

OASIS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

FORMAT OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR INFORMATION

OASIS Automotive – Meeting 25-03-2003

Document Control

Document Code	TC-014
Author(s)	Philip Johnstone, John Chelsom
Date	29-04-2003
Version	Version 1.0

Notes:

This document uses a standard template for the OASIS TC – Format of Automotive Repair Information. By using it, documents can be identified easily and tracked through version control. Documents in other formats and templates may be circulated as part of the work of the TC, but this template should be used where possible to help with general management of our work.

Document Codes are assigned to allow tracking and reference of versions. A list of all coded documents will be maintained by the programme managers. To obtain a new code for your document please email your intended title and document category to autorepair@csw.co.uk

TC-xxx	General TC documents
SC1-xxx	Documents for sub-committee 1 – Use Cases and Requirements
SC2-xxx	Documents for sub-committee 2 – Architecture and Specification
SC3-xxx	Documents for sub-committee 3 – Terminology and Vocabulary

Version numbers should be assigned starting with 1.0 and incremented with each new version circulated by the author(s). A version note should be added for each new version on page 2.

Please put the correct title on the front page and in the header on subsequent pages. The title field can be updated by selecting File|Properties and updating the Title field in the Summary tab. Then update the fields on the front page and header.

Please use heading styles Heading 1, Heading 2, etc for the titles of sections.

The table of contents on page 2 can be updated by right clicking and selecting Update.

Version	Note
1.0	First version

Contents

1. Meeting and Attendance.....3
2. Review of Work Plan to the end of the project3
3. Reports from sessions on 24 April5
4. Demonstrations.....6
5. SC2 - Next Steps6
6. SC3 Next Steps.....7
7. Any Other Business.....8
8. Item 6 - planning for final TC meeting on 28th May8

1. Meeting and Attendance

5th Meeting of the OASIS Technical Committee

London, 25 April 2003

[List of those present to be confirmed by Paul Greening]

Chair: Paul Greening

Chairman - roll call of members

ACEA - present
JAMA - present
CECRA - present
CLEDIPA - present
FIA - not present, RAC representing
Cognitran - not present
Ford - present
EUROTAX - present
VW - present
BMW - present
RAC - present
AIRC - present
CLEPA - present
EGEA - present
Autodata - not present, apologies
Honda - present
Toyota - not present, JAMA representing

2. Review of Work Plan to the end of the project

The Chair announced that Jamie Clarke from OASIS was attending the current meeting. At the last TC meeting on 14th March, Patrick Gannon, President and CEO of OASIS, discussed the option of setting up a members section, which would be the basis of providing funds from dues paid to join OASIS. Chair announced that OASIS had put up extra money for 22 days work by CSW.

There had been some problems with getting TC members to join the members' section. If sufficient members join, there will be more money available for the ongoing work.

Jamie Clarke (OASIS) confirmed that following members had indicated intention to join members' section: ACEA, IRC, Autodata, BMW, CECRA, CLEDIPA, CLEPA, CSW, EGEA, Ford, Honda, JAMA, RAC, VW, also confirmed: Toyota, Eurotax.

It was also announced that FIA should be joining.

John Chelsom confirmed that CSW had signed contract with OASIS for 22 days further work. As a result of this, although the effort had been wound down since last TC meeting, CSW had now brought in additional resources and were confident that they could make up the time lost.

Chair announced that there were 3 TC members who had formed the steering committee of the members' section. Invited discussion as to whether others might join or take over.

Paul Greening announced that the OASIS KAVI database was up and running. TC would try to update it over the next week or so. It provided an online forum for distributing info to TC, and also a voting mechanism.

Existing e-mail list continuing to the end of the project. John Chelsom confirmed that minutes of the last TC should have been received by everyone. Aiming to put all the others in the KAVI database. Comments on minutes invited. Sylvia Gotzen's corrections will be added. Requested that minutes be checked. Draft minutes in KAVI put up as draft, open only to TC, but an administrator at OASIS had changed them to be readable by everybody. This won't happen next time.

Jamie Clarke (OASIS) confirmed that default is that everyone can read everything in KAVI. John Chelsom invited objections to the placing of documents in KAVI database. None. But Sabine Spell (JAMA) requested e-mails to continue. Sylvia Gotzen confirmed that e-mails still required, JC advised that some people may receive same e-mail more than once.

Very few members had received password for KAVI database. OASIS/CSW to check e-mail list and ensure that every TC member has opportunity to sign up for password.

TC-012 and TC-013 discussed. Should be received by members over weekend. First one is plan of work to run to final TC mtg on 28 May. JC summarised what was in each of work streams:

Work on SC1 - 2 deliverables to be continued: (1) use cases based on technical spec. (SC1-D4), starting on Monday, completion by 16 May. Technical spec. also to be finished by then. Then 2 weeks to circulate and consider before final TC meeting.

Metrics and acceptance document (SC1-D3) to be completed by 23 May.

SC2-D6 Test Suite turned into description of implementations and where they can be found on Web.

SC3 - terminology, packaging of Ford lexicon (out of spreadsheet into RDF), consideration of lexicon.

Comment by Chris Jones (CJ): should be a document which describes the 'input mask' (UI). Proposed that in the end there would be a pair of standards: the namespaces/metadata, plus a description of the interface. RAC has a proposal which could be circulated as a draft document. Matching pair of specifications would be created.

John Chelsom (JC) commented that not clear in spec. distinction between metadata for searching and metadata for describing resources, so suggested that input mask idea be covered by making the distinction clear, leaving implementation possibilities open.

CJ: wanted consistency of look and feel.

JC pointed out that interfaces could change over time, specification of 'input mask' could restrict this. Suggested inclusion of the ideas in final outputs, but not agreed as part of standard which would be almost impossible to do in a month.

Richard Shorter (RS) confirmed opinion that difficult to complete and undesirable, because standard should be more generic. Peter Diettrich (PD) said that publishers might not like restriction.

CJ would like e.g. vehicle identification to 'look the same each time'.

JC compared with a travel booking Web portal: no standards, but each looks similar because limited number of fields. Commercial pressures lead to user-friendly interfaces.

Günther Freund (GF) suggested common order of steps and fields. CJ: could TC make separation between vehicle and problem identification explicit in the standard?

JC agreed that this could be done.

CJ: would make a proposal to go in SC2-D5.

JC said it could go into Metrics and Acceptance document (to be discussed later).

3. Reports from sessions on 24 April

John Chelsom reported on development of 4 use cases.

Chris Jones announced that AFCAR meeting this morning had identified 3 other use cases that they were prepared to work on and present to the group. One of them would relate to accident damage which affects emission equipment. Another use case already developed, illustrating the scenario when MIL light on. Chris Jones proposing use case related to roadside repair where resetting of immobiliser required. Query as to whether use cases will be circulated.

John Chelsom proposed that they should be fed into a new deliverable, SC1-D4, with following objectives: to check that the specification can handle the scenarios; and to identify and document any gaps (if no time to fill gaps, appendix to SC2-D5 would specify that known use cases not covered). Also examples would help with general understanding of specification purpose.

John Chelsom presented use case format. Proposed another box: observations made during development of use cases. Proposed a smaller working group to work on use cases.

Dick Klein said use cases should be either actual, or based on where we want to be. JC proposed that scenarios should be based on what *could be possible* given the standard.

Chair mentioned difficulties of anticipating e.g. fuel cell technology etc. CJ felt that future developments where being covered as far as possible. Jan Koolen (l.sikkes@focwa.org), Thomas Chieux (thomas.chieux@wanadoo.fr), Andreas van der Sand (sand@ika.rwth-aachen.de), CJ (cjones@rac.co.uk) proposed for SC group. JC suggested four more. Andrew O'Hare (andy.o'hare@trw.com) volunteered.

Dates suggested: 29 April, 6 May, 13 May, 3pm BST.

RS said that only subset of use cases would be produced which specifically apply only to the data format. All have same actors: technician, customer, information provider.

Dick Klein/Chris Jones discussed issues of security: how to identify bona fide users of systems. Dick Klein mentioned issue of technician who goes home and uses same password. Not yet resolved. Chris Jones pointed out that registration process should be quick, although secure. Need to address issue of signing up for registration. Is it part of the standard?

John Chelsom pointed out that ordering and subscription metadata not yet covered. Will be looking at e.g. UBL.

Peter Diettrich said that his experience was that it should be a manual process. Thomas Chieux said that Peugeot has info on Web site which is potentially available to everyone.

Dick Klein thought that workshops wouldn't register for when they have e.g. a Honda in the workshop if that's only a few times each year. Simple quick registration therefore likely to be a requirement. CJ emphasised that if free registration allowed would help. After-market/manufacturers disagreeing on cost issues. RS: central agency should take responsibility for registration, perhaps same agency as handles the registries.

Chris Jones - most users would belong to trade associations which could assist the registration. ISO work could produce an electronic certificate for trade bodies which would be responsible for producing certificates for workshops.

Suggested that use cases be circulated to all sub-committee members for comment after the weekly working group meetings.

4. Demonstrations

John Chelsom gave the URLs and password for the demonstrations developed by CSW and Ralph Mermagen:

<http://www.autorepair.eu.com/autorepair/home.htm>

<http://oasis.kfzgewerbenet.de/autorepair>

Username: oasis
Password auto4repair

5. SC2 - Next Steps

John Chelsom confirmed that following the review on 24 April of SC2-D5, we need to finish development of namespaces and refine framework. He asked Jamie Clarke to confirm that 3 implementations required to move to an OASIS specification. Jamie Clarke suggested that the implementations demonstrated would be sufficient for OASIS. He also confirmed that we need one more manufacturer to be involved in an implementation.

The plan to do workshops with manufacturers in April was not carried through. John Chelsom asked the TC whether it was feasible to do this during by 28th May. He pointed out that the workshops with manufacturers were meant to resolve the issue of whether the specification would be too costly to implement. This still needs to be addressed.

Richard Shorter pointed out that the committee had not reached agreement on performance levels, which affects costs. John Chelsom proposed that the SC1 working group should confirm what conformance level 1 meant, and should ask manufacturers about complexity. Would this be sufficient to reach agreement? Peter Diettrich said that this should be reviewed at the next SC meeting.

Richard Shorter said it was very ambitious to get cost estimates by end of May.

Jamie Clarke (OASIS) said that there was a question of whether having a computable and complete artifact is separate from the issue of implementation. Are demos just to prove the syntactic completeness of the standard?

Chair said that implementation of results of TC would require assessment of costs for each conformance level. But assessment would have to be after completion of standard.

John Chelsom said that SC2 group should at least come back with an acceptable level 1 conformance.

Peter Diettrich proposed switching SC2 meetings to Tuesday. This was agreed.

6. SC3 Next Steps

RS: since SC3-D1 in November, no meeting. Ford had offered lexicon. Difficulty in persuading ISO to extend J1930 into other languages (other than French and English). J2012 not yet translated into French. No progress on recommendations, other than supply of Ford lexicon.

Ford lexicon only covers Ford Focus, in 23 languages. Hard to make the basis of standard for all manufacturers. Would take a long time to get into all documentation (2005-2015?). Very long-term project. Lot of discussion would be required between manufacturers. Ford willing to modify vocabulary recommendations where reasonable argument put forward. Where could be useful: basis of search terms in registries. So far only distributed in English. RS had brought English-German version.

John Chelsom asked committee what issues to be addressed, if TC to agree that Ford lexicon was basis for metadata.

Chris Jones: reported on ISO developments. People working on 15031 (2) very active group. Every intention of keeping it a live document, covering petrol and diesel, also to cover LPG etc. No intention of expanding beyond emission-related. Chris Jones had discussed Ford lexicon as starting point for this with ISO committee. ISO only obliged to publish in English, French, and Russian. Proposed that non-English speaking nations with automotive industry interest should prepare a translation which ISO could reference (not publish).

Peter Diettrich said there was a problem with ISO delays, also that new technology not announced until after launch, so new vocabulary never included until 2 years or so after launch. Then documentation would have to be re-written.

But supplying Ford lexicon to ISO is a starting point. Peter Diettrich asked whether ISO could be forced to meet timescales. Paul Greening said that the Commission can ask ISO to meet timescales, but difficult to enforce.

John Chelsom said that CSW can package up Ford lexicon as deliverable. Asked about likelihood of independent publishers providing vocabulary. David Wilde (Eurotax International AG) confirmed that he would check whether they could provide this – he expected that they could.

John Chelsom invited comments on Ford lexicon and independent publisher lexicon being part of OASIS standard. None offered.

Jamie Clarke for OASIS said that deciding on how much extensibility will be needed for vocabularies will be required.

Richard Shorter said that a minimum set of languages needs to be specified by the after-market, or by the European Commission. John Chelsom said that the working group must look at this.

--- lunch ---

7. Any Other Business

(Item 6 to be returned to)

Chairman offered the Independent publishers the chance to make a presentation, but this was not taken up.

Chris Jones gave a report on behalf of the interim steering committee for the OASIS members section. Agreed in principle to divert membership funds for payments to CSW. Opportunity for objections. Also discussed IPR issues. OASIS has said that all outputs from contract belong to OASIS. But that was already the case with the TC.

It was understood that outputs belong to OASIS *in order that they may be made open*. That is, it ensures that it is not used by anyone for own profit. Jamie Clarke offered to send letter to confirm that whatever is an OASIS standard/IPR is available to anyone without licence fees.

8. Item 6 - planning for final TC meeting on 28th May

OASIS procedure and timescales. Jamie Clarke to be at next meeting to discuss timescales and procedure.

Chair noted that some people may not be members at a later stage. Jamie Clarke confirmed that OASIS members 'go in and out all the time'.

Richard Shorter asked about the possibility of getting a vote on the standard through on 28 May, given that TC couldn't agree on requirements.

John Chelsom described the procedures in OASIS. There is a TC specification, where a TC has agreed on it. This then goes to full OASIS membership for voting, if it meets certain criteria, it becomes an OASIS standard. When TC voted for requirements, applied the rules for the whole of the OASIS membership. TC could take the view that members vote as individuals of a TC on a specification. Only when full OASIS membership votes on the standard is it the organisation, rather than the individual who votes. Before full membership vote, could have a TC specification that is open and labelled as such. Can then be used, but wouldn't have the stamp of an OASIS standard. It would however be an official specification from a TC.

Jamie Clarke, OASIS, said that in order to get to the point where various industries here can even talk about cost of implementation, need to have a set of assumptions about what is going to be the basis of the implementation. TC might consider extent to which realistic to reach a view on elements and levels, etc., then begin to explore question of what to do and at what cost. TC has already made some progress. Need to figure out what is susceptible to agreement first, then move on to feasibility and cost. Whether it is possible to go beyond that, depends on what can be done in a month.

Rudolf Schuessler (CECRA) - asked what happens next. Paul Greening (chair) explained that after standard developed, then have to decide how to pursue it. Doesn't have to be a political process. Number of ways to do it. Possible to avoid legislation by the manufacturers undertaking voluntary commitment to utilise a methodology. But has to be monitored (e.g. with CO2 commitment). Other way is to refer to it in legislation. Or proceed as with block exemption, even more punitive in case of non-compliance. DG Competition also interested in this.

John Chelsom said that committee could decide on show of hands to make material produced a TC approved specification.

Jamie Clark (OASIS) said that individuals vote because they think it would be a good standard to have, but there is no commitment to implementation.

Richard Shorter said that it is normally mutually beneficial to parties in TC to accept a standard. But this is different because of the issue with EU legislation. Agreeing on the standard 'risks' it becoming part of EU legislation. Should think about that now.

Paul Greening (Chair) said that commission couldn't introduce the standard into legislation without consultation. It's a technical issue. Would have to be voted on by member states. So there is a safety valve there. Manufacturers will talk to their government representatives as they do presently. That is the bridge between the output of this TC and any implementation.

Dolf Lamerigts said that issues of costs and so on would be then part of later process. He asked why vote was necessary.

John Chelsom said that vote was to produce a consensus that 'x' is the output of the TC.

Dolf Lamerigts said that then it shouldn't be a problem, but he hadn't talked with the manufacturers.

John Chelsom asked whether some words could be produced by JAMA etc. to ensure that the specification does not commit anyone to implementation.

Rudlof Schuessler said that at the end we have the papers with or without a vote. Chair confirmed that Commission can make reference to papers regardless of vote, but wanted to respect due process.

Jamie Clarke (OASIS) said that if drafts produced but not approved, conclusion is that TC didn't come to agreement. Outputs are then "the unofficial product of a number of discussions". How likely would it be that such a product would be respected/referenced?

Chris Jones said that TC not volunteering to acceptance of the standard but voting technically to say that TC agreed this is the best way.

Sabine Spell (JAMA) said that she wouldn't be allowed to vote on something which isn't clear or doesn't cover all eventual costs. Japanese companies would see it as binding. She would report back, and HQ would make decision.

Dolf Lamerifts said that it was OK to accept that specification is the outcome of the work.

Paul Greening said that the Commission would have to look very carefully at the cost. Would it be possible to consider a vote from TC at end of Commission's study? Would require a vote after a year.

John Chelsom asked again whether it would it be possible for e.g. JAMA to come up with statement which would have to be inserted on page one in order for them to agree to a specification?

Sabine Spell (JAMA) said that she couldn't give a definite answer, but would have to be pretty comprehensive statement.

Richard Shorter said that the issue of conformance causes the problem. If the final specification didn't have level of conformance against each item in namespace, but instead referred to an annex, then perhaps could that this specification accepted without conformance levels. Then costing against conformance levels possible as separate exercise.

Chris Jones said that they just wanted agreement that specification would be the basis of future discussions .

Discussion between Dick Klein and Chris Jones about approach and costing. Dick Klein said it was like asking an engineer to design a car without costs. Accepting OASIS spec. could work doesn't mean it's viable in commercial world. So how do we make that clear in a vote?

Chris Jones said that TC had tried to find the lowest cost way of meeting objectives.

John Chelsom observed that not possible to say TC believes it to be the lowest cost.

Jamie Clarke (OASIS) said that TC would need to sort out whether they would have anything to say about cost in the next meeting.

John Chelsom said that it had always been understood that cost was outside scope of the specification. What we've tried to do is to come up with technical specification which has sufficient flexibility to allow various costs to be assessed.

Jamie Clarke (OASIS) said that OASIS TC determinations are not binding on members' companies.

Members of the TC observed however, that a public specification might nonetheless be regarded as accepted by the companies behind the individual TC members.

Chair: TC would request the manufacturers to create an opening statement for the published documents.

Richard Shorter asked whether that meant that conformance levels for each item of metadata would remain?

John Chelsom said no, groups would discuss this, but probably will take out the conformance levels against metadata items.

Ideally should have statements acceptable to manufacturers by 16 May. Sabine Spell (JAMA) said that this would be difficult, but would note it. John Chelsom said that otherwise the statement would be circulated separately.

The next TC meeting on 28 May would:

- review the charter, note achievements against goals.
- review document to be produced by Paul Greening for discussion...
- vote on the deliverables.

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held in Brussels. John Chelsom recommended that travel arrangements remain flexible with regard to time of close of meeting.