

TWELFTH MEETING OF THE ISO IEC ITU UN/ECE MoU MANAGEMENT GROUP

22-23 April 2004, ISO building, 1 rue de Varembé, Geneva, Ground floor

DRAFT MEETING REPORT

Document

Apologies: Jean-Marc Chatelard, Kenji Itoh, Pat Snack.

Present: see List of Participants in Annex B.

1 Welcome and administrative details

Mr Mason welcomed members, and expressed himself pleased with an increased level of information exchange since the last meeting, and briefly outlined the salient points of the proposed agenda. Mr Barta as duty secretary went over some administrative details.

2 Adoption of the revised draft agenda

MoU/MG/04 N0170 rev.1

With a regrouping under 5.7 (now to include 6.1, 9.1 and 9.2) the revised draft agenda was accepted.

3 Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

MoU/MG/02 N0166 rev.1

Mr Mason had corrected, in 5.5 (p.4), a reference to "SC 31" (not SC 32).

4 Matters arising from the minutes and previous resolutions

These were covered as far as relevant under succeeding agenda items.

5 Co-ordination of existing actions

5.1 MoU/MG Framework

Action 03/01: Chair to provide new draft of Annex A. Members to comment on draft diagram

Action 03/02: Pat Snack of AIAG has submitted a skeleton (model) for a matrix showing which standards are used where. Members to comment on and add to draft matrix

Action 03/09: JC, HM, DW to coordinate development of a single overview model which will meet the needs of the MoU MG (Annex A)

eBusiness Standards Convergence (eBSC) Forum (per Karl Best)

The sub-items under 5.1 constituted a single group and would probably all end up referring to the same set of concepts and actions, so they were dealt with together. For personal reasons Mr Mason had not had as much time to develop the new Annex A draft as planned, but some progress had been made. Mr Best described the eBSC workshop held the previous week, at which he had presented the OASIS Conceptual Model. An important open question was the relationship between eBSC and the MoU/MG. Mr Mason proposed to recognize and use the eBSC Forum as an important contributor, and had invited it to provide its work plan so that common items might be identified, and eBSC resources used to support the MoU/MG work. Mr Best had suggested to Mr Palmer of eBSC that an informal contact should be established and maintained (since eBSC was not an organization which could become a formal member of the MoU). On the Chairman's proposal, the MoU Management Group agreed to this approach (*new action item 04/01: Distribute work plan & other contributions as received from eBSC Forum*).

Mr Galinski drew attention to the EU Interoperability Framework activity.

5.2 Cooperation between OASIS and UN/CEFACT

5.2.1 ebXML (ref: Resolution 03/04)

MoU/MG/04 N0174

A statement on the future cooperation, requested at the last meeting, had now been produced and was read by Mr Kubler. It described their joint intent to produce a detailed cooperation agreement, giving rise to a press release by 2004-05-17 and a formal approval by Sept. 2004. This development was welcomed.

5.2.2 BPSS

This item now formed part of the discussion described under 5.2.1 above.

5.2.3 CCTS - harmonization of content (ref: Resolution 03/03)

Public review of the first 21 UN/CEFACT core components, which were well-advanced, had been launched. The Chairman was due to attend a US aerospace meeting where the standards to be recognised would be discussed; the integrity of the UN/CEFACT review process would be respected by the MoU/MG participants. Both this work and the harmonisation going on in TBG 17 had excellent liaisons with all other relevant work. Ms Probert stressed how important it was, in addition to the CCTS document even in its final version, to harmonize *semantics* of the use of core components.

Resolution 04/02 — *Core Components*

MoU/MG confirms its Resolution 03/03 in support of the CCTS (v 2.01) and encourages all organizations developing e-business content to harmonize that content through the UN/CEFACT TBG 17 working group.

5.2.4 Action 03/03: Core Components: RW to prepare first draft of a workshop whose purpose is to explain the UN/CEFACT work and to discuss certain issues

If still needed, this workshop would be organized after the rescheduled UN/CEFACT Plenary now to be held on 2004-05-17..19. Given the importance of the UN TDED, it seemed to several members that the workshop *was* probably still needed. Mr Clark outlined one of the principal aims as being “socialization”, i.e. explanation and publicity, for the ongoing technical effort and its results, with a consequent need for a very wide attendance. UN/CEFACT TBG would be requested to consider organizing it.

5.2.5 Communications from Mr K. Itoh

Mr Kubler for UN/ECE explained that Mr Itoh’s communications on the subject of OASIS had been personal ones and not ones submitted by UN/ECE or UN/CEFACT. Both OASIS and UN/ECE proposed, and members agreed, to thank Mr Itoh for his personal contribution as a member of the MoU/MG and reassure him that the points he raised were being effectively addressed. It was also determined by members that, beyond what was already contained in the joint statement just discussed, no outstanding action remained. The MoU/MG expressed its delight at the discussions going on and regarded no further action on its part to be necessary.

5.3 UMM/UBL coordination

5.3.1 UBL update (OASIS UBL TC) (see also *OASIS Update*, 10.2)

Ms Probert summarized a presentation of which she would provide a longer version to the secretariat. This work should be helped by the agreement UN/CEFACT and OASIS were working on. Mr Galinski mentioned a very successful e-government implementation in the UK (Brighton), with 500 companies currently adhering, but UBL seemed not to be involved in it. Mr Welch asked whether the work had already been submitted to ISO/TC 154, but this was not the case; Ms Clivio responded that only the ebXML work had currently been approved for submission, as part of the ISO 15000 series. Mr Clark added a comment on the importance of localization for future developments, and asked that all OASIS

reporting should in future be dealt with under a single agenda item (*new action item 04/03: Place all OASIS work under a single agenda item*).

Ms Clivio reported that four ebXML projects had been submitted by OASIS as Technical Specifications (TSs) to ISO/TC 154, and had been approved. Their forewords explained that the material involved would be further developed by OASIS and submitted for standardization to ISO/TC 154. She described ISO's rules for reconfirming or revising TSs and standards, and added that in this particular case there was an agreement that OASIS would be responsible for maintenance of the standards (the agreement was available on the ISO/TC 154 web site, and would be distributed as an MoU/MG document) (*new action item 04/04: Distribute OASIS – ISO/TC 154 agreement—done?*).

5.3.2 Action 02/31, resolution 03/02: UBL in UN/CEFACT

This was covered under items 5.2 and 5.3.1.

5.4 Data retention/archiving as it relates to e-business - coordination between ISO/TC 46/TC 10, IEC TC 3

A possible overlap problem existed between ISO/TC 10 and ISO/TC 46 with a new work item involving archiving; however, at a TC 10 meeting in late 2003 a decision had been taken to reinforce liaison, so that Mme Guillabert now believed that no further problem was likely. Any future coordination needs would simply require discussion with ISO/TC 46 and no further action from the MoU/MG was required at this time.

5.5 Security issues—member contributions invited

No further inputs had been received; discussion of some security aspects was held under 6.2 below.

5.6 Permanent marking of parts (ref: Action 02/34: further status report by Chair)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 31 and ISO/TC 20 (Aerospace) had now agreed to progress the item together. Mr Mason described the significance of being able to identify individual items of inventory, and gave an eloquent example concerning defence inventories.

5.7 Product classification, terminology and catalogues

MoU/MG/04 N178, N179

This item now also included items 6.1, 9.1 and 9.2 of the draft agenda. Mr Galinski first talked about 5.7 “eCatalogues” combined with 6.1 “Product data classification”, and mentioned three projects in the CEN/ISSS “eCat” Workshop (“ePDC”). Current catalogues were not suitable for global use, so a project was developing one that would be. A classification scheme document was on the way to publication as a CEN Workshop Agreement (CWA). Another CWA on models for eCatalogues was also planned. The information becoming available from the CEN projects would be distributed as MoU/MG documents for information (*new action item 04/05: Distribute information on CEN “eCatalogue” projects—done?*).

In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Galinski gave an example of what “product classification” represented. In contrast to this the work in ISO/TC 184/SC 4 included the actual product descriptions, which is why it was a catalogue or product library (“PLib”) rather than simply a classification. Mr Galinski explained that for localization it had been found that PLib needed certain extensions, and the product classification work already took localization (local language etc.) entirely into account.

Finally he gave a brief update on efforts in terminology unification in product description areas. For semantic (content) interoperability in a future semantic web, terminology across different broad areas such as e-business, e-learning and e-government needed to be unified as well. It was remarked that the Core Components work was performing precisely this task.

A discussion took place on the role and future of registration agencies and maintenance agencies with respect to “database” standards such as those for product catalogues, where their *contents* (rather than the standards specifying their format and rules) were the focus of interest. The possible legal ramifica-

tions of offering “catalogues”—a potentially commercial service, with high stakes in its intellectual property—were also raised.

It emerged in further discussion that a metadata standard was not sufficient fully to specify future data models to the extent which would be needed for semantic interoperability. This was because a metadata standard needed to allow modelling of *any* semantic approach; it standardized only how the different approaches were described, and not the contents of the approaches themselves. Therefore it was essential to “standardize contents”, in the way that Plib and Core Components were doing, and not simply to choose a representation formalism such as Express or XML.

Then Dr Wilkes presented OIIDDI and Plib (formerly item 9.2 in the agenda).

In the course of the presentation, Dr Wilkes questioned the implementation of IEC’s recently changed policy on making IEC 61360 dictionaries available electronically. Mr Barta for IEC recommended that National Committees of the IEC should be requested to raise this point in the IEC Standardization Management Board, as being the correct method for investigating whether official policy was being implemented correctly.

After Dr Wilkes’s presentation, Mr Clark recommended the effort described at the end of item 5.8 below to take into account the possibly much greater demand for the organization identifier model offered by OIIDDI as development proceeded. A discussion took place on “certification”, where Dr Wilkes explained that it was here being used in a weak sense, as the technical judgment that a potential dictionary supplier could interoperate with the other providers in the future OIIDDI Association.

The Chairman expressed his impression that the OIIDDI/Plib work would fulfil a need, and saw the eCat efforts, for example, as useful future participants in fulfilling the need together with the OIIDDI Association. Mr Barta asked about the relationship with UN/CEFACT Core Components, and Mr Mason about that with the future ISO/IEC Guide on product properties; on the latter, Dr Wilkes saw it as too vague for the moment to allow any answer, and on both it seemed that participation in the planned OIIDDI Workshop on 2004-07-08..09 should help to clarify the relationship. A question was raised whether a dictionary provider would see a sufficient return on the investment it would have to make to join OIIDDI. Mr Dill described the intention in DIN to allow future standards only if they used the standard method to describe product data; Mr Mason saw OIIDDI as pursuing the same goal, and Mr Galinski noted the same need in product classification.

Mr Larmouth then presented object identification according to the ASN.1 approach. In answer to Mr Kubler’s question, Mr Larmouth declared ASN.1 object identifiers (OIDs) perfectly suitable for customs authorities to track consignments. Mr Clark queried the very-long-term reliability of each link in the chain leading back from an organization’s allocated OID to the root, and what service could be provided to the organization at what cost. An exchange took place on the similarities and differences with the EPC (extended product code) of EAN; Mr Barta pointed out that an EPC could be made universally unique by including in front of it the ICD for EAN, and in front of that the OID for ICDs. General discussion showed that OIDs were useful in naming objects of whatever kind, as long as a hierarchical system was suitable. The MoU/MG concluded that one of the existing identification systems, such as OIDs, should always be used in preference to inventing a new one.

The MoU/MG emphasised the need for ISO/TC 184 and ISO/TC 37 to ensure that there was a common perspective of the relationship between the roles of product classification structures, product libraries covering sets of products within such classification structures, product models within such libraries, and underlying reference data/code lists.

5.8 Online registry of ongoing standards work (refs: Action 02/37; 6.1 of N166rev1)

The registry had now been populated with OASIS data and in Dec. 2003 had been made available to other organizations. ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 was going to standardize the work which had been done to design the registry, and Mme Clivio believed that a new work item might have been submitted, but would check (***new action item 04/06: Check whether new work item proposal for design of standards***

work registry has been submitted to ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32). Mr Galinski indicated other efforts in the same direction which would not necessarily be taken into account in an approach involving only ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32, e.g. the ex-Diffuse project from the European Union, and expressed the need for them to be linked, with unified registration methods. Mr Welch felt that it was even more important that bodies working on standards or similar specifications should be able to announce themselves and advertise widely what topics they were working on; Mr Best agreed but stressed that the format in which this was done needed to be unified, otherwise *finding* the information would be impossible. Mr Clark listed three items to concentrate on:

- standard metadata;
- transport mechanism (access, availability);
- keeping track of the *status* of each item (draft vs final, proprietary specification vs IS, ...), e.g. for WTO TBT purposes.

The Chairman saw the MoU/MG's role as being to make such a coherent facility available to all the organizations possibly concerned (e.g. those listed in Diffuse), and to encourage them to populate it. Mr Hill pointed to a difficulty: ITU would need to agree the format through its official channels, which would take a certain time, and ITU already had a format for its catalogue of standards. Ms Fuller mentioned the ISO WSSN (World Standards Services Network) and asked about its relevance in the current discussion; she herself still used the US version, NSSN. Mr Kubler offered to distribute a new UN/ECE recommendation on a "single window", defining one access per shipment for providing all trade facilitation information (*new action item 04/07: Distribute UN/ECE recommendation on "single window" for access to shipment information*). For IEC, Mr Barta indicated some difficulties similar to those mentioned by Mr Hill, especially the resource issue, but Mr Mason pointed out that, given public information about *how* to apply resources in a distributed way and still be mutually linked and useful, many different organizations would see their interest in providing some resources. Mr Clark agreed that a multi-authored, federated approach was the only possibility for the future, rather than the single-authored method involved in Diffuse. So Mr Mason suggested that the MoU/MG should evaluate the existing sets of metadata in conjunction with the development of the MoU integrated framework (see 5.1), compile the proposed set of coherent metadata and "metamethods", circulate it to relevant organizations for comment (the mailing list being that of Diffuse), fine-tune the methods, and then encourage all organizations to contribute their data.

Action 04/08

MoU/MG, and specifically those members working on the integrated framework, to compile a set of coherent metadata and "metamethods" for standards registries, circulate it to relevant organizations for comment (the mailing list being that of Diffuse), fine-tune the methods, and then encourage all organizations to contribute their data.

- 5.9** Resolution 02/13: Full public information source on e-business standards, specifications and consortia
This had been effectively discussed under 5.8.

6 Identification of new coordination issues

- 6.1** Product data classification (ref: Action 03/08: The MoU/MG should monitor product data classification activities to ensure consistency)

See item 5.7.

- 6.2** Information management aspects of supply chain security (ref: Action 02/43: Update on work of the MoU for freight movement within the supply chain) MoU/MG/04 N173

Mr Tom Butterly gave a presentation on trade security and its relationship to information, with some of the links with and implications for standardization. Ms Fuller and Mr Vuilleumier gave some elements of information on other work on both safety (incl. chemical/hazardous waste) and security; Mr Vuil-

leumier distinguished customs responsibilities from the more general border-crossing ones. He expressed a wish for standards and mutual-recognition agreements which could avoid the insuperable disadvantages of some of the security measures currently being proposed or even developed.

In response to the Chairman's question, Ms Clivio reported that the proposed MoU on freight movement had not been signed, and she was not aware of any current activity. However, Ms Probert felt that this MoU was vital and urgent. ISO/TC 154 had the relevant liaisons for supply chain security, and in the framework of this Mr Vuilleumier had mainly been in touch with ISO/TC 8; however, he saw a lack of *implementation* of standards, rather than a lack of standards. Two exceptions to this were that standards in biometrics, and on electronic (more than physical) sealing of containers, were still lacking. Mr Butterly reported that a meeting of all UN agencies involved in trade security would be held within three months, so that their various interests and initiatives might be coordinated; ISO, IEC and ITU would hopefully also be invited to a subsequent meeting involving the European Commission and the World Customs Organization, and the Chairman proposed that the MoU/MG Secretariats should then transmit the information to all known groups involved.

Resolution 04/09

The MoU/MG strongly recommends its members to inform themselves actively on the requirements of trade security for standardization and standards implementation, and to involve themselves directly in the relevant common activities (e.g. coordination meetings led by UN/ECE), so as to be able to contribute rapidly to this vital area for the whole of society, without duplication.

6.3 Gaps in e-government standards (Action 03/07): any actions needed after OASIS report in Nov. 2003

Mr Mason asked whether any further actions were in fact needed; for Mr Clark as for other members there were none. Mr Galinski mentioned the EU Interoperability Framework concentrating specifically on e-government, but since there were members in common Mr Clark felt no intervention was needed from the MoU/MG unless there were new developments. Action 03/07 is therefore closed.

6.4 Biometrics: applications in security (per ISO/TC 68 and ITU/T SG 17) MoU/MG/04 N171, N181

Ms Fuller reported that an ISO/TC 68/SC 2 CD would soon be released; the ANSI standard on which it was based was the best-selling one in recent years, which showed the interest in biometrics. Mr Clark asked for confirmation that the ISO/TC 68 work did not specify actual biometric parameters but rather how they may be integrated in applications; Ms Fuller believed that this was generally true, but was not sure whether future development (e.g. the new CD) would also conform to this model. She also explained that the ISO/TC 68 work was specific to the banking industry, thus distinguishing it from more general potential developments (such as might emerge from ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27 or 37). However, the history of the Personal Identification Number, which was originated by TC 68 for the banking industry but had been adopted by many other industries, could be repeated, depending on specific needs and events to come. Mr Ketchell confirmed that CEN was also becoming active, but in early stages and on a limited scale. The Chairman concluded that a summary report from each actor would be useful, since it seemed clear that the MoU/MG needed to keep a global view if it wished to identify commonalities. Mr Vuilleumier listed four items needing to be examined for fighting terrorism:

- identification and movement of persons;
- means of transport;
- ports and airports;
- cargo.

The last three items were satisfactorily dealt with by current work, which left persons, e.g. crew and passengers. ID cards and passports were formerly considered reliable, with the information gathered from them being sufficient, but now biometrics seemed to be needed. ISO/TC 154 had initiated a new work item in this area, which implied close liaison with organizations which could provide it with the biometric tools it would need. To Ms Fuller, it was thus clear that ISO/IEC JTC 1 (at the TC level, not just the SC level) needed much more active and effective representation in the MoU/MG.

Resolution 04/10

The MoU/MG draws the attention of all participating and interested organizations to the number of ongoing work items in a long list of organizations in biometrics. It strongly suggests that all future developments should make maximum possible use of what is already being developed, rather than starting new initiatives. Particular attention should be paid to the information requirements arising from biometrics.

Resolution 04/11

The MoU/MG is becoming aware that the work represented by its members is impinging more and more on specific work being carried out in ISO/IEC JTC 1 Subcommittees, and vice versa. It therefore requests the ISO/IEC JTC 1 Officers to encourage JTC 1-level participation in the MoU/MG so as to be able to discuss, at least in general terms, the full range of work going on in the Subcommittees. The MoU/MG also intends to invite specific subcommittees as relevant, and would be grateful for the JTC 1 Officers' support in this.

Action 04/12

Secretariat to request the IEC Technical Director and the ISO Director of Standards to convey Resolution 04/11, *ISO/IEC JTC 1 participation in the MoU/MG*, to the ISO/IEC JTC 1 Officers.

Mr Ketchell reported on a new group, joint between the European Commission and the U.S.A., concerning regulation in information and communications technology. The standardization organizations had been included at their insistence, but the purposes of the group were not yet clear. However, two areas which seemed likely to be treated were biometrics and e-business.

Action 04/13

CEN/ISSS to provide information on the EU-US regulatory dialogue as it becomes available.

6.5 Privacy

MoU/MG/04 N171

Mr Ketchell briefly reported on the CEN/ISSS Workshop on privacy; he invited all other organizations (including ISO/IEC JTC 1) to keep the Workshop informed of any developments. W3C had done a certain amount of work on privacy profiles, and Mr Hill proposed attempting to involve them again.

Action 04/14

All organizations are invited to provide information to CEN/ISSS on work on privacy issues.

Action 04/15

Secretariat to contact W3C and invite it to exchange information on privacy work.

6.6 Other new issues

None were proposed.

7 Promotional activities

7.1 Action 02/02: Members to include link to MoU site on their sites (continued—Mr Barta)

7.2 Action 02/06 (on hold): FV to prepare FAQ as required (continued—Mr Vuilleumier)

7.3 Action 02/25: New version of N086 to be posted to web; summary page for OAGIS to be provided by OAGIS (continued—Messrs Connelly and Mason—and public availability linked from public MoU site at ITU—Mr Hill)

7.4 Action 02/29: ITU to propose dates for an event intended to promote the work of the MoU/MG and its members (continued—Mr Hill)

7.5 Action 02/30: Review at each meeting the promotional activities that have been carried out by individual participants (continued)

8 Secretariat issues: Best practices to follow in order to reduce confusion about “duplication”

Reports from Secretariats, MoU/MG N027rev2

Action 03/10: The Chair and Secretariats should review the current text of the MoU, to determine whether any changes to strengthen coordination efforts would be required, or whether additional internal MoU/MG operating procedures should be developed (see also MoU/MG N027)

Mr Best made a short presentation on “best practices” he felt would be useful in addition to what was already contained in N027. Some of the major points of the presentation were that each organization should:

- publish the scope, deliverables and schedules for its major activities;
- publish its approval process and rules, its IP policies and its liaison rules;
- report any relevant new activities to the MoU/MG;
- identify related work and announce its own new work to the organizations carrying out the related work; and
- establish internal procedures to encourage liaisons so as to reduce duplication and increase re-use and interoperability.

Mr Hill found the goals expressed to be laudable. The four signatories—large SDOs—already had several of the proposed procedures in place, but their size and complexity made e.g. finding, absorbing and using the scope of each work item a very difficult exercise. This, as well as the difficulty of interpreting an organization’s own view of the relationships of its work to other projects, should be helped by the framework and a possible registry (as discussed under previous agenda items).

Mr Mason proposed that he as Chairman and the Secretariat should review N027 in view of these goals and the experience obtained since the procedures in N027 were last updated (four years before), and produce a revised version for members’ review by June 2004, for approval at the next meeting (*new action item 04/16: Chairman & Secretariats to revise MoU/MG N027*).

In connection with item 5.3.1, the Chairman had asked whether complete organizational/project updates should in future be presented at the very beginning of MoU/MG meetings rather than later in the agenda, or as an option be previously distributed in written form, as a coherent basis for the remaining discussions; members were in favour of these alternatives (*new action item 04/17: Future agendas and their preparation to request organization/project updates in written form distributed in advance, and/or presented at the beginning of the agenda*).

9 Presentations and discussions

9.1 Object Identifier (OID) Model (ref: Action 02/08)

See item 5.7.

9.2 Presentation by TC 184/SC 4/WG 2 on OIID and PLIB

See item 5.7.

- 9.3** Presentation by ISO/IEC JTC 1 (ref: Action 03/11: Chair to invite ISO/IEC JTC 1 to inform the MoU MG how it intends to work with its partners in the MoU MG to address the issues covered in Resolutions 9 (Web services) and 11 (Coordination methods) of N0164 (JTC 1 Nov. 2003 Resolutions) and to make a presentation at the next meeting) MoU/MG/04 N180

In the absence of an ISO/IEC JTC 1 representative, Mr Best who had attended reported on the Feb. 2004 web services workshop. The conclusion had been that JTC 1 could mostly add value by endorsing current web services efforts, rather than launching more itself. OASIS agreed with this position. Added value could come from central support of some kind, e.g. a registry, but the same resource difficulty had been identified as during the current MoU/MG meeting. A JTC 1 owner for the topic would be identified at some stage (e.g. an existing JTC 1 subcommittee), and another meeting would be held in Montréal on 2004-06-17..18.

Many of Mr Larmouth's SC 6 colleagues had been present at the same workshop, and balloting was taking place in ITU-T SG 17 and in ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 of an item on "fast web services". The strong feeling in both SG 17 and SC 6 was that this work should not be duplicated by the newly launched "web services" initiative; Mr Best's impression was that the workshop had been in tune with this concern and did not propose any such duplication. Ms Fuller would provide a list of user groups which to her knowledge were involved in "web services" but had not attended the workshop, and the secretariat would transmit this for information to the convenor of the ISO/IEC JTC 1 web services group (*new action item 04/18: Ms Fuller to provide a list of user groups which to her knowledge were involved in "web services"; Secretariat would transmit for information to the convenor of the ISO/IEC JTC 1 web services group*).

- 9.4** CEN/ISSS Cultural Diversity Steering Group MoU/MG/04 N182

Mr Küster gave a presentation. Mr Ketchell saw a serious problem in finding people who simultaneously understood the technical issues and could also provide translation and the necessary linguistic knowledge, but for Mr Küster it was perhaps sufficient to *enable*, rather than actually to execute, the translations. A decentralized approach using registration authorities could sometimes permit the desired final result to be achieved. In summary, architecture, infrastructure and registration bodies needed to be in place, and then market needs could drive what was implemented. Mr Mason highlighted the "principles" appearing near the end of Mr Küster's presentation, which applied more universally than to just the continent of Europe. Following a comment of Mr Clark's, he proposed generating a set of principles for e-business standards in general, ready for the next meeting (rather than on the spot). Mr Galinski reinforced the need for principles by citing Microsoft's successful development of a smooth process for generating local versions of its software. OASIS, UN/CEFACT, ISO/TC 37 and CEN/ISSS seemed to Mr Mason to be the relevant organizations to generate the set of cultural diversity principles.

Action 04/19

The MoU/MG requests OASIS, UN/CEFACT, ISO/TC 37 and CEN/ISSS to develop for the next MoU/MG meeting a set of recommendations for the application of cultural diversity aspects to e-business standards. The Secretary will communicate the mailing list to Mr Küster, who will coordinate.

In response to Mr Vuilleumier, Mr Küster felt that legal differences should not purposely be made a part of cultural diversity issues, but there was no way of avoiding their involvement at some level.

- 10 Items for information** MoU/MG/04 N168, N169

10.1 Update on UN/CEFACT

Mr Welch gave a brief update, referring for all items to www.unece.org/cefact. The next meeting was taking place on 2004-05-15..17. The UN/CEFACT Forum was a twice-yearly general meeting of the six groups carrying out UN/CEFACT's standards work, and Mr Welch ran through some of its recent items and approvals. The next Forum would be held in the U.S. in Sept. 2004.

10.2 Update on OASIS

MoU/MG/04 N176

The OASIS report was given by Mr Clark. Items of interest since the last MoU/MG meeting were:

- Six new TCs: DITA, ebSOA, legal XML SDHI, WSRF (Research framework), WSN (Notification), XDI.
- Two new final OASIS standards: CAP V1.0 (Common Alert Protocol-Emergency); WS-Security 1.0 V2004.
- The completed V2.0 ebXML standards are ISO 15000 (CPPA, Messaging, Registry RIM and RS).
- Discussions with ITU re submissions of OASIS security standards.
- OASIS Symposium on Reliable Infrastructures (New Orleans, 24-27 April 2004).

The next phase of ebXML would be web-services based.

A discussion took place on what “web services” were between Mr Clark, Mr Welch and Mr Kubler. ISO/IEC JTC 1 participation would be needed. Billions of dollars were invested in these activities and the work of standards organizations (SDOs) was essential. The SDOs must be seen as neutral. (See also 9.3 above.)

10.3 Update on OAGIS

MoU/MG/04 N177

Mr Connelly gave a presentation, highlighting OAGIS v9.0.

10.4 UCC and EAN update/report

Messrs Kramer and Osinski presented an update, including organizational news and EPCglobal which was the implementation of radio-frequency identification (RFID). Mr Kramer referred members to the www.ean-int.org site for more information. In answer to Mr Welch, he confirmed that the Global Data Synchronization Network would be fully conformant to the Core Components, and that EAN’s Core Componets would be submitted to UN/CEFACT for harmonization. Mr Galinski expressed a wish that the product classifications used by EAN-UCC should match the schemas used elsewhere.

10.5 CEN/ISSS (see also 9.4 above)

MoU/MG/04 N171

Mr Ketchell covered some news other than that already included under 9.4 above. There were 15 Workshops currently, of which one was new.

10.6 Other organizations

SWIFT would give an update at the next meeting, due to shortage of time at this one. For the same meeting, Mr Vuilleumier would give a general update on the situation with “semantic nuggets” (core components, content harmonization, etc.) in various groups (*new acion item 04/20: At 2004-11 meeting, SWIFT to present, and Mr Vuilleumier to give general core-component/content harmonization/“semantic nuggets” update*).

11 Any other business**11.1 Dates and venues of next two meetings**

2004-11-22..23 in the U.S. (near Boston) were decided for the next meeting, and 2005-04-21..22 were pencilled in for Asia if arrangements could be made.

12 Close of meeting

Mr Mason thanked members for their contributions, complimented them on generating a powerful atmosphere of cooperation, and wished them a safe journey home.

Annex A: Action Items and Resolutions

In addition to the action items and resolutions decided upon at the current meeting, shown in all-bold type, only those items are recorded below which appear to possess continuing importance.

The first number is the action item or resolution number. Numbers in parentheses refer to Agenda items.

Actions

02/02 (4.2 of N0096): At each meeting, remind members to include on their sites a link to the MoU, namely to: <http://www.itu.int/itu-t/e-business/mou/>

02/06 (4.6 of N0096) (additional marketing materials): As appropriate, FV to prepare a set of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ). On hold.

02/25 (4.3 of N0151): Summary pages for OAGIS to be sent by them.

02/29 (5.1 of N0113): ITU to propose dates for an event intended to promote the work of the MoU MG and its members

02/30 (5.1 of N0113): Review at each meeting the promotional activities that have been carried out by individual participants

02/34 (4.14 of N0151): Permanent marking of parts by bar-coding—any further status updates.

02/43 (4.18 of N0151): Update on work of the MoU for Freight Movement Within the Supply Chain.

02/46 (4.21 of N0151): Liaison to ISO/IEC regarding terminology database.

03/01 (incorporating 03/02, 03/09): Complete the new version of Annex A.

03/03 (5.2 of N0151): Core Components: RW to prepare first draft of a workshop whose purpose would be to explain the UN/CEFACT work and to discuss certain issues.

03/08 (5.7 of N0166rev1): The MoU MG should monitor product data classification activities to ensure consistency.

03/10 (10.2 of N0166rev1): The Chair and Secretariats should review the current text of the MoU, to determine whether any changes to strengthen coordination efforts would be required, or whether additional internal MoU/MG operating procedures should be developed (see also MoU/MG N027).

03/11 (9.1.9 of N0166rev1): Chair to invite JTC1 to inform the MoU MG how it intends to work with its partners in the MoU MG to address the issues covered in Resolutions 9 and 11 of N0164 and to make a presentation at the next meeting (the Chair will send the request for information and the invitation).

04/01 (5.1): Distribute work plan & other contributions as received from eBSC Forum.

04/03 (5.3.1): Place all OASIS work under a single agenda item.

04/04 (5.3.1): Distribute OASIS – ISO/TC 154 agreement (done?).

04/05 (5.7): Distribute information on CEN “eCatalogue” projects (done?).

04/06 (5.8): Check whether new work item proposal for design of standards work registry has been submitted to ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32.

04/07 (5.8): Distribute UN/ECE recommendation on “single window” for access to shipment information.

04/08 (5.8): MoU/MG, and specifically those members working on the integrated framework, to compile a set of coherent metadata and “metamethods” for standards registries, circulate it to relevant organizations for comment (the mailing list being that of Diffuse), fine-tune the methods, and then encourage all organizations to contribute their data.

04/12 (6.4): Secretariat to request the IEC Technical Director and the ISO Director of Standards to convey Resolution 04/11, *ISO/IEC JTC 1 participation in the MoU/MG*, to the ISO/IEC JTC 1 Officers.

04/13 (6.4): CEN/ISSS to provide information on the EU-US regulatory dialogue as it becomes available.

04/14 (6.5): All organizations are invited to provide information to CEN/ISSS on work on privacy issues.

04/15 (6.5): Secretariat to contact W3C and invite it to exchange information on privacy work.

04/16 (8.): Chairman & Secretariats to revise MoU/MG N027.

04/17 (8.): Future agendas and their preparation to request organization/project updates in written form distributed in advance, and/or presented at the beginning of the agenda.

04/18 (9.3): Ms Fuller to provide a list of user groups which to her knowledge were involved in “web services”; Secretariat would transmit for information to the convenor of the ISO/IEC JTC 1 web services group.

04/19 (9.4): OASIS, UN/CEFACT, ISO/TC 37 and CEN/ISSS to develop for the next MoU/MG meeting a set of recommendations for the application of cultural diversity aspects to e-business standards; Secretary to communicate the mailing list to Mr Küster who will coordinate.

04/20 (10.6): At 2004-11 meeting, SWIFT to present, and Mr Vuilleumier to give general core-component/content harmonization/“semantic nuggets” update.

Resolutions

02/07 (6.4 of N0113): It is recommended that RELAX NG, ASN.1, and XSD be considered as important and to some extent complementary candidates for XML schema definitions.

02/08 (6.4 of N0113): It is recommended that groups producing XML schemas for E-business should consider parallel specification using at least two of the techniques mentioned in Resolution 02/07, in order to maximize the tools available to developers, and in order to benefit from efficient binary encoding (currently available only in ASN.1).

02/09 (6.4 of N0113): It is recommended that standard setting bodies do not further extend their standards where the area is already covered by one of the above (for example, binary encoding for XML).

02/10 (6.5 of N0113): It is recommended that existing terminology should be made publicly available, and that searchable databases of terms should be provided by the standards bodies.

02/13 (8.3 of N0133): The MoU MG requests research and standardization organizations and administrations, for whom full information dissemination is important in order to produce coherent standards and eliminate contradictions and waste, to establish and maintain a full

and friendly information source on all e-business standards, specifications, and consortia. All major industrial and trading areas in the world should be covered. An existence proof that such a source is feasible and effective exists in the European DIFFUSE project.

03/01 (8.1 of N0166rev1): The meeting elects Howard Mason as Chair from 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2005.

03/03 (5.3 of N0166rev1): The MoU MG encourages the concerned parties to develop a project plan to address harmonization of content. The MoU MG welcomes Core Components Technical Specification (CCTS) version 2.01 and encourage all organizations developing e-business content to harmonize their efforts using that specification.

03/04 (9.1.2 of N0166rev1): The MoU MG encourages the development and publication of a joint OASIS - UN/CEFACT statement on the issues and in particular on their future commitment and direction for ebXML and to develop effective methodology for future cooperation. The MoU MG welcomes the progress made by OASIS and UN/CEFACT and the technical experts in developing the various elements of ebXML. The MoU MG notes the clear commitment of UN/CEFACT to support ebXML as one of the core technologies for implementing their vision for the Business Collaborative Framework. The MoU MG encourages the development of ebXML core components to support multiple implementation techniques. The MoU MG encourages the experts to work on developing complementary process-centric or document-centric approaches to BPSS which retain upward compatibility.

04/02 — Core Components (5.2.3)

MoU/MG confirms its Resolution 03/03 in support of the CCTS (v 2.01) and encourages all organizations developing e-business content to harmonize that content through the UN/CEFACT TBG 17 working group.

04/09 — Freight movement & supply-chain security (6.2)

The MoU/MG strongly recommends its members to inform themselves actively on the requirements of trade security for standardization and standards implementation, and to involve themselves directly in the relevant common activities (e.g. coordination meetings led by UN/ECE), so as to be able to contribute rapidly to this vital area for the whole of society, without duplication.

04/10 — Biometrics (6.4)

The MoU/MG draws the attention of all participating and interested organizations to the number of ongoing work items in a long list of organizations in biometrics. It strongly suggests that all future developments should make maximum possible use of what is already being developed, rather than starting new initiatives. Particular attention should be paid to the information requirements arising from biometrics.

04/11 — ISO/IEC JTC 1 participation in the MoU/MG (6.4)

The MoU/MG is becoming aware that the work represented by its members is impinging more and more on specific work being carried out in ISO/IEC JTC 1 Subcommittees, and vice versa. It therefore requests the ISO/IEC JTC 1 Officers to encourage JTC 1-level participation in the MoU/MG so as to be able to discuss, at least in general terms, the full range of work going on in the Subcommittees. The MoU/MG also intends to invite specific subcommittees as relevant, and would be grateful for the JTC 1 Officers' support in this.

Annex B: Participant List

Gabriel Barta (GB) Secretary	IEC	gb@iec.ch
Karl Best (KB)	OASIS	karl.best@oasis-open.org
Tom Butterly (TB)	UNECE	tom.butterly@unece.org
Jamie Clark (JC)	OASIS	jamie.clark@oasis-open.org
Sophie Clivio (SC)	ISO	clivio@iso.org
David Connelly (DC)	OAGI	dconnelly@openapplications.org
Michael Dill (MD)	ISO TC 154	dill@gefeg.com
Jean-Marie Eloy (JME)	S.W.I.F.T. SCRL	jean-marie.elay@swift.com
Cindy Fuller	ISO TC 68	cindy.fuller@x9.org
Christian Galinski (CG)	ISO TC 37	infopoint@infoterm.org
Marie Martine Guillabert (MMG) martine.guillabert@afnor.fr		ISO TC 46 marie-
Richard Hill (RH)	ITU	richard.hill@itu.int
John Ketchell (JK)	CEN/ISSS	john.ketchell@cenorm.be
Regenald Kramer (RK)	EAN-INTERNATIONAL	Kramer@ean-int.org
Jean Kubler (JK)	UN/ECE	jean.kubler@unece.org
Marc Wilhelm Küster (MK)	SAPHOR	kuester@saphor.net
John Larmouth (JL)	LARMOUTH T&PDS	j.larmouth@salford.ac.uk
Howard Mason (HM) Chairman	ISO TC 184 SC4	howard.mason@baesystems.com
Ted Osinski (TO)	JCT1, UCC, EAN	tosinski@uc-council.org
Sue Probert (SP)	ISO TC 154	sue.probert@dial.pipex.com
Mika Vepsäläinen (MV)	UN/CEFACT	mika.vepsalainen@unece.org
Francois Vuilleumier (FV)	ISO TC 154	fvuille@attglobal.net
Dave Welch (DW)	UN/CEFACT	dmwelch@microsoft.com
Wolfgang Wilkes (WW)	FERNUNIVERSITÄT	wolfgang.wilkes@fernuni-hagen.de