

UN /CEFACT

Minutes of TBG5 Finance Plenary Forum San Diego 2003

Participants: Mike Adcock, Jack Fang, Yves Gailly, Walter Hoffman, Stig Korsgaard, Elsie Lapeyrade, Hendrik Muus, Carlo Palmers, Renato Polo, Anne Sundqvist, Wu Ting-Yu Fu. Siri-Anne dos Santos and Stein Fosmo joined on Wednesday.

Monday plenary session:

1. Participation to other groups :

The first plenary on Monday was focused on deciding participation to various groups:

- 1.1. Harmonisation, TBG 17: there is a need to clearly define the respective roles between this group and ICG
 - We think that for SWIFT CC they should firstly be given to harmonisation and then to ICG
 - TBG 5 Participants: Mike as chair, Stig vice chair,
 - Agenda: Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday from 9 to 17.
- 1.2. MOP:
 - TBG 5 participants: Stig chair, Anne, Renato and Yves
 - Agenda: Tuesday and Thursday from 10:00 to 12:00
- 1.3. ICG: they are in fact two projects to participate in
 - Carlo, Elsie
 - Walter
- 1.4. ATG participants:
 - ATG1: DMRs, Hendrik
 - ATG2: Frank
- 1.5. E-government: Elsie, Yves
- 1.6. UBL: Mike and Stig are working in the group. UBL will not do finance messages such as payment/credit transfer. This is already agreed with Mike => no action required with UBL during San Diego meeting.
- 1.7. Accounting and auditing: remittance information, shouldn't be anymore a black box (Hendrik thinks it should remain). Carlo, Yves, Hendrik to build an interface with them. Some discussion went on on remittance information: historic, how it was done in EDIFACT, ...
- 1.8. Insurance: later after having gained experience with accounting.
- 1.9. E-tendering: this project is managed in TBG 6. It is felt that there is no need to participate actively, but a follow-up could be interesting. Renato will liase with them.

- 1.10. UN/TDED: Trade Data Element Definition. Mike who has been participating to ISO TC154 will check with Sue what we are supposed to do so that we can define what, who and when the work will be done.
2. Definition of TBG 5 plenary agenda for the week:
 - 2.1. Thursday 3pm, this session will be to define Resolutions and finalise minutes.
 - 2.2. Wednesday 9 am, this session will be a full plenary to go through Rome action points, SWIFT harmonisation process, as well as some recent topics: TWIST, TC68, IBAN,
 - 2.3. Tuesday 9am to 10am: preparation of MOP on TBG procedures which were distributed.
3. Internet domain:

Hendrik has reserved a domain name which he is transferring to TBG 5 www.tbgs-finance.org .
Yves signed the document.

Wednesday Plenary session

1. Steering Committee report from Tuesday (see appendix)
 - 1.1. Changes in the schedule:
 - 1.1.1.A meeting between three representatives from the CSG and TBG will take place Wednesday at 2pm which objective is to give information on IPR and resources for the secretariat of the UN/CEFACT.
 - 1.1.2.An extraordinary StC will take place Wednesday at 8am to deal with the MOP raised in the first MOP meeting.
 - 1.2. TBG1 and TBG2 decided to merge in TBG1 with the title of "Supply Chain".
 - 1.3. OASIS TC initiatives:
 - How to invite OASIS members to come to TBG to get information on the business requirements?
 - Some says that we are too low to define standards. Y.Gailly remarked that those telling that are often software vendors, but that users prefer not to let those vendors define quickly users requirements as it favours them.
 - Issues are recognised to be linked with Marketing and Co-ordination between different organisations. Various MoU exist but the one between UN/Cefact and OASIS defining the limits of responsibility and avoid duplications was in fact never signed. There is a MoU with ISO, ... but the co-ordination is insufficient.
 - On e-government meeting with the project leader John Boras will be possible on Thursday.
2. Extraordinary StC meeting on MOP

It was considered that in fact the main issue was not the membership to TBG, but the attached responsibilities of this membership. A consensus came on for decisions and voting only at Steering Committee level. This will solve TBG membership issue and give more flexibility to each TBG working group. It is clear that for important decisions chairs will have time to query their group before taking a position. They will also always be able to be replaced and not only by a vice chair. It was also said that electronic vote has to be envisaged.
3. Action points from Rome:
 - 3.1. Documents to be sent after Rome: OK
 - 3.2. Convergence group to meet and produce results: Has not met, waiting for approval of Harmonisation paper to meet again.
 - 3.3. E-government: letter sent to Ralph who answered, follow up to be done in San Diego. Meeting envisaged with John Boras on Wednesday. See above.
 - 3.4. Local European characters:

- 3.4.1. Creation of sub-group: Tim Decker wrote to call for a meeting. Yves should liaise with him to avoid misunderstanding with Robert Bol who said in future group he will organise it.
- 3.4.2. Maintenance group to study EDIFACT existing possibilities: Hendrik will contact Robert.
- 3.4.3. Carlo indicated that this topic was on the agenda of the next Standards committee.
- 3.4.4. Write to EPC: to be reviewed later.

3.5. Country representative to get a clear view on the acceptance of IBAN in his country. To be addressed with IBAN topic.

3.6. A project on functional security has to be created. Write the Terms of Reference
Not done. Prepare before September Forum.

3.7. Annual report:

- 3.7.1. National co-ordinators to write a country report and send it to Yves and Martine, if possible before the 28th February : Switzerland and Sweden only.
- 3.7.2. All members to make remarks on the chairman draft statement before 28th February :
None

Actions:

- send Swiss report as an example. **YG Remark:** without criticising the only complete report I received, thank you to Switzerland, I would like you to add to such a report the way you are organised or organising the relations between the different standardisation bodies in your country: to say between SWIFT user group, TBG 5 members, ISO representation, ...
- Yves indicated that if the percentage of reports received at end of April is not sufficient Report for 2002 will be abandoned.

3.8. Hendrik Muus to liaise with ISO on AUTACK

Yves to review the origin of this topic

Hendrik said no risk of consequences on our current existing implementations.

1.9. Hendrik Muus to confirm capacity to maintain his tool and define manageable rules and limits.

128€ to pay each year: participants will pay 10\$ to Hendrik and get a receipt.

Hendrik to check coherence of his tool with CCTS

4. Procedures

Will be readdressed only after TBG procedures are approved.

5. Forum organisation

Waiting for concrete proposal during this week. The group strongly complained on the lack of organisation which should allow transversal work and describe the workflow between the main groups.

6. SWIFT

6.1. Co-ordination: document and decision procedures

TBG5 approved unanimously the last version of the document and SWIFT will bring it to the board next week.

Yves will send the document to ISO TC68 chair. He will add comments on the fact that it was written everywhere SC4 for TC68 when responsibilities are not yet clear.

6.2. Liaison with TC68

Extension of SC4 which was envisaged is still not clear. Mike remarked the need for a lot of people with different skills if the extension is approved. He also mentioned the risk of different meanings for same words in cash and securities 15022 which is the reference for SC4 as an image of securities which will remain difficult to be accepted by cash management people.

- Carlo reminded the respective roles: Cefact: harmonisation with the other industries, ISO management of the financial dictionary,
- EPC: agreement with SWIFT and MoU between ECBS and SWIFT should protect against duplication of work in standardisation. Unfortunately examples prove there are still risks. We need to liase and lobby for avoiding standardisation within EPC.

6.3. March Board papers:

Yves went through some points of interest:

- FIN will continue to be maintained
-

7. BPM & CC:

7.1. Customer to bank report

Business validation group last week, Mike: minutes this week + conference call
Issue was remittance information possibility of different domain spaces (Rosettanet, ...°

7.2. General situation and action plans: given the on-going agreement with SWIFT, is it necessary to review the terms of reference and action plans?

For BPM, Mike confirmed that there is a need for revision of ToR, especially with a BPM not fully taken in account by SWIFT. Proposal for new version will be done in June.
A meeting will be organised before 23rd of April conference call.

Questions:

- Does somebody have information on Authorisation. How is authorisation used in MT101?
- Balance of payment reporting: who assign categories? Who needs it? What elements does it contain?
- Intermediary bank: Why it is requested in a customer to bank message, for what business reason?

We need to have an editor: SWIFT. It means that SWIFT is the one proposing the core components.

How to fill the status in the matrix? Ready to go out for community review. Specify the project it is linked to like B2C, credit transfer, customer to bank.

Participation to harmonisation group for further Forum and interim meetings:

Mike, being not available, will probably be replaced in SEOUL.

8. TWIST: to be discussed between banks firstly

Carlo was at the last TWIST meeting. He tried to convince them to be interoperable with other standards.

There is a conflict between a presentation done in a TWIST meeting and the agreement which was reached in Oslo in the Future group. SWIFT was unduly "considered" as supporting TWIST!!!
CRG name has been used as advertising and as having given a delegation to TWIST to move EDIFACT messages to XML.

This situation is surprising referring to the last Future Group minutes which extracts are:

- TWIST will not develop new payment messages which have been or will be developed by SWUFT/CEFACT
- TWIST, SWIFT & CEFACT should all base the financial core components on the same directory.

Actions:

- Yves will send a message to Andreas, as CRG chair, reminding that the above delegation was supposed to address only gaps not covered by SWIFT.
- Siri-Anne will also write to Andreas and CRG

Thursday 13th March

1. IBAN

Following a request from corporate to the banks in the last Future group, a draft explanation document has been prepared and was discussed.

TBG5 to issue a paper recommending that every bank accept IBAN and BIC. The document has been written and approved. See appendix.

2. Comparison of SWIFT concepts and CCTS

SWIFT has made a document that compares the standards development approach that is currently followed by SWIFT / ISO 15022 to the Core Component Technical Specification.

The document identifies the following relationships between the Core Component concepts and the concepts of SWIFT/ISO 15022:

CCTS v1.90	SWIFT / ISO 15022
Aggregate Core Component	Business Component
Association Core Component	Business Association or Business Element (when typed by another Business Component)
Basic Core Component	Business Element (when typed by a Data Type)
Aggregate Business Information Entity	Message Component
Association Business Information Entity	Message Element (when typed by another Message Component)
Basic Business Information Entity	Message Element (when typed by a Data Type)
Data Type	Data Type
Core Component Type	Data Type Representation
Representation Term	Data Type Representation

Some additional clarifications:

- SWIFT / ISO 15022 Business Components, Business Elements and Business Associations could also be considered as Business Information Entities because they are the view of the financial industry on the underlying concepts (and hence have the “financial industry” context). SWIFT considers that these items are more closely related to Core Components because they are used to describe business concepts independent of a particular use.
- SWIFT / ISO 15022 has currently two types of Message Components and Message Elements: those that are directly related to an equivalent Business Component, Element or Association and those that have been created for technical and/or message assembly reasons. SWIFT only considers the first type to be equivalent to Business Information Entities.

- SWIFT / ISO 15022 Data Type Representations are a subset of the list that is defined in the CCTS. SWIFT has only considered Core Component Types that are relevant to the part of the financial industry that is currently covered by its financial dictionary.

The main conclusion of this comparison is that there is a high degree of compliance at the Core Component level and that there is a more important gap at the Business Information Entity level. This larger gap is mainly due to the fact that SWIFT doesn't support Business Context in an explicit way and doesn't use explicit Qualifier Terms in its naming conventions. The document also includes some recommendations to change some of the current CCTS-rules.

SWIFT intends to take a number of actions to increase its compliance level. These actions include the verification of quality of definitions and names, the verification of relations between Message Components and Business Components, the creation of a Controlled Vocabulary, the definition and use of additional Supplementary Components for Data Types and the use of Qualifier Terms.

As far as Business Context is concerned, SWIFT intends to further assess the need to capture this information explicitly. An important part of the Business Context is namely implicitly defined through the business documents (or messages) that use the dictionary items.

Concretely, for the work to be done in UN/CEFACT in order to push the SWIFT Core Components in approved CEFACT CCs, SWIFT will, in a first step, present to the Harmonisation group a sample of Core Components before their next meeting. This should allow to have a better idea on what need to be done before Seoul and before presenting the full set of Core Components for validation. Normally, after being approved by the Harmonisation group, they will have to be send to ICG for registration in the Repository, this means that at that time a physical repository should exist.

For Core Components, the view is that we are finally entering in a concrete step which, once the validation procedures will be tested, should allow us to define a concrete action plan for the validation of a full set of Core Components.

3. Participation to other meetings:

3.1. ICG:

Presentation on their proposal of workflow. This was discussed a lot outside of the meeting. It seems they now have an agreement between TBG, ICG and ATG. ICG is defining a template for submission as candidate CC and BPM by Harmonisation group.

Creation of UN/CEFACT repository: not yet started. The definition of what to put in the repository should at least be defined. Domains could so start temporary repositories.

Interface with ATG to ask for a physical representation in EDIFACT or ebXML: not started too.

Participation to ICG appears as being necessary.

3.2. ATG

10 DMRs on card payments were approved.

Finance needs representatives in ATG, but it is more a technical work which should be done by SWIFT.

3.3. E-government

The convenor of the e-government group in OASIS joined the TBG meeting and met with some interested domain groups. The time available didn't allow Finance to have a specific meeting with him but the joint meeting allowed us to tell our interest for this topic and regret that a TBG group didn't start before the OASIS group was started as we think that it is our job to define the business requirement. John Boras said he was very open for co-operation. It is now to TBG members to organise and see how the synergy with the OASIS group could be the best.

3.4. MOP

The participation of Finance to the definition of Terms of Reference and Procedures of TBG was important. Our main requests have been taken in account letting domain group having a quite important flexibility to define their own ToR and Procedures. The approved documents are joined in appendix.

4. WEB:

The Forum has an agreement with DISA that they will manage the web for the Forum. It seems that some information was sent to chairs since Geneva, unfortunately, for technical reasons apparently, Yves Gailly didn't receive any mail since Geneva (it is difficult to know which information we lost). At the same time in Rome, the TBG 5 plenary approved the proposal from Hendrik to book a domain name (see above). We are then in presence of two sites. After discussion with the TBG in charge of the web, it appears that there is no issue to have on the DISA site only a routing to the TBG 5 site. In order to prepare the content of this site the Marketing group will review the proposal they made two years ago and send it to Hendrik.

5. CLOSING of Forum

The last Steering Committee approved the few resolutions presented. Those resolutions should be soon on the web site: <http://webster.disa.org/cefact-groups/fct/index.html>

The Plenary was a presentation of the work done by each group, slides presented should also be soon on the web. The TBG 5 slides are joined in appendix.

APPENDICES:

- TBG_MOP Terms of Reference_Rev3.doc
- TBG_MOP Procedures and Organisation_Rev3.doc
- TBG5 Final Presentation.ppt
- TBG Opening Plenary.ppt
- ISO-TC154_n436r1 7372ma 2003-03 res-act.doc
- TBG5 response to TC154.doc
- ISO7372_UNTDEDMA_110303.xls
- Concerning the use of IBAN.doc
- List of TBG 5 members still to be updated with new participation rules: N001Rev13a.xls
- SWISS ANNUAL REPORT:
 - TBG5_Annual_Report_2002_CH.doc
 - tableau rapport annuel-CH.xls

ACTION POINTS

1. Remaining points from ROME
 - 1.1. Harmonisation: convergence group to meet and produce results
 - 1.2. Local European characters
 - 1.2.1. Creation of the sub-group: Yves to see with Tim and Robert
 - 1.3. Country representative to get a clear view on acceptance of IBAN in his country.
 - 1.4. A project to be created on functional security. Write Terms of Reference.
 - 1.5. Annual Report: before end of April
 - 1.5.1. Yves to send example of Switzerland
 - 1.5.2. All nations to send their report
 - 1.5.3. All national co-ordinator to give remarks on chairman draft statement
 - 1.6. Hendrik Muus to liaise with ISO on AUTACK: Yves to check where this topic came from.
 - 1.7. Procedures and Terms of Reference: to be reviewed in view of new approved procedures for TBG.
2. Core Components:
 - 2.1. Yves to send the document on comparison between SWIFT and CCTS
 - 2.2. SWIFT to write down an action plan for approval of Core Components
 - 2.2.1. First phase should be: SWIFT to submit a sample of Core Components to Harmonisation before their intermediate meeting
3. Harmonisation in the financial world
 - 3.1. SWIFT to submit to the next board
 - 3.2. Yves to send it to ISO TC68
4. Questions from Mike, see Wednesday point 7, on authorisation, balance reporting and intermediary bank, to send him information
5. TWIST
 - 5.1. Yves to write to Andreas
 - 5.2. Siri-Anne to write also
6. IBAN: Hendrik to put the approved position from TBG 5 on the web.
7. Web:
 - 7.1. Hendrik to fill up the TBG 5 web site liaising with Marketing group which prepared something some months ago.
 - 7.2. Establish the link with the DISA one.
8. Future Forum:
 - 8.1. Prepare a list of groups in which Finance want to participate and send it to secretariat when any.
 - 8.2. Prepare list of topics to be addressed at least one month before the Forum even if this list can be completed up to the last minute.
 - 8.3. Members to send proposals or request for presentation on interesting topics: web services, security, e-government, ...
9. Next plenary in SWIFT La Hulpe in June: Yves to confirm the dates 26 & 27 of June
10. Yves to update the list of participant to clearly recognise: active members, copy receivers, former members still on the list to keep a track.

11. E-government: prepare Terms of Reference for a potential TBG group. Liaison with the OASIS group to envisage.