**Disposition of comments to the
ePDC Project Proposal (version 7.2 dated 20 August 2003)**

FOR DISCUSSION

"Global multilingual product description and classification for ecommerce and ebusiness"

1) From Stuart Campbell, TIE, NL - e-mail dated 22 August

Barbara et al

[cc: Chair eBES, Chair ec Workshop]

Thank you for this document. Coming straight to the point it makes me very worried due to the summary bullets mentioned below. The details around this are in the attached document in MS Words redline mode.

Concerns:
1. It inexorably pushes the concept of a monolithic approach eg ..'maintaining only one and using it everywhere is much more efficient and economical...' , 'we don't proceed much longer with the deployment of locally based classifications '. The world around us is not monolithic and the successes of recent years are based on distributed and flexible approaches where the necessary data is held at the lowest level. XML, ebXML, DNS, webServices, SOC are examples of this - and i see catalogs being no different
2.It drives the idea of harmonising existing standards. This is a noble objective but once again it is similar to the above. The world is not moving in this direction and in addition past CEN work like PBDH shows the difficulty/impossibility of this. Approaches like ebXML core components and semantic web demonstrate a better approach is to standardise the minimum core and facilitate extensible and formalised approaches for the rest. But not to think we can distil the world into one.
3.It seems to ignore all ebXML work and indeed EDI activity which can provide a good basis for this - eg for extensible classification semantics and repository

Personally, i could not support a workshop based on the current plan and objectives because of these facts

On a positive and constructive note i think it is very easy to fix, and the same thrust can be maintained, provided:
- the monolithic approach is changed to a distributed one
- the harmonisation aspects includes in equal balance an extensible/referencing aspect
- ebXML/EDI activity is taken into consideration

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me

PS: There are also one or two very small typos in the document as well that i redlined

Regards

STUART

Chief Technical Officer
Managing Director TIE Product Development
----

2) From Gerold Carl, Lufthansa, DE - email dated 29 August

Liebe Frau Lindquist,

dieses Projektvorhaben finde ich gut, zumal es ja hoffentlich Lösungen zu den Problemen bringt, die ich in meinem Vortrag u.a. auch angesprochen habe.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Gerold Carl Deutsche Lufthansa AG

----

3) From Sue Blank, Portex, UK   - email 1st September

Hi Barbara

My comments are as follows:
1. As someone currently engaged in attempting to generate online product information into a global supplier ecatalogue, I have undertaken research into the different classification schema used by different markets and countries. As far as I am aware, there are several schema in use (depending on the requirements) in both the USA and the UK. Taking just those two coutries as an example, and multiplying the different schema which are required according to the intended use of the information, I have assessed that my ecatalogue will need space for at least 10 different schema to be held against each product. 2. As an 'end-user', I am keen to ensure that any proposal covers the urgent need to agree and implement a solution globally and would cite the example of GMDN - whereby although the classification contiues to be taken up by various national bodies, it has yet to become universal. Similarly, here in tyhe UK, the NHS is attempting to create a Medical Device Data Dictionary (MDD) in conjunction with Snomed that will cover requirements in both the US and the UK. Unless that is, the information is to be used for adverse incident data reporting, in which case we need to hold product info classified by GMDN. So there's two classification schema that we need to hold as a supplier already! 3. Following on from the above, I believe that the project would need to undertake an initial feasibility study that would ascertain the likelihood of a classification scheme being taken up globally, and what suppliers could do in the event that this fails to be the case. The study could reasonably also identify the critical mass required for the classification to eventually become a standard. This could include a risk analysis of the failure to achieve takeup etc.

Best wishes
Sue Blanks
Sue Blanks, E-business Advisor, E-Business Team
Portex Limited, UK