OASIS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

FORMAT OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR INFORMATION

Notes from SC-3 Meeting 02-08-02

Document Control

Document Code	SC3-004
Author(s)	Richard Shorter
Date	29-09-02
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
SC4-xxx	Documents for sub-committee 4 – Accessibility

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. Introduction

These notes were taken by Richard Shorter during the first meeting of what is now SC3 – Terminology and Vocabulary. They were sent to John Chelsom at the end of August and have been made into a document for circulation to the sub-committee members at the end of September.

2. Notes from the Meeting

1. Mike Ward from LUK suggested that we define "vocabulary" as words and "terminology" as phrases.

2. I explained what I think is the problem that we are trying to address and everybody agreed. Unfortunately, I can no longer remember exactly what I said! It was along the lines that different manufacturers use different vocabulary/terminology for the same things, particularly in languages other than English, and different methods of navigation to find the desired information. I notice that you have left navigation out of the scope, and that perhaps it is covered by item 5 of the TC charter, which belongs in WG 4, accessibility. However, we did discuss it and we definitely agreed that it is within the scope of this WG. Navigation and terminology are closely related.

3. There was discussion about a possible solution to the navigation problem. (In fact, we in Ford have investigated this problem in detail previously, have proved this solution is feasible, and did not come up with any alternative to it.) This would involve agreeing on a common "content model" to cover all parts of the vehicle and then mapping each manufacturer's navigation scheme to this common model. SAE J2008 could possibly be used for this (it would not be Ford's first choice for internal use but we could hardly expect other manufacturers to adopt our own scheme).

4. There was discussion about the fact that you cannot map two different content models exactly to each other, it is just impossible. The best you could do with mapping is to go down your generic content model until it gives you the correct entry point to the manufacturer's content model, then navigate down further within that manufacturer-specific content model.

5. The mapping exercise is a lot more work than it appears at first sight and would presumably fall upon each manufacturer to complete.

6. We definitely agreed that the scope of this exercise is restricted to emission related information. That means the information which is needed to repair a vehicle with a specific symptom: "Malfunction Indicator Light (MIL) is on." The aftermarket representatives re-affirmed their desire to eventually extend the standard to cover more (or all) information, but agreed that if we start with an unrestricted scope we will not achieve anything.

7. SAE J1930 is the correct scope (it covers emission related vocabulary and terminology) but is only available in American (English with funny spelling). Now that it has become ISO 15031-2 it should be available in French as well.

Is it? We agreed that, even taking this as a starting point, extending it to all the required languages would be a massive task which is beyond the resources available to this initiative. Perhaps ISO could be persuaded to take it on. Chris Jones (RAC) has agreed to raise this with ISO.

8. We need to agree exactly which languages are required.

9. We discussed a list of constraints:

    1. Even if standard vocabulary and terminology is agreed, and it is made available in all the required languages, and the manufacturers agree to adopt it, it will takes many years to fully implement. This is because none of the manufacturers is willing to go back and re-write documentation for existing models and when we write documentation for new models we often incorporate blocks of text from previous usage.

    2. Therefore, an interim solution is likely to be needed. Two suggestions are:
        1. An automatic translator of vocabulary (and possibly terminology, although that is a little harder) which would reside somewhere in the architecture (WG 2) between the data source and the user.
        2. A data dictionary available to the user.

    3. Content models can only be aligned at the highest levels.

10. It has been suggested in the TC, and I mentioned it again in this WG, that the large amounts of work involved in mapping content models (5 above), defining vocabulary/terminology in all languages (7 above), and creating a universal data dictionary (9.2.2) or automatic translator (9.2.1) overlaps with work that is already being done by the independent publishers. If this project were to be completed successfully, they would be put out of business. On the other hand, it is their business to do the work for us.