

ICG meeting Minutes

1 Present:

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address
Mike Conroy	Atos Origin/ France	Michael.conroy@wanadoo.fr
David Dobbing	Standard Chartered, Hong Kong / Australia	ddobbing@attglobal.net
Hidekazu Enjo	NTT Data, Japan	enjoh@nttdata.co.jp
Francis Berthomieu	France Télécom, France	Francis.berthomieu@francetelecom.com
Yao-Ming Yeh	National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan	ymyeh@ice.ntnu.edu.tw
Hajime Yagi	JASTPRO, Japan	Hajime.yagi@jastpro.or.jp
Shang Chi Chen	Institute for Information Industry, Taiwan	chi@iii.org.tw
Ed Buchinski	Treasury board of Canada Secretariat, Canada	Buchinski.ed@tbs-sct.gc.ca
Tzung-Jehng Ho	Environment Protection Administration, Taiwan	tcho@epa.gov.tw
Fabrice Bourge	France Télécom, France	Fabrice.bourge@francetelecom.com
Badlishah Bin Shabudin	EC Partners of Malaysia, Malaysia	shah@ec-partners.com
Sang Won Lim	Korea Institute for electronic Commerce, Korea	swlim@kiec.or.kr
Benoit Van Daele	SWIFT, Belgium	Benoit.daele@swift.com
Frank Cheng	Institute for Information Industry, Taiwan	Cch100z@iii.org.tw
Karlson Hsia	Institute for Information Industry, Taiwan	khhsia@iii.org.tw

2 Monday, 14th of March 2005

2.1 Welcome and opening remarks by the ICG Convener

M. Conroy welcomed everyone to the sixth plenary meeting of the ICG. He indicated we had a very busy agenda with one of the final revisions of the RSM and more importantly the review of the UN/CEFACT Registry specification.

2.2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved with the following modifications to the published version:

1. Point 6 on the agenda was deleted since a special work group that included an ICG representative had been set up to define a set of revised procedures that would be applicable to all permanent groups. As soon as this document became available the group could examine and comment on it.
2. Point 13 on the agenda was moved up in the agenda to replace point 6.
3. ATG had requested a joint meeting with the ICG and TMG to discuss the XML/XMI situation. This was scheduled for Monday afternoon at 16h00.

2.3 Approval of the minutes of the last meeting

The minutes were approved without change.

2.4 Report from the March UN/CEFACT directory audit

M. Conroy reported that the production of the D.04B directory had been produced on time. He indicated that once again there was a proportionately high level of errors (11%). He also indicated that the audit was held up waiting for the approved DMRs that had not been supplied at the end of the Washington meeting. Other than that, the Audit went rapidly as there was only 9 DMRs.

2.5 Review of the ICG Website

M. Conroy introduced the subject by indicating that he had received three remarks about the website

1. The site gave no indication of the documents up for review on the home page;
2. A number of people complained about the difficulty to find download information;
3. It was requested that we envisage archiving the e-mail from the ICG lists.

D. Dobbing opened the web page for every one to see and accepted the first remark as did the rest of the members. He showed the new TMG webpage that provided everything on the first page and suggested that a compromise between the two approaches would be a good idea.

He indicated that he found it difficult to understand the problem with the downloads and immediately demonstrated what he meant by looking up the download page. H. Yagi agreed and indicated that he visited the web page often and found no difficulty with it.

F. Berthomieu indicated that the web page had the same format as the pages of the other groups and that this principle should be maintained in order to ensure a homogenous approach for UN/CEFACT. The TMG page had now become an exception that should not necessarily be followed.

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

After a discussion on the subject D. Dobbing indicated that he would revamp the webpage but maintain the basic layout to keep it harmonized with those of the other groups. This would make any documents that were under review to be more visible.

In addressing the third point D. Dobbing indicated that this was a problem of the UN/CEFACT mail server and not the webpage as such. The UN server did not have the functionality to enable such archiving. He also tended to question the usefulness of such a function. H. Yagi agreed and brought up the question of who was on the ICG list. It appeared that he was not and that he was not aware that it was necessary to subscribe specifically to the list even though he was a member of the group at each forum meeting. M. Conroy indicated that he had had a similar remark from several other members and apologized for the apparent discrepancy between the forum inscription list and the list server.

D. Dobbing indicated that this would be rectified immediately and that from now on each member inscribed on the ICG forum list would be automatically inscribed on the list server.

2.6 Review of the approved Recommendations – Recommendation 20

D. Dobbing introduced the subject by explaining that the only comments he had received were from the WCO (World Customs Organization). He had replied to their comments with proposals to satisfy their comments. They had since also provided their remarks to these proposals. We had now to review the final proposals and agree their insertion in the Recommendation. He indicated that the WCO had not been able to confirm some of his proposals up to now (two proposals remain outstanding). Consequently if there were any changes to the Recommendation then these would have to be introduced in a later release.

The modifications were then individually reviewed and commented on by the group and the finalized changes were introduced in the Recommendation.

D. Dobbing reported that the document would now be sent within the next 2 weeks to the UN Secretariat for them to translate into the approved languages and to put them into the UN standardized format. The documents would then be presented by M. Conroy to the UN/CEFACT Plenary for final approval in June.

2.7 Review of the UNCL migration plan.

H. Enjo presented the issues that had been raised in Japan concerning the UNCL. The essential question being whether or not there should be a new code list for the ebXML components. The issues raised were:

- 1. We should clear the process for making UN/CEFACT official Core Component library. We should develop rules and the workflow for approving and publishing the Core Component library.*
- 2. During discussions of DMR assessment in TAG of Japan, we have encountered the issue whether we accept new code to register into the code lists of EDIFACT if the new code is never used in EDIFACT environment. Because some users have a plan to use the new code only in ebXML environment.*
- 3. If the code list of EDIFACT is referred to in the specification of another standards body and some users want a new code in that of the other specification, TAG of Japan accepts the new code request or not.*

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

M. Conroy indicated that the ICG has had a migration project since the inception of the ICG. The intent is for the ICG to assume responsibility for the UNCL and make it a generic list for UN/CEFACT enabling it to be used by any syntax in a similar fashion to the UN Recommendations. D. Dobbing confirmed this but indicated that because of a lack of time we had never been capable of beginning it. He also indicated that the intent was to use the code lists for ebXML since they represented a considerable investment that should not be lost.

After a discussion on the subject the UNTDED was examined to see what had been referenced in that respect. It was discovered after this discussion that there was currently no provision to provide a bridge between the data element defining the code list and the equivalent Basic Core Component.

It was agreed that this issue should be addressed immediately. D. Dobbing would bring the question to the chair of TBG17 in order to determine exactly if something had been provided for or not.

2.8 Joint meeting ATG/ICG/TMG

M. Conroy introduced the meeting by indicating that it had been made at the request of ATG and consequently handed the floor to M. Crawford to enable him to explain the subject matter to be addressed during the meeting.

M. Crawford indicated that two principle subjects were to be addressed, namely the question of UML to XML and XMI profiles.

M. Crawford went on to explain that from his understanding that had been clarified by e-mail with M. Conroy the TBGs would provide their models to the ICG as an XMI file and that this file would be passed on to the ATG for transformation into the relevant technology solution. He also understood that the TMG were working with the ICG to provide UN/CEFACT profile for UML and XMI. He indicated that he had had discussions on the subject with a colleague who was deeply involved in the OMG. From those discussions he understood that the current version of XMI would not satisfy the ATG requirements to generate an XSD schema in compliance with the NDR and that XMI 2.0 was a better option. He also was led to believe that it would be possible to evolve XMI 2.0 to satisfy all NDR needs with the development of a MOF profile. A. Tell indicated that one should not mix up the use of XMI to define a profile and its use to generate an instance of a UML diagram.

A. Tell explained that it was in the interests of UN/CEFACT to encourage the participation of ISO and OMG as the combination of the three organizations would be a powerful indication to the software world of the importance of UMM.

A discussion then ensued where ICG and TMG explained the intent of their effort to get something defined quickly in order to enable the process to be worked through to completion. S. Capell gave a detailed explanation of both the current situation and the ideal situation explaining that it would be a very long time before the ideal situation using MOF would become commonplace in the market. Currently there are few if any tools supporting MOF.

This explanation satisfied M. Crawford and he understood that ICG and TMG were looking to provide the ATG with an XMI file that would enable the automatic generation of an XSD which in the short term would most likely need some XSL reworking which in the long term would become limited. The question was raised as to the use of the ODETTE XMI profile, but M. Conroy indicated that this would serve as a contribution in order to help us fast track the development. A.

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

Tell also indicated that the final XMI profile would not correspond to the ODETTE version but that it would be possible to incorporate such a version within it.

It was also agreed that the complete responsibility to generate the XSD schemas was with the ATG.

From the standpoint of the UN/CEFACT Registry M. Conroy indicated that it would be possible to inject partial schemas, such as one for a core component, into it. After some explanation M. Crawford indicated that he was also satisfied with these explanations.

G. Stuhec suggested that the ATG participate along with the ICG and TMG in the BCSS project that is currently working on the XMI output format as well as the UML profiles. This would ensure that the requirements from ATG would be covered in the development.

M. Crawford agreed to this.

The meeting broke up at 17h30.

3 Tuesday, 15th of March 2005

3.1 Review of RSM mapping comments

M. Conroy introduced the meeting by explaining the function of the RSM within the context of the Forum workflow. He stressed its importance being the transmission mechanism between the TBG, ICG and ATG. He indicated that there were some 58 comments that had been made. He also indicated that should it be necessary, the ICG had reserved the whole day to work on the comments

He welcomed all the participants from the ATG, the TBG (amongst them being members from TBG17 and TBG5) and the TMG who had joined the meeting in order to assist in the disposition of comments.

He also indicated that the Chair of the TBG had informed him that TBG 1 could not attend the meeting during the morning but that they would like to attend in the afternoon to assist at the disposition of their comments. M. Conroy explained that he had agreed to this request in the interests of transparency and that if there were any problems related to TBG 1 comments these would be discussed during the morning but finally disposed of with TBG 1 in the afternoon.

He felt confident that in view of the limited number of comments that it should be possible to review them all during the course of the morning.

The comments were analyzed during the morning and all the comments were processed.

At the request of M. Crawford, the ICG will review chapter 7 of the CCTS in order to determine if the tables proposed in the RSM covered any requirements expressed in the chapter.

A position in relation to TBG 1 comments was established during the morning these outstanding questions were reviewed with TBG1 in the afternoon. All the comments and the actions to be taken were confirmed by TBG 1.

The disposition of comments will be available on the ICG website (www.disa.org/cefact-groups/icg) along with the new revision of the RSM (V0R4).

The meeting broke up at 15h00 to enable to group to attend the TMG training session.

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

4 Wednesday, 16th of March 2005

M. Conroy opened the morning session by indicating that the group was going to focus all day Wednesday and most of Thursday on the specification for the UN/CEFACT Registry. This would be divided into two parts, the preparation for the Lunch and Learn presentation on Thursday and the review of the comments on the Specification.

The morning then proceeded by a step by step review of the Lunch and Learn presentation by F. Berthomieu. Each transparent was commented by the members of the group.

The afternoon began with the review of the comments received about the UN/CEFACT Registry. F. Bourge indicated that in all there were some 187 comments to process. The comments received were reviewed with the active participation of the members of the group. Additional comments were provided by the members of the group during the course of the meeting.

The disposition of comments was updated and the Specification was modified interactively except in cases where some global rewording was required. Some 150 comments were processed before the close of the meeting.

The meeting broke up at 18h00.

5 Thursday, 17th of March 2005

M. Conroy began the day by informing the group that instead of giving the ICG presentation during lunch, it had been moved to the beginning of the afternoon session where a joint presentation of TBG17 and ICG would be given. He therefore indicated that the presentation would have to be revised accordingly.

D. Dobbing and F. Bourge continued the processing of the comments with the help of the group.

During the course of the morning Y. Yeh gave a presentation of the Taiwan project “A Gazette Content Management System in Taiwan eGovernment Platform” that made use of the ebXML RegRep and had incorporated some of the ideas advanced during the Washington forum meeting. After a very interesting presentation of the project that centered around the federation of registries. M. Conroy suggested to the group that it would be interesting for the whole of the Forum to hear about the project. With the group’s agreement the presentation was incorporated into the afternoon presentation.

S. Lim then gave a live presentation of the work carried out on an ebXML RegRep in Korea that incorporated the ebXML core component functions. The presentation gave some further insight into how such a registry could be implemented and the group commented M. Lim for the presentation.

After lunch the joint TBG17/ICG meeting was held. On the ICG side the presentation was composed of three parts:

1. M. Conroy presented the UN/CEFACT Registry Specification and gave its status
2. Y. Yeh presented the Taiwanese experience
3. F. Bourge and JL Champion (TBG1) presented the French experience RepXML and its use by Boostaero.

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

The meeting was well attended and appeared to interest the participants.

After the meeting the processing of the UN/CEFACT Registry specification comments continued and the disposition of comments and document were updated accordingly. Some 30 comments were processed which left 7 comments to be processed on Friday morning.

The meeting closed at 18h30

6 Friday, 18th of March 2005

F. Bourge and D. Dobbing led the group to terminate the comments on the UN/CEFACT Registry.

M. Conroy thanked the group for the considerable effort that had been put into disposing of the comments.

6.1 Review of work program

The work programme was reviewed and agreed.

6.2 ICG action list update

1	XMI profile development	M. Conroy, K. Hsia	XMI profile initialized. Leadership handed over to the TMG BCSS project group (see joint resolution)
2	RSM examples	H. Enjo	Completed with the preparation of the e-Tendering RSM
3	UNCL migration	D. Dobbing	Project initialized this meeting
4	ICG repository architecture development	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, D. Dobbing, M. Conroy	First draft submitted 2005-02 reviewed this meeting
5	D.04B directory audit (2 nd to 5 th of November 2004)	M. Conroy A. Dechamps	Completed
6	Recommendation 20 publication	D. Dobbing	Final review this meeting. Will be presented to Plenary 2005-06

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

6.3 ICG resolutions

6.3.1 ATG/ICG/TMG joint resolution

The ICG, ATG and TMG resolve to jointly define a profile for the generation of XMI interchange documents for UMM compliant class models. The profile will be defined within the TMG BCSS (Business Collaboration Schema Specification) project. An initial profile will be developed to contain as much information as possible that is CCTS and NDR conformant.

The TMG Core Component Working Group (CCWG) will take over the responsibility for ensuring that the UML/UMM profiles are fully compliant to current and future releases of the Core Component Technical Specification in respect to UMM artifacts.

This will enable the ATG to develop the mechanisms necessary for the automatic generation of NDR compliant XML schemas using the same format that ICG will use for input to the registry.

It will enable the ICG, using the XMI instance output, to carry out the necessary validation checks to ensure that all core component information within the class model exist within the UN/CEFACT Registry, thus providing a coherent set of documentation.

It will enable UN/CEFACT to provide a Core Component deliverable that can be inserted into UML compliant software packages thus facilitating the use of the Components in the development of data models.

The initial XMI profile will be based on the most commonly used XMI OMG Standard specification in order to address the largest possible community of UML software platforms.

Once an initial experience has been gained with this profile, the project will evolve it to the latest version of the XMI specification including MOF (Meta-Object Facility) capabilities.

7 AOB

M. Conroy distributed the UN-CEFACT eBusiness Strategy Vision document and informed the group that these would be presented to the Plenary at their June meeting. He asked everyone to read the document and if they had any comments to provide them to him before the 1st of April for transmittal to the UN/CEFACT Bureau.

The meeting closed at 13h00.

ICG Meeting minutes – Kuala Lumpur 2005-03-14/18

8 Work to be completed for the next meeting

1	XMI profile development (first draft for September 2005 with BCSS project)	M. Conroy, K. Hsia
2	UNCL migration progression (September 2005)	D. Dobbing, H. Enjo
3	UN/CEFACT Registry Specification (V0.6 released end of April 2005, reviewed end of June 2005, V0.7 released September 05)	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, M. Conroy, D. Dobbing
4	D.05A directory audit (17 th to 20 th of May 2005)	M. Conroy A. Dechamps
5	Recommendation 20 publication of finalised document (April 2005 for approval June Plenary)	D. Dobbing