean audit report for a directory production, it could then make the operational decision to send the audit report forward to the CEFACT Steering Group with a request for publication. This would be necessary in order to ensure that directories are available in a timely manner prior to each EWG meeting.

Procedures

11. **Decision:** It was agreed that documents or decisions which the EWG Plenary was expected to approve would be distributed 30 days in advance of the meeting in order to give participants the time to review and consult on these documents or decisions. It was further decided that Plenary decisions would be made early in the EWG meeting week, at a time to be indicated in the meeting agenda.

12. **Decision:** It was decided that the final session on Friday of the EWG meeting week would be considered a Steering Committee meeting open to all EWG participants.

Single International Technical Assessment Group

13. TASWG (previously, JTAG) was requested to develop a set of procedures in support of a single international tag for approval by the EWG at its Brussels, September 1998 meeting. This was necessary so that the objective of a January 1999 implementation could be met.

14. While the TASWG recognized that it would be very helpful to have the DMR process automated, they believed that a single international tag could be effectively implemented and approval times shortened even without automation. TASWG also believed it was important to understand that a single international tag would require a membership that included not only technical experts appointed by their respective Heads of Delegation but also specific representatives from each EWG message development group. They further pointed out that it would be equally important to ensure that these representatives to the single international tag from the message development groups were empowered to act and make decisions in matters affecting their respective groups.

DMR Processing Procedures

15. Because it was anticipated that MOP would need 12-18 months before it would be able to address DMR processing procedures, the TASWG was requested to draft a set of comprehensive DMR procedures for consideration as a replacement for the existing Rapporteurs Procedures. The TASWG expected to be able to do this prior to the March 1999 EWG meeting.

Miscellaneous

16. It was agreed that, unless it became clearly necessary, there would be no interim MT meeting between the Miami and Brussels EWG meetings due to the short period between these two meetings (barely 5 months) and the inability of newly appointed MT members to have planned ahead for an interim meeting. However, it was also agreed that the chairman would organize consultations between the members via e-mail and conference calls in order to be sure that all MT members are properly prepared for the September meeting.