

OASIS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

FORMAT OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR INFORMATION

Voting and Feedback on SC1-D2

Document Control

Document Code	SC1-014
Author(s)	John Chelson
Date	08-01-2003
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@cs.w.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.....3

1. Introduction

This document summarises the voting on SC1-D2 Autorepair Requirements Specification, made in December 2003. The vote did not receive sufficient support for the document to be adopted as a deliverable from the Technical Committee and will be reviewed during January 2003, with a view to re-voting later as soon as the issues raised in the voting process have been resolved to the satisfaction of the SC1 sub-committee.

2. Voting on Acceptance of SC1-D2

The voting on SC1-D2 by the 17 voting members of the Technical Committee was as follows:

YES (total 11)

AIRC
 AIT/FIA,
 Autodata
 Cognitran
 CECRA
 CLEDIPA
 CLEPA
 EGEA,
 EurotaxGlass's
 RAC
 VW

NO (total 6)

ACEA
 BMW
 Ford
 Honda
 JAMA
 Toyota

To be accepted, the document must receive a minimum of 2/3 of voting members in favour for adoption and no more than 1/4 of voting members against.

3. Comments from Ford

These comments were submitted by Richard Shorter on 18-12-2002.

Section	Requested Change	Reason for Change
1.5	Add new statement: Manufacturers will not be required to change their internal systems or the way they provide information to their franchised dealers / authorised workshops	This concept has been mentioned many times in discussion but has not been included in the requirements document. The manufacturers compete with each other. This competition is not restricted to product specification, design, pricing, and cost of ownership. We also compete on image, the sales experience and the whole ownership experience. Each manufacturer must be free to design his own internal

Section	Requested Change	Reason for Change
		systems and the way in which he supports his authorised workshops to optimise his competitive position.
2.1.5	This requirement could be deleted, but we are not going to insist on deleting it.	This is not a requirement it is a statement. It is a duplicate of 1.2.
2.2.7	Reword so that it is clear that this refers to meta data which is outside of the manufacturers' systems and not to data supplied by the manufacturers.	Whilst the provision of a mechanism to allow information to be referenced from outside Ford systems may be possible to build, we would need to offer indemnities and guaranty that this information would be valid which is hard as we understand that it would be outside our direct control. For Ford eTIS online data it could change many times in a single day. We would have to publish this metadata at the same time and ensure that wherever this data was used, it also was updateable.
2.3.4	Change "remote diagnostics" to "Remote diagnostics, provided this is part of the normal diagnostic process and is available to all franchised dealers."	We note that this requirement is Important, not Essential. Ford and Volvo do not currently provide remote diagnostics. However, we see this as a possible future technology for hard-to-fix and potential buy-back situations. It would not be appropriate to offer this facility to independents.
2.4.1	Change "Information must be available" to "Information provided through the internet must be available"	Training information provided on CD or DVD will not be available instantly or 24/7.
2.5.2	Add text: "When the manufacturer only holds the information in hard copy format or (for example) a large PDF file, it may be reasonable to only provide the whole document."	3.3.5 requires "All information which is contained in the repair manual". For older vehicles (which may be of particular interest to independents) the repair manual may exist only as a hard copy that has been scanned into a single file.
2.5.3	Change "must enable a user to gain information immediately" to "must enable a user who is already a registered subscriber to gain information immediately"	If pay-per-view is used, it is not practicable for manufacturers to authenticate casual users (see requirement 2.5.4) and collect payment by credit card for each small transaction. This change probably makes Note N4 unnecessary.
3.1.2	Change "request for information from the vehicle ECU" to "request for information from the vehicle ECUs"	More than one ECU may be involved.
3.2.2	None	We note that this requirement is Important, not Essential. Ford, Volvo, Jaguar and Land Rover are unable to support this requirement.
3.3.1 and 3.5.7	None	We note that these requirements are Nice to have, not Essential. Ford and Volvo do not intend to provide re-call information to independents. Ford and Volvo do not intend to reimburse independents for carrying out re-call work. We advise that the information is worthless unless the user also has access to a database giving vehicle histories, which we also do not intend to provide.

Section	Requested Change	Reason for Change
3.3.4	None	We note that this requirement is Important, not Essential. Volvo are unable to support this requirement.
3.3.5	Change “which has traditionally been” to “which is”	Too vague. How far back do you have to go to find a “traditional” repair manual?
3.4.1	Delete “and problem identification”.	See 3.2.2. We are unable to index our information by symptom. We have tried. While this was possible on simple systems years ago, modern, complex electronic systems have too many possible faults in relation to the number of discernable symptoms.
3.5.2	Delete “E” from the whole requirement. Split priority by adding the following text and priorities at the end: Information supplied through internet to all consumers – I Guided diagnostics provided through manufacturers’ own tools – E Guided diagnostics provided through a tool manufacturer (see also requirement 2.2.6) - E	This is one of the most fundamental requirements in the whole document. It is important that we all have the <i>same</i> understanding about what is being agreed.
3.6	Leave 3.6.1 as “E”, change 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.4, 3.6.5, 3.6.6 to “D” or delete “reasonable distance” from 3.6.5	Ford provides training courses in Daventry (English) and Koln (German). National Sales Company representatives attend these and design and implement their own training programs, in their own language, locally. There is no central record of what training is offered locally. Usually the content will be less, but it may be more to cater for local needs. Volvo provide central training in Gothenburg (English).
3.7.6 and 3.8.6	Add: “Instructions for use and precautions” as “I”	We would not supply these tools without warnings about when and how they should be used.

4. Comments from JAMA

These comments were submitted by JAMA on 16-12-2002.

1. The document SC-D2 has too many key points, including even items not currently released to affiliated dealers.
For example, key points 3.7 and 3.8 are not provided as information to the dealer system. A system should be established for independent maintenance companies.
2. Although demand is presently greater than the range of information provided to dealers, the condition and utilization cases of the data of each company have not been sufficiently investigated.
Moreover, since individual content definitions within the document SC1-D2 are unclear, they are open to interpretation, and this interpretation has a major impact on the current systems and data of each company.

For example, if the vehicle identification items defined in 3.1 are used to specify maintenance information, the information of each company must be reconstructed at this level. To do this, each car company is compelled to spend heavily on maintenance companies, which inevitably leads to heavy utilization expenditure.

3. Although unforeseen information search criteria appear, they are not concretely defined. For example, if symptoms are assigned top priority on the search route, the data structure of car companies must be reconstructed so that symptoms have priority.

Furthermore, it is necessary to recreate data whose symptoms do not have a separate key.

Search criteria have an extremely large impact on the data structure of each company, and since a broad impact increases not only car company expenditure burdens but also those of the maintenance companies, careful and adequate investigation should be undertaken. It must be said that investigation is insufficient.

4. The definition of the information format is ambiguous.

ASCII is the code system, HTML is the viewer language, and PDF is the printed document exchange format. However, XML alone has a structured style (in defined format). The meaning of this is a great mystery. At a guess, ultimately it can be assumed that it means, "it must be provided as an XML structured style".

Furthermore, if the use of both structured documents and unstructured documents is possible, since the majority of car companies are thought to use unstructured documents, it is meaningless even if XML is made a structured document.

Concerning structured documents, their usefulness and referencing properties are markedly superior to those of unstructured documents in their utilization. However, since structured documents are very expensive to prepare, when the interests of the person preparing a structured document differ from those of the user, agreement cannot be reached with a structured document.

Furthermore, if XML is defined as a structured document, since XML cannot be used unless it is a structured document (in defined format), XML itself becomes unused.

XML should not accept structured documents. It should be changed into XML in undefined format (XML without DTD).

5. As in CGM and others, it contains a graphics data format that cannot be displayed by an internet browser, which acts as the present signal distribution medium. We cannot understand why this format has been made a key point.

The style used in SC1-D2 is not that of a technical key points document. When SC2 is made the technical specification by the SC1-D2 document, in interpreting the SC1-D2 text, the argument inevitably gets complicated, and we expect that the considered scope of SC1-D2 will be limited to that of guidelines.

Furthermore, although we think that the aim of the OASIS Project is to investigate the method of providing information to general maintenance companies, we think that a

large number of key points concerning the supply of data from car companies to maintenance information distribution companies targeting general maintenance companies appear to be included in the key points of SC1-D2 (for example, Information Format).

We sincerely hope that the key points of SC1-D2 will be restricted to the provision of emission information from car companies to general maintenance companies.