



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/TRADE/C/2007/13  
18 September 2007

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**COMMITTEE ON TRADE**

Second session  
Geneva, 22-25 October 2007  
Item 6(b) of the provisional agenda

**PROGRAMME OF WORK AND ITS EVALUATION  
EVALUATION: Draft Accomplishment Accounts for the 2006-2007 Biennium**

Note by the secretariat <sup>(\*)</sup>

*Summary*

This document was prepared as a result of the request from the Committee on Trade to be provided with accomplishment accounts for the purpose of evaluating its activities (see ECE/TRADE/C/2006/18, Decision 22, para. 34). For the 2006-2007 biennium, the secretariat has prepared accomplishment accounts based on indicators of achievement as contained in the adopted 2006-2007 Strategic Framework (see document A/59/6, Prog. 16). These accounts cover the following expected accomplishments: (a) Adoption of new and/or updated ECE recommendations, norms, standards, guidelines and tools, including for agricultural produce; (b) Implementation of trade facilitation recommendations, e-business and regulatory cooperation and standardization policies; and (c) Enhanced policy dialogue on practices and regulatory framework for trade cooperation, trade and environment and trade facilitation and security.

The Committee on Trade is entrusted with the implementation of the UNECE Trade subprogramme. These expected accomplishments were undertaken in support of the objective of the UNECE Trade subprogramme, which is, "To facilitate trade and economic cooperation among countries of the UNECE region and with the rest of the world" (see the United Nations biennial programme plan, document A/59/6/Rev.1, para. 16.22).

The 2006-2007 budget for the Trade subprogramme also contains a list of outputs planned in support of the expected accomplishments. A detailed table listing these planned outputs and their status can be found in document ECE/TRADE/C/2007/13/Add.1.

---

(\*) The present document has been submitted after the official documentation deadline by the Trade and Timber Division due to resource constraints.

**I. ADOPTION BY MEMBER STATES OF NEW/REVISED TRADE FACILITATION RECOMMENDATIONS, NORMS, STANDARDS, GUIDELINES AND TOOLS, INCLUDING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE**

**Performance indicators**

**A. Number of new and / or updated UNECE recommendations, norms, standards, guidelines and tools for trade facilitation and electronic business agreed upon by member states.**

1. Development work is done in five UN/CEFACT Groups that meet together twice a year at Forums in different regions of the world with up to 250 participants per Forum. Individual meetings of the Groups and their project teams are held between the Forums. The outcomes of the work, as well as plans for future work are presented to annual UN/CEFACT plenary sessions for approval.

2. The expected accomplishment for the 2006-2007 biennium was “The agreement by member States on simpler and more effective trade practices and procedures” as evidenced by the number of new and/or updated UNECE recommendations on trade facilitation and e-business accepted by countries. A review of the number of new or updated recommendations and standards approved by the UN/CEFACT Plenary provided the following results: for 2006-2007: 28 (14 in 2006 and 14 in 2007) and this was compared to the result for 2004-2005 (i.e. the previous biennium), which was 25 (11 in 2004 and 14 in 2005).

3. The most important final, approved outputs from UN/CEFACT sub-groups since January 2006 are presented here. There will be some additions to this list during the fourth quarter of 2007, such as new UN/EDIFACT and UN/LOCODE releases.

- (a) Three UN/EDIFACT (United Nations Electronic Data Interchange for Administration, Commerce and Transport) Directory releases: D06A, D06B and D07A, available at <http://www.unece.org/trade/untdid/welcome.htm>
- (b) Two UN/CEFACT Core Component Library (CCL) releases: D06A and D06B, available at [http://www.unece.org/cefact/codesfortrade/codes\\_index.htm](http://www.unece.org/cefact/codesfortrade/codes_index.htm)
- (c) Three UN/LOCODE (United Nations Code For Trade and Transport Location releases: 2005-2 (released in 2006), 2006-1 and 2006-2, available at [http://www.unece.org/cefact/codesfortrade/codes\\_index.htm](http://www.unece.org/cefact/codesfortrade/codes_index.htm)
- (d) UN/CEFACT Consolidated Documents Set (ECE/TRADE/CEFACT/2006/10 and Corrigendum 1)
- (e) Revisions of five existing Recommendations:
  - (i) Recommendation 20, Revision 4 “Units of Measure Used in International Trade” in document CEFACT/ICG/2006/IC001 with a code annex
  - (ii) Recommendation 21, Revision 5 “Types of Cargo, Packages and Packaging Materials” in document CEFACT/ICG/2006/IC003 with a code annex

- (iii) Recommendation 23, Revisions 2 and 3 “Freight Cost Code – FCC Harmonization of the Description of Freight Costs and Other Charges” in document CEFACT/ICG/2007/IC001 with a code annex
- (iv) Recommendation 24, Revision 4 “Trade and Transport Status Codes” in document CEFACT/ICG/2007/IC002 with a code annex
- (v) Recommendation 28, Revision 2 “Codes of Types of Means of Transport” in document CEFACT/ICG/2007/IC003 with a code annex
- (f) Requirements Specifications Mapping (RSM), available at <http://www.uncefactforum.org/ICG/Documents/ICG%20Archive/rsmv0r220040312.pdf>
- (g) Technical Specification for UN/CEFACT XML naming and design rules (NDR) (document ECE/TRADE/CEFACT/2006/13 and Corrigendum 1)
- (h) Four Business Requirements Specifications:
  - (i) Business Requirements Specification Cross-Border Supply Chain (UNeDocs), ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2007/8
  - (ii) Project Schedule and Cost Performance Management Business Requirements Specification, ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2007/10
  - (iii) Small-Scale Lodging House Information Process Business Requirements Specification, ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2007/11
  - (iv) Material Safety Data Sheet Business Requirements Specification, ECE/TRADE/C/CEFACT/2007/28
- (i) Two XML Schema Releases, available at: ([http://www.unece.org/cefact/xml\\_schemas/index.htm](http://www.unece.org/cefact/xml_schemas/index.htm))
  - (i) UN/CEFACT e-Tendering Candidate XML Schema release
  - (ii) UN/CEFACT Cross Industry Invoice (CII) Candidate XML Schema release
- (j) Business Process Specification Schema (BPSS) standard (ISO/DTS 15000-6)
- (k) UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) Base
- (l) UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) Foundation Module
- (m) Business Collaboration Specification Schema (BCSS) version 1.0
- (n) Core Component Technical Specification (CCTS) version 2.2

**B. Number of agreed new or revised international standards and recommendations on agricultural produce.**

4. The UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards and its four specialized sections work within the framework of the UNECE Committee on Trade and contribute directly to the Committee’s overall trade facilitation objectives by setting internationally harmonized commercial quality standards for fresh fruit and vegetables (including early and ware potatoes), dry and dried produce, seed potatoes, meat, eggs and egg products and cut flowers. This work is of great relevance to the operation of the international food supply chain because the standards have been widely implemented. The European Union has based 36 of its standards on UNECE

standards and is in the process of completely aligning its standards with those of the UNECE. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development has adopted 52 UNECE standards and promotes them internationally through their Fruit and Vegetables Scheme. UNECE agricultural quality standards also continue to be used as the basis for Codex Alimentarius work on commodity standards, which include additional health and sanitary requirements. The UNECE secretariat actively promotes the application of the standards and also offers assistance to countries wishing to apply the standards through the organization of seminars and training.

5. A number of external factors influence the success of this work. These include: commercial and technological developments; the number of requests for creating/updating standards; the degree of agreement of participants on the contents of the standards; the limited resources available for many countries to participate; and the level of resources available to the secretariat for the work and its promotion.

6. The expected accomplishment for the 2006-2007 biennium was “new and updated international standards and recommendations on agricultural produce” and the related indicator of achievement was “the number of [agreed] new or revised international standards and recommendations on agricultural produce”.

7. A review of the work accomplished shows the following number of agreed new or revised international standards and recommendations and for comparison. We have included the figures for the previous two biennia:

2006-2007:	36 (17 revised standards, 6 new standards and 15 recommendations)
2004-2005:	32 (12 revised standards, 1 new standard and 19 recommendations)
2002-2003:	38 (21 revised standards, 5 new standards and 12 recommendations)

8. This indicator is an approximative measure of the level of activity of the intergovernmental bodies and the interest that countries and non-governmental organizations take in this work area. It is not precise because standards differ in their complexity and in their importance in trade, e.g. updating one standard on meat can be as much work as updating several standards for fresh fruit and vegetables. The secretariat expects this level of activity to remain stable as this is the maximum amount of work that can be carried out with present secretariat and delegation resources. It would be difficult to do more without either sacrificing the quality of the work or decreasing work on promoting the standards.

## **II. INCREASED IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE FACILITATION RECOMMENDATIONS, NORMS, STANDARDS, GUIDELINES AND TOOLS, INCLUDING FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE**

### **Performance indicators**

#### **A. Increased number of trade facilitation recommendations, norms and standards, guidelines and tools implemented by member States**

9. The implementation of UN/CEFACT recommendations and standards has been measured by three baseline studies.

### 1. First baseline in 2002

10. The first baseline study was carried out in 2002 covering the implementation of all UN/CEFACT recommendations throughout the UNECE region (TRADE/CEFACT/2004/31). The exercise was too resource-intensive to be repeated annually, and most importantly, the study failed to produce reliable baseline data on the level of implementation of UN/CEFACT recommendations. Consequently, there was no baseline from 2002 for comparison in 2004. The 2004 – 2005 baseline study was reorganized in order to produce a more reliable and consistent estimate of the level of implementation of UN/CEFACT recommendations.

### 2. Second, revised baseline in 2005

11. The second study was carried out in 2005, covering the level of implementation of five recommendations in a sample of 10 countries, representing the most important types of recommendation and a cross-section of types of economies in the UNECE region and, for comparison, some non-member States: (a) EU members and advanced economies in the UNECE region represented by the Czech Republic, Sweden, the United Kingdom; (b) EU accession members represented by Bulgaria (currently a member of the EU); (c) CIS member countries represented by Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Ukraine; and (d) non-UNECE member States represented by the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Republic of Korea.

12. The 2005 results were presented as a baseline and, consequently, the 2007 study follows developments in the above group of selected member States for the selected recommendations based on the same methodology of rating the implementation of these instruments.

### 3. Third baseline in 2007

13. The third study was conducted in June – August 2007, with the 2005 results as the baseline. The data collection was improved slightly by introducing legal evidence of implementation as the primary source of information for Recommendation 1 (United Nations Layout Key) and Recommendation 25 (UN/EDIFACT). They are now reviewed based on the adherence of the respondent countries to the revised Kyoto Convention for Recommendation 1 (United Nations Layout Key) and respectively, to eCOM standards of Global Standards 1 (GS1) for Recommendation 25 (Implementation of UN/EDIFACT).

14. In order to increase the coverage of the study, some additional countries were included in the sample. In addition, there were two countries from the original study whose data we were unable to collect, these being the Islamic Republic of Iran and Ukraine. Thus, the 2007 analysis covers the following countries:

- (a) Canada, Czech Republic, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and Bulgaria, as advanced economies and/or member countries of the European Union
- (b) Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, representing the CIS and/or transition economies in the UNECE region
- (c) Republic of Korea, Thailand representing the Asia Pacific region

4. 2007 baseline results:

- (i) Recommendation N° 25 - Use of the United Nations Electronic Data Interchange for Administration, Commerce and Transport Standard (UN/EDIFACT)

15. The level of implementation of UN/EDIFACT is verified by the number of countries in the sample having implemented the standard, as evidenced by Global Standards 1 (formerly EAN Code International) on the one hand and by the number of downloads on the other. According to Global Standards 1 (GS1) data for 2006, the following countries were using UN/EDIFACT: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The Republic of Korea had separately already reported 100 per cent usage in 2005. According to GS1, Canada was using other standards, while there was no information available for Thailand, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan.

16. There were large variations in the responses, from no response for Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan to 100 per cent use in Sweden and the Republic of Korea. The responses would seem to indicate that the use of UN/EDIFACT has stabilized in Customs, ports and certain private companies in the industrialized countries, while it would seem that transition and developing economies may be hesitating between different e-business solutions.

- (ii) Recommendation 1: The United Nations Layout Key

17. The use of Recommendation 1, which is the international standard for aligned trade documents, was verified by the adherence of the member States in question to the revised Kyoto convention. The use of the United Nations Layout Key (UNLK) is an obligatory precondition of adhering to the revised Kyoto convention. Full implementation was reported for the following countries in 2006: Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, the Republic of Korea, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. In addition, Russia and Kazakhstan were reported as partial users in 2005, both with an estimated level of implementation at 49 per cent. No information was available for Thailand.

- (iii) Recommendation 4: National Trade Facilitation Organs

18. This recommendation specifies arrangements at the national level to coordinate work on facilitation of trade procedures. In 2006, the recommendations had been implemented in Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and Sweden. It had not been implemented in Canada, Switzerland, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Thailand.

- (iv) Recommendation 33: "Single Window"

19. The implementation was verified against a repository maintained by the secretariat, according to which single windows were operational or under way in Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Sweden and Thailand. No implementations had been reported from Canada, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

Table 1: Implementation of selected UN/CEFACT recommendations  
in a group of countries in 2006

<i>Country</i>	<i>Recommendation 25: UN/EDIFACT</i>	<i>Recommendation 1: UN Layout Key</i>	<i>Recommendation 4: National Trade Facilitation Organs</i>	<i>Recommendation 33: Single Window</i>
Azerbaijan	-	X	X	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X
Canada	-	X	-	-
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X
Kazakhstan	-	-	-	X
Republic of Korea	X	X	X	X
Russian Federation	X	X	-	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X
Switzerland	X	X	-	-
Thailand	-	-	-	X
United Kingdom	X	X	X	-

20. In conclusion, the table shows that 29 recommendations were implemented in the selected countries.

21. The performance indicator is slightly above the target set for the biennium based on the baseline set in 2005 of 14, but fully in line with expectations for the biennium. Those countries that have participated in the UNECE work on harmonizing trade procedures reported significant levels of implementation. In addition, transition economies that benefited from advisory services reported systematically higher levels of implementation than countries where implementation relied on national efforts only.

22. In future reports, it would be useful to present UN/CEFACT standards and recommendations according to their status within the UN/CEFACT Open Development Process ("ODP" in document TRADE/R.650/Rev.4/Add.1), which has six steps going from the initiation of a "project" to its final approval. This would better reflect the actual status of work. The progression through the ODP process depends upon both technical factors and the ability of experts to come to agreement on the issues involved. Therefore, it is influenced by external factors outside of the secretariat's control.

**B. Number of downloads of key recommendations, norms and standards, guidelines and tools from the UNECE Internet site, as a proxy for their use**

(v) Recommendation N° 16 – LOCODE

23. The level of implementation of UN/LOCODE continues to be analyzed through the number of downloads of the code set from the UN/CEFACT web site. In 2006, a total of 23,928 downloads were made, corresponding to a monthly average of 1,994 downloads.

24. There were large variations in the responses covering UN/LOCODE. In the future, if the baseline were to be modified, the question could be reformulated to enquire about the use of UNLOCODE in domains, such as Customs, airlines, freight forwarders, as well as regional trade facilitation initiatives. Another issue for further investigation is the fact that there are codes different from UN/LOCODE in use, especially in countries that do not use the Latin alphabet, represented in the sample by the Russian Federation, Kazakhstan and previously Azerbaijan.

Table 2: UN/LOCODE downloads

<i>LOCODE downloads</i>	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Total number of downloads for the year	17,092	36,585	23,108	23,928	<i>(To be finalized)</i>
Average downloads per month	1,709	3,049	1,926	1,994	<i>(To be finalized)</i>

- (vi) Recommendation N° 25 - Use of the UN Electronic Data Interchange for Administration, Commerce and Transport Standard (UN/EDIFACT)

19. UN/EDIFACT downloads in 2006 totalled 50,000, with an average of 4167 monthly downloads. These values were within the range of a normal long-term level after a significant peak with over 370,000 downloads in 2005 when a new UN/EDIFACT message (DAPLOS for phytosanitary declarations) had been introduced.

Table 3: UN/EDIFACT downloads

<i>EDIFACT downloads</i>	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Total number of downloads for the year	83,635	117,048	373,177	50,000	<i>(To be finalized)</i>
Average downloads per month	8,364	11,705	53,311	4,167	<i>(To be finalized)</i>

**C. Cumulative total number of implementation of UNECE agricultural quality standards in member States (total number of standards multiplied by total number of countries implementing them)**

25. The performance indicator states that the implementation should be measured as the total number of standards multiplied by total number of countries implementing them.

26. The revised target was 1100 implementations of individual agricultural standards in member States for 2007.

27. In the European Union reference is made to 36 UNECE agricultural standards in their regulatory framework, which makes their use obligatory for member States. In conclusion, since the European Union comprises 27 member States and there are 36 standards the minimum number of implementations of the UNECE agricultural quality standards is 972 implementations.



In addition, the Secretariat knows that there are a large number of other implementations in non-EU member states. The exact number is difficult to assess without a thorough study

28. In an attempt to acquire more information at its 2006 annual session, the Working Party discussed how to keep track of progress in the implementation of standards at the national level and it asked the secretariat to draw up a questionnaire to be sent out to countries every two years to collect information on the practical use of UNECE standards, whether they are mandatory or voluntary. This questionnaire will be submitted for approval to the November 2007 session of the Working Party. The first survey will be undertaken in 2008-2009.

### **III. ENHANCED POLICY DIALOGUE ON PRACTICES AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS FOR TRADE COOPERATION, TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT AND TRADE FACILITATION AND SECURITY**

#### **Performance indicator**

##### **Percentage of participants in policy discussion who evaluate them as being useful for decision-making**

29. This performance indicator will be based on the following events:

- (a) Forum on Common Regulatory Language for Global Trade, Geneva, June, 2006
- (b) Symposium on Trade rules regulations and standards: different level of rule making and their impact, Geneva, October, 2007
- (c) Seventeenth session of the Working Party on Regulatory Cooperation and Standardization Policies (Working Party 6), Geneva, 5-7 November 2007 and its International Seminar on Product Safety and Counterfeiting

30. The accomplishment account cannot be drawn up at this point time due to the fact that the indicator of achievement is based on three events of which only one has taken place so far.

31. The first event, "Forum on Common Regulatory Language for Global Trade, Geneva, June, 2006" was evaluated in connection with the 2006 sessions of the Committee on Trade and the Working Party on Regulatory Cooperation of Standardization Policies.

32. The overall meeting evaluation average (on a scale of 1 to 5) was 3.94 for the session and 4.03 for the Forum. Eighty per cent of the survey participants will use the information in their work, which demonstrates a strong interest in the issues. The participants recommended organizing topical meetings specialized in energy, telecommunications, agriculture, forums and round tables as possible follow-up to this event.

33. The evaluation of the other two events will take place in October and November 2007 respectively.

-----