

ICG meeting Minutes

Contents

ICG MEETING MINUTES	1
1 PRESENT:	3
2 MONDAY, 24TH OF SEPTEMBER 2007	4
2.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS BY THE ICG CONVENER.....	4
2.2 APPROVAL OF AGENDA	4
2.3 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	5
2.4 ACTION LIST	6
2.5 REVIEW OF THE ICG WEBSITE.....	6
2.6 REVIEW OF THE WORK PROGRAM	6
2.7 REVIEW OF UN/ECE RECOMMENDATIONS	6
2.8 TBG6 MEETING	6
2.9 REPORT ON THE D.07A UN/EDIFACT DIRECTORY AUDIT.....	7
2.10 REPORT ON THE D.07A CCL DIRECTORY AUDIT	7
3 TUESDAY, 25TH OF SEPTEMBER 2007	8
3.1 CONTINUATION OF CCL AUDIT REPORT	8
3.2 CCTS 3.0 COMMENT LOG REVIEW	8
3.3 JOINT MEETING WITH TBG18.....	8
3.4 REVIEW OF THE UN/CEFACT REGISTRY SPECIFICATION	9
3.5 PRESENTATIONS OF PROOF OF CONCEPT TESTS (FRANCE, CHINESE TAIPAI, KOREA, CANADA)	9
4 WEDNESDAY, 26TH OF SEPTEMBER 2007	9
4.1 JOINT MEETING WITH ATG2	9
4.2 JOINT MEETING WITH TBG17 AND TBG6	10
4.3 AFTERNOON.....	11
5 THURSDAY, 27TH OF SEPTEMBER 2007	11
5.1 JOINT MEETING WITH TMG UPCC	11
5.2 UNCL MIGRATION.....	11
5.3 PRESENTATIONS OF PROOF OF CONCEPT TESTS (FRANCE, CHINESE TAIPAI, KOREA, CANADA)	12
5.4 BRAINSTORMING CONCERNING A PROTOTYPE REGISTRY	12
6 FRIDAY, 28TH OF SEPTEMBER 2007	12
6.1 FINALISATION OF THE BRAINSTORMING	12
6.2 ICG RESOLUTIONS.....	12
6.3 ICG ACTION LIST UPDATE	12
6.4 CLOSING PRESENTATION PREPARATION	13
6.5 REVIEW OF THE MINUTES	13

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

7 AOB..... 13

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

1 Present:

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address
Mike Conroy	Atos Origin, France	Michael.conroy@wanadoo.fr
David Dobbing	SWIFT, Belgium	ddobbing@attglobal.net
Fabrice Bourge	France Télécom, France	fabrice.bourge@orange-ftgroup.com
Francis Berthomieu	France Télécom, France	francis.berthomieu@orange-ftgroup.com
Yao-Ming Yeh	National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan	ymyeh@csie.ntnu.edu.tw
Sang Won Lim	Korea Institute for Electronic Commerce, Korea	swlim@kiec.or.kr
Kimiko Watanabe	Jastpro, Japan	k-watanabe@jastpro.or.jp
Anders Tell	Financial Toolsmiths AB	anderst@toolsmiths.se
Tahseen A. Khan	NIC DOC	takhan@nic.in

2 Monday, 24th of September 2007

2.1 Welcome and opening remarks by the ICG Convener

M. Conroy welcomed everyone to the eleventh plenary meeting of the ICG.

He indicated that there were a number of key points to be covered during the course of this meeting. These were: The progress of the Registry implementation Specification and finalization of its implementation plan, the resolution of audit issues raised, and the progression of the UNCL migration.

2.2 Approval of agenda

The agenda as follows was approved:

Monday 2007-09-24 13:30 – 15:00 General

Welcome and opening remarks

Roll call of participants

Approval of agenda

Approval of minutes of last meeting

Review of ICG website

Review of work program

UN/ECE Recommendations

- Revisions of recommendations
 - Rec. 20 – Units of measure
- Final ICG approval for latest versions of:
 - Rec. 23 - Freight Cost Codes

Report on the D.07A UN/EDIFACT directory audit

Monday 15:30 – 17h00

Report on the D.07A CCL directory audit

BRS/RSM and D.07A Schema Audit

Formal requirements for the audit

CCL Directory audit rule review

Tuesday 9:00 – 10h30 - UN/CEFACT Registry

CCTS 3.0 Comment log review

Review of UN/CEFACT Registry V1.1 publication.

Tuesday 11:00 – 12:30 - UN/CEFACT Registry

TBG18 meeting

UN/CEFACT Phased implementation possibilities

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

Tuesday 13:30 – 15:00 - UN/CEFACT Registry

Registry target input/output formats

Presentations of proof of concept tests (France, Taiwan, Korea, Canada)

Tuesday 15:30 – 18:00 - UN/CEFACT Registry

Review of implementation plan

Milestones

Wednesday 9:00 – 10h30

Joint meeting with ATG2

Wednesday 11:00 – 12h30

Joint meeting with TBG17

Wednesday 13:30 – 15h00

Genericcode presentation and review

UNCL migration work

Wednesday 15:30 – 18h00

UNCL migration work

Thursday 9:00 – 10h30

Joint meeting schedule TMG

Thursday 11:00 – 12h30

UNCL migration work

Thursday 13:30 – 15h00

Open

Thursday 15:30 – 18h00

ICG Resolutions

ICG closing plenary presentation preparation

Friday 09:00 – 10h30 Closing meeting

ICG Action list update

Review draft minutes

AOB

2.3 Approval of the minutes of the last meeting

The minutes were approved without change.

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

2.4 Action list

M. Conroy presented the action list that were in the previous minutes and noted that there were some of the points that had not managed to be completed. He indicated, however, that a lot of things were to be covered on the agenda.

2.5 Review of the ICG website

D. Dobbing presented the ICG website explaining its content. During the course of this presentation, he presented the current mailing list. These were reviewed and additions and deletions were carried out.

He concluded by asking if anyone had suggestions for new content. M. Conroy made the suggestion that we should add to the Links section the different Registry implementations that were being used within the group. This was agreed.

2.6 Review of the Work program

M. Conroy presented the work program as defined and agreed at the UN/CEFACT Plenary. He noted that the only projects that ICG had currently were the Registry and the UNCL migration. These were over and above the recurring work of the code list maintenance and the audits. There were no other proposals for projects.

2.7 Review of UN/ECE Recommendations

D. Dobbing presented the changes to be made to Recommendation 23 (Freight Cost Codes) and indicated that these had gone through the ODP public review. No comments had been received. He presented a number of the changes as indicative of those being made.

He asked if there were any problems concerning the approval of this document. No opposition being forthcoming, the Recommendation was approved.

D. Dobbing went on to present the current state of the revisions with Recommendation 20 Units of Measure. There were in all some 260 requests for new codes. There was no basic issue concerning the codes, however, he explained that the conversion factor provided although correct was not in compliance with the UN presentation format for providing such information. Each conversion factor consequently had to be recalculated. He asked that if anyone was interested in helping in this effort he would very much appreciate it.

A. Tell indicated that Recommendation 20 was very interesting from a modelling point of view and he indicated that there was an American Ontological group that was very interested in subjects such as this. He wondered if it would be possible to ask them if they were interested in developing such a model. It was generally agreed by the group that he pursue this query with the group in America.

D. Dobbing will advance this work over the coming months and will arrange the update to go out for its public review cycle.

2.8 TBG6 meeting

M. Conroy reported that a short meeting was held with TBG6 during the lunch hour to resolve the issue of the e-tendering RSM which had been rejected by the ICG due to the incorrect use of ABIEs in the Canonical model. He indicated that the current version had ABIEs that did not have all the attributes that were to be found in the CCL directory. TBG6 indicated that in fact this was a means of indicating specific constraints to be applied to the ABIE. It was explained that the

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

business requirements could be clearly indicated in the conceptual model (no requirement for ABIEs) whereas the canonical model had to be compliant with the CCL entries. M Conroy explained that there was currently no means of expressing constraints in the CCTS and that this was clearly becoming a requirement.

TBG6 will attempt to resolve the issue before the end of the week.

2.9 Report on the D.07A UN/EDIFACT directory audit

M. Conroy reported that the production of the D.07A Edifact directory had been completed without too much effort. He presented the audit statistics and noted that most of the errors were more due to a relaxing of quality control than anything else. He also noted that out of the 90 odd DMRs some 80 were exclusively related to codes. This was significant since it was indirectly a part of the ICG workload for the migration of the UNCL. The faster we could complete this migration, the better we would be able to handle all these new codes.

2.10 Report on the D.07A CCL directory audit

M. Conroy reported that once again this audit had taken a long time. However, some of the delay was related to time constraints. He also indicated that YM. Yeh had been able to carry out some automated verifications while injecting the directory into his Registry.

He explained that our intent was to finally publish a single audit report covering the CCL, BRS, RSM, and Schemas.

He indicated that in relation to the CCL there were a number of issues that needed resolving. In order to bring to light the issues raised he went to the current draft of the Audit report.

D. Dobbing indicated that some of these issues would have to be addressed with TBG17 during the joint meeting that would be held with them. These concerned:

- Repetitive use of “A {name} is...”

This issue was raised originally due to a case where CCTS rules requiring the name to be extracted from the definition were not respected. The TBG17 solution was to place the name with the phrase “a xxx is...” thus circumventing the rule.

After discussion it was agreed that this practice should be abolished and that every effort made to convince TBG17 of the incorrectness of their solution which in essence made the rule not applicable.

- Redundant words in DEN

The use of redundant words is in conflict with the CCTS rules. This issue remains open from the point of view of TBG17

- “Identification. Identifier” terms in DEN

This issue is mainly focused on the CCTS rule using the very case of “identification, identifier” to demonstrate how to remove redundant words.

- “Project. Project Portfolio. Identifier” BCC

D. Dobbing explained that the problem arose because TBG17 wished to avoid a concept of “circular relationships” at the ACC level. He explained that he was fundamentally in conflict with the fact that there were two different BCCs with exactly the same meaning.

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

M. Conroy indicated that at the ACC level he saw no problem with the creating two ASCCs and at the ASBIE level only indicating which relation was required.

A. Tell indicated that it appeared to him at first sight the approach used was likely the simplest for them to overcome the problem. He also indicated that although UML could easily handle such a question, CCTS was unable to do so. He mentioned in particular the question of matching the pairs at either end of the relation.

M. Conroy suggested that this was not in fact the issue it was more of the question of bringing a bidirectional relationship into a hierarchical model.

The question was left open as the meeting had to break up.

The meeting broke up at 17h00.

3 Tuesday, 25th of September 2007

3.1 Continuation of CCL audit report

M Conroy gave a summary of the CCL audit that had been reviewed yesterday. He explained that on the subject of the overlapping or duplicate BCCs it would be preferable to suggest that the BCC in question be removed and that the ACC relationships also be removed.

He went on to explain the other aspects of the audit report, indicating however, that D. Dobbing could provide a better explanation of the multi-qualified QDTs issue.

He indicated that there remained outstanding issues that were left over from the D.06B audit that also remained to be covered at the TBG17 joint meeting.

3.2 CCTS 3.0 Comment log review

M. Conroy presented the results of the comments made by the ICG concerning the CCTS 3.0. He indicated that of the 61 comments that the ICG submitted only there were only 17 accepted. This meant that some 75% of the comments were rejected. In his opinion such a large rejection rate appeared to be abnormal. He showed some examples where the ICG comments were rejected where they normally should have been accepted. He in particular presented the UML model of the ABIE where he explained that this in his opinion was indeed wrong. He asked A. Tell for his opinion.

A. Tell examined the model and presented to the group where he felt there were indeed inconsistencies.

In general it was felt that if an important UML diagram led to different interpretations then this was a serious default and the diagrams should be modified to ensure that these differences would be reduced in order to ensure consistent interoperability of implementations.

M. Conroy asked everyone to examine the comments (distributed by USB) and to provide their opinion by Thursday.

3.3 Joint meeting with TBG18

M. Conroy attended a meeting with TBG18 who were asking questions as to the procedures to be followed in respect to the BRS/RSM/Schema production and acceptance. He explained the workflow process and the constraints which were in majority held within TBG. He also indicated that once a CCL was ready and a RSM provided the production period from that point was roughly 6 months.

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

An issue raised concerned recommendation 20 and the measure.type where there was a requirement to provide the SI symbol as well as the description along with the measure. M. Conroy indicated that that was clearly within the hands of TBG17 and eventually ATG2. He indicated, however, that this issue was not within the scope of the ICG. The ICG however was responsible for Recommendation 20 itself and it was currently working on the development of an XML version of Recommendation which would include all the different attributes of the recommendation.

3.4 Review of the UN/CEFACT Registry Specification

F. Bourge went over the changes that had been carried out on the specification and also presented the errors that YM Yeh had discovered during the proof of trails. These were reviewed and agreed. A discussion took place on the use of the UUID, the UID or a temporary UID to link object classes in an ASCC. The conclusion of the debate agreed to the use of the UID as this would be a more permanent solution in particular to handle cases where there were multiple Registries. This needs further investigation to confirm its validity.

The changes were agreed and F. Bourge will distribute the adjusted document to the group. D. Dobbing will carry out some editing in order to bring it into alignment with the UN/CEFACT document standards.

3.5 Presentations of proof of concept tests (France, Chinese Taipei, Korea, Canada)

YM YEH presented the proof of concept tests that were carried out concerning the input and validation of the Core Component Library. His excellent presentation underlined the need to map the excel CCL to XML before carrying out the main bulk of the tests. It was also of interest that the processing time was not really significant for a CCL such as that of D06B. He was unable to finish his presentation due to the discussions that it raised. He will finish his presentation on Thursday.

The Meeting broke up at 17:00.

4 Wednesday, 26th of September 2007

4.1 Joint meeting with ATG2

J. Fromyr presented the issues that needed resolution, but beforehand he explained that ATG2 had worked on the DATE issue and would be making a proposal on the subject.

He went on to explain that there were issues related to codes the first of which concerned whether or not the EDIFACT code lists were to be used. D. Dobbing indicated that this was the case since ICG was currently in a migration effort to transform the UNCL into a neutral code list. However, the question of subset code lists was not yet elaborated and it remained the question for the ICG to work on. Any new code lists will managed by the ICG and any change requests will not go through the EDIFACT process. A question was raised about the capability for the DTED tag to be sufficient with 4 characters.

A discussion took place concerning the naming of the code lists, both generic and restricted. The code list appeared to be the agency, the DEN, and code list identifier (tag). This needed further debate.

4.2 Joint meeting with TBG17 and TBG6

MK Blantz introduced the meeting by indicating that TBG17 had two points to cover:

- The CCL library lifecycle
- ABIE evolutions

M. Conroy indicated that the ICG would also like to discuss the following issues:

- The “a name is..” at the beginning of a definition
- Code/identifier use in language
- Redundant words in DEN
- Circular relations
- Multi qualified qDTs

MK Blantz indicated that there would be 15 minutes at the end of the session for TBG6 to present their questions.

She went on to explain the TBG17 development of the library life cycle. This can be resumed as basically three phases, Harmonisation CCM, Posted draft CCL, Beta CCL, published CCL. She asked if ICG had any position concerning these stages. M. Conroy replied that they have no issue with such a series of stages since fundamentally they were only concerned by the beta stage for validation and the published stage after audit. He also indicated that such stages would eventually have to be taken into consideration in the UN/CEFACT Registry. Currently these were merely at the moment named “working libraries”. J. Fromyr indicated that it would be preferable that this be changed. D. Dobbing agreed.

MK Blantz requested a clarification on the use of bulk inputs. M. Conroy explained that bulk inputs were to allow outside organisations to submit their internally standardised ACCs to be harmonised into the UN/CEFACT process, for example, in the case of external Standards Organisations such as GS1 or SWIFT. To a question about whether this also included ABIEs M. Conroy indicated that this was not envisaged since ABIEs were normally designed to support a BRS and its information requirements.

K. Smith presented the changes that were envisaged to the ABIEs to bring them into line with a better practice. This concerned the improvement of the use of multi language use, multi status information and the improvement of binary object descriptions. ICG and ATG2 saw no difficulties with proposals.

M. Conroy explained the problem with the increased use of the “a name is” in the object definitions which did not respect ISO 1179. This raised a discussion which concluded with the agreement that the definitions in question should be adjusted.

Due to a lack of time M. Conroy moved to the question of redundant words in the DEN. He explained that the basic rule was not to be adhered to and cited two instances. S. Probert, indicated that the redundant rule did not apply between an object class and a property term. This was noted, however, there were other instances which also involved the property term and the representation term; D. Dobbing noted that concerning the identification/identifier issue that TBG17 would be requesting a corrigenda to remove the example from the CCTS.

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

D. Dobbing explained the problem about the circular references. He was provided another example and would look into the issue. This issue was not concluded.

D. Dobbing explained the last issue concerning multi qDTS but there was insufficient time to conclude and the issue would be re-examined later.

B. Longhi raised some issues concerning the timing for the release of the schemas. J. Fromyr explained that the target was for the end of the week for them to be released to ICG. D. Dobbing indicated that this should be completed within 7 weeks.

B. Longhi also raised the issue about the procedures for the maintenance of the published documents. D. Dobbing explained that this would be taken up by the new procedures group.

4.3 Afternoon

The afternoon was taken up at a public meeting on IPR.

The meeting broke up at 17h00.

5 Thursday, 27th of September 2007

5.1 Joint meeting with TMG UPCC

M. Conroy presented the situation as he believed it was currently. After discussion it was agreed that there was a misunderstanding in the UPCC objectives. J. Dietrich made a presentation concerning the project he was working on in Germany (see presentation for details). A discussion ensued about the profile that would be used for UN/CEFACT. J. Dietrich proposed that it be the Eclipse Modeling Framework (EMF) XMI version 2.1. He also indicated that there were several products that were now using this profile. A. Tell indicated that it was not sufficient to limit the reference to the XMI reference, he indicated that both the MOF, UML and OCL profiled also needed to be included to ensure that the right add on was selected.

After discussion it was agreed that the full reference will be include in the forthcoming revision of the UPCC document. It would be better to use such a profile which had already a number of product installations, rather than to reinvent a profile. If the EMF profile evolved it would be sufficient to consider it as the UN/CEFACT profile.

J. Dietrich also presented the use of the UN/CEFACT UML profile and its use with Xgenerator and explained that all the formal CCTS rules had been included and that the XMI output could be consequently validated against it. M. Conroy indicated that this save the ICG a considerable amount of time and indicated that this could eventually be used as the frontend to the Registry. It may be possible to output from Xgenerator the CCTS file that YM Yeh had used to input the library into the Registry.

J. Dietrich will provide the group with the UML profile for UPCC along with Xgenerator and a sample XMI output file containing 2 ACCs associated together with 2 ABIEs based on them.

5.2 UNCL migration

D. Dobbing introduced A. Coates and explained that he would provide a presentation on Genercode which was an XML method for the management of code lists. He indicated that such a method could be applied to our UNCL migration project. He passed over the floor to A. Coates who gave a presentation on Genericode (presentation enclosed)

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

A discussion followed where what it could and could not do. There also remained some room for evolution such as the codeset function.

D. Dobbing concluded by indicated that Genercode could help us moving the UNCL project and suggested preparing a draft of all existing UN/CEFACT codelists under our responsibility (UNCL,Recommendations and Syntax). This was agreed by the group.

He went on to thank A. Coates for his time and for his proposal to provide assistance if necessary.

5.3 Presentations of proof of concept tests (France, Chinese Taipei, Korea, Canada)

YM Yeh finished the presentation that was interrupted on Tuesday. The presentation brought to light some interesting aspects that would need further research which were the versioning principles and the access constraints. YM Yeh proposed the outline of a syntax for formalising the access constraints. This was interesting work and should be continued.

5.4 Brainstorming concerning a Prototype registry

M. Conroy indicated that with the finalisation of the specification and the proof of concepts that were possible that it was perhaps the occasion to develop a “quick and dirty” registry which would provide to the outside world a view of what the registry could provide. The minimum requirements for such a registry were identified in respect to content, input formats and output formats and man machine interface.

Against these the current available bricks were identified as well as the loopholes that needed filling.

This was left as homework for the Friday morning meeting.

The meeting closed at 17h00.

6 Friday, 28th of September 2007

6.1 Finalisation of the brainstorming

Afer discussion F. bourge will coordinate the effort and work with YM. Yeh and A. Tell using the Omar platform as the baseline. The objective is to have a workplan by January.

6.2 ICG Resolutions

There were no resolutions.

6.3 ICG action list update

1	UNCL migration	D. Dobbing	Convert for April 2008 all codes lists to Genercode
2	UN/CEFACT Registry prototype	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, I. Bedini, S. Lim, A. Tell	Develop the bricks necessary for the UN/CEFACT Registry prototype requirements. April 2008

ICG Meeting minutes – Stockholm 2007-09-24/28

		D. Dobbing, M. Conroy,	
3	EDIFACT D.07B directory audit (12 th of November to 13 th of November 2007)	M. Conroy A. Dechamps	Release for December 2007
4	Schema D.07A Audit 8 th of October – 31 st of October 2007	M. Conroy D. Dobbing YM Yeh S. Lim F. Bourge I. Bedini	Release for December 2007
5	CCL and schema directory audit D.07B	M. Conroy D. Dobbing YM Yeh S. Lim F. Bourge I. Bedini	Release for December 2007
6	Recommendation 20,	D. Dobbing	April 2008
7	Recommendation 23 for Plenary noting	D. Dobbing	December 2007
8	worked example for RSM	D. Dobbing	Preparation for next meeting
9	Validate use of EMF XMI protocol	M. Conroy	December 2007

6.4 Closing presentation preparation

The closing plenary presentation was reviewed and agreed.

6.5 Review of the minutes

The minutes were reviewed and will be agreed at the next meeting

7 AOB

No other business was noted.

The meeting closed at 10:30.