

ICG meeting Minutes

1 Present:

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address
Mike Conroy	Atos Origin/ France	Michael.conroy@wanadoo.fr
David Dobbing	Standard Chartered Bank, Hong Kong / Australia (via Skype)	ddobbing@attglobal.net
Francis Berthomieu	France Télécom, France	Francis.berthomieu@francetelecom.com
Fabrice Bourge	France Télécom, France	Fabrice.bourge@francetelecom.com
Thierry Drege	Axway, France	tdrege@axway.com
Bruno Joguet	Axway, France	bjoguet@axway.com
Yao-Ming Yeh	National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan	ymyeh@ice.ntnu.edu.tw
Kuang-Shun Lin	BSMI of Taiwan, Taiwan	Kick.lin@bsmi-gov.tw
Marco Zapletel	University of Vienna, Austria	marco@mminf.univie.ac.at
Hidekazu Enjo	NTT Data, Japan	enjouh@nttdata.co.jp
Frantisek Jablonicky	Ministry of Economy of Slovak Republic, Slovakia	jablinicky@economy.gov.sk
Ivan Bedini	France Telecom, France	Ivan.bedini@francetelecom.com
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
Sang Won Lim	Korea Institute for electronic Commerce, Korea	swlim@kiec.or.kr
Karlson Hsia	Institute for Information Industry, Taiwan	khhsia@iii.org.tw

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

2 Monday, 26th of September 2005

2.1 Welcome and opening remarks by the ICG Convener

M. Conroy welcomed everyone to the seventh plenary meeting of the ICG. He indicated there were two main points to be covered during the course of this meeting: The finalization of the RSM and the preparation for version 1 of the UN/CEFACT Registry. He indicated that the vice-chair of the group couldn't be present at this meeting. However, he explained that a permanent telephone connection had been set up that would enable D. Dobbing to participate. His presence being very necessary for the progression of the revisions of the code lists and the UNCL migration.

2.2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved without change to its published revision 2. M. Conroy indicated that on Wednesday afternoon members of the TMG would also attend. He also indicated that on Thursday afternoon members from TMG and ATG would attend.

2.3 Approval of the minutes of the last meeting

The minutes were approved without change.

2.4 Work to be completed before this meeting

1	XMI profile development (first draft for September 2005 with BCSS project)	Still ongoing, now in the hands of the BCSS TMG group
2	UNCL migration progression (September 2005)	On agenda for this meeting
3	UN/CEFACT Registry Specification (V0.6 released end of April 2005, reviewed end of June 2005, V0.7 released September 05)	Completed
4	D.05A directory audit (17 th to 20 th of May 2005)	Completed
5	Recommendation 20 publication of finalised document (April 2005 for approval June Plenary)	Completed

2.5 Report from the D.05A UN/EDIFACT directory audit

M. Conroy reported that the production of the D.05A directory had been produced with some delay to the planned timetable. This was mainly due to finding the occurrence of segment collisions in two of the 3 message DMRs. In particular the new message DAPLOS (Data Plot Sheet) segment collisions took some time to resolve due to the non-availability of the originators.

2.6 Report from the June 2005 Plenary meeting

M. Conroy reported that the group had already heard a report on the UN/CEFACT Plenary during the course of the opening Forum Plenary. However, he gave some background information on the following points:

- The UN/CEFACT Mandate and Terms of Reference, R650/Rev4, had been adopted and would now be the main reference document concerning the UN/CEFACT basic procedures.

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

- The IPR policy was still not finalized as mentioned during the course of the Opening Forum Plenary. However, then main principles being accepted, it was considered that the policy in question would regulate this meeting.
- A New Chairman, Dr. Stuart Feder (United States), Advisor at the Bank of International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, has been elected for a period of two years.
- It had been agreed to further develop the ODP Process.
- The Plenary had accepted the principle of creating a new TBG for e-government. It was now up to the TBG group itself to put this into action.
- The next UN/CEFACT Plenary meeting would be from the 29th of May to the 2nd of June 2006
- Concerning the Report on UN/ECE, he explained that:
 - UN/ECE had commissioned a report on the state of the UNECE to develop recommendations on the scope of changes to the role, mandate and functions of the UNECE, which are necessary in light of the changed European institutional and political landscape. This was published on the 30 of June of this year.
 - The report in question was divergent on the attachment of CEFACT to a Regional office (UN/ECE).
 - It recognized the positive action of CEFACT however it recommended that standardization activities should be handled by recognised standardisation bodies. (IDO, ITU,...).
 - It Ignored the uniqueness of CEFACT in bringing together business sectors to define mutual requirements..
 - As indicated during the Forum Plenary, the Bureau has responded to the report

To a question asked about what happens next in respect to the report, M. Conroy indicated that the report and Bureau response had been placed in the hands of the UN/CEFACT Heads of Delegation for further consideration. Any resulting actions would be taken at that level.

2.7 Review of The ICG Website

D. Dobbing introduced the subject, via the telephone link asking the ICG membership if they had any comments on the website. M. Conroy opened the web page for every one to see. There were no particular remarks. One member indicated his satisfaction of finding the site to be always up to date.

D. Dobbing concluded that apparently all the issues raised during the course of the preceding meeting were now resolved.

2.8 Review of UN Recommendation change requests -Recommendation 21

Because all the agenda times for the day had been covered M. Conroy proposed to cover the change requests to Recommendation 21 and 23. D. Dobbing introduced the subject on Recommendation 21 by firstly explaining the content and usage of this recommendation concerning Package types. The two change requests in question were reviewed and approved. D. Dobbing then indicated that the Recommendation would now be published on the UN/CEFACT website for a one month open review period. After this review, assuming no comments, it would be released as final.

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

2.9 Review of UN Recommendation change requests – Recommendation 23

D. Dobbing explained the content and usage of this recommendation concerning freight costs and charges. He also explained the four change requests and some of the minor editorial adjustments. During the course of the examination of the recommendation it was noted that there appeared to be inconsistencies in its content. Two major issues were identified, the first being the use of the same 6 digit code for several different descriptions, the second being the apparent concatenation of the transport mode to differentiate several of these duplications. The question then was asked as to whether or not the code was in fact 8 characters?

D. Dobbing requested that M. Conroy bring these issues to the attention of TBG 3 (Transport) and proposed that we create a small joint project team to resolve the issues by carrying out a QA on it. In the meantime he proposed that as for recommendation 21 we post it to the web site for a one month open review period, after which barring comments, it would be released as final.

Note: M. Conroy on Tuesday met with TBG 3 and it was agreed to create a small project team to resolve the issues in question.

All the agenda points that could be handled were finalized at 15:00. M. Conroy proposed that M. Zapletel, a member of TMG, provide the group with a small presentation concerning the TMG restructuring of UMM.

M. Zapletel gave a very interesting presentation on the subject that solicited a large number of questions and brought to light the necessity to coordinate the TMG work with the work currently being undertaken on the Registry especially since UMM objects would normally be registered there.

The Meeting broke up at 17:00.

3 Tuesday, 27th of September 2005

3.1 Review of RSM mapping comments

M. Conroy introduced the meeting by welcoming the members from the other Groups and by explaining the function of the RSM within the context of the Forum workflow and its relationship with the BRS. He underlined its importance being the transmission mechanism between the TBG, ICG and ATG. He retraced the history of the RSM revision process indicating that we were currently at its fifth review. Version 0.4 of the document had generated over a 100 comments. These had been processed and the current version (0.5) had been released along with its underlying disposition of comments in late July this year. The comment period for the current version closed on the 23rd of September and M. Conroy was pleased to announce that no new comments had been received. He indicated that the ICG had reserved the whole morning to resolve any outstanding issues.

He asked the audience whether there were any further comments to be raised. None were forthcoming and consequently he proposed that the current version be submitted to all groups through the FMG and consequently the Group chairs requesting that it be approved by the Wednesday at closure.

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

He underlined that it was now time to put the document to the test of implementation and that any further issues should be brought in the light of concrete implementations. He asked if this was acceptable to those present. There were no disagreements to the proposal.

The RSM document was consequently submitted to the FMG and the ICG list servers after having altered the title page to reflect the decisions of the group. The version for approval bring given the number 1.0.

No further business being required on the RSM the subject was closed at 10:00. M. Conroy used the last half hour before the coffee break to answer questions concerning the RSM and the BRS.

3.2 Registry presentations

The second half of the morning was devoted to a presentation by Y. Yeh presented an overview of the registry work being done in the National Taiwan Normal University. TBG14 joined the group for a presentation by F. Bourge on the experimental EDIFRANCE registry project.

3.3 Review of work program

The work programme was reviewed, agreed and updated.

3.4 Review of UN Recommendation change requests – Recommendation 20

M. Conroy presented the agenda point indicating that this was the last item to be covered during the course of the day. He suggested that those members of the group who were not concerned with this issue should go to other groups to get some experience of their operation. He also indicated that some of the related points, especially those that could be considered as concerning the management and maintenance of code lists using the UN/CEFACT Registry, would be handled on Thursday afternoon.

F. Vuilleumier, the Chair of ISO TC154 joined the group to discuss the changes proposed for Recommendation 20, Units of measure. D. Dobbing explained that just after the recommendation had been approved by the Plenary, a member of the UN/Secretariat had discovered that there were a number of discrepancies concerning the SI conversion factors. He also explained that whilst these were being examined he had also discovered other discrepancies. Finally he indicated that there was a third category of updates which were in fact new code requests. The proposed updates were documented in a spreadsheet.

F. Vuilleumier underlined that it was important to remember the rule that had been defined concerning the use of the conversion factor and the description. This being that for level 1 (SI normative units, standard and commonly used multiples) and level 2 (SI normative equivalent units (UK, US, etc.) and commonly used multiples) entries, these all should have conversion factors. For level 3 (informative) entries if there was a conversion factor then a description was not mandatory and that if there was no conversion factor then the description became mandatory.

In examining the corrections it was suggested that wherever there was a case of a conversion factor which began with “1/” then it should be indicated that this was taken from the ISO/TC12 SI Guide reference document. F. Vuilleumier explained that in reality such a case was not really a factor of conversion. D. Dobbing agreed with this proposal and undertook to update such entries with a reference to the SI Guide in entry’s description.

D. Dobbing also explained that there were a few conversion factors that could not be verified. After discussion I was agreed to set the status of these entries to “Marked as deleted” and wait to

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

see it there was any reaction from the user community. This position was taken since there was no way of determining who to contact to confirm the conversion factors in question.

Concerning the new code requests, two were put to pending due to a lack of a conversion factor for the codes in question. M. Conroy will contact the requestor in order to obtain the factors in question.

The meeting broke up at 17:00.

D. Dobbing subsequently advised that an update Recommendation 20 would now be published on the UN/CEFACT website for a one month open review period. After this review, assuming no comments, it would be released as final.

4 Wednesday, 28th of September 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. To start off the meeting he asked F. Bourge to present the comments received against version 0.6 that led to the production of v0.7.

During the course of the review, some modifications were made to the comments and the Disposition of comments was updated accordingly. E. Buchinski made some suggestions concerning additional items that needed to be added to the document for completion. He identified in particular the need for the identification of the Registry services profile that was going to be used.

Most comments were reviewed, however, the review was adjourned to address the agenda item concerning the business process requirements. Both TBG 14 and TMG were invited to attend. N. Sharma and Colin Clark led the TBG 14 team and N. Sharma began the discussion by giving a presentation of the TBG14 vision of the business process requirements for the Registry.

M. Conroy indicated that during the review of the current version of the UN/CEFACT Registry specification the section on the BP requirements was addressed and he suggested that before any concrete Registry work on the subject be advanced it would be necessary to identify what objects were to be placed in the Registry. Such objects were not apparent in the BP requirements specification. He also indicated that there was a discrepancy in what the BP group were proposing and what the TMG group was defining in the UMM. G. Stuhec of the TMG agreed that it was now necessary to clearly identify the UMM objects that would become Registry candidates. After a discussion on the subject it was agreed that the following three points needed to be clarified:

1. The context categories and their values;
2. How context drivers can be used within UMM;
3. What should be stored and how should it be stored.

The conclusion of this part of the meeting was that TMG and TBG14 should meet to resolve the major part of these issues. Once the storage objects had been identified, the ICG could come in to participate in the elaboration of the storage mechanisms.

S. Capell suggested that the objectives of what, who and how the Registry was to be handled should be elaborated. He also proposed that we should try to position the Registry between the different natures of user and its contents. Should the registry be implementation orientated or

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

should it be design orientated? The answer to this question would help provide the answers to his initial question.

E. Buchinski agreed with this approach and underlined that the correct positioning of the Registry was imperative. M. Conroy added that it was essential to specify where the Registry content starts and ends.

S. Capell went on to provide the status of the BCSS project and in particular the situation with the XMI profile for the CCTS. He showed some examples of the current specifications and hoped that this would soon meet with the agreement of the members.

The meeting broke up at 17h00.

5 Thursday, 29th of September 2005

The meeting began with the continued review of the comments to the Specification revision. During this discussion Y. Yeh proposed that the directory should be divided into 3 parts in order to provide visibility for what parts of the Registry specification were stable enough for prototyping and what parts were not. After a long discussion on the subject it was agreed to present the new revision of the specification with the following outline:

- Introduction
- Basic principles (registry use, library publication – release management)
- Registry storage
 - Core component storage (BCC, ACC, ABIE, etc.)
 - Code set storage (Rec 20, 23, UNCL,..)
 - Reference document storage (BRS, RSM, UN/EDIFACT Library,...)
 - Business process storage (*not for prototype implementation*)
- Data exchange format (input/output)
- Federation (*not for prototype implementation*)
- Conformity tests (mapping, content, etc.. *not for prototype implementation*)
- Registry services profile
- Glossary

The sections not for prototype implementation would be clearly marked as indicated in the outline.

I. Watt joined the group to present the work of the MRI group and particularly the proposal of where the group was going to go from here. He explained the initial intent of the creation of the group which was to provide a forum for the exchange of modelling results for the TBG groups. He indicated that after an initial analysis of the current situation it had become clear that there were release management issues within UN/CEFACT and suggested that the tasks of defining procedures release, change and project management should be added to the MRI's responsibilities. M. Conroy explained that the ICG had opened up a project to take in comments for a future revision of the BRS. He indicated that the MRI could be an excellent mechanism for receiving,

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

summarising and harmonising BRS comments and proposals for change. The results could then be fed into the ICG for implementation.

The MRI group would provide a report on the situation and its proposal for evolution in the coming month.

5.1 Review of the UNCL migration plan.

M. Conroy opened this agenda item and welcomed the members from the other Groups, in particular ATG2 (XML Assembly Documents/Production Rules). By way of presentation slides, he outlined the background to the Migration Project stressing the need to arrive at a solution that delivers the UN/CEFACT code lists as reusable information components, independent of the syntax in which they are used. He explained the business requirements from the ICG perspective highlighting the relationship between the development of the UN/CEFACT Registry and need to shorten the publication release cycles, to provide Registry support for Web based use code requests and status updates, and to cater for code list identification and versioning independent of the syntax solution.

M. Crawford and J. Frømyr explained the ongoing work in ATG2 with finalising XML NDRs (Naming and Design Rules), drawing attention to the proposed approach on using code lists within XML schemas. The ICG commended this work and M. Conroy underlined the importance of aligning common areas between the NDRs and the UN/CEFACT Registry design, such as versioning. Both teams appeared to have overall consensus.

D. Dobbing raised a potential issue with respect to code list identification. In considering the use of EDIFACT data element numbers to identify individual UN/CEFACT code lists, this mechanism would also likely need to cover the UN Code Recommendations and potentially other UN/CEFACT maintained code lists that may not be used in EDIFACT. ATG2 considered this to be a management issue. D. Dobbing undertook to elaborate his concerns in an email.

In response to the ISO code set (e.g. currency) versioning issue raised by D. Dobbing in earlier emails, J. Frømyr reported on his dialogue with F. Vuilleumier (TC/154 Chair). Of note was the absence of a formal versioning mechanism at the ISO code list level. TC/154 planned to form a task group to address this issue in the ISO environment. D. Dobbing requested that he be included as the ICG representative in the group.

D. Dobbing also suggested that the proposed Code List Schema be extended to cover not only EDIFACT like code lists but also to cater for the UN Code Recommendations where a number of lists have other additional attributes defined. J. Frømyr responded that adjustment to the Schema to cover these special requirements was likely feasible and requested that D. Dobbing provide detail on the various UN Code Recommendation structures. D. Dobbing agreed to do this over the next week.

5.2 Finalisation of the specification comments

The comments from S. Lim were processed and were the last comments received concerning the document.

The next steps were defined namely:

- Release for comment of V0.8 by the 5th of October 2005
- Closure of the comment period end of November 2005

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

- Interim meeting in Paris, France end of 5/9 December 2005
- Production of the V1.0 release for prototyping January 2006
- Prototype operation for testing mid 2006

The meeting closed at 17:30

6 Friday, 30th of September 2005

6.1 Review of minutes.

Prior to reviewing the minutes M. Conroy went through the agenda to identify anything that had not been covered. He noted from Wednesday that the comments to V0.6 and V0.7 had been finalized on Thursday. In a similar fashion that the priorities for version 1 of the specification had been implicitly finalized during the reorganization of the structure of the document where certain chapters were identified for later work. However, he indicated that the face to face interim meeting had not been discussed. He consequently opened the discussion on the subject stressing its importance insofar as the finalization of version 1 of the specification in his opinion would depend on it. This was generally agreed. After a discussion it was considered preferable to hold the meeting in Paris and rather than in November it was considered preferable to move the date to the first week in December (5th to 9th). He thanked France Telecom for accepting to host the meeting.

From the Thursday agenda he noted that the question of versioning, although being discussed extensively in relation to several subjects during the meeting was not in itself addressed in relation to the Registry. He felt however that everyone now had a clearer idea of the requirements and proposed that contributions on the subject be submitted to the editors.

After this review, M. Conroy was pleased to announce that we had covered nearly everything on the agenda.

Following this the minutes were reviewed and revised and the ICG action list was updated accordingly..

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

6.2 ICG action list update

1	XMI profile development	M. Conroy, E. Buchinski, S. Lim	XMI profile initialized. Leadership handed over to the TMG BCSS project group (see joint resolution). Follow up to be continued
3	UNCL migration	D. Dobbing	Identification, versioning and schema issues to be resolved. Develop draft project plan
4	UN/CEFACT Registry	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, I. Bedini, S. Lim, D. Dobbing, M. Conroy, E. Buchinski	Interim meeting November 2005 First Version to be published January 2006
5	EDIFACT D.05B directory audit (28 th of November to 3 rd of December 2005)	M. Conroy A. Dechamps	Release for December 2005
6	Recommendation 20, 21 and 23 publication	D. Dobbing	After the review period, January 2006
7	Task group to review Recommendation 23	D. Dobbing	Proposals for March 2006 Forum meeting
8	Recommendation 20, 21 and 23 revisions	D. Dobbing	To be forwarded to UN/Secretariat for noting at the next UNCEFACT Plenary, June 2006
9.	Release V0.8 of Registry specification	F. Bourge, I. Bedini	5 October 2005
10	Interim meeting Paris, France	France Telecom	5/9 December 2005
11	Release of V1.0 of Registry specification for prototyping	F. Bourge, I. Bedini	January 2006

ICG Meeting minutes – LYON 2005-09-26/30

12	Request that the UN Secretariat create the UN namespace definitions as previously requested by ATG2. Indicate that the preparatory work could be carried out by the Forum.	M. Conroy	To be established for January 2006
13	Submit contributions on the versioning requirement for the UN/CEFACT Registry	ALL	Prior to the December face to face meeting

6.3 Closing presentation preparation

M. Conroy then went on to present what he felt were the salient points for the Forum closing plenary. After discussion these were accepted by the group.

7 AOB

No other business being forwarded, M. Conroy closed the meeting by indicated that he felt that it had been an extremely productive meeting and that a lot of ground had been covered, the RSM was finalized, the other groups had been made aware of the importance of identifying the UN/CEFACT deliverables that had to be placed in the Registry and the Registry specification itself had advanced significantly. He thanked everyone for their active participation and their contributions without which we wouldn't be where we were today.

He also thanked D. Dobbing for participating remotely particularly concerning the UN Recommendation modifications and the code lists since without him these points would have been difficult to address.

He looked forward to seeing everyone in firstly in Paris in December and then in Vancouver in March 2006.

The meeting closed at 10:30.
