

ICG Meeting Minutes

1 Present:

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address
David Dobbing	Standard Chartered, Hong Kong / Australia	ddobbing@attglobal.net
Sung-Hyuk Kim	Sookmyung W. University / Korea	Ksh@sookmyung.ac.kr
Su In Ryu	ECIF / Korea	Suinii@ecif.or.kr
Marc Langlois	Edifrance / France	Langloismarc@compuserve.com
Mike Conroy	SchlumbergerSema / France	Michael.conroy@wanadoo.fr
Douglas Hill	EAN international / Belgium	Hill@ean-int.org
Michael Dill	Gefeg / Germany	Dill@gefeg.com
Jean Kubler	UN/ECE Secretariat	Jean.kubler@unece.org
Federico Franciosi	EAN international / Belgium	Franciosi@ean-int.org
Kit K Ko	H.T. Technical / Hong Kong	Kitko@vtc.edu.hk
François Vuilleumier	Swiss Customs / Switzerland	fvuille@attglobal.net
Yoshio Kito	WAVE / Japan	va8y-ktu@asahi-net.or.jp
Yutaka Miyaji	WAVE / Japan	miyaji@wave.or.jp
Henri Vienot	GTFF / France	vienot@gtff.org
Didier Vanhamme	UIC / Belgium	edifer@euronet.be
Yves Marchand	UN/ECE Secretariat	Yves.Marchand@unece.org

1.1 Virtual Members

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address
Rie Sakamoto	JASTPRO / Japan	jastpro@jastpro.or.jp

2 Monday, 9 September 2002

2.1 Welcome and opening remarks by the ICG Convener

Mr. Dobbing welcomed everyone to the first plenary meeting of the ICG. He indicated that this first meeting was going to be difficult since there were a number of issues to be rapidly addressed. He indicated that he had attempted to cover the major issues in the layout of the provisional agenda and that these would be highlighted as the agenda items were presented. In summing up his introduction he asked all the participants to present themselves to the group.

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

2.2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved after the addition of two new items.

1. Scope of work which was intended to cover what has to be taken onboard that exists today
2. The inputs and outputs between the other UN/CEFACT Groups

2.3 Meeting logistics and administrative items

Due to the size of the group Mr. Dobbing suggested that all the agenda items could be carried out as a plenary meeting. This was agreed. As of Tuesday the meeting would be held in room 3005.

2.4 Election of ICG Chair and Vice chair

Mr. Kubler indicated that there was currently only one nomination for Chair, M. Conroy. He asked the group if there were any other nominations from the floor. D. Dobbing indicated that he would propose himself as vice chair. Seeing that there were no other nominations Mr. Kubler asked the group whether there was a requirement for a secret ballot. No abstentions or objections were received. As a consequence, Mr. Kubler declared M. Conroy as Chair and D. Dobbing as vice chair of the ICG.

2.5 Scope of work

The group then went on to identify all the existing technical specifications that fell under its responsibility. The group identified itself as being responsible for ensuring that the final UN/CEFACT products were of the required quality and in some cases also responsible for maintaining certain UN/ECE Recommendations. It was therefore decided to annotate where it saw its role in an “audit” capacity and where it saw itself in a “maintenance” capacity.

Technical specification	Audit	Maintenance
UN/EDIFACT directories EDED – EDCD – IDCD – EDSO – IDSD – EDMD – IDMD – UNCL	X	
UNSL not in the immediate scope of the ICG being a JSWG work item		
TDED		Liaison to 7372MA(ISO 7372 data elements only) TDED codes to be maintained by group
UN Recommendations		X
UN Recommendation No. 3 (ISO Country Code for Representation of Names of Countries)		Look into possibility of changing the recommendation to reference the ISO 3166 URL (http://www.iso.org/iso/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/index.html). S. Feder inquired how country groupings, such as the EU,

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

		Americas, or Asia, could be given an international code. The general opinion was that this could be processed through the ICG for integration into the recommendation and eventually ISO 3166.
UN Recommendation No. 5 (Abbreviations of INCOTERMS)		This Recommendation contains the ICC codes but also specific explanatory text from the UN
UN Recommendation No. 7 (Numerical Representation of Dates, Time, and Periods of Time)		Recommendation on the usage of ISO 8601
UN Recommendation No. 8 (Unique Identification Code Methodology – UNIC)		A methodology for creating unique identification codes
UN Recommendation No. 9 (Alphabetical Code for the Representation of Currencies)		ISO 4127 copy
UN Recommendation No. 16 (UN/LOCODE Code for Trade and Transport Locations)		Code requests actually carried out via the Web
UN Recommendation No. 17 (Payterms – Abbreviations for Terms of Payment)		Partially codes and the method for creating other codes
UN Recommendation No. 19 (Codes for Modes of Transport)		
UN Recommendation No. 20 (Codes for Units of Measure used in International Trade) –		To be specifically reviewed at this meeting Wednesday/Thursday
UN Recommendation No. 21 (Codes for Types of Cargo, Packages and Packaging Materials)		To be reviewed in conjunction with Rec. 20
UN Recommendation No. 23 (Freight Cost Code)		M. Dill indicated that this Recommendation had many unclear meanings
UN Recommendation No. 24 (Trade and Transport Status Codes)		
UN Recommendation No. 28 (Codes for Types of Means of Transport)		To be specifically reviewed at this meeting Wednesday/Thursday

Mr. Conroy indicated that two pieces of information in this list were of particular interest:

1. The UNCL as one could consider it as a generic list of codes that could be used in any implementation.
2. The EDED for the same reasons.

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

He also indicated that when looking into the deliverables it would be interesting to focus on a staged set of deliverables for the new requirements and consider firstly attempting to put together an “information” repository of the deliverables such as the “core components” and the “business processes”.

A suggestion was made that the ICG should aim at producing only UN/ECE Recommendations as this would provide increased creditability and recognition to the UN/CEFACT outputs.

Prior to the Day 1 meeting drawing to a close, it was proposed that the work as started should continue for Day 2 and that the proposed meeting with the ATG be moved to Wednesday morning in order to enable the meeting to be better prepared.

The meeting was closed at this point.

3 Tuesday, 10 September 2002

3.1 Continuation of Scope of work

New work will require the validation of the business requirements produced by the TBG against a defined set of harmonization criteria. The harmonization criteria will be developed and maintained by the ICG and provided to the TBG.

The business requirements content specification will be proposed to the TBG by the ICG (proposal for the next forum).

If a business requirement document does not satisfy the harmonization criteria it will be returned to the TBG for adjustment.

The ICG will be responsible for the creation of the syntax neutral core components from the candidate components proposed by the TBG. The candidate core component request form will be maintained and provided by the ICG.

The ICG will be responsible for the creation and maintenance (such as DMR processing) of a common syntax neutral code list library.

Syntax specific implementations of business requirements developed by the ATG after validation by the TBG will be audited for conformity by the ICG prior to publication.

Syntax specific components developed by the ATG will be audited by the ICG prior to publication.

BIEs will be specified in the business requirements documents and a study will be made on how to capture this information for the purposes of establishing a library.

F. Franciosi inquired whether or not the ICG should ensure that the TMG makes correct use of the rules and definitions put into place by the ATG. In reply M. Conroy indicated that TMG output did not appear within the scope of the ICG. However, he felt that the TMG should respect any recommendations issued by UN/CEFACT. He indicated that he would raise the question during the forum meeting this evening.

With this review the group felt that it had covered the issues of its scope and its inputs and outputs.

3.2 Approval of ICG mandate

In light of the scope that had been identified for the ICG the mandate was reworked accordingly. See revised mandate for the details.

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

The revised mandate was approved by the group.

3.3 Preparation of Project Proposals and formation of Project Teams

D. Dobbing suggested that it would be necessary to create a project to carry out the reworking of Recommendation 20 in order to progress this work from the CDWG to its conclusion as quickly as possible. This was agreed. The project should include experts from the other groups and in particular the TBG. See attached project proposal.

D. Dobbing also suggested the creation of a second group to take into consideration the changes being requested for Recommendation 28. He indicated that this project could become a permanent project covering Recommendations 16 – 19 – 21 - 23 - 24 and 28. These are all transport related Recommendations and would in particular need the participation of the TBG Transport Working Group. M. Conroy suggested that if the project was to become permanent then it would be preferable to identify it as a ICG Working Group. No definitive conclusion was made. However, in the short term a project would be identified to handle the Recommendation 28 review. Transport would meet with the ICG tomorrow to process their final comments in respect to this Recommendation.

A discussion continued on the workflow of the modified UN/EDIFACT directories, in particular D02B. In the workflow described in the Forum formation document (TRADE/CEFACT/2002/8/Rev.1), the TBG should be responsible for ensuring that D.02C had indeed included the change requests that they required. D.02C would then be passed to the ICG for a conformity audit and release. It is proposed that the document once approved by the ICG could be immediately released. It would not be necessary to go through the CSG for release approval. M. Conroy indicated that he would inform the FCT that the TBG should not overlook this requirement. It would also be necessary to indicate this decision to the CSG and seek their agreement.

The meeting then broke up for the day at 17h30.

4 Wednesday, 11 September 2002

4.1 Report from the FCT

M. Conroy indicated that the FCT had made the proposal for the next forum meetings as :

March 2003 (week of the 10th or the 17th) West coast USA

September 2003-09-23/27 Seoul, Korea

March 2004 Brussels ?

He also informed the ICG that the Group should assemble around the globe in front of the building at 14h46 for 2 minutes silence in memory of the 11th of September.

4.2 Creation of Working Groups

It was decided to set up two ICG Working Groups:

- ICG1 Trade and Transport UN/ECE Recommendations Working Group, convenor D. Dobbing

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

- ICG2 Group Interface Definition Working Group, interim convenor M. Conroy, M. Langlois, D. Hill, D. Dobbing. The objective is to be in a position to provide an initial draft of the Business Process Definition to the TBG prior to the next Forum meeting in March 2003.

4.3 ATG Meeting 1

The ICG held a preliminary meeting with the ATG to consider the migration of the UN/EDIFACT UNCL (Code List Directory) to ICG. Consideration was given to the mandates of the ICG and ATG, with particular reference to the document TRADE/CEFACT/2002/8/Rev.1 (Proposal for Future Structure and Organization of the UN/CEFACT Permanent Working Groups). M. Conroy outlined the ICG position with respect to the UNCL and Core Components and the ICG understanding of role of the ICG with respect to these two items. A general discussion was held between the ATG and ICG and concluded that a second meeting be convened to resolve the respective differences in their interpretation of TRADE/CEFACT/2002/8/Rev.1 and to align their Group Mandates accordingly.

4.4 Recommendation 28 review with TBG3 (Transportation Domain)

The ICG was attended by three representatives from the TBG3, Y. Kito, Y. Miyaji and H. Vienot. H. Vienot requested two changes to the draft version of Rec. 28 (Codes for types of means of transport). These were reviewed and accepted as:

+ 3 137 Truck, with tail-lift
Automotive vehicle with a hydraulic lifting device on the rear of the vehicle for loading and unloading goods.

#| 3 30 1 Bus, with trailer
Automotive vehicle with an attached trailer for carrying passengers and/or luggage.

Subject to application of the above changes, and a revision to the body text of Rec. 28 to replace CDWG with ICG, the second edition of Rec. 28 was approved by the ICG.

D. Dobbing to forward the final version of Rec. 28 to the UN/Secretariat for publication by Friday 27 September, 2002.

4.5 Recommendation 23 maintenance with TBG3 (Transportation Domain)

A further representative from the TBG Transport Working Group, D. Vanhamme, joined the ICG and requested a change to an existing code entry in Rec. 23 (FCC Freight cost code). This request was to change:

from:

601003 Insurance or declaration of value (charge for) (20)

to:

601003 Declaration of value (charge for) (20)

This change was not considered appropriate by the ICG since it conflicts with the category description to which the code entry belongs, namely “Transport Insurance Charges”. D. Vanhamme advised that he would contact the originator of request to confirm whether a new entry would requested, for example under the category “Administration Fee”.

Y. Kito reported that the SMDG (Ships Planning Message Design Group) is progressing with their review of Rec. 23 with the intention of submitting of a number of change requests following their

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

October SMDG meeting in Tokyo. D.Dobbing advised that these change requests would be processed by the ICG following receipt of these from SMDG.

4.6 Recommendation 16 UN/LOCODE

Y. Kito requested clarification on the allocation of UN/LOCODEs for territories, islands and platforms that are administered by a particular country. In some instances the country code of the administering country is used (e.g. “ES” for the Canary Islands under Spain) and in other instances the territory has its own country code (e.g. “FO” for the Faroe Islands under Denmark). F. Vuilleumier explained that this was largely determined by the country themselves, taking account of the respective country administrative processes, etc.

4.7 Recommendation 20 review

M. Conroy requested D. Dobbing to take into consideration the following as part of the review of Rec. 20.

1. “Megavolt ampere reactive hours” description “Total amount of reactive power across a power system.” Is this the same as D84 – “Magavolt ampere hour per hour reactive” ?
2. “Megavolt ampere reactive” description “A unit of electrical reactive power represented by a current of one thousand amperes flowing due to a potential difference of one thousand volts where the sine of the phase angle between them is 1.”. Is this the same as E06 “Megavolt ampere reactive”?

The ICG meeting was joined by F. Vuilleumier to review the draft (first cut) update of the three Rec. 20 Annexes as prepared by D. Dobbing. The following points were agreed:

1. Annex I (UoMs listed by quantity). This Annex would be normative, and limited to those Rec. 20 entries with a level/category of 1, 1S, 1M and 2, i.e. SI or SI equivalent units. All 1S, 1M and 2 entries must have a conversion factor specified. D. Dobbing to update conversion factors accordingly.
2. Annex I contains a number of new entries allocated with level/category of 1 or 2 should be reassigned with a level/category of 3, i.e. informative units. D. Dobbing to adjust entries accordingly.
3. Annex II (UoMs list by name) and Annex III (UoMs listed by code) would cover all level/categories.
4. Units of count need to be designated as such. Use of the UoM description “A unit of count defining the number of” was considered sufficient.
5. Use of the column “cross reference number” will be dropped from the Annexes but retained in the database.
6. Where a conversion factor is not available for an UoM entry, a description of the UoM should be provided.
7. All existing units of packaging in Rec. 20 are to be flagged for deletion and moved to Rec. 21 as appropriate. The approach proposed by D. Dobbing and detailed in the drafts of Annex II and III was accepted.

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

8. D. Dobbing to review the comments from Ms. Rie Sakamoto of JASTPRO with respect to the entries with a use identification of “Z” in the current release of Rec. 20, to ensure that they are retained in the new draft where a description was supplied as part of the earlier review process.
9. The body text of Rec. 20 should include a disclaimer with respect to the usage of Rec. 20. F. Vuilleumier to include this as part of the revisions to Rec. 20 body text.
10. D. Dobbing to take account of the above and to prepare an updated version of the Rec. 20. F. Vuilleumier and Y Kito agreed to perform a detailed consistency check with the “blue book” on receipt of the updated version. D. Dobbing to advise schedule for this work.

5 Thursday, 12 September 2002

5.1 ICG1 Trade and Transport UN/ECE Recommendations Working Group

D. Dobbing reported on the work with respect to UN/ECE Recommendations 16, 20 and 23 (refer to captioned subjects elsewhere in the minutes)

5.2 ICG2 Group Interface Definition Working Group

M. Langlois, D. Hill and K. Ko reported on their development of a draft paper concerning the business requirements specification (see attached paper). The purpose of this paper is to serve as a basis to develop a full interface specification for consideration by the TBG. D. Hill offered to distribute the latest version of the EAN.UCC Business Requirements Document (BRD) template for consideration of the ICG. ICG thinking is that this document could be incorporated in the ICG Business Requirements Specification with appropriate references to the source, EANUCC.

5.3 ATG Meeting 2

The ICG held a second meeting with the ATG, facilitated by M. McCarthy (FCT Chair) to resolve the differences between the ICG and ATG in their respective interpretation of TRADE/CEFACT/2002/8/Rev.1 and to align their Group Mandates accordingly. D. Dobbing articulated the ICG position and understanding of its role and responsibilities. The meeting concluded that the validation (technical assessment) of maintenance to the UNCL and Core Components would in the future be handled by the ICG. For the current release of the D.02B UN/EDIFACT Directories, the ATG would undertake the technical assessment for changes to the UNCL. It was agreed that a joint project would be initiated between the ICG and ATG to effect the migration of the UNCL entries to become reusable information components as part of the UN/CEFACT Library of code lists managed and maintained by the ICG. Based on this outcome, D. Dobbing submitted a project proposal to FCT that was accepted by the FCT. The ICG was designated as the prime Group, with D. Dobbing (ICG) and M. Pemberton (ATG) acting as the project leaders. The ICG Mandate was subsequently adjusted and confirmed.

5.4 Establishment of External liaisons

The ICG agreed to establish the following external liaisons

- ISO/TC154 M. Dill
- JSWG D. Dobbing
- UN/LOCODE D. Dobbing

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

5.5 Friday, 14 September 2002 – ICG Closing Plenary and UN/CEFACT Forum

5.6 Preparation of ICG report to the UN/CEFACT Forum closing plenary

5.6.1 Review of the Plenary Report

D. Dobbing presented a draft of the Plenary Report, which in turn was reviewed and updated by the ICG.

5.6.2 ICG Meeting Schedule

It is proposed that the ICG meeting schedule should in the short term remain a twice yearly face-to-face meeting. Between meetings work would be carried out over the Internet. In order to ensure progress reporting a periodic (monthly) conference call (16h00 CET) would be held between members. K. K. Ko requested that this be a US number because the cost of calls from Asia to Europe were higher.

The first conference call is scheduled for:

Tuesday 08 October (M. Conroy to arrange conference call number).

5.7 Recommendation 16 UN/LOCODE Request from Japan

D. Dobbing, in response to an email from Y. Kito requesting the allocation of UN/LOCODE for West Bank and Gaza, agreed that the West Bank was not location but rather an area. Given the possible political implications of this request, Y. Kito was advised to write to the UN/Secretariat with copy to the WCO with this request. ISO 3166 (Country codes) has an entry “PS” for the Palestinian Occupied Territory. Subsequently, F. Vuilleumier offered to progress this matter with the appropriate body. Y. Kito to forward the request to F. Vuilleumier, copy D. Dobbing.

5.8 Recommendation 20 Master Database

D. Dobbing meet with Y. Marchand from the UN/ECE Secretariat to updated him on progress with applying updates to the Rec. 20 Master Database. D. Dobbing outlined a number of issues he had with the Database:

- Inclusion of superscript, subscript and special characters directly in the database for conversion factors and representation symbols
- Inclusion of quantity descriptions consistent with that published in the “blue book”
- Omission of original code entries with a use identification of “Z”

Y. Marchand outlined the approach used by the UN/Secretariat to handle the superscript, subscript and special characters, using the Arial Unicode MS font. D. Dobbing was not able to replicate the results and Y. Marchand offered to send further instructions this can be achieved. D. Hill undertook to discuss this issue with the EAN development team and to ascertain whether another approach could be used.

In the course of discussing the handling of the quantity descriptions it became apparent that the Master Database provided by the UN/Secretariat during the May 2002 CDWG meeting did not have the same format as the Database available for download from the UN/CEFACT Web site. D. Dobbing had used the Master Database from the CDWG meeting as the basis of applying the revision 6 changes. D. Dobbing queried whether the Master Database he had used as the basis to prepare the next revision was indeed the “Master Database” and requested Y. Marchand to forward

ICG Meeting minutes – Geneva 2002-09-09/13

him the correct Master Database as a matter of urgency. Y. Marchand to discuss the database issue with Markus Pikart from the UN/Secretariat and inform D. Dobbing of the outcome.

D. Dobbing also informed Y. Marchand that UN Secretariat resources would be required to assist in formatting the three Rec. 20 Annexes for publication and asked that this resource requirement be conveyed to the appropriate individuals in the UN/Secretariat.

5.9 Work to be completed for the next meeting

1. ICG Terms of Reference: D. Dobbing, December 2002, first draft
2. ICG Operating procedures: M. Conroy, December 2002, first draft
3. UNCL Migration Project D. Dobbing December 2002, first draft of migration plan and schedule, and outline of UNCL specific processing procedures

11:00 Adjournment

(12:00 – 15:00 Participation at the UN/CEFACT Forum closing plenary)
