AD-HOC GROUP 1 (AC.1)
UN/EDIFACT - Research, Strategy and Implementation Planning

Chairman’s Report
**Introduction**

1. The group met during 24-26 June 1996 in Munich, Germany. In addition to the AC.1 membership, two ITT group members and a SC1/SC30 expert on Object Technology were in attendance.

**ITT Related Work**

2. As reported during the last GE.1 meeting, an important part of the top-down approach to establishing a “Business Architecture Framework” is the creation of Business Models at the conceptual layer. The ITT model represents such a Business Model.

3. In order to progress the research effort in this area AC.1 invited two ITT members (Ms. Martine Brewster and Ray Battersby) to assist in the creation of an IDEF0 ITT Model.

4. For two days, AC.1 worked on developing parts of the ITT model in the IDEF0 methodology using the existing work of the ITT group. The exercise proved positive and AC.1 agreed to informally continue (in parallel to the current ITT work) to develop the IDEF version of the ITT model in order to assist in developing a strategy and implementation plan using this technology as part of the overall framework.

**Object Oriented Technology (OOT)**

5. After the ITT discussion, two days were use to progress the work item assigned to TG.1 (see GE.1 report, paragraph 49). As reported, during the March GE.1 meeting, this Task Group was created to review the applicability of OOT in relation to the Business Architecture Framework. Because of the lack of membership nominations, AC.1 agreed to progress this work item as part of its plenary meeting.

6. AC.1 likes to thank Paul Levine (USA) in accepting the invitation to assist AC.1 in its task to review the applicability of OOT.

7. In summary, AC.1 agreed to collect definitions for Object Class or Class, Property, Data Element, Data Element Concept, Data Composite, Object, Activity, Activity Unit, Scenario (Open-EDI scenario), Role, Information Parcel, Dialogue, and Actor in order to form a bases for its future discussion.

8. Further, AC.1 is aware of the SC30/WG1 issue on Open-EDI scenario granularity and hopes to make a contribution in the near future.

9. The current dialog within AC.1 is that an Open-EDI scenario may be one of many implementations that handle the activities associated with a class of business transactions. The revision of ISO/IEC CD 14662 states that Open-EDI Scenarios shall allow for hierarchical decomposition and a modular approach. Therefore, the Business Operational View (BOV) related standards shall provide for the possibility of defining Open-EDI scenarios with different levels of granularity. This implies that each Open-EDI scenario, at whatever level of granularity, will be unique and registered. The mechanism (as defined in the IDEF methodology) of each Activity Unit can be visualized as the Role associated with that Activity Unit. All of the Activity Units associated with a Role within an Open-EDI scenario comprise the business process corresponding to that Role in the Open-EDI scenario. The execution of each Activity Unit corresponding to a Role in an Open-EDI scenario transitions the Role from one state to another. Object Classes can be incorporated within larger Object Classes, as required by the business process. An Object Class is described in terms of its properties, represented as data elements/composites, and operations that can be performed on the Object Class and its data elements/composites. Object Classes will be registered as standards within an EDI repository. In the execution of Activity Units, data elements/composites may be added to operations on Object Classes, or data elements/composites that are part of Object Classes may be nulled out in specified operations.
10. AC.1 continues to support its proposal to use the IDEF modeling methodology. This could be the answer to the question of what is an Open-EDI Description Technique (SC30/WG1’s work item). AC.1 will keep this in mind as it works on a recommendation to GE.1 (which could become a SC30/WG1 contribution).

11. AC.1 agreed to continue the work on a) incorporating the above mention definitions into a SC 30/WG 1 contribution; b) show how these concepts relate to the diagrams of the Open-EDI meta model developed by Trond Johansen; c) work on the Open-EDI meta model using IDEF0 and IDEF1X; d) develop a more general (practical) Business model to learn as much as possible about Object Classes, Activity Units, Roles, Information Parcels, (Open-EDI) scenarios, etc. This would include a state diagram (using IDEF3) for the Roles played over the entire scenario.

GE.1 Related Issues

12. In accordance with the request noted in the GE.1 report (TRADE/WP.4/GE.1/103, paragraph 55), AC.1 agrees that it should be the deciding party to distribute selected AC.1 documents that are viewed as being important to AC.1’s work. (Note: Currently, AC.1 has only two internal documents, its Strategic Work Plan and a “Place Holder” Document which contains its work in progress. AC.1 does not envision the creation of many more documents for distribution sake).

13. Further in accommodation of the request in TRADE/WP.4/GE.1/103 paragraph 55 to open up the AC.1 membership, AC.1 suggests to hold two day meetings at the JRT beginning with the Helsinki meeting. AC.1 plans to present at those meetings an AC.1 issues list that it would like to review with the JRT participants in order to facilitate AC.1’s work. The preferred meeting times would be Wednesday and Thursday.

14. Because of the short notice in regard to the Helsinki JRT, AC.1 will use that meeting as an interim meeting to progress its work on OOT, the ITT Model, and the creation of an issues list. The first official meeting as referenced in the above paragraph would be at the Singapore JRT.

15. In regard to the name of AC.1 (TRADE/WP.4/GE.1/103, paragraph 55) the group resolves that in written communication its name will be referred as “AC.1” and in verbal communication it will be referred as “AC1”. It’s formal name shall be AC.1: “Research, Strategy and Implementation Planning”.

16. In an attempt to progress AC.1 Vision#3 (Create a quality-conscious UN/EDIFACT culture), the group concluded that the tasks to a) define an UN/EDIFACT quality-conscious program; b) develop a leadership development program; c) develop a training program for quality; and d) develop a Public Relations program; were no longer relevant in relation to the overall Re-engineering work undertaken by WP.4.

17. AC.1 concludes that “Quality” is not a bottom-up exercise, but a top-down solution, applicable to all parts of the new Re-engineered Organization.

18. Therefore AC.1 recommends to WP.4 that in the event of the approval of the Re-engineering effort and the establishment of CEFACT, that CEFACT establish, support and coordinate a formal quality management program. In order for CEFACT to implement this program, a full-time quality consultant should be retained and a CEFACT Vice-Chair appointed as the Senior Officer in charge of the program,
Recommendation to GE.1 for approval

19. Recommendation 1: Approve that AC.1 is the deciding party for document distribution (see paragraph 12 above).

20. Recommendation 2: Approve the informative meetings of AC.1 with JRT participants at upcoming JRTs (see paragraph 13 and 14 above),

21. Recommendation 3: Approve the new name of AC.1 as “AC.1 - Research, Strategy and Implementation Planning” (see paragraph 15 above).

22. Recommendation 4: Recommend to WP.4 “That in the event of the approval of the Re-engineering effort and the establishment of CEFACT, that CEFACT establish, support and coordinate a formal quality management program.” In order for CEFACT to implement this program, a full-time quality consultant should be retained and a CEFACT Vice-Chair appointed as the Senior Officer in charge of the program” (see paragraph 16-18).