	Economic and Social Council	Distr. GENERAL TRADE/CEFACT/2002/35 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

**SWIFT comments on "Proposal for Future Structure and Organisation of the UN/CEFACT
Permanent Working Groups" Revision 12, 2002-03-12**

Submitted by the Head of Delegation of SWIFT *

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-

Major comments

Following comments are considered as potentially blocking for the approval of this document:

[§16]   The picture showing the overall structure is misleading in the sense that it puts the TBG, ICG and ATG at the same level. In our opinion the TBG is the core group as it contains the core activities of CEFACT (i.e. trade facilitation through the definition of processes, procedures and best practices). All other groups are in fact supporting groups. SWIFT recommends that the picture be modified to clearly illustrate this.

[§21]   The proposed composition of the FMT gives the same weight to each of the five Groups. This doesn't seem correct (see above remark on [§16]). SWIFT expects the TBG to take the leading/driving role and the other Groups to have an advising role in the FMT.

[§21-§22]   Establishing two management teams (i.e. the FMT and the CSG), both managing the same five Groups, may be a cause for conflicts, confusion, lack of decision and malfunctioning. SWIFT strongly recommends therefore to have only one management team.

[§22]   Whereas the five empowered Groups can define their internal structure and operating procedures, it's not clear who will define the structure, the mission and the operating procedures for the management team. Given the important role of the management team these points must be clarified before the plenary delegates any responsibility to the FMT.

[§30-§31]   The exact mission of the ICG must be further clarified to take into account following points:
- The ICG must closely collaborate with existing groups and organisations that have a similar responsibility in a particular industry domain such as SWIFT, WCO, IATA and others.
- The ICG must be operational in a continuous mode (i.e. it is not sufficient to have ICG-meetings every x months or weeks). The ICG must be available at all times in order to guarantee a timely, high quality support to project teams and working groups that develop standards.
- It must also be clear that the role of the ICG is not to question the business need or business value of components that are identified and defined within industry domains. Its main role is to focus on quality assurance and harmonisation.

[§33]   The definition of Core Components should not be an activity of the ATG: it must be the result of the work of the TBG or of an industry domain and a subsequent assessment and quality control of the ICG. The role of the ATG must be limited to the (re)use of Core Components. Assembly and restructuring of Core Components to optimise their use in documents will of course be allowed.

Comments on the proposed migration plan

Following comments propose a number of corrections or clarifications to the proposed migration plan as identified in paragraph §43 and appendix B:

- The cross-domain harmonisation must be included in ICG as it deals with the quality assurance and harmonisation of reusable information.
- SWIFT doesn't know the role of the Technical Specification Audit and Technical Specification Production and is therefore unable to assess whether they should indeed be part of ICG.
- As already mentioned "Core Component Definition" cannot be part of ATG. It should be clarified to indicate that it's only about the assembly of "document components".
- EWG/T9 must become part of TMG in order to take care of the educational aspects.
- All Library and Catalogue specification projects must indeed go to TMG. It should be clarified that these projects must be conducted in strong collaboration with ICG.
- The "Core Components Supplements" project must move into TBG and ICG (as it is a proof of concept of the work of these groups).
- The "Core Component Realization Schema" project must be split in two parts (both in TMG):

- One part must be renamed to "Core Component Library Specification" project (to be conducted in strong collaboration with ICG).
- The rest of the current work of this project relates to XML design rules and document assembly. This work must be moved into another project in TMG (to be conducted in strong collaboration with ATG). See also the related comments on the "UML to XML Design Rules" project.
- The "UML to XML Design Rules" projects must be moved to TMG as it deals with technical specifications. The project must be split in two parts:
  - The work on UML to XML as a support of the BP-work must be integrated in the "Business Process Information Model Exchange Schema" project and/or the "Business Process Specification Scheme" project.
  - The work on UML-to-XML as support for the generation of XML documents must be conducted in strong collaboration with ATG. We recommend combining this topic with the assembly of documents and the definition of XML design rules (see comments above on "Core Component Library Specification" project). We also recommend combining/integrating this project with the related parts of the OASIS/UBL project.

Additional comments

Following comments are proposals for additional precision:

[§17]	Mention explicitly that Working Groups and Project Teams also have the option to convene at their discretion.
[§18]	Clarify in this paragraph that Project Teams – in most cases – will be cross Working Group and even cross Group as it is beneficial to have team members with a different background. It is of course a good idea to give each Project Team a "home base" in one of the groups, depending on its scope. There will also be projects that – because of their nature and scope – are purely intra-Group.
[§23]	Clarify that this implies the need for monthly status reports by the project leaders and/or working group chairs. This need is one element of the complete project management process, which will have to be defined and organised. The possibility to invite project leaders and/or working group chairs in these meetings should also be foreseen.
[§24, §38]	Liaisons with other groups and organisations are only mentioned for the TBG and LG. Clarify that this is an important and mandatory activity of each Group.
[§26]	Replace the term "Data Maintenance Requests" by a more general term to take into account any possible type of future maintenance requests.
[§28-§29]	Clarify that these paragraphs are not only focused on common data but also include common processes (as mentioned in paragraph §31).
[§40-§42]	Mention explicitly that the described workflow approach must only be considered as a possible framework. The actual workflow(s) will have to be defined in detail by the actual Groups, once they have been established. This overview also has to be extended to cover the relevant activities of the FMT.

—————————