

Code Management Project

Minutes

06-JUL-2017

CET 14.00-15.30

Attendees:

Gerhard Heemskerk, (GH), Akio Suzuki(AS), Ken Holman (KH), Gait Boxman (GB), Lance Thompson (LT), Anders Grangard (AG), Mary Kay Blantz (MK). Sue Probert (SP), Jostein Frømyr (JF), Hidekazu Enjo (HE)

Regrets:

Rolf Wessel (RW), Frans van Diepen (FD), Niki Dieckmann (ND), Eric Cohen (EC), Hisanao Sugamata (HS), Andreas Pelekies(AP), Jorg Walter (JW), Michel Bormans (MB),

Discussion items	Short description of discussion
Definitions decoupled	Provide one for technical and business people.
Coupled or decoupled or both	Only decoupled seems to be the best for users.
NDR 2.1/CCTS/etc	Check which tech rules prevent decoupling now.
Supplementary component URI	We must point to a code list location from the SC.
Publication format code lists	The basis for deriving other formats (XML, etc)
Guidance material	Use/refer to existing material as much as possible

Agenda:

- **Specifications: discuss specs for decoupling**
 1. The definition of 'decoupling of code lists modules' (to be checked):
"The separation of code lists from UN/CEFACT message syntax constructs which can be achieved by non-technical separation (trade partner agreement) or technical separation (semantics from syntax) in order to allow two step code validation process".
 2. An explanation for Business people must be written (to be checked):
"Enhanced interoperability and flexibility regarding code list management can be achieved by a data model which puts code lists independently of any validation mechanism. From this data model different syntaxes including needed code lists (such as XML) can be produced. A standard format for code lists is the basis of this data model."
 3. Discussion on UN/XML: publish both coupled and decoupled versions of messages?. Semantically these versions are equal; though a decoupled version does not force users to validate against published codes lists. AG wants only decoupled version, in order to keep it simple. GH explains that a decoupled version will introduce a twostep validation mechanism for any user of future messages. May be they want to decide themselves.
 4. The NDR rules should be checked and updated if necessary to support default decoupled code list modules. First focus should be therefore on the Qualified Data Type sections (JF).
 5. The NDR Rules which block decoupling now should be identified. Also other technical specifications, such as CCTS must be taken into account.

6. In the CCL the supplementary components associated with code lists, in addition to agency ID, ID, name and version, we should look at the use of the uniform resource identifier (URI).
 7. Using a generic publication format of code lists (such as genericode) and the use of supplementary components we can separate semantics from syntax in a proper way. The CCL refers using the URI to the associated code lists file. Even in the case of a union of code lists we could refer to a file holding a union of code lists.
 8. The use of standard code lists and recommendations published by UN/CEFACT will not suffer when applying technical or non-technical decoupling. The code lists will still be published together in the publication set of message(s). For the EDIFACT standard, the possible codes behind each data element will still be published. This applies also for UN/XML; the code lists behind a basic business information entity (BBIE, XML element) will still be published. The use of the code lists and validation is done in any second validation step, organized by the user.
- **Guidance material : discuss template of user guidance**
 1. GH added some content for discussion to the template sent in advance of the meeting, GH suggests that the issues of extending, restricting and temporary codes have lots of similarity. Perhaps they can be joined to one chapter. We will refer as much as possible to specifications already made. More attention should be given to the examples of validation mechanism in the Annex of the guidance. If possible, the guidance should be clear and short.
 - **Supporting Lead Editor: allocate work (volunteers needed)**
 1. Technical Specifications: GH will make a list of these rules, with the help of MK and SP. JF (from medio sept) and GB will review. Probably HS can help as well.

AOB

SP: There must be some clarity of the exact deliverables of this project.

AG: Referring to the project proposal: the deliverables from the project will be:

- a) A Technical Specification which describes how to manage codes and code lists.
- b) Updates to existing Technical Specifications, if rules and/or guidelines in the new Technical Specification proposed in point a) contradicts existing rules/guidelines

Next Call:

20-JUL-2017 CET 14.00-15.30