1 Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Membership Status</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Crawford (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jostein Fromyr (Secretary)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunther Stuhec</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisanao Sugamata</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc Mouchot</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Lin</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dill</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Heilig</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Pemberton</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Minakawa</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Aguemon</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hogg</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øyvind Aassve</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Krupke</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Rowell</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alain Deschamps</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>P P P P P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATG2 currently have 10 voting members. Quorum is constituted with 5 members present – the meeting is in quorum.

2 Agenda

The agenda for the week was agreed as follows:

1. Administrative items
   a. FMG update
   b. TMG update
   c. IPR update
   d. Other CEFACT information
2. NDR - Outstanding comments
3. NDR - Section 9
4. NDR - Schema review and testing
5. NDR - Final review and approval
6. NDR - Decision on ODP step
7. SBDH – Discussion, update on status, next steps
8. FMG reorganization proposal
9. CCTS meta model impact on future NDR versions
10. Schema production process
11. Next project

3 Administrative items

3.1 FMG update

The last meeting of FMG was in Amsterdam some 2 weeks ago.

The FMG chair has been in discussion with X.12, as well as UBL, OAG, GS1 and RosettaNet with regard to improving the relationship between these group and CEFACT. Following this there is a proposal for reorganization of CEFACT under discussion. Key elements in this discussion are the role of the FMG, the harmonization process and how other groups may work under the umbrella of
CEFACT. A draft document will be developed for formal discussion with the bureau and external groups. The aim is to present this proposal for the Forum in Vancouver.

The discussion on the reorganization proposal was based on information received by the ATG chair from the chair of another working group. The essence of the proposal is portrayed in the following figure:

![Diagram of Trade Facilitation]

The TMG chair informed the group that a number of the FMG representatives are in favor of the proposal.

Members of ATG expressed a concern that yet another reorganization is not what we need as it will create uncertainty within as well as outside of the organization.

RosettaNet are considering aligning their next version of their standards with the CEFACT architecture, i.e. applying CCTS and CEFACT NDR.

BPSS, a joint version of the BPSS (CEFACT and OASIS) will be developed during Vancouver for submission to ISO. If this is not feasible the OASIS version will be submitted.

A task force has been established with representatives from each Group in order to provide a revised version of the ODP process. The aim is to present a revised draft ODP procedure for the CEFACT Plenary in 2006. The group was concerned that this work should in it self be subject to ODP.

The coming Forum meetings are as follows:
- Vancouver – web site now available
- New Delhi - dates not finally confirmed
- Cairo - not confirmed

The ICG expect to have the CEFACT Registry specification available for the Vancouver Forum meeting. A beta version of the registry is expected to be available in June/July 2006, with a final version available in the beginning of 2007.

### 3.2 TMG update

The TMG had its meeting in Sydney the week before.

The CC working group reviewed and restructured the CCTS metamodel and started work on data types. A revised document will be released for TMG review next week.

The UMM working group focused on developing an on-line user guide/tutorial for modeling of Business Processes. They expect to have this available by Vancouver. No comments were
received on the new metamodel released before Lyon. The metamodel is now in ODP step 5 (public review).

No work on Message Assembly.

The BCSS project focused on interoperability testing with unsuccessful results. The group now expects to publish explanatory text or XSLTs to move a model from one product to another.

3.3 IPR update

The US delegation in Geneva has now taken a lead in promoting the IPR towards the OLA. The US encourages other national representatives to express similar concerns to the OLA.

3.4 Other CEFACT information

No reports

4 NDR - Outstanding comments

Latest version of the NDR document from the editor is Draft 1.2, December 22, 2005.

The meeting continued its review of the NDR document and commented on the issues as follows (See annex A for details):

<p>| 22 | Explanatory text added at the start of section 5.5.3.6. Text between R71 and R72 should be removed (line 996). |
| 23 | Disagree – no change required |
| 24 | New text to be added at the beginning of section 5.6 Change R40 |
| 25 | Agreed |
| 26 | Editorial (correction at editors discretion) |
| 27 | Disagree – no change required |
| 28 | Editorial |
| 29 | Editorial |
| 30 | Editorial |
| 31 | Editorial |
| 32 | Agree Change R55 and move to section 8, as a new section 8.2 (XSI based schema location) |
| 33 | Disagree. Change R67 cct: and ccts: should not be used as token for CCTS constructs other than in xml code |
| 34 | See item 33 |
| 35 | See item 33 |
| 36 | Agreed |
| 37 | See item 33 |
| 38 | Agreed – Insert the word “basic” |
| 39 | Editorial |
| 40 | Editorial |
| 41 | Editorial |
| 42 | Editorial |
| 43 | Editorial |
| 44 | Agree to change introductory text in 7.2.4 |
| 45 | Change R84 to “…known as the root element, representing the business information exchange, …MUTS be declared in the…” |
| 46 | Disagree – no change required |
| 47 | Disagree – no change required |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Change to “The name of the root schema xsd:complexType MUST….”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Move to last rule in section 7.1.4. Change wording of the rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Change wording of the rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Agree to editorial change Don’t agree to the change in token.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Disagree – no change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Agree - correction at editors discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>See 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>See 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Disagree Editorial corrections noted, as well as a change to R103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Editorial change to R105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Editorial changes agreed for R106 and R109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Change R117 to … and approved abbreviations applied”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Editorial change to R119 and R120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Wording of R130 changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>See 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Disagree Change R131 to … and approved abbreviations applied”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Changes to R132, R133, R134, R135, 136 and 137 agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>See 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Change to Simple type ….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Change to Simple type ….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Agree, should use “declared”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Agree, delete “relevant”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Agree, delete “relevant”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Change to “…other than …”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Agreed and change section heading to “Extension and restriction”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting reviewed and corrected the text in section 9. During this review changes were identified for the following rules:
6 NDR - Schema review and testing

The meeting assigned individual actions to review and correct the individual schema modules as appropriate.

When reviewing the schemas changes were identified for the following rules:
- New rules added for file name
- The structure of the schema modules as defined in annex B
- R173 deleted and its introductory text changed

Each schema contains the following namespace declaration for CCTS:

```
xmns:ccts="urn:un:unece:uncefact:documentation:standard:CoreComponentsTechnicalSpecification:2.01"
```

It was noted that this namespace is included in the schemas only in order to make the schemas validate correctly with commonly used editors. No schema module exists for this namespace.

It was also noted that the xsd names defined in the table in section 6.5.1 is not consistent with the underlying metamodel, but that the table provided the linkage between the xsd names and the metamodel. The meeting reviewed and corrected all documentation annotation to ensure consistency with the CCTS metamodel.

When reviewing the schema for language code the group discussed the relationship between this list and the xsd:language. It was agreed that xsd:language should be used in the data type schema modules published by ATG. Main reason is that this reduces the number of imports and thus increases the efficiency. It was further agreed that, although the code list schema for language will not be used by any of our schema modules, it is recommended that this schema be be made available through the UN/CEFACT registry.

When reviewing the QDT schema module the group identified changes required to R154 in order to improve efficiency while maintaining the logical hierarchy between UDT and QDT. It was further agreed that if was not the responsibility of the group to publish the QDT schema module as this is not based on formally submitted and processed business requirements.

7 NDR - Final review and approval

The group reviewed the final draft of the NDR document, during which some further editorial changes were implemented.

The chair expressed his thanks to the lead editor (Paula) for her devotion and patient during the meeting.

8 NDR - Decision on ODP step

The group agreed that the final document and XML schemas should be published for OPD step 7, as version 2.0.

ATG2 then approved the NDR document and the associated XML Schema modules as a candidate for step 7 of the ODP and approved that it should be forwaed to ATG as a Technical Specification.
9  SBDH – Discussion, update on status, next steps

SAP is implementing the SBDH. Based on this some issues have been identified:

- Alignment to UMM and CCTS
- Business Scope_Process. Details is currently defined as a ABIE based on the ACC Process. Details. It was agreed that this should be either Business Scope_ Business Process. Details or a new ACC should be requested for Scope (assuming that the ACC for Process already exists).

Gunter will submit comments to Margaret and Paula.

10  FMG reorganization proposal

The meeting discussed the proposal for reorganization of the Forum currently under discussion in FMG. During this discussion a number of concerns were identified. It was agreed that the ATG2 chair should address these concerns to the ATG chair by forwarding the following message:

Quote:

We have discussed this in ATG this week and feel strongly that you need to oppose this proposal at this time. We are troubled by the reorganization proposal. The current structure is working fine, and fully supports the goals and objectives of UN/CEFACT. No business case has been presented to justify any tinkering with the current structure. Given the turmoil we have seen over the last four years with multiple reorganizations, it is our opinion that if the FMG reorganizes yet again, it will be the death of UN/CEFACT. We can not afford another two years wasted in trying to make yet another new structure exist without any real work progressing. Even bringing this subject up will result in turmoil in Vancouver that will preclude any real work from being accomplished, and will raise serious questions as to why we should even meet as ATG.

The focus of the FMG should not be on reorganization, it MUST be on resolving the IPR to ensure that we don’t lose current participants, rather that we are in a position to attract new participants to ensure we are a growing organization. Cooperation agreements with other standards bodies is of course important, but not as important as growing our own organization.
In looking at the proposal, we see several key points that are very questionable. First and foremost is the elevation of UNeDOCS as a separate methodology to a position of prominence that is unjustified and very unwise. The UNeDOCS is just one of the methodologies that CEFACCT is responsible for, and it should not become the focal point of CEFACCT.

Second, the recasting of the harmonization group into an independent harmonization office with only a few people and without representation of business experts from all of the TBG domains makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. The fact is the current TBG17 is only failing to make satisfactory progress because of too little participation from the TBG members. Recasting TBG17 as an independent group, or as part of TMG, will not help that situation. The focus of the harmonization must also be adjusted to reflect a different model for the entire core components approach. Currently, we have a tightly controlled/tightly coupled structure in which the CCs and BIEs are all required to go through the TBG harmonization process. As CEFACCT looks for partnerships between the various industry consortia, this model will not scale. Rather, we need a new approach in which the harmonization is tightly controlled/coupled for the conceptual CCs, and loosely coupled/controlled for the BIEs. Supporting this would be a new vision for a federated registry environment with status indicators for the various BIEs in the various registry/repositories as belonging to one of three levels: CEFACCT, Industry Consortia, private.

Third, the casting of ICG as an audit activity without registry/repository librarian function is wrongheaded thinking.

Fourth, ATG is no more or no less important than TMG, LG or ICG. Aligning external groups such as RosettaNet, OAGi, XBRL, etc, within the ATG structure makes no sense. The proper place for them is as part of the harmonization and/or relevant TBG group. This is where they actually interface at the component level. We don't expect these groups to change their process models, and we shouldn't expect them to change their context specific BIEs, rather we expect them to help build the conceptual core component library and to use it in their efforts.

Finally, with respect to UBL, the agreement in Lyon was that they should become an integral part of TBG as TBG20, since the bulk of their work is business content models. Why are alternatives even being considered?

Please ensure this message is given to the FMG prior to their next teleconference.

11 CCTS meta model impact on future NDR versions
Not discussed.

12 Schema production process
Not discussed.

13 Next project
Not discussed.

14 Next meetings
The next meeting following Vancouver was agreed for the week of June 5 in Waldorf, DE.
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Next conference call was agreed for January 30 at 13:30 CET.

In closing the meeting the chair expressed his thanks to Discray and Margaret for hosting the meeting and the excellent support provided.

--- Meeting adjourned on January 20, 2005 at 11:30 ---
15 Annex A – Discussion notes from MC with comments from GS

1. The xsd:complexType definition for ccts:Identifier.Type currently is named udt:IdentifierType. This seems in conflict with rule R13 which requires the use of approved acronyms. We either need to write an exception to the rule and include it in the NDR, or else change the xsd:complexType definition in the UDT to IDType. Thoughts?

GS  →  That is correct, we should change it in "udt:IDType" go get a common representation of all terms.

12/12 – agreed. We need to update the UDT schema and all occurrences throughout the text and examples in the NDR wherever Identifier is used for an element or attribute declaration or type definition. Paula to take FORAC

2. The schema location attribute for our UDT and QDT schema are not currently specified in the document. We can use the general schema location rule:

[R 1]  The general structure for schema location MUST be:

   http://www.unece.org/uncefact/<schematype>/<name>_major.<minor>.
   [revision][<status>].xsd

   Where:
   schematype = a token identifying the type of schema module:
   data|process|codelist|identifierlist|documentation
   name = the name of the module (using upper camel case)
   major = the major version number, sequentially assigned, first release starting with the number 1.
   minor = the minor version number within a major release, sequentially assigned, first release starting with the number 0.
   revision = sequentially assigned alphanumeric character for each revision of a minor release.
   Only applicable where status = draft.
   status = the status of the schema as: draft|standard

Following this rule, the schema locations for our UDT and QDT schema while still in draft would be:

http://www.unece.org/uncefact/data/unqualifieddatatype_1.0_draft.xsd
http://www.unece.org/uncefact/data/qualifieddatatype_1.0_draft.xsd

Is this acceptable to all?

GS  →  Fine with me
Agreed. Mark to change section 9. Paula look for other instances in document that need corrected.

3. the schema locations for our code list schema are currently relative paths. Following rule 42, these must be changed to resolvable url paths.

GS  →  Fine with me
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Alice. Coordinate with Mark for questions.

4. Line 279 has this guiding principle:
   - Messages must express semantics fully in schema and not rely on well-formedness.

5. I am not sure I understand this. Should we drop it?

GS→ I guess, we would like to say: The messages must express its standardized semantics by fully qualified XPath

12/12 – delete line.

6. After: Additionally, designers of XML schema outside of the UN/CEFACT Forum community may find the rules contained herein suitable as design rules for their own organization. At line 193, append the following new sentence:

   Since the CCTS constructs are consistent with UML classes, attributes, and associations, these design rules can easily be applied to non CCTS constructs as well.

12/12 – agreed.

GS→ A question raised up, if we will be fully consistent with UML. Because, a composition belongs always to only one owner ABIE (e.g.: Item belongs only to Purchase Order). Here is the question: Makes it sense that the type name of the composition should also include the name of its owner as a prefix? E.g.: Item should have “PurchaseOrderItemType”. Otherwise it is not clear to which owner the specific composition belonging to.

7. Line 199 – change “5” to “6” for accuracy

GS→ Fine with me

8. Line 249 – spell out first occurrence of XSD – XML Schema Definition Language

GS→ Fine with me

9. Line 285 – Change Modularity Strategy to Modularity Model to align with the subsection header

GS→ Fine with me

10. Line 286 – Insert new bullet Schema Location between Namespace Scheme and Versioning bullets

GS→ Fine with me

11. Line 340 – this line is no longer correct given the change to figure 5-3. change to read: “An ABIE is defined as an xsd:complexType and a corresponding xsd:globalElement is declared.”

GS→ A xsd:global element is only declared, if the ABIE is not a composition.

Final resolution: Change to read:
An ABIE is defined as a `xsd:complexType` and a corresponding `xsd:globalElement` is declared.

12. Line 342 – This sentence is not clear as the word composition is not given a context. Change to read: “If the nature of the association expressed by the ASBIE is a `uml:composition` it will be declared as a local element within the `xsd:complexType` representing the associating ABIE. If it is not a `uml:composition` (i.e., `uml:aggregation`) it will be declared as a global element.

GS: I guess, `uml:composition` is also not very clear. Than many people will thinking that we have also a XML schema construct for UML artifacts. It is better, if we use only this kind of representation for artifacts, which will be really expressed in XML schema. Better, we should explain composition, in a glossary or we should say “a composition according UML conventions”.

12/19 – disagree with inserting UML. However, agreed to the following changes:

Depending on the type of association an ASBIE will be declared as either a local element or will be referencing a global element. If the ASBIE is a composition it will be declared as a local element within the `xsd:complexType` representing the associating ABIE. If it is not a composition (i.e., aggregation) the ASBIE is included in the content model by referencing the global element that was declared for the associated ABIE. The ASBIE element is in itself based on (is of type) `xsd:complexType` of the associated ABIE. In this way the content model of the associated ABIE is included in the content model of the associating ABIE.

13. Line 367 – Shouldn’t this read “A CCT is defined as an xsd:complexType.”?

GS: I thought that we don’t have CCTs anymore. Our starting point are the UDTs.

12/19 – disagree to marks proposal because X is not a vowel. To GS point, we make this clear elsewhere in the document.

14. Line 372 – Currently reads “The UN/CEFACT library contains fully conformant CCTS dictionary entry names as well as truncated XML element names developed in conformance with the naming constraint rules specified below.” This seems confusing. The library doesn’t contain names, it contains XML constructs as registry artefacts. Recommend changing to:

UN/CEFACT XSD Schema are derived from components created through the application of CCTS and UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) process modelling and data analysis. UN/CEFACT XSD Schema contain XML syntax specific constructs that follow the naming and design rules in this specification. Those naming and design rules have taken advantage of the features of XSD to incorporate naming constraint rules that in many cases result in truncation of the CCTS dictionary entry names. However, the fully conformant CCTS dictionary entry names of the underlying CCTS registry artefact are preserved as part of the `xsd:<annotation>` element accompanying each element declaration in UN/CEFACT schema, and can be
reconstructed through use of XPath expressions. The XML fully qualified XPath ties

......

GS\rightarrow Fine with me.

12/19 – agreed to change.

15. Line 433. The value Cd is not in the keyword font.

GS\rightarrow Correct, should be changed.

16. Line 463 – Values are not in keyword font.

GS\rightarrow Correct, should be changed.

17. Line 465 – Values are not in keyword font.

GS\rightarrow Correct, should be changed.

18. Line 465 – Append \texttt{uml}: to occurrences of “composition” and change to keyword font

GS\rightarrow See my answer to comment 12.

12/19 - disagree


GS\rightarrow Correct, should be changed.

20. Line 624 – Need carriage return after the word module to create new paragraph as the topic of the next two sentences are different than the topic of the first three sentences.

GS\rightarrow Correct, should be changed.


GS\rightarrow Correct, should be changed.

22. Rule 29 and Rule 31 – the wording should be the same. Currently, Rule 29 is somewhat ambiguous and confusing in that it only states that schema modules must be created to convey code list enumerations. This implies that if you are conveying code list enumerations, you do so in a code list schema module. It does not require the use of the code list schema module for validation. Rule 31 states that an Identifier List schema module must be created to convey enumeration values that requires run time validation. This implies that you can include Identifier enumerations in a BIE type definition if you don’t insist on run time validation. I recommend that the following wording be used for both:

Code/Identifier Lists will only be enumerated in reusable code/identifier list schema modules.
Correct, only existing and reusable code/identifier lists should be represented in a code/identifier schema module and by enumerations. Because, it is impossible to put all identifiers of daily produced items into this schema module. But: I guess we should only allow the usage of enumerations in code lists. Because code lists could be used for value help (representation of names or description of its code) and identifiers refer to other objects. This is a completely other mechanism. If it is required, an identifier could also refer to a codelist getting the name and description information.

12/19 – still open.

23. Line 773 – The two colons after <URN> do not make sense.
   
   Why not. This is a valid representation according Backus-Naur-Form (BNF), which is also used in ASN.1. No change.

24. Line 822 – Rule 40. A Namespace is a collection of names for elements, attributes and types that serve to uniquely distinguish the collection from the collection of names in another namespace. A namespace acts as the token in a two part qualified name. The text at 5.6.5 has it right. The wording of the ruling is incorrect - Namespaces don’t contain schema. Recommend changing rule to read:

   UN/CEFACT namespace values will only be assigned to UN/CEFACT developed objects.

Correct, we should change the rule, because a namespace is an abstract container. A namespace name names this namespace and a schema module makes this namespace physically visible.

25. Line 824 – recommend changing to read:

   Namespace URIs are typically represented by tokens rather than citing the entire URI as the qualifier in qualified xml constructs. UN/CEFACT has developed a token pattern for each type of UN/CEFACT schema module. These token patterns are identified in the applicable schema module subsection in Section 7.

Fine with me.

26. Line 867 – change to keyword font

Fine with me.

27. Line 870 – Rule 44 – change namespace declaration to schema location.

This URI represents the namespace name and not a schema location.


Fine with me.
29. Line 921 – change “unqualified” to unqualified.
   
   GS⇒ Fine with me.

30. Line 922 – change “xsd” to xsd.
   
   GS⇒ Fine with me.

31. Line 923 – change to hyperlink
   
   GS⇒ Fine with me.

32. Line 930 – Rule 55 is wrong. Xsd:schemaLocation and xsd:noNamespaceLocation do not exist. schemaLocation, noNamespaceSchemaLocation, nil and type attributes are part of the xmlSchema-instance namespace (http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance). Also, since these are instance document attributes, they should be moved to Section 8 before the xsi:nil and xsi:type subsections. Recommend correcting rule 55 to read:

   The xsi prefix will be used as the token for xsi:schemaLocation and xsi:noNamespaceSchemaLocation instance document attributes.

   GS⇒ Correct. Additionally, we forgotten do say thay we have to use “xmlns” prefix for declaration of the namespace names.

33. Line 951 – R67 – change to An xsd:attribute representing a ccts:supplementarycomponent….
   
   GS⇒ This kind of representation convention makes the reading very hard for me. As I mentioned before, we should only use this representation for XML artefacts.

34. Line 953 – R 68 – change to An xsd:attribute representing a ccts:supplementarycomponent for codes …
   
   GS⇒ See my answer to comment 33

35. Line 955 – R69 change to An xsd:attribute representing a ccts:supplementarycomponent for identifiers …
   
   GS⇒ See my answer to comment 33

36. Line 967 – incorrect. Change to: Elements are declared for document level message assembly, ABIEs, BBIEs, and ASBIEs.
   
   GS⇒ Correct
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37. Line 970 – out of place. Also conflicts with rules R29 and R31 in both their current and proposed form. I thought we had killed this option. If not, then we need to have a supporting rule that specifically defines how to do the element declarations for enumerated lists as a BBIE.

GS→ Correct, enumerations should be only allowed in code lists (as I mentioned in comment 22).

38. Line 974 – Rule 72 second line. We use (BBIE) after “source business information entity”. Either change the acronym to (BIE) or change the wording to “source basic business information entity”.

GS→ We can say: the source of the basic business information entity.


GS→ Correct

40. Line 1093 – insert carriage return and change font for urn to keyword.

GS→ Correct

41. Line 1095 – insert carriage return and change font for urn to keyword.

GS→ Correct

42. Line 1096 – change “ccts” to keyword font

GS→ Correct

43. Line 1263 – incorrect font for “single”

GS→ Correct

44. Line 1260 – Confusing since we now have more than one global element declaration in our root schema. Recommend changing to:
Each UN/CEFACT business message will have one global element declaration defined as the root element for all instance documents that use that schema. The global element that represents the root element is named according to the business information exchange that it represents. This global element will be of the named xsd:complexType that represents the message assembly that contains the actual business information.

GS→ Fine with me.

45. Line 1263 – R48 – change to:
A global element representing the business information exchange MUST be declared in the rsm:RootSchema.

GS→ Fine with me
46. Line 1265 – R85 – change to:
The name of the global element representing the business information exchange MUST be …..

GS \Rightarrow Fine with me

47. Line 1276 – “Root schemas are limited to defining a single xsd:complexType and declaring a single global element that fully describe the business information exchange.” I don’t believe this is correct ivo of our decision to declare global elements for ASBIEs and ABIEs.

GS \Rightarrow Correct we should change the words.

48. Line 1280 – R87 – Confusing. Change to:
The name of the message level complex type MUST be the name of the global element that has been defined as the instance root element, with the word “Type” appended.

GS \Rightarrow Fine with me

49. Line 1282 – R88 – confusing. Change to:
The global element that has been defined as the instance root element must be of type xsd:complexType of the message-level complex type.

GS \Rightarrow Fine with me

50. Line 1298 – R89 – change the word root to global.

GS \Rightarrow Fine with me

51. 1373 – change “ram” to keyword font without quotes. Also, what about versioning of the RAM schema? The token will have to be versioned as well. We need to address this in the rule.

GS \Rightarrow Correct

52. Line 1415 – change “Details” and “Type” to keywords without quotes.

GS \Rightarrow Fine with me

53. Line 1424 and 1425 – two occurrences - add uml:to composition and make keyword

GS \Rightarrow See my comments before.

54. Line 1550 – change ‘identification’ and ‘identifier’ to keywords without quotes.

GS \Rightarrow Fine with me.

55. Line 1551 – change ‘identification and ‘indication’ to keywords without quotes.
56. Line 1552 – change ‘indicator’ and ‘indication’ to keywords without quotes.

GS ➔ Fine with me.

57. Line 1559 – add uml: to compositon and make keyword.

GS ➔ See my comments before.

58. Line 1562 – remove extra parens

GS ➔ Fine with me.

59. Line 1564 and Line 1569 – these two rules should have consistent wording. Recommend ‘be of xsd:type’ instead of ‘be of the complex type’

GS ➔ It is xsd:complexType and as I mentioned before ➔ the name of a composition ASBIE should also include the owner of this ASBIE. We need a new rule for it.

60. Line 1812 – change “cct” to cct

GS ➔ Fine with me.

61. Line 1830 – Rule 118 – what do we do about IdentifierType? Leave as is, or change to IDType? Either way, we must change a rule. For consistency, I would prefer IDType.

GS ➔ Change it.

62. Line 1836 – xsd:extension – change to keyword font

GS ➔ Fine with me.

63. Line 1839 – shouldn’t this read “an xsd:attribute” rather than “a xsd:attribute”?

GS ➔ yes.

64. Line 1869 – Rule 122 - remove quotes from name and change to keyword.

GS ➔ Fine with me.

65. Line 1876 – remove quotes from identification and change to keyword.

GS ➔ Fine with me.

66. Line 1878 – Remove quotes from text and change to keyword.

GS ➔ Fine with me.
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67. Line 1896 – change to read “The core component type schema module is a generic module with fixed values that are based on the underlying ccts:cct’s. No restriction or extension is appropriate.

GS⇒ It is quite hard to read, if we put always a prefix to all keywords and if we write all key words in upper camel case. This is not the normal way. Many people are believing that is a part of our XML schema construct and than they’re just wondering, because “cct’s” couldn’t be defined in XML schemas.

68. Line 1974 – change to read “the specific format is shown below. This format adheres to the format of the relevant sections as detailed in Appendix B.”

GS⇒ Fine with me.

69. Line 2011 – R129 – change “udt” to udt

GS⇒ Fine with me.

70. Line 2023 – ambiguous. Change to “The Unqualified Data Type schema will import any code list and identifier list schema modules used by supplementary components. The Unqualified Data Type schema will not import any other schema modules.”

GS⇒ Fine with me.

71. Line 2024 – change rule R130 into positive restrictive rather than negative restrictive:

GS⇒ Fine with me.

72. [R130] The udt:UnqualifiedDatatype schema MUST only use the xsd:import attribute for the following schema modules:

GS⇒ Do we have udt:UnqualifiedDatatype as a artefact name in the XML schema?

73. Line 2045 – replace second occurrence of the word “defined” with “specified”

GS⇒ Fine with me.

74. Line 2046 – Rules 131 and 132 - We have changed CCTS to eliminate the referenced table. Recommend changing the rule to:

[R131] A udt:UnqualifiedDataType MUST be defined for each approved ccts unqualified data type.

GS⇒ Do we have udt:UnqualifiedDatatype as a artefact name in the XML schema?
75. [R132] The name of each \texttt{udt:UnqualifiedDataType} must be the dictionary entry name of the approved ccts unqualified data type, with separators, spaces, and the word \texttt{type} removed.

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Do we have udt:UnqualifiedDatatype as a artefact name in the XML schema?

76. Line 2051 – unclear as to which data type is being referred to at the end of the sentence. Recommend inserting the word unqualified between the words that and data at the end of the sentence.

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Fine with me. Remark: Please have a look to this sentence ant line 2055, we say in this sentence “XSD built-in data type” (which I prefer) and in line 2055 we say \texttt{xsd:dataType} (which I do not prefer). This is an inconsistency in wording.

77. Line 2073 – typo – convey is spelled covey.

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Correct.

78. Line 2076 – change to keyword font Code. Type and Identifier. Type. Also, shouldn’t we say udt:CodeType and udt:IdentifierType?

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Yes change into keyword font. But again, I recommend that we can’t use this conventions for all keyword. \textbf{pro:This vrb:Is adj:Very nou:Confusing:}.

79. Line 2076 – Next Sentence is unclear. Change to:
If an implementation desires this metadata to be conveyed as attributes rather than part of the namespace declaration, a qualified datatype with the additional attributes representing the missing supplementary components can be specified.

and delete last sentence beginning: Thus, those attributes …

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Fine with me.

80. Line 2085 – change simpleTypes to Simple types or else add the \texttt{xsd:} prefix

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Fine with me.

81. Line 2086 – change simpleTypes to Simple types or else add the \texttt{xsd:} prefix

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Fine with me.

82. Line 2090 – dangling participle. Add the word “lists” to the end of the sentence.

\textbf{GS} \rightarrow Correct.

83. Line 2094 – R140 change “the representation term of the parent CCT” to “the unqualified data type”
84. Line 2097 – R141 – change ‘identification’ (2 occurrences) to keyword
   GS⇒ Correct.

85. Line 2099 – R142 – change ‘text’ to keyword
   GS⇒ But without prefix!!!!!

86. Line 2168 – we use ‘user declared attributes’ in this sentence, but ‘user defined attributes’ in the next to talk about the same thing. Select one or the other to use in both.
   GS⇒ Elements and attributes will be declared and types, namespaces, groups will be defined. Then we have to say: “user declared attributes”.

87. Line 2170 – R143 – change “Code” to keyword and remove the word relevant as unnecessary and not consistent with the other supplementary component rules
   GS⇒ But without prefix!!!!!

88. Line 2186 – R144 – change “Identifier” to keyword and remove the word relevant as unnecessary and not consistent with the other supplementary component rules
   GS⇒ But without prefix!!!!! We should also change the rule: Identifier schemes are patterns for the specific representation of identifiers. The identifiers itself refers to other objects. Therefore, the identifiers are not listed in a list (like a code list). If an identifier should use for representation reasons a fixed list, this identifier should refer to a code list scheme module.

89. Line 2203 – R145 – confusing. I had to read this three times. Recommend changing to read:
   for all supplementary components whose representation term is other than Code or Identifier, the attribute must of type xsd:datatype.
   GS⇒ Do we talk about XSD build-in type.

90. Line 2219 – change to read:
    The unqualified data types can be further restricted through the creation of qualified data types. These qualified data types are defined in the qdt:QualifiedDataType schema module.
   GS⇒ But without prefix and UUC!!!!!

91. Line 2290 – extra space between goals and requires
   GS⇒ Correct
92. Line 2292 – insert the word schema between UN/CEFACT and module

   But without prefix and UCC ;-)  

93. Line 2298 – remove quotes from the word qualified

   Correct

94. Line 2337 – R148 – change “qdt” to keyword font

   No

95. Line 2361 – remove keyword font

   Yes

96. Line 2366 – change xsd:complexType and xsd:simpleType to keyword font

   Yes

97. Line 2370 – R153 – remove space between xsd:data and type

   Do we talk about XSD build-in type.

98. Line 2375 – should this be a note, or explanatory text starting with the words – For example – and appended to the sentence preceding rule 153.

   Yes

99. Line 2437 – R156 – missing period at end of the fist sentence, and capitalization of the word when that starts the second sentence. The end of the second sentence should use a period rather than semi-colen. The third sentence needs capitalization

   Yes

100. Line 2486 – keyword must not capitalized

    but with white spaces.

101. Line 2502 – we are allowing for the declaration of attributes in the UDT schema. Second sentence needs changed to:
    Attribute declarations in the qualified data type schema will either be those present in the parent unqualified data type with further restrictions applied as required, or else represent supplementary components either not declared in the unqualified data type or represented by xsd built-in datatype facets, such as those conveyed in the namespace declaration for code and identifier lists or representing further restrictions to xsd:datetime.
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GS → Fine with me.

102. Line 2607 – Sentence is not correct. Codes facilitate the flow of information while saving bandwidth and standardizing values. Recommend rewrite to read: Codes are an integral component of any business to business information flow. Codes have been developed over time to facilitate the flow of compressed, standardized values that can easily be validated for correctness to ensure consistent data.

GS → We should also say that the code list can be used of value help, because it represents the codes, its names and descriptions.

103. Line 2665 – this is a second level bullet and needs further indenting. Values need changed to keywords

GS → Correct

104. Line 2667 – this is a second level bullet and needs further indenting. Values need changed to keywords

GS → Correct

105. Line 2670 – Values on the left side of the equal sign need changed to keywords

GS → Correct

106. Line 2740 – change value <Code List. Version. Identifier> to keyword

GS → Correct

107. Line 2779 – the example numbering jumps by 10

GS → ?

108. Line 2805 – change to keyword

GS → Correct

109. Line 2807 – R166 – change all values on left side of equal sign to keyword

GS → Correct

110. Line 2835 – code list name text is in incorrect keyword font

GS → Correct

111. Line 2848 – change xsd:normalizedString to keyword and drop quotes.

GS → Correct
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112. Line 2869 – R175 - confusing. A Schema’s root element is always <xsd:schema .....>
Recommend changing to:
Code list schema MUST only have one global element declaration in addition to the
<xsd:schema> element declaration.

GS→ Correct

113. Line 2870 – in line with comment above, change R176 to:
The name of the code list global element MUST ..... 

GS→ Correct

114. Line 2870 – R177 - keyword code list name text in wrong keyword font
115. Line 2872 – in line with comments for R176 and 177, change rule to:
The code list global element MUST be of the xsd:type representing ....

GS→ XML schema built-in type

116. Line 2878 – change to read:
The declaration of a single global element .......

GS→ Correct

117. Line 2892 – change identifier list to code list

GS→ Correct

118. Line 2892 - insert the words ‘or superset’ after the word subset

GS→ Correct

119. Line 2894 – insert bullet to reflect option for subsetting code list.

GS→ Correct

120. Line 2897 – change ‘both of these’ to ‘each of these’

GS→ Correct

121. Line 2898 – provide pointer to section 9.

GS→ Correct

122. Line 2904 – change example to align with our approach for naming the elements

GS→ Correct

123. Line 2915 – insert comma after ‘When required’
ATG2 F2F meeting  
Wollongong, January 16 - 20, 2005

**GS** Correct

124. Line 2968 – change un to keyword

**GS** Correct

125. Line 2970 and 2972 – these are second level bullets and require additional indentation

**GS** Correct

126. Line 2970 and 2972 – change values to keyword font

**GS** Correct

127. Line 2975 – R181 – Values on the left side of the equal sign need changed to keywords

**GS** Correct

128. Line 3002 – R182 – Values on the left side of the equal sign need changed to keywords

**GS** Correct

129. Line 3030 – change <Identifier Scheme. Version. Identifier> to keyword font

**GS** Correct

130. Line 3074 – R184 – Values on the left side of the equal sign need changed to keywords

**GS** Correct

131. Line 3100 – Sentences seem confusing and out of place. Recommend replacing with:
   Each identifier list schema module will have a single xsd:simpletype defined. This single xsd:simpleType definition will have an xsd:restriction expression whose base is an xsd:datatype. The xsd:restriction element will be used to convey the content component enumeration value(s).
   Recommend also using this in Section 7.8.6 as a preamble prior to rule 170.

   **GS** We don’t need an identifier list schema module, because we have only “code list scheme modules”. Therefore, we should change the complete paragraph 7.9 Identifier List Schema. Because, identifiers refers to Objects, which could be based on ABIEs. This is comparable to the primary and secondary key construct of relational databases. And codelists are a fixed lists with necessary information of the code itself (names and descriptions). If an identifier type will be based on a code lists, than it should used the same kind of code list as a code type itself. Otherwise, we would like to create a lot of confusion.

132. Line 3117 – R190 – change xsd:normalizedString to keyword and drop quotes

   **GS** See my comment to 131
133. Line 3118 – R191 – change xsd:enumeration to keyword
   GS→ See my comment to 131

   Recommend changing to:
   Identifier list schema MUST only have one global element declaration in addition to the
   <xsd:schema> element declaration.
   GS→ See my comment to 131

135. Line 3139 – in line with comment above, change R194 to:
   The name of the identifier list global element MUST …
   GS→ See my comment to 131

136. Line 3141 – R195 – in line with comments for R193 and 194, change rule to:
   The code list global element MUST be of the xsd:type representing …
   GS→ See my comment to 131

137. Line 3146 – change to read:
   The declaration of a single global element …
   GS→ See my comment to 131

138. Line 3161 – insert the words ‘superset or’ between any and subset.
   GS→ See my comment to 131

139. Line 3164 – insert bullet to represent option to subset
   GS→ See my comment to 131

140. Line 3166 – change ‘Both’ to ‘Each’
   GS→ See my comment to 131

141. Line 3167 – provide pointer to section 9.
   GS→ See my comment to 131

142.