

ICG meeting Minutes

Contents

ICG MEETING MINUTES	1
1 PRESENT:.....	2
2 MONDAY, 6TH OF OCTOBER 2006.....	3
2.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS BY THE ICG CONVENER	3
2.2 APPROVAL OF AGENDA.....	3
2.3 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	3
2.4 ELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR	3
2.5 REPORT FROM THE D.06A UN/EDIFACT DIRECTORY AUDIT	3
2.6 REVIEW OF THE ICG WEBSITE.....	3
2.7 REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS	4
3 TUESDAY, 3RD OF OCTOBER 2006.....	5
3.1 REVIEW OF UN/CEFACT REGISTRY SPECIFICATION	5
3.2 PRESENTATIONS OF REGISTRY IMPLEMENTATIONS.....	5
3.3 MEETING WITH TBG19	5
4 WEDNESDAY, 4TH OF OCTOBER 2006	5
4.1 JOINT MEETING WITH TBG14	5
4.2 REGISTRY CONTINUATION ON PROOF OF CONCEPT	6
4.3 JOINT MEETING WITH THE TMG ARCHITECTURE GROUP	6
4.4 REGISTRY CONTINUATION ON VERSIONING	6
4.5 SPECIAL MEETING WITH TMG - CCTS	6
4.6 ICG CCTS MEETING REVIEW	6
5 THURSDAY, 5TH OF OCTOBER 2006.....	7
5.1 JOINT MEETING WITH TBG17	7
5.2 VERSIONING SURVEY.....	7
5.3 BRS/RSM – UMM CORRESPONDENCE.....	8
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS CHANGE REQUESTS	8
5.5 REGISTRY REVIEW CONTINUED.....	8
5.6 D.06B CCL AUDIT.....	8
6 FRIDAY, 6TH OF OCTOBER 2006	9
6.1 REVIEW OF MINUTES.	9
6.2 ICG ACTION LIST UPDATE.....	9
6.3 CLOSING PRESENTATION PREPARATION	10
7 AOB.....	10

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

1 Present:

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address
Mike Conroy	Atos Origin/ France	Michael.conroy@wanadoo.fr
David Dobbing	Data Logistics / Australia	ddobbing@attglobal.net
Fabrice Bourge	France Télécom, France	Fabrice.bourge@francetelecom.com
Yao-Ming Yeh	National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan	ymyeh@ice.ntnu.edu.tw
Hidekazu Enjo	NTT Data, Japan	enjoh@nttdata.co.jp
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
Anoop Singh Meena	Reserve Bank of India	asmeena@rbi.org.in
Dr. Deepankar Sinha	Kolkata Port Trust India	Dsinha2000@gmail.com
Toichiro Hamabe	Jastpro, Japan	t-hamabe@jastpro.or.jp
Shumpei Nakagaki	NEC Corporation	s-nakagaki@bp.jp.nec.com
Fabrizio Setta	UIC France	setta@uic.asso.fr

2 Monday, 6th of October 2006

2.1 Welcome and opening remarks by the ICG Convener

M. Conroy welcomed everyone to the ninth plenary meeting of the ICG. He indicated that the principle points to be covered during the course of this meeting were: The election of the Chair and Vice-chair of the Group, the finalization of version 1 of the UN/CEFACT Registry after having passed ODP review, the discussion on the requirements for business process information needed in the Registry, the UNCL migration, and the status of the Recommendations. He also indicated that a meeting with TBG17 would be held on Thursday in order to clarify maintenance, versioning and the use of the UNTDED.

2.2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved without change to its published revision 4.

2.3 Approval of the minutes of the last meeting

The minutes were approved after minor editorial changes.

2.4 Election of the Chair and Vice Chair

Both M. Conroy and D. Dobbing indicated that they were prepared to re-stand for election. There being no candidates they were elected by acclaim.

2.5 Report from the D.06A UN/EDIFACT directory audit

M. Conroy reported that the production of the D.06A directory had been completed after a considerable amount of effort. He reported that the directory was released just before the Forum instead of the usual June timeframe. He presented the audit statistics, highlighting that there were a significant number of basic errors, a number which had not been encountered for many years and he hoped that they would not appear again. A series of recommendations were developed for action by the ATG.

2.6 Review of the ICG Website

D. Dobbing introduced the subject by reporting that consideration was being given to moving the directory from DISA to CEN, because of maintenance constraints. He showed the current website and sought feedback on potential improvements. Everyone was satisfied with its current contents. He hoped that very soon a stable site with easy maintenance access would soon result.

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

2.7 Review of action items

M. Conroy indicated that this review should concentrate on the evolution of the UN/CEFACT Registry development. The work program was reviewed and updated.

1	XMI profile development	M. Conroy, E. Buchinski, S. Lim	M. Conroy indicated that the question had been raised with the BCSS Chair who was not aware that the group was awaiting it. Ongoing
2	UNCL migration	D. Dobbing	The UNCL migration has not progressed over and above that which was developed at the last Forum. This should be advanced this week
3	UN/CEFACT Registry	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, I. Bedini, S. Lim, D. Dobbing, M. Conroy, E. Buchinski	The ODP release has now been completed. The comments would be reviewed this week
4	EDIFACT D.06A directory audit (1st of May to 5 th of May 2006)	M. Conroy A. Dechamps	The directory had been audited vary late. See report above.
5	Recommendation 20, 21 and 23 publication	D. Dobbing	20, 21 and 23 noted by UN/CEFACT Plenary .Resolution of Rec. 23 duplicate entries awaiting TB3 input.
6.	Proof of concept project plan	F. Bourge YM; Yeh, S. Lim E. Buchinski	Completed. However, the proof of concept could not be started due to funding problems.
7	worked example for RSM	D. Dobbing	Ongoing, Mr. Enjo will provide an e-tendering example to Mr. Dobbing

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

8	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	Ongoing
---	--	-----------	---------

The Meeting broke up at 17:00.

3 Tuesday, 3rd of October 2006

3.1 Review of UN/CEFACT Registry specification

The day was spent reviewing the comments received after the ODP review of the Registry. The review was incomplete and will be continued Wednesday. The disposition of comments recorded all the conclusions of the day.

3.2 Presentations of Registry implementations

Y. Yeh and E. Buchinski gave very interesting presentations concerning the update on Registry implementations in Chinese Taipei and Canada. Y. Yeh also identified other projects which would be relying on Registry support.

3.3 Meeting with TBG19

M. Conroy met with TBG19 and gave a presentation concerning the BRS and RSM documents and their lifecycle.

The Meeting broke up at 17:00.

4 Wednesday, 4th of October 2006

4.1 Joint Meeting with TBG14

M. Conroy welcomed the TBG14 members, N. Sharma, I. Watt, N. Sahling and E. Buchinski (also an ICG member), to the joint meeting explaining that the meeting objectives was to clarify the Registry support for the inclusion of the Business Process requirements in the Registry.

I. Watt suggested that E. Buchinski give a presentation on the current thinking within TBG14 in relation to Business Process Registry requirements.

A discussion took place on the tasks that needed to be completed before the business process requirements could be introduced. An explanation on the need to determine the granularity of the objects that needed to be stored and to ensure that this was at a level really usable by the user community ensued and the required characteristics agreed upon. Y. Yeh explained the importance of the objects that were needed in the Registry and their required relevance.

N. Sharma agreed that the task was now well understood and that TBG14 would now work on determining the required levels and the metadata required for the insertion of Business Processes to be introduced. It was agreed that another joint meeting should be held once this had been determined.

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

4.2 Registry continuation on proof of concept

A discussion took place on the different possibilities of carrying out a proof of concept test with reduced means through the very specific allocation between the PoC members. The work advanced but was not concluded.

4.3 Joint meeting with the TMG Architecture group

D. Dobbing attended the joint meeting on behalf of ICG and reported back that the meeting concerned the establishment of the basic ground rules for the reinitialisation of the architecture group project.

4.4 Registry continuation on versioning

The review of the registry versioning continued with the proviso that the this information was only a placeholder until a formal rules document had been developed. The work advanced but was not concluded.

4.5 Special meeting with TMG - CCTS

A special meeting with members of TMG-CCTS, G. Stuhec, S. Capell, J. Wilson, N. Reinprecht, and M. Coates which concerned the request by the ICG that the Registry metamodel be withdrawn from the new revision of the CCTS. M. Conroy indicated that the request was fundamental because it is not possible to have a Registry Metamodel specified in two places and that the most appropriate place for such a metamodel was within the ICG. M. Stuhec explained that the request had been rejected because it was felt that the Registry specification was too oriented towards the ebRim product and that the CCTS product had a more generic requirement. S. Capell indicated that it appeared reasonable that the Registry metamodel was within the ICG whereas that the CCTS metamodel was within the CCTS. M. Conroy reminded everyone that the Registry specification was for the implementation of the UN/CEFACT Registry whereas the CCTS as a basic standard whose role was to define core components not Registry requirements.

A discussion ensued on the subject which resulted in a basic agreement that the TMG would investigate the removal of the Storage section of the CCTS and that the ICG would investigate the segmentation of the Registry specification between implementation issues and generic specifications. It was agreed that this would be discussed within each group and that they would reconvene to provide the conclusions. M. Conroy also suggested that the TMG investigate the possibility of changing the granularity of their requirements since the current granularity was extremely expensive to maintain and more than likely provided no basic user value. Y. Yeh explained the consequences of providing multiple links to a registry class and the need to provide only objects that would effectively be used. This was generally agreed and G. Stuhec indicated that the question would be investigated.

4.6 ICG CCTS meeting review

In the remaining minutes of the meeting the group examined the eventual consequences of separating the ebRIM information from the center of the text. E. Buchinski explained that this would be extremely difficult especially since it would require the specification of services in a technology independent manner such as query and event management which were implicit in ebRIM. Y. Yeh indicated that it would require a considerable amount of work to provide a generic solution to federation management. S. Lim indicated that the Asian consortium had begun their federation testing making use of different products but after some time it became apparent that this

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

was next to impossible and in the end the testing was carried out using the same product specifications (the Sun free software as well as the Hong Kong or KIEC free software).

The discussion was adjourned for the moment due to time constraints.

The meeting broke up at 18h00.

5 Thursday, 5th of October 2006

5.1 Joint meeting with TBG17

MK Blantz introduced the ATG/TBG17/ICG meeting by indicating that its objective was to address the following questions were on the agenda:

1. the question of TDED use
2. What the Registry viewed versioning
3. Maintenance procedures for the CCL

She then gave the floor to M. Conroy to present the ICG thinking of the questions. M. Conroy gave firstly the position concerning the TDED and its importance in international trade. He underlined the necessity that it remain in alignment both with the TDID/EDED and the CCL entries. M. Crawford queried where the alignment should be placed. M. Conroy replied that in his opinion it should be kept at the level of the Basic Core Component. After a long discussion the general consensus was that:

1. The TDED should be maintained by the ISO 7372 maintenance agency where UN/CEFACT was a member, but also where all other involved parties were also members.
2. TBG17 should ensure the consistency of the core components with the TDED. TBG17 could eventually recommend that all TBG groups verify the consistency at submission time. (*Note: this position was apparently not agreed when the conclusions were presented to the FMG. The exact form is not known.*).
3. The TDED content should be evolved to incorporate more pertinent CCL information. It is recommended that a task force be set up to rapidly to carry out this task.
4. The TDED should be realigned with the CCL since the current 2005 version contained CCL information that was incorrect. This may be a two way process in the case of definitions. One of the concerns raised was who would carry out the alignment.

M. Conroy went on to present the ICG view on versioning and explained that this was essentially a bootstrap to enable the versioning issue to be debated. After a discussion the hypotheses made by the ICG were basically agreed to be satisfactory. The only real issue raised was the use of the term “Version/Release” or “Major/minor” to explain the expression “1.0”. It was suggested that the FMG should be informed of this difference and that they be requested that the FMG should take the steps to align the terms.

5.2 Versioning survey

In the afternoon the group met with K. Duvinger to quickly explain a project that had been initiated to carry out a survey of versioning techniques and to make recommendations on their use.

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

She indicated that it would be useful for more participants, Y. Yeh, and F. Bourge proposed eventually to participate.

5.3 BRS/RSM Lifecycle

M. Conroy presented a paper that he had prepared on the BRS/RSM lifecycle which he indicated would be necessary for the Registry in order to determine the different administrative requirements. After discussion and corrections it was agreed to submit as a draft.

5.4 BRS/RSM – UMM correspondence

The Group then met with TMG members, C. Huemer, J. Dietrich and M. Zapletal to discuss the way to present to the Forum participants the relationship between the BRS/RSM and UMM or in its proposed new name SOCA-MM (Service Oriented Collaboration Architecture – Modeling Methodology). C. Huemer then presented an overview of UMM with a detailed worked example. Time constraints prevented the meeting to obtain a conclusion but the discussion was very fruitful and provided a few possibilities to follow up with another meeting.

5.5 Recommendations change requests

D. Dobbing reviewed the change requests concerning the Recommendations and provided the status of the changes to recommendations 23 & 24.

5.6 Registry review continued

The group finished the day by concluding the comments for the Registry. It was also decided that the finalized document should be produced by February 2007.

The PoC position was also reviewed and the project plan updated with the results. It was agreed that it was now feasible to carry out such tests. The results were hoped to be available for the next Forum. M. Conroy will provide Y. Yeh with some basic input data for testing.

5.7 D.06B CCL Audit

M. Conroy asked the group who would be interested in participating in the CCL 06B directory release audit. S. Lim and Y. Yeh along with D. Dobbing and F. Bourge agreed to participate.

The meeting closed at 17h00.

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

6 Friday, 6th of October 2006

6.1 UNCL migration work

Due to time constraints it was agreed to progress this work between Forum meetings and to present the findings at the next meeting.

6.2 Review of minutes.

The minutes were reviewed and agreed.

6.3 ICG action list update

1	XMI profile development	M. Conroy, E. Buchinski, S. Lim	ongoing
2	UNCL migration	D. Dobbing	Ongoing
3	UN/CEFACT Registry	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, I. Bedini, S. Lim, D. Dobbing, M. Conroy, E. Buchinski	Prepare Registry specification for definitive publication February 2007 Carry out proof of concept March 2007
4	Registry proof of concept plan	F. Bourge YM; Yeh, S. Lim E. Buchinski	Finalisation for November 2006
5	Registry proof of concept	F. Bourge YM; Yeh, S. Lim E. Buchinski	Test completion March 2007
6	Registry Implementation plan draft	F. Bourge YM; Yeh, S. Lim E. Buchinski	January 2007
7	EDIFACT D.06B directory audit	M. Conroy	Release for January 2007

ICG Meeting minutes – New Delhi 2006-10-02/06

	(4 th of December to 7 th of December 2006)	A. Dechamps	
8	Recommendation 23 and 24 publication	D. Dobbing	Preparation for review at the next meeting
9	worked example for RSM	D. Dobbing	Preparation for next meeting
10	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 beginning 2007

6.4 Closing presentation preparation

The closing plenary presentation was reviewed and agreed.

7 AOB

No other business was noted.

The meeting closed at 10:30.