ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32
Data Management Services

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC32 N 36

DATE: 1997.12.01

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
Other document

TITLE:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 30/WG 1 Issues List

SOURCE:
Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 30/WG 1

PROJECT:

STATUS:
For information and review.

ACTION ID: FYI

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P & L Members
SC Chair
WG Conveners and Secretaries

MEDIUM: D

DISKETTE NO.: 4

NO. OF PAGES: 8

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32,
American National Standards Institute, 11 West 42nd Street, New York,
NY 10036; Telephone: 212-642-4976; Fax: 212-398-0023;
E-mail: mtopping@ansi.org

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 30/WG1 N 071

1997-10-16

EDIMASTER

Mannerheimintie 73 C

FIN-00270 Helsinki
Finland
Direct Line : +358 9 4780 3130
Direct Fax : +358 9 4780 3131

ISO/IEC JTC 1/ SC30/WG 1

OPEN-EDI

TITLE : WG1 ISSUES LIST

SOURCE : SECRETARIAT, ACCORDING TO THE DECISIONS MADE IN THE PARIS MEETING

STATUS : FOR INFORMATION. THIS DOCUMENT REPLACES WG1 DOCUMENT N063

ACTION : ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

SC 30/WG 1 Issues List

Experts participating in WG1 work as well as national bodies and liaison organisations are invited to make contributions pertaining to these Issues referencing the particular Issue to which their contribution pertains.

Issue 1: Composition/Decomposition

IS14662.2 mentions the ability of a scenario to be decomposed in elements. Inversely, it can be anticipated that a scenario could be assembled from elementary modules. The selected OeDT should allow for composition and decomposition of scenarios.

Group A's conclusion: Change title to«Composition/decomposition and identification of scenario»

Add the next sentence at the bottom. «In the composition and decomposition of scenarios the scenario attributes have to be taken in account»

WG1 action: Agreed that this issue is no longer relevant since issue 3, 4, 5 and 9 have been resolved.
Issue is closed.

Issue 2. Implementation Considerations

This is a two part issue: guidance for implementation and experience of prototyping. As work progresses on mapping business requirements to requirements on Open-edi Scenarios, the feasibility of implementation based on those requirements is fundamentally important. As requirements on Open-edi Scenario components are formulated, their acceptance must be based on criteria such as:

- the existence of applicable tools, i.e., OeDTs that can facilitate implementation,
- the identification of applicable standards that already exist,
- the ease of definition of operational standards that can be modelled and can be readily registered and reused,

the incorporation of successful implementation prototype results.

Group B's conclusion: Since there is a dependency between the two sub-issues, it is recommended to split issue 2 into two separate issues.

The first issue (2A - Guidance for implementation) is to provide help on how providers of FDTs should use the example scenario in chapter 4 to validate that their particular FDT meets the requirements (chapter 6) using the criteria outlined in chapter 8.

The second issue (2B - Experience of prototyping) is to help WG1 to outline how to test a submission (see issue 2A). Since this must be complete before asking for submission on FDTs, this issue must be resolved first. Therefore we recommend that contributions to this issue and chapter 8 are given a high priority.

WG1 action: Agreed, to be modified this way.

Issue 3. Identification of Semantic Components (SCs)

a. Do SCs have their own unique ID, i.e. autonomously?
b. Do Scs take their unique ID, i.e. part of it, from the IP of which they are part?
c. Can a) and b) coexist ? Are there other possibilities?

This issue is stated in the context of unambiguous identification for referencing, maximising reusability and minimising redundancy of SCs.

Group A's conclusion: Change title to«Composition/decomposition and identification of semantic component»

This issue is solved as follows:
put the following text in N061 in 2.3.1:

- «SCs can have their own unique ID, i.e. autonomously
- SCs can take their unique ID, i.e. part of it, from the IB of which they are part.
- a and b can coexist

This requirement is stated in the context of unambiguous identification for referencing, maximising reusability and minimising redundancy of SCs.»

WG1 action: Agreed, N061 to be modified as suggested. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 4. Identification of Information Bundles (IBs)

a. Do IBs have their own unique IDs, i.e. autonomously?
b. Do IBs take their unique IDs, i.e. part of it from the role (or scenario) of which they are part?
c. Can a) and b) coexist? Are there other possibilities?

This issue is stated in the context of unambiguous identification for referencing, maximising reusability and minimising redundancy of IPs.

Group A's conclusion: Change title to«Composition/decomposition and identification of scenario information bundle»

This issue should be modified as follows:

- «IBs can have their own unique ID, i.e. autonomously
- Do IBs take their unique ID, i.e. part of it, or scenario of which they are part ? (Depends on resolution of issue 5 upon composition/decomposition and identification of role.)
- can a) and b) can coexist?

This issue is stated in the context of unambiguous identification for referencing, maximising reusability and minimizing redundancy of IBs.»

WG1 action: The issue was solved by modifying the text on "Information Bundles" in the base document of topics 14 and 15. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 5. Composition/decomposition and identification of Roles

a. Do Roles have their own unique IDs, i.e. autonomously?
b. Do Roles take their unique IDs, i.e. part of it, from the scenario of which they are part.

This issue is stated in the context of unambiguous identification for referencing, maximising reusability and minimising redundancy of Roles.

Group A's conclusion: Change title to«Composition/decomposition and identification of scenario roles»

This issue is left as it is. The underlying question is: «Is it possible to define a role by itself without being a part of a scenario?»

WG1 action: Agreed, title changed. Issue is still open.

Issue 6. Identification and Naming

The issue of identification and naming of scenarios and their components in a multilingual business environment. Resolution is required for unambiguous referencing, reusability and the interworking of organisations via Open-edi.

Group A's conclusion: This issue is going to be addressed based on ISO standards regarding identification and naming. Jake Knoppers is going to propose a draft text to include in N061 to address this issue.

WG1 action: Agreed.

Issue 7. Class(es) of Business Requirements

Presently no classes of business requirements exist for Open-edi scenarios. Such information is required to support reusability of Open-edi scenarios. What are the approaches to classification (or categorisation) that would be useful/appropriate here?

This issues was not reviewed by any group since Jake Knoppers will resubmit a revised earlier contribution on this subject.

WG1 action: Agreed.

Issue 8. A role consisting of two or more business functions making up a "clearly understood purpose" modelled as an "external behaviour".

How do we differentiate among roles which have several activities, where the only difference between two roles is one activity. Resolution of this issue is required to ensure interoperability and reusability as well as avoiding excessive redundancy of roles representing basic common business functions.

Group B's conclusion: This should be addressed by Group A.

WG1 action: After a long and emotional debate it was agreed to keep this issue open.

Issue 9. Scenario Referencing

There is a need for a scenario to be able to reference other scenarios in order to reuse existing scenarios as building blocks. This will avoid excessive redundancies of basic common business goals.

Group C's conclusion: Text on scenario referencing needs to be added to N61 rev. 1.

The referencing needs to be done between roles taking into account the sequence of information bundles and clearly addressing the "right point of (relative) time" when another scenario is to be executed. The reference does not address a specific scenario (e.g. "Transport order in international trade") but a class of scenarios (e.g. a transport order scenario).

A new action type is needed. This can be called e.g. "Invoke scenario"

Testing of consistency of all sub-scenarios needs to be made possible

WG1 action: Agreed to add text based on above suggestion to section 2.1 of N061. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 10. Initiation of a scenario

It is needed to have clear guidance on how to initiate a scenario, i.e. when there are one or more starting points.

Group C's conclusion: It must be possible to allow a scenario to have several starting points. The starting point(s) need to be specified in a role definition.

WG1 action: Agreed to add text based on above suggestion to chapter 6 of N061. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 11. Business Rules versus demands on an OeP

How to differentiate between business rules versus demands on an OeP?

Group B's conclusion: Since business rules are define as demands on an OeP there is no need to differentiate between the two.

WG1 action: No longer relevant due to the disposal of issues 9 & 10. No other modifications are needed to N061. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 12. Scope and boundary of a scenario

There is a need to be able to clearly define the scope and boundary of a scenario. This is required for reusability of scenarios.

Group C's conclusion: This issue is not really an issue, because it's not relevant. It is self clear that the scope and boundary of a scenario needs to be defined at the BOV level. N061 at its present form already captures this need. As a matter of fact the scope and boundary of a scenario needs to be described by those, who design scenarios. This needs to be stated explicitly in the document.

WG1 action: Agreed to add text based on above suggestion to section 2.1 of N061. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 13. Termination of a scenario

The issue of termination of an instance scenario from the business perspective, i.e. the reaching of some mutually agreed upon goal, and the termination of the scenario from a law/regulation perspective, (e.g. records retention, reporting, etc.)

Group C's conclusion: The termination of a scenario should be clearly identified at each of the roles involved in this scenario. This is a requirement on the FDT to be used for these roles, analogously to the initiation of a scenario. The law-regulation aspects of this issue are either dealt with at the FSV level (for instance in terms of a non-repudiation requirement), or at the company level (if a company has to keep records for a certain period of time, this is up to the company to decide as an internal task).

WG1 action: Due to closing of issue 10 and by agreeing to add text based on above suggestion to chapter 5 of N061 this **issue is closed.**

Issue 14. Error Handling

How to identify and differentiate among common kinds of error handling which re-occur in an instantiation of a scenario and its components, i.e. those of a business rule nature, those of a semantic nature, etc.

Included in this issue is, that the potential OeDTs are able to verify that all possible initiation paths of a scenario lead to allowable termination.

Group C's conclusion: (first part) Following text to be added to page 27 (lines 963-969): both the choices made by roles and the events that influence the execution of a role, as well as their concurrent interpretation. This requirement guarantees that all common forms of exception handling can be modelled (in combination with the requirement to have timers).

(second part) There is a need to add some text to the document saying (Chapter 8), that an OeDT should allow for the verification whether all possible initiation paths of a scenario lead to allowable termination.

WG1 action: Agreed to add text based on above suggestion for part 1 to chapter 6 and part 2 to chapter 8 of N061. **Issue is closed.**

Issue 15. OeP Playing several Roles

There is a need to add as a scenario attribute a means of dealing with an OeP playing two or more roles in different scenarios, where one scenario invokes another scenario and the combination of scenarios introduces new constraints. The question is on how to identify and to handle the situation.

Group B's conclusion: There needs to be an interface defined to link one scenario to another. It is via this interface that rules would be defined identifying what roles can or can't be played by the same OeP.

WG1 action: No conclusion was reached. The issue is still open.

Issue 16. State of roles

There is a need to enable an OeP to know at any time the state of role(s) it is playing within a scenario.

Group B's conclusion: This is a BOV requirement (and is be mention in N061, section 6.2, potential need 7) on the FSV and is stated in the Reference Model.

WG1 action: Agreed , **issue is closed**. However, a new issue needs to be raised to define what "the dynamic properties" of a scenario are.