ATG EDIFACT Working Group (ATG1) meeting
16-20 June 2003
Walldorf, Germany

Meeting Participants:
Mr. Anders Grangård
Mr. Bernd Bösler
Mr. Gaït Boxman
Mr. Tim Cochran
Mr. Alain Dechamps
Mr. Dany De Zutter
Mrs. Margaret Pemberton

Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATG 1 – UN/EDIFACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walldorf, 16 – 20 June 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday**
1. ATG1 Agenda
2. Appointing Secretary
3. Minutes of previous meeting

**Tuesday**
1. DMR Review
2. Review of Rec. 20 (Units of Measure)
3. Review of Rec. 23 (UN Freight Cost codes)
4. Review directory audit report
5. Update DMR procedures and templates
6. Review Library Content Management work flow

**Wednesday**
1. UML to EDIFACT Transformation Rules project
2. nXg/Edifact

**Thursday**
1. UML to EDIFACT Transformation Rules project
2. nXg/Edifact

**Friday**
1. Update Message Design Rules
2. Update Technical Assessment Checklists
3. Update workplan & issues list

Monday, 16 June 2003
Mr. Anders Grangård, Chair, convened the ATG1 meeting at 16:00 following the close of the Monday ATG Plenary and welcomed the participants to the Walldorf ATG1 meeting.

**ATG1 Agenda**

The first order of business was the review of the ATG1 agenda for the week. The agenda was modified as described above and approved by the group.
Appointing Secretary
The chair asked for a volunteer to serve as secretary for the group. Mr. Tim Cochran volunteered and was appointed secretary.

Minutes of previous meeting
The minutes from the 10-14 March San Diego ATG1 meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Tuesday, 17 June 2003

Data Maintenance Review (DMR) Review
Reconvened at 9:00 am. ATG1 has only a few DMRs to review and disposed of these DMRs as follows:

UN-03-00351 – AS-2002-0010 submitted by the Japanese Automobile Manufacturers Association (JAMA) and requests the addition of a code to Data Element (DE) 1001, used in C002 in the BGM segment in the DESADV message. Deferred – Need further explanation.


UN-03-00353 – AS-2003-0005 submitted by Japan Association for Simplification of International Trade Procedures (JASTPRO) for addition of a code to DE 3055 for the JASTPRO organisation. The suggested code definition addition was JT’d and modified as follows: ‘JASTPRO is a nonprofit organisation for simplifying international trade procedures and is the responsible agency for the registration of the Japan Export and Importers Standard Code’.


Review of Rec. 20 (Units of Measure)
ICG requested that ATG review and comment on the changes suggested to Recommendation 20 Units of Measure. A recommendation had been made by T1 to the Code Working Group to add code definitions to each of the codes in DE 6411 to make it easier to assess additions and changes to the codes. The group noted that the list still lacks many descriptions, which at a minimum should describe the type of measurement being described, for example, weight, energy, distance, etc. The appropriate TBG domain groups should review the suggested deletions and changes, as they will be directly affected by such changes. ATG1 partially reviewed the list and found inconsistencies such as 2C Roentgen and 2Y milliröntgen and coded 08 ‘heat lot’ should be retained as it is widely used in the steel industry.

Review of Rec. 23 (UN Freight Cost Codes)
ICG requested that ATG review the revisions to Recommendation 23 UN Freight Cost Codes. ATG1 recommends that these changes be forwarded to TBG3 as the additions require specific transportation expertise in review.

DMR procedures discussion
The group agreed that though a new directory wouldn’t be created at ATG meetings which are held between CEFAX Forum meetings, codes that are designated and assigned for requested codes and definitions would be made available so implementers could begin using them, if desired.

Issues that need to be addressed include the need to:

1. Inform about the code assigned
2. Inform that the code has been approved

There currently is no means of knowing whether a requester is asking for a specific code value or asking for random assignment from available codes. ATG1 discussed and agreed to submit a DMR to make a change to DMRDEF, which would make the inclusion of the code optional rather than mandatory, as it is now. If the field is left blank, this indicates the requester is not asking for a specific code.

The group discussed the option of posting on the ATG website those codes requested or assigned by ATG immediately following the meeting at which they were approved. This would relieve the UN Secretariat of the responsibility of assigning code values as this would now be done by ATG1.

Action: Send a reminder to the UN Secretariat that when a specific code is included in a code add request, this code should be used in the code assignment.

Action: Inform the Chair of TBG of the changes to DMR procedures approved in January 2003 related to code requests. [Anders Grangård]

Mr. Bernd Bösler noted that the Composite C292 is not used in any segment or message.

Actions: A DMR will be developed to request the removal of the C292 composite by Mr. Bösler. Additionally, Mr. Bösler will create a DMR to make the suggested change to DMRDEF described above.

Review of Directory Audit Report

ATG1 reviewed the Directory Audit Report for the D03A directory, which was reported to have been produced in compliance with existing procedures and satisfactory for implementation. The audit report noted a number of issues and made several recommendations to ATG. The discussions of these recommendations follow.

Recommendation 1: The Audit Team recommends that the ATG ensure that the complete signed off paper list are made available for the audit process.

ATG1 duly notes Recommendation 1 from the audit report and ATG will make every effort to ensure procedures are in place to provide the audit team with the requested signed paper list.

Recommendation 2: The Audit Team recommends that the UN/Secretariat ensure that the complete Excel list of implemented DMRS are provided to the audit process. The format of the list should be the same as that provided at the end of each audit. That is to say a worksheet for each directory (EDED, EDCD, EDSD, EDMD, IDCD, IDSD and UNCL) that contains the implemented DMRs. An additional worksheet should be provided in the case of discrepancies. (Postponed, withdrawn or rejected DMRs should not figure in this list).

ATG notes this recommendation and ATG will provide the excel list of implemented DMRs as per Recommendation 2 if requested to do so.

Recommendation 3: The Audit Team recommends that the ATG ensure that all modifications are correctly identified with an appropriate DMR.

ATG1 agrees with the recommendation and will make every effort to ensure that all changes are correctly indicated and associated with the appropriate DMRs.

Recommendation 4: The Audit Team recommends that the ATG avoid anticipating future changes that cannot be verified by the user community.

ATG1 will avoid anticipating such future changes until they can be verified by the user community, but sees the need to ensure that the approved changes are not lost pending user community validation. This may be accomplished by either marking the changes as ‘postponed’ with a note describing these changes as “approved in principle awaiting the approval of the new version of ISO 7172.”
Other Audit Report issues

5. Use of square and round brackets in the code list.
Square [ ] brackets indicate that the code means that the code is exactly the same as it appears in the TDED and round ( ) brackets indicate that the code is semantically identical to the referenced code in the TDED, but expressed differently.

The explanation of what is meant by the square and round brackets was formerly included in a document called Notation Text. ATG1 proposes that that a similar explanation of bracket usage be included in the Code List section (Section 8) of R1023. (Two paragraphs from the notation text be included. Incorporate lines 252 through 292.)

ATG1 disagrees that the examples of usage of square and round brackets provided for DEs 4260, 4180, 4490 and 4244 are incorrect.

6. Clarification of anti-collision rules
As noted, there is currently no collision between the DTI segments at position 090 and 150, with only one occurrence of each DTI segment is permitted, segment group 2 is allowed. When reviewing DMRs a request for an increase in the number of occurrences of the FTI segment(s), for example, ATG regularly reviews for the possible introduction of collision.

7. Associated Text Files
Modified the Directory text file to change ‘Source’ from UN/CEFACT EWG to UN/CEFACT INFORMATION CONTENT MANAGEMENT GROUP, ICG. The title and name of the directory was also corrected to reflect D.03A and date of 2003-05-15.

Licence Agreement: All right as is.

Glossary:
Made several typographical corrections, e.g., changed round brackets around references to ISO 9735 from round brackets to square brackets for consistency.

Deleted definition of EWG.

Modified the definition for Technical Assessment to refer to UN/CEFACT Applied Technology Group, ATG1 – UN/EDIFACT Working Group as part of the agreed UN/CEFACT procedures.

UN/CEFACT definition modified to read The United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business. Made United Nations plural in definition for UNCL.

Added definitions for each of the existing groups within UN/CEFACT, that is:

UN/CEFACT Applied Technology Group (ATG): The group responsible for the creation and maintenance of the trade, business and administration document structures that are based on a specific technology or standard.

UN/CEFACT Information Content Management Group (ICG): The group mandated to take all the steps necessary to ensure the release of quality technical specifications for e-business.

UN/CEFACT Legal Group (LG): The group mandated to develop contractual solutions and voluntary instruments in the area of electronic commerce.

UN/CEFACT International Trade and Business Processes Group (TBG): The group responsible for business and governmental business requirements and content.

UN/CEFACT Techniques and Methodologies Group (TMG): The group responsible for providing all UN/CEFACT Groups with Meta (base) Business Process, Information and Communication Technology specifications, recommendations and education.

ATG: see UN/CEFACT Applied Technology Group
LG: see UN/CEFACT Legal Group
ICG: see UN/CEFACT Information Content Management Group
TBG: see UN/CEFACT International Trade and Business Processes Group
TMG: see Techniques and Methodologies Group

Introduction:
The group modified number two to reflect the UN/CEFACT Groups and also modified number 4 to reflect UN/CEFACT Groups and include the current URL from which the respective groups' web sites are linked (http://webster.disa.org/cefact-groups/fct/).

Section 5 – 5.1 UN/CEFACT Groups and addition of FCT web site link (http://webster.disa.org/cefact-groups/fct/). 5.1 c and d modified to reflect UN/CEFACT Groups.

Section 5.2 modified to include updated URL at which the documents for developers of UNSMs may be obtained (http://webster.disa.org/cefact-groups/fct/)

Section 5.2 d modified to include the appropriate groups

Update DMR procedures and templates
ATG1 began to review and make proposed modifications to the UN/CEFACT Data Maintenance Request (DMR) Processing Procedures (ED001 rev2) to make it conform to the new CEFACT Forum organisation and new proposed processes. See draft proposed rev3 (attached).

Review Library Content Management work flow
ATG1 discussed the high-level flow that had been agreed upon between representatives of the ICG, ATG and TBG at the March meeting in San Diego to developing a more detailed level to share with the project team.

Question: Does the workflow represent the process for existing structures, or does it represent the process for new development?

The group looked at the workflow for the processing of DMRs and Business Requirements Specifications (BRSs) among the appropriate groups – TBG, ICG and ATG. Mr. Grangård led ATG1 through an exercise in which the DMR process was modelled. What is the scope of the process that ATG is trying to model?

UN/CEFACT Data Maintenance Request (DMR) Processing Procedures
The group began reviewing the UN/CEFACT DMR Processing Procedures ver2 document to make necessary changes. The document name was changed from an EWG document and the meaning of the acronym UN/CEFACT on top of cover page was corrected to ‘The United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business’. The primary changes to the document centred around modifying the DMR procedures to conform to the new UN/CEFACT organisational changes and to allow maintenances to more that one syntax standard.

Removed figure 1 DMR Flow diagram from the document to be replaced by updated flow diagram. The textual descriptions of the local and international procedures have also been removed, as they will be included in the new Library Content Management Procedures document being developed.

Wednesday, 18 June 2003

Review:
Worked on the Library Content Management Procedures document. The group defined the audience for the procedures document.
Sections 6 was worked on by making each of the ‘bubbles’ in the workflow PowerPoint subsections of section six

6.2 Definition of business requirements
6.3 Harmonisation
6.4 TBG Approval
6.5 ATG Assessment
6.6 Verification of conformity
6.7 Validation of RSM
6.8 Update of repository
6.9 Generation of syntax specific core components
6.10 Generation of syntax specific business documents
6.11 Validation of syntax solution
6.12 Audit of syntax solution
6.13 Publication
6.14 Modification of syntax solution

Beginning with section 6.2, the sections were discussed and filled out in the draft procedures document. (See attached draft UN/CEFACT – Library Contents Management Procedures rev 0.1)

UML to EDIFACT Transformation Rules project

Mr. Grangåråd overviewed the additions and changes he had made to the draft UML to EDIFACT Transformation Rules document. At this point the content is based solely on the work done by EAN-Gencod and provides a very good start at for the rules. This initial draft was circulated to ATG participants for review and discussion the next day on Thursday morning.

UN/CEFACT Data Maintenance Request (DMR) Processing Procedures continued from

The group continued review and editing of the draft DMR processing procedures document – proposed version 3. Each section was reviewed in order, with appropriate changes made to those sections.

Thursday, 19 June 2003

Mr. Grangåråd reconvened the ATG1 meeting at 11:00 am following the Thursday morning full ATG plenary.

UN/CEFACT Data Maintenance Request (DMR) Processing Procedures continued from

Table 1.1 Data Elements Subject to Category 3 Codes. Mr. Bösler suggested that modifications were necessary to this table. The group reviewed the form and proposed the change to the title to read UN/EDIFACT Code List. The names of the code lists were changed.

Proposed Modifications included:

Removed Rec 30 as this is no longer maintained.

Added new Code lists as follows:

ISO 639-1 – Language in Data Element 3453 – Language name code
ISO 3166-2– Country Subdivision in Data Element 2339 – Country sub-entity name code
ISO 5218 – Representation of human sexes in Data Element 3229 – Gender code
Changes:
DE 3207 Country code to Country name, coded
DE 8453 Nationality of means of transport, coded to Transport means nationality code
DE 6345 Currency, coded to Currency identification code
DE 3225 Place location identification to Location name code
DE 3223 Related place location identification to First related location name code
DE 3233 Related place location two identification to Second related location name code
DE 54277 Terms of Payment identification to Payment terms description identifier
8067 Mode of Transport, coded to Transport mode name code
6411 Measure unit qualifier to Measure unit code
DE 6417 -- deleted
DE 7065 Types of packages identification …… to Package type description code
DE 8023 Freight charges identification to Freight and other charges description identifier

Add other actions…from table 1.1

The ATG1 group agreed with the modifications proposed to the DMR Procedures document and the group agreed on the following course of action for the proposed changes:

- ATG review, request that ATG2 add the XML-specific forms needed in the DMR procedures document,
- Will be sent to TBG and ICG with a request to review and add the process necessary for Core Components.

UML to EDIFACT Transformation Rules project
The examples used in the draft document are not compliant with the BRS, but rather the BRMs used in EAN. This is close, but will have to be amended. The status of the document is approved by the Project Team for internal review with distribution of the draft document limited to ATG project teams.

Discussion of whether this piece of the approved project proposal, that is the UML to EDIFACT transformation rules, may be approved and published prior to completion of the other one or two sections for rules. These sections are the UN/EDIFACT to UML rules and the Context Application Rules to UN/EDIFACT.

The documents included in the scope of the approved project may alternatively be published as separate sections in a single document of UML transformation rules, or as two or three separate documents each with specific rules. The current title of the document is UML to UN/EDIFACT Transformation Rules and with a modification to section 2.3 – Summary of Contents of Document; this document can be limited to only the UML to EDIFACT rules. The ATG1 members will review the document and provide suggestions as to whether the alternative to separate the pieces of the project into separate documents is the desired direction.

See draft rev 0.1 (attached).

Update Message Design Rules
Mr. Grangård did an initial review of the MDRs, e.g., the reference to EWG or code lists whose names have changed.

The names used must be as close as possible to those identified in the UN/CEFACT – ebXML Core Components Technical Specification (CCTS) and therefore must, in principle be the same naming conventions rules as used in the CCTS.
Volunteer to review the MDRs for necessary changes, such as changes in documents and organisations referenced in the document. Mrs. Pemberton will do this preliminary review.

Review to identify any changes that are necessary based on changes in methodology. It is possible that the transformation rules being developed could affect the MDRs, such as the Rules for Naming Data Elements and Segments, etc. The suggestion was made that updates to the MDRs adopt the conventions used in the CCTS v1.9.

Alternative 1:
If the group agrees to take them as is and bring them into the MDRs, we have a new set of rules – when something new is added, we would incorporate them into use in the MDRs. Copy and paste into MDRs. Adopt section 6.1.4 Naming Convention of the CCTS into the message design rule.

Alternative 2:
Remove the section on naming conventions from the MDR, and follow the rules used in the CCTS. The naming must be compliant to the conventions used in the CCTS.

nXg/Edifact
Due to the full agenda and lack of input since the last meeting, this topic was deferred to the next meeting.

Friday, 20 June 2003

Update Message Design Rules
Modify Rule 67 (page 15) in MDR_ver6.doc as follows:
In the last sentence, ‘description’ should be changed to ‘text’.

Using Figure 6.2 Normative model based on Business Information Entities. Naming conventions are in section 6 and meta data requirements are in section 7. Every construct in the EDIFACT directory should be associated with a ‘level’ of BIE as indicated in figure 6.2.

A review of deliverables from the TC154 meeting in July will take place at the September ATG meeting in Seoul. Sue Probert asked if a representative from ATG would be able to participate at the TBG17 Harmonisation WG meeting in London. Several ATG members indicated their intention to participate.

Recommend that the work that Gunther has done on the CCT representation terms be provided as input into the TBG17 Harmonisation efforts.

Any new DE that is needed for a new UN/EDIFACT DE should be submitted as a CC/BIE. Therefore should follow the rules of CC/BIEs and be registered as such. We can remove Annex B of MDRs (Naming Conventions). If someone submits a request for a new DE, what do we need to do with it?

Need a definition of what a CC and BIE is in the MDRs. The DE name should be named in accordance with its corresponding Core Component or BIE in the CCTS.

Requirements when new DE is being submitted:
BIE upon which DE is based
Mapping from the CCTS date/time core component (2379).

Figure 4.1 Core Component Overview from CCTS v 1.9

Update Technical Assessment Checklist
The group did a preliminary review of the Technical Assessment Checklist (TAC). Several changes are immediately seen as being needed. For instance, the title must be changed from EDIFACT Working Group to UN/EDIFACT Technical Assessment Checklist.
Next ATG1 meeting
The next meeting will be held 15-19 September 2003 at the 3rd UN/CEFACT Forum at the COEX, World Trade Center in Seoul Korea. The draft agenda will be forthcoming.

Adjournment
The vice chair Mrs Pemberton thanked the participants for a productive week and adjourned the meeting so the group could participate in the full ATG Closing Plenary.