

ICG meeting Minutes

Contents

ICG MEETING MINUTES	1
1 MONDAY, 7TH OF APRIL 2008	3
1.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS BY THE ICG CONVENER.....	3
1.2 APPROVAL OF AGENDA	3
1.3 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	4
1.4 ACTION LIST	4
1.5 REVIEW OF THE ICG WEBSITE.....	4
1.6 REVIEW OF THE WORK PROGRAM	5
1.7 REVIEW OF UN/ECE RECOMMENDATIONS	5
2 TUESDAY, 8TH OF APRIL 2008	6
2.1 UN/CEFACT SPECIFICATION 1.2 APPROVAL	6
2.2 REGISTRY LITE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT	6
3 WEDNESDAY, 9TH OF APRIL 2008	6
3.1 REGISTRY LITE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT CONTINUED.....	6
3.2 JOINT MEETING WITH TBG17 AND ATG2.....	7
3.2.1 Maintenance (DMR formal approval).....	7
3.2.2 Change indicators.....	7
3.2.3 Identification of codelists (changing QDTs).....	7
3.2.4 D.08A submissions (RSM or equivalent).....	8
4 THURSDAY, 10TH OF APRIL 2008	8
4.1 JOINT MEETING WITH ATG1/TBG17	8
4.2 CONTINUATION OF WORK ON THE REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATION.....	9
4.3 JOINT MEETING WITH ATG2/TBG17	9
5 FRIDAY, 11TH OF APRIL 2008	10
5.1 PREPARATION OF THE ICG CLOSING PLENARY TRANSPARENT	10
5.2 PREPARATION OF THE AUDIT WORKFLOW	10
5.3 GENERICODE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CODELISTS	10
5.4 CONFERENCE CALLS	10
5.5 ICG RESOLUTIONS.....	10
5.6 ICG ACTION LIST UPDATE	11
5.7 REVIEW OF THE MINUTES	12
6 AOB	12

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

Present:

Name	Company / Country	E-mail address	Init.
Mike Conroy	Atos Origin, France	Michael.conroy@wanadoo.fr	MC
David Dobbing	SWIFT, Belgium	ddobbing@attglobal.net	DD
Fabrice Bourge	France Télécom, France	fabrice.bourge@orange-ftgroup.com	FB
Yao-Ming Yeh	National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan	yaomingyeh@gmail.com	YY
Sang Won Lim	Korea Institute for Electronic Commerce, Korea	swlim@kiec.or.kr	SL
Tahseen A. Khan	NIC DOC	takhan@nic.in	TK
Nikola Stojanvic	Rosettanet	Nikola.stojanvic@rosanettanet.net	NS

1 Monday, 7th of April 2008

1.1 Welcome and opening remarks by the ICG Convener

MC welcomed everyone to the twelfth plenary meeting of the ICG in Mexico.

He indicated that there were a number of points that had to be covered during the course of this meeting and he indicated that he would outline these when he presented the agenda.

1.2 Approval of agenda

The agenda as follows was approved:

Monday 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
 - Rec. 21 - Codes for Passengers, Types of Cargo, Packages and Packaging Materials

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

Monday 15:30 – 17h00

Report on the BRS/RSM and D.07B CCL directory audit

D.07A Schema Audit

D.07B Schema Audit

Formal requirements for the audit

CCL Directory audit rule review

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

Review of UN/CEFACT Registry V1.2 publication.

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

UN/CEFACT Registry Lite implementation possibilities

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

Registry target input/output formats

EMF XMI protocol

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

Tuesday 15:30 – 17:00 - UN/CEFACT Registry

Review of implementation plan

Milestones

Wednesday 9:00 – 10h30

UNCL Genericcode implementation review

UN Recommendations Genericcode implementation review

Wednesday 11:00 – 12h30

UN Code lists migration work

Wednesday 13:30 – 15h00

Study of a worked example of the RSM

Wednesday 15:30 – 17h00

Joint meeting with TBG17

Thursday 9:00 – 10h30

Joint meeting with ATG1

Thursday 11:00 – 12h30

Joint meeting possibilities

Thursday 13:30 – 15h00

Joint meeting with ATG2

Thursday 15:30 – 17h00

ICG Resolutions

ICG closing plenary presentation preparation

Friday 09:00 – 10h30 Closing meeting

ICG Action list update

Review draft minutes

AOB

1.3 Approval of the minutes of the last meeting

The minutes were approved without change.

1.4 Action list

MC presented the action list that were in the previous minutes and explained the progress of each point. He indicated that a lot of things were to be covered on the agenda. See meeting presentation for details.

1.5 Review of the ICG website

DD presented the website and asked if there were any points to be addressed. FB suggested that the ICG should present its project progress on the website. MC indicated that this combined with

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

the use of RSS feeds could be very interesting. After a discussion DD indicated that he would investigate whether or not this was possible on the CEN website.

1.6 Review of the Work program

MC 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.

1.7 Review of UN/ECE Recommendations

DD presented the changes to be made to Recommendation 21 (Package Type Codes) and indicated that these had gone through the ODP public review which closed on the 4th April 2008. No comments had been received. He presented a number of the changes as indicative of those being made.

FB raised a question on the definition of “vehicle” which was discussed and subsequently changed. MC raised an issue concerning the use of something to code “vehicle” as a package type. After a discussion this was clarified through an examination of the definition of package type. However, another issue was raised concerning the publication of Recommendation 21 on the website since the updates only referred to annex V and VI. After a discussion on the subject it was agreed that DD would inform the UN/Secretariat that the names of the last two recommendation publications should be revised adding the expression “Annex V and VI”. In addition as a conclusion to this examination it was agreed that MC should refer the recommendation to TBG 3 requesting that they examine the recommendation in relation to its relevance of the codes defined codes in all the six Annexes and determine whether TBG 3 considers that there is need to undertake a complete revision of the body text of Recommendation 21, with adjustment to the annexes accordingly.

After these conditions it was agreed to approve and publish revision 6 of annex V and annex VI.

DD went on to address the ongoing revision of Recommendation 20. He indicated that there was a parallel revision going on in ISO concerning a new standard numbered 80000 to supersede ISO 31 (Quantities and units). DD explained that some 160 new codes were requested, a high percentage related to the normative entries requiring conversion factors. He noted that Mr. Norbert Kaiser from Germany had provided invaluable assistance in reviewing and providing technical information regarding these codes. He indicated that the revision period was still ongoing and that this should be finalized by the month of May this year.

DD also presented a request for a unit of measure for “Dragée”. He asked if it was necessary to create a specific unit of count for such a code. A discussion on the subject expressed a doubt on the creation of such a specific code. DD will go back to the requestor and find out if there were more specific requirements.

The meeting broke up at 17h00.

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

2 Tuesday, 8th of April 2008

2.1 UN/CEFACT Specification 1.2 approval

FB presented all the changes that had occurred since the last revision of the specification.

The specification version 1.2 changes were reviewed. FB will clean up the document to use a single term instead of the mix between binding and mapping. Two other issues were raised:

1. Verify and clarify the use of the LID and ID.
2. The use of the term “API” needs to be clarified.

During the afternoon these points were clarified through an internet connection with I. Bedini.

FB and AS carried out the necessary adjustments to the specification.

The UN/CEFACT Registry Specification with the incorporated modifications in version 1.3 was formally approved for passage to ODP 6.

2.2 Registry lite requirements document

In parallel work began on preparing of an implementation plan for the registry. After some discussion it was agreed to use the initial document that had previously been prepared as the basis for preparing a phased plan.

The discussion centered around defining an approach which could be implemented in a phased manner. It was eventually agreed to use the silo diagram from the initial plan as the basis for identifying the implementation content. In the initial implementation, phase 1, it was agreed that only the first silo would be implemented, this would be followed by phase two which involved the implementation of the second silo, finally a third phase would implement the remaining silos.

Work began on the definition of the contents of the first phase and in particular how this should be expressed. There was insufficient time to finalise the discussion.

The Meeting broke up at 17:00.

3 Wednesday, 9th of April 2008

3.1 Registry lite requirements document continued

MC began the day by indicating the agenda items which remained to be covered and indicated that it would be preferable to focus on the registry implementation plan and the UNCL migration and all other subjects, barring the joint meetings, would be completed in the remaining time available.

The discussion resumed by MC providing for DD a brief resumé of the preceding days work. This helped refocus the debate and clarified how the document content should be presented. It also brought to light the need to prepare the implementation plan in the context of finishing up with a fully fledged production system. It was consequently decided that the word “lite” should not be used since this concerned only the first phase which was in fact a minimum implementation. The first draft of phase 1 was prepared as well as the initialization of the content of the other two phases. The work on the document was incomplete since a joint meeting with TBG17 and ATG was scheduled for the end of the day. Everyone was assigned as homework to reread the implementation plan as it currently stood and to prepare comments for the meeting on Thursday.

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

3.2 Joint meeting with TBG17 and ATG2

MC initialised the meeting by presenting what the ICG felt needed discussion at the meeting. This was completed by MKB with the TBG17 outstanding items. The agenda was consequently agreed as follows:

- Maintenance (DMR formal approval)
- Change indicators
- Identification of codelists (changing QDTs)
- D.08A submissions (RSM or equivalent)
- Schema issues (identifier codelist/codelist)
- Impact of changing text file names in QDTs

3.2.1 Maintenance (DMR formal approval)

DD began by explaining what he understood by the agenda item and explained that the ICG needed to know what rules were applied in the case of an evolution of an ABIE to ensure it complied with whatever had been determined as forwards or backwards compatibility rules. MC added that the forwards/backwards compatibility requirement was perhaps the first rule to identify. Especially related to how these impact the developed schema. MKB indicated that TBG17 was following the same principles as those used for EDIFACT. MC replied that this could not be the case since if a business requirement defined something new as mandatory then it would have to be implemented as mandatory. MKB indicated that TBG17 would prepare a list of rules and would initially use the current EDIFACT MDRs as a baseline.

3.2.2 Change indicators

MKB explained that the focus point of this issue concerned the use of the “X” change indicator which appeared to have two meanings: marked for deletion and marked as deleted. After some discussion it was agreed that there should be only one indicator with the description of “deprecated”. During the course of this discussion a secondary subject was raised concerning the use of the user generated version number and the opinion of the ICG on this subject. This also led to some discussion but in the end MC indicated that the ICG would not attempt to follow the user generated versioning as this was considered by the ICG to be a “local” complementary requirement. JF asked what impact this had on the resulting schemas. MC indicated that the ICG verified that the CCTS annotation in the schema corresponded exactly to that of the CCL. It was consequently agreed that CCL user versioning was the realm of TBG17 to define and manage.

3.2.3 Identification of codelists (changing QDTs)

DD explained that the ICG held the position that all UN codelists should be identified by the 4 numeric tag as used in the TDED. He therefore requested that the filename defined in the enumeration field of the CCL should use this tag as its identification. JF objected explaining that this would make the filename difficult to understand by the user community. MC felt that “implementation” oriented information should not appear in a syntax neutral specification and felt that it would be more appropriate that this information was expressed as a textual expression such as “use of recommendation 20 units of measure recommended”. The use of a filename in this context he felt was in some way dictating an implementation.

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

DD explained that the ICG had a project that was nearing completion that would provide in a single XML schema all the UN/CEFACT managed codelists.

After some discussion on the pros and cons it was agreed to compromise on the use of a filename which included both the UNTDED tag and the name.

3.2.4 D.08A submissions (RSM or equivalent)

MKB explained that this issue essentially concerned bulk submissions and the RSM. She asked AS to present the bulk issue specification used by the insurance group, TBG8. AS explained that he was in a position to provide a CHM file which provided all the navigation possibilities around the insurance ACC models. DD indicated that such an expression of the model could be termed an RSM. JF indicated that since this concerned ACCs ATG2 was not involved. MC explained that if there was a bulk submission concerning ABIEs then it would be necessary to provide a model or to reference a model which could be publicly accessed. This led to a discussion on the bulk submission from Swift which in the end led to the agreement that SWIFT would provide a model but that they would not have a requirement for the development of any schema. This was agreed.

There remained insufficient time to cover the outstanding agenda points.

The meeting broke up at 17h00.

4 Thursday, 10th of April 2008

4.1 Joint meeting with ATG1/TBG17

MC introduced the subject by indicating that the problem to address in a brainstorming fashion was how to increase the use range of UN/TDED tags. DD indicated that this would be required as we began to issue new tags when new qualified data types were introduced in the CCL.

MKB felt that this was not really within the scope of the TDED since the codes did not relate specifically to it.

DD felt that first of all we should agree that the objective was to build a single code list. This was generally agreed. Following on from that DD proposed that the next question to ask was whether or not all code list identifications should be in the TDED. MKB felt that this should not be the case. MC reminded everyone that firstly it should be borne in mind that we were only dealing with code lists that were to be managed by UN/CEFACT. Secondly, this being the case, it may be possible for the codelist to be used by an EDIFACT implementation. Finally, if the second point was a possibility, a TDED data element would be required. GB agreed that if such a codelist was to be used effectively a TDED element tag would be required.

After a discussion around the above mentioned points, it was generally felt that element tags should be allocated and that it would be necessary to ensure that only UN/CEFACT managed codes were to be catered for. The following action items were agreed:

- ICG to prepare a position paper for validation by ATG1 and TBG17
- ICG will do an analysis of gaps currently in TDED codes (verify and differences with EDED)
- DD will provide ATG1 with the new TDED tags for noting

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

4.2 Continuation of work on the requirements specification

Everyone participated in the finalization of the work on the phased implementation plan which was completed and approved. DD was requested to submit the plan (see implementation plan for details) to the FMG for approval.

4.3 Joint meeting with ATG2/TBG17

MC, while waiting for JF to arrive, asked TBG17 to review the ICG minutes of the joint meeting held on Wednesday. These were agreed as being a correct reflection of the meeting.

MC then went on to indicate that it would be necessary for ATC/ICG and TBG17 to answer the following question asked by the FMG:

“ICG, ATG and TBG, with ICG in the lead, to document the issues preventing predictable and reliable publication of the CCL library and Schemas for the Bureau with the objective of eventually developing a project for funding”

The following points were agreed with TBG17 and with the arrival of JF were also agreed as a reasonable reflection of the current issues:

- **CCL:** production cycle now on target to produce a 2 yearly library
- Limited resources for the audit of the CCL. Audit methodology now under control
- Current production however, *nearing 2 months after submission (note: reduced from 3 to 2 during the course of the FMG meeting)*
- Dialogue ICG/TBG17 and correction cycle rapid and under control
- **Schema production:** production cycle not yet on target to produce two directories per year. Dependant on the delivery of audited CCL (i.e. 3 months after submission)
- Resource problems in production
- *The use of multiple generation tools major cause of holdups*
- Main production issues now nearing resolution
- Need to reissue schemas even though no change has occurred. *(note: added during the FMG meeting)*
- Audit cycle roughly 3 weeks after schema production. Can be improved by further resources, The audit methodology now under control. Testing underway on a automated validation tool from KIEC

Finally JF asked for clarification on the use of unique UIDs for different artefacts, even if these were not necessarily going to be detailed in the Registry. The case in point concerned the use of the “MA” and “RSM” schema objects. MC indicated that if an object defined something completely different then it necessarily had to have a different UID. He saw no reason for example of a schema element and its descriptive complex type to have different UIDs since these were in fact different representations of the same thing. This however was not the case with the “MA” and “RSM” stereotypes. If they were the same, then there was one too many.

After a discussion on the point JF agreed with the explanation.

The meeting closed at 17h00.

5 Friday, 11th of April 2008

5.1 Preparation of the ICG closing plenary transparent

MC presented the transparent that he had prepared for the closing plenary which after some additions and editorial corrections were approved. (see closing plenary presentation for details).

5.2 Preparation of the audit workflow

MC explained that he had prepared the workflow concerning the CCL and Schema audits. These were presented and some modifications were carried out. MC indicated that SL with the automated validation tool fit well into the workflow and proposed that this be used with the D07B audit. SL agreed to this. After some other minor editorial corrections the workflows were approved and it was agreed that they be submitted to the FMG for information.

5.3 Genericode development of the codelists

MC presented the current implementation of genericode for the UNCL and Recommendation 20 code lists. In all there were 271 code lists. He explained the modifications that he had made to the standard schema and the modifications the TC had provided as an alternative method. MC had not yet had the time to completely proof the alternative schema which he proposed to do for the next meeting. He underlined however that the cooperation with AC was excellent and was providing excellent results.

After a discussion on the subject it was agreed that MC introduce some other selected recommendations depending on their complexity in order to finalise the genericode requirements

5.4 Conference Calls

SL raised the topic of ICG conference calls, with the suggestion that these occur on a biweekly basis. Following discussion it was agreed that these be held monthly, the first to be held on 2008-05-13 at 10h00 CET.

5.5 ICG Resolutions

There were no resolutions.

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

5.6 ICG action list update

1	Recommendation 21 (Codes for Passengers, Types of Cargo, Packages and Packaging Materials)	D. Dobbing M. Conroy	DD to update and provide approved Rev. 6 to UN Secretariat for publication. ASAP MC to contact TBG3 (Transport) to request review of Rec. 21 body text and applicability of Annexe.
2	Recommendation 20 (Units of Measure)	D. Dobbing	Finalise Rev 5 at end of ODP5 on 2 nd May 2008. Seek ICG approval and request UN Secretariat to publish.
3	UNCL migration	M. Conroy	Progress with conversion of all CEFACT maintained code lists into Genericode format. Subject to ICG review (ODP4), this meta code list should be progressed to ODP5 – Public Review.
4	UN/CEFACT Registry Implementation – Phase 1	F Berthomieu, F. Bourge, Y. Yeh, I. Bedini, S. Lim, N. Stojanvic A. Tell D. Dobbing, M. Conroy,	Subject to FMG decision, progress with Phase 1 implementation
5	D.07B Schema Audit	M. Conroy S. Lim D. Dobbing	
6	D.08A EDIFACT directory audit	M. Conroy A. Dechamps	

ICG Meeting minutes – Mexico 2008-04-07/11

7	D.08A CCL and schema directory audit	D. Dobbing M. Conroy	Target completion 22 May 2008
8	D.08A Schema Audit	M. Conroy S. Lim D. Dobbing	
9	worked example for RSM	D. Dobbing	Preparation for next meeting

5.7 Review of the minutes

There was no time left to review the minutes

6 AOB

No other business was noted.

The meeting closed at 10:30.