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1. Introduction
This document contains feedback on the document SC1-D2 received from 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2003 onwards. At that date version 6 was completed and that will remain as the final version of the document.

Subsequently, the SC1-D2 was circulated to voting organisations on the Technical Committee for formal comment and an indication of voting intention. It was decided at the Technical Committee meeting on 14\textsuperscript{th} March 2003 not to proceed with the Technical Committee vote on the document, but to keep it as a working document approved by the members of the SC1 sub-committee.

This document (SC1-018) acts as a single source of comments and feedback on version 6 of SC1-D2, including the comments received as part of the indication of voting intentions. There is no significance to the order in which the comments are presented in this document.

2. Comments from AFCAR
Reproduced below is the text of a letter from Sylvia Gotzen to Paul Greening, dated 6\textsuperscript{th} March 2003.

Dr Paul Greening  
European Commission  
DG Entreprise  
Rue d’Arlon 88  
02/49  
BE – 1040 Brussels  

Brussels, March 6\textsuperscript{th}, 2003

Subject: SC1-D2 version 6.1: AFCAR’s request for points to be taken into consideration

Dear Dr. Greening,

AFCAR would like to kindly request the following points being considered during the course of the ongoing debate and work of the OASIS project:

2.2 Information Formats

2.2.7 – Metadata

Although point 2.2.7 does not give - at this stage - any indication on who should from a practical point of view provide the metadata, it should be made clear that from a technical point of view, only vehicle manufacturers can produce these metadata.
Therefore, AFCAR emphasises the need for a clarification in the sense that vehicle manufacturers are still responsible to provide the metadata, even if they chose to sub-contract the task. The access to the meta-data should be free.

3.2. Information Search Criteria

3.2.2. Symptoms

The possibility of an information search by symptoms is of outstanding importance for independent repairers. Therefore, the search by “Symptoms” should be classified as “Essential” and not only as “Important”. According to the proviso in Point 1 “General Statements”, vehicle makers must offer the search by symptoms only if they provide this facility to their own dealers. This should be considered as a sufficient safeguard to the remarks made by Ford at the instigation of which the point was changed from “Essential” to “Important”.

2.4. Frequency of Access and Production

During the last SC1 meeting, the point was made that independent training institutes need the relevant training material from vehicle manufacturers ahead of the launch of a new vehicle model in order to be able to prepare the courses. This fact was commonly acknowledged during the discussion, conditioned however by the obligation to confidentiality. Therefore, AFCAR would like to see point 2.4.3. accepted accordingly:

2.4.3. Manufacturers are required to make training material available to consumers at the time it is made available to franchised workshops or earlier subject to agreement of confidentiality.

We would appreciate it if these comments would find further consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Gotzen
AFCAR co-ordination secretariat

3. Comments From JAMA

Reproduced below is the text of a letter from JAMA to Paul Greening, dated 5th March 2003.

March 5, 2003

European Commission
Dr. Paul Greening

Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Information Prior to Voting on SC1-D2 Reference Material

Vote: Opposition

We very much regret casting our vote against the SC1-D2 reference materials this time; however, as it forces us automobile companies to restructure our data, we have no choice and plan to cast an opposing vote.

Reason for opposition:
In 1.5 of the General Statements, there is a clause that states “We will not require alterations in the internal systems of automobile companies. However, the automobile companies will be required to follow the OASIS technical regulations and alter their interfaces”. Unless the method of using Information types stipulated in 3.2 is clearly defined, questions remain about its validity.

This was pointed out as a reason for opposing the previous Information Search Criteria (3.2).

As we feared, in SC2, the use of Information types for the RDF namespace is being considered.

With the regulations currently under consideration, if we had to use the Information types in RDF, the automobile companies would have to restructure our information, as we pointed out previously. Also, clause 1.5 may become substantially ineffective.

This is the reason we also opposed it previously; however, as the content of each definition in the SC1-D2 document is unclear, it is possible to interpret them in various ways, and depending on the interpretation, each company’s current system and data would be greatly affected.

For example, if the vehicle identification item defined in 3.1 were to be used to specify maintenance information, it would be necessary to restructure each company’s information at this level. Also, they are completely different scenarios whether this Vehicle Identification is to be handled as vehicle information, or to be used to specify individual pieces of information.

1) When handled as vehicle information: a basic description is in the spec table. It would be helpful if new information, such as the country of manufacture, were in the spec table.

2) When used to specify information: as items for specifying information differ for parts and maintenance information, these items are not sufficient. Specifying the color for parts information would become an absolute item. For maintenance information, the maintenance method would differ according to whether it was with SRS or without SRS => It is necessary to know if the SRS is equipped or not.

Also, if a symptom were used in the namespace of the RDF, and if each symptom did not have independent information data associated with it, it would make it necessary to recreate the data.

What would be used in the namespace to specify information would have a significant influence on the data structure of each company. Since substantial influences increase
costs to each automobile company, as well as the costs to maintenance providers, this needs to be fully considered.

With the SC1-D2 regulations, SC2 has started the task of making the technical specs, however, judging from the content of it, unless the regulations in SC1-D2 are clarified, it is inevitable that there will be a raging debate about the interpretation of SC1-D2.