

OASIS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

FORMAT OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR INFORMATION

OASIS Automotive - Meeting 28-05-03

Document Control

Document Code	TC-017
Author(s)	CSW
Date	13-06-03
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	

Contents

1. Attendees	3
2. Chairman’s introduction	4
3. Roll call of members	4
4. Report on the operation of the Members’ Section.....	4
5. Consideration of the deliverables of the TC.....	4
6. Review of TC Charter	6
7. Recommendations for implementation.....	7
7.1 Presentation by the Chair	7
7.2 Presentation by AFCAR.....	8
8. OASIS procedures and timescales.....	9
9. Vote on the Deliverables	10
10. Next steps	11

1. Attendees

Name	Association and Company	e-mail
Anthoni, Carel	CECRA (Snap-On)	carel.anthoni@snapon.com
Bukholczer, Karel	AIRC	k.bukholczen@focwa.org
Chelsom, John	CSW Group Ltd	john.chelsom@csw.co.uk
Chieux, Thomas	CECRA	thomas.chieux@wanadoo.fr
Clark, Jamie	OASIS	Jamie.clark@oasis-open.org
Coombes, Peter	CECRA (Retail Motor Industry Federation (UK)	p.coombes@blueyonder.co.uk
Diettrich, Peter	ACEA (BMW Group)	peter.diettrich@bmw.de
Dinse, Klaus	CECRA (EGEA)	klaus.dinse@de-bosch.com
Dinsey, Niki	CSW Group Ltd	niki.dinsey@csw.co.uk
Freund, Günther	CLEDIPA (ATR)	freund@t-online.de
Fricker, Achim	ACEA (VW AG)	Achim.fricker@visionunltd.com
Gamerman, Sophie	ETAI	sgamerman@etai.fr
Gotzen, Sylvia	CLEDIPA	sylvia.gotzen@federauto.be
Greening, Paul	European Commission, DG Enterprise	paul.greening@cec.eu.int
Guillaneuf, Claude	CECRA	guillaneuf-cnpa@wanadoo.fr
Havaux, Laurence	CLEDIPA	laurence.havaux@federauto.be
Johnstone, Philip	CSW Group Ltd	philip.johnstone@csw.co.uk
Jones, Chris	RAC (FIA/AIT)	cjones@rac.co.uk
Kieman, Elisabeth	CECRA (ZDK)	kiemann@kfzgewerbe.de
Klein, Dick	JAMA (Honda)	dick.klein@honda-eu.com
Koolen, Jan	AIRC	l.sikkes@focwa.org
Lamerigts, Dolf	ACEA (secretariat)	al@acea.be
Mermagen, Ralph	CECRA (ZDK)	mermagen@kfzgewerbe.de
Mok, Chee Kong	Cognitran (OASIS member)	cmok@cognitran.com
Mons, Bert	EGEA	bert.mons@federauto.be
O'Hare, Andrew	CLEPA (TRW)	andy.o'hare@trw.com
Parlett, Colin	CECRA (Retail Motor Industry Federation (UK)	colinparlett@btopenworld.com
Pradeau, Michel	CLEDIPA (Autodistribution)	m.pradeau@autodistribution.com
Rixon, Malcolm	Independent Publisher Autodata	m.rixon@autodata.ltd.uk
Rosso, Carlo	CECRA	federica.gilli@ucif.it
Sechepine, Jacques	CLEDIPA (AFCAR)	jsechepine@wanadoo.fr
Shorter, Richard	ACEA (Ford Motor Co Ltd)	rshorter@ford.com
Smith, Richard	Facom UK (OASIS member)	rasm@blueyonder.co.uk
Spell, Sabine	JAMA (secretariat)	pa@jama-e.be
Stevens, Didier	JAMA (Toyota)	didier.stevens@toyota-europe.com

Van de Sand, Andreas	CLEDIPA (RWTH Aachen)	sand@ika.rwth-aachen.de
van West, Frank	AIT & FIA	f.vanwest@fiafoundation.com
Ward, Mike	CLEPA	mike.ward@luk-as.de
Wilde, David	Independent Publisher Glass's Guide	david.wilde@glass.co.uk

2. Chairman's introduction

The Chair: Dr Paul Greening, Enterprise DG, European Commission

The Chair welcomed delegates to the sixth meeting of the OASIS Auto Repair Technical Committee. Thanked Sylvia Gotzen/CLEDIPA for hosting the meeting and providing facilities.

3. Roll call of members

The Chair confirmed those members present and entitled to vote. There was a total of 18 such members, listed under 'Vote on the Deliverables' below.

4. Report on the operation of the Members' Section

The agenda item 'OASIS procedures and timescales' was postponed until later in the day to allow for consultations with OASIS in the US by telephone.

There was a brief report on the operation of the Members' Section. Sylvia Gotzen confirmed that the release of funds had been requested, and reported that there had been no further applications for membership.

5. Consideration of the deliverables of the TC

(These notes, and those in subsequent sections, should be read in conjunction with the slides presented at the time, to be distributed to the TC after the meeting).

John Chelsom (CSW) ran through the actions from last TC meeting in London on 25th April. He confirmed that the draft minutes had been distributed and comments received would be reflected in a final version of these minutes to be released on the OASIS web site after this meeting. John Chelsom confirmed that the SC1 WG was formed and conference calls had taken place as planned; the deliverable SC1-D4 had been created and circulated. The work of the SC2 WG had continued and the deliverable SC2-D5 was distributed on 20th May.

A draft of the Technical Specification (SC2-D5 version 0.4) had been distributed on 20th May. Version 0.5 with corrections had now been produced, and limited number of printed copies were distributed among the TC members at the meeting. John Chelsom reviewed the changes that had been made between version 0.4 and 0.5 (slides 5 & 6) noting that the list of meta data items had been thoroughly checked and updated.

Sabine Spell requested change to sentence on p3 (Introduction) regarding the participants. The change was made to lines 75 and 76 (to "... parties active in the automotive industry in Europe..."). This and other changes made during the meeting formed version 0.6 of the document.

John Chelsom then ran through all sections in the specification, inviting comments. Regarding lexicons, John pointed out that in theory the specification allows for any lexicon to be attached. Richard Shorter (Ford) commented that this could give rise to many conflicts between lexicons from other manufacturers.

John Chelsom described how CSW had obtained feedback from the XML and RDF community, and this led to improvements in the way the packages were specified in section 6.

It was confirmed that following the discussion at the last TC meeting, conformance levels were no longer shown against meta data items. The description of conformance levels remained.

Some references in the specification were to be completed (N6, N7 and N8).

Terms in Appendix A from other namespaces such as the Dublin Core and OASIS UBL were pointed out. John Chelsom explained that this is a fairly common practice in making this kind of specification.

Appendix C included a statement from JAMA, provided by Sabine Spell. Other members were given the opportunity to add statements, and this was done during the meeting (see below).

Comments were invited on Appendix E, containing SC3-D1. Richard Shorter and Chris Jones (RAC) discussed the time lags that occur in producing vocabularies. With reference to ISO work in this area, Chris Jones pointed out that national automotive bodies could be invited to make translations of ISO terms which could be referenced on a Web site. This would be a practical solution to the issue of translating a standard vocabulary, although the translations themselves would not be part of the standard.

Chair suggested some changes to point 5 in Appendix, referencing the 'European Commission'.

Jamie Clark (OASIS) suggested that the permanent final location for the TC's material at www.autorepair.eu.com could be at the OASIS site (http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg_abbrev=autorepair). John Chelsom said that the data on this site would be put in a ZIP file and uploaded to the OASIS site.

John Chelsom confirmed that although version 0.4 of the Technical Specification might have looked very different from earlier versions, there was not a substantial amount of material change.

Chris Jones: commented that examples of code were hard to read in the specification (in the printouts made on 28th May, the background colour was darker than in previous printouts).

AIRC and AFCAR statements added to Appendix C. Paul Greening said he thought that the AIRC statement could be reviewed, as the Specification was not meant to be seen in a legislative context. However, AIRC made no additional comment and so their statement remains as drafted.

Slide 7: the proposed deliverable SC1-D3 'Metrics' was discussed. John Chelsom described the document, and pointed out that no further work had been done since it had been distributed in January. He recommended it be left as it is, because it is not a formal specification. The document had been created in a brainstorming session, and hadn't been reviewed to see whether criteria were sensible or not. If it were to be changed to a formal

deliverable, the TC should probably spend more time on it. Richard Shorter also recommended leaving the document as it was. The TC accepted that the document should be left with the reference SC2-006.

Slide 8: the deliverable SC1-D4 'Use Cases' was discussed which had been distributed to TC members on 21st May. Richard Shorter pointed out that the title of Use Case 3 should read 'No MIL light on'. This was amended during the meeting and SC1-D4 was adopted as a deliverable of the TC.

John Chelsom recommended that the AIRC Use Case document should be made into a separate output with its own number. This was accepted by AIRC.

The TC accepted the inclusion of SC3-D1 as an appendix in the Technical Specification (SC2-D5).

6. Review of TC Charter

Document TC-016 (Review of Charter and Achievement) was presented to the TC.

John Chelsom explained that the deliverable SC2-D3 had been dropped for lack of time.

The TC accepted that the part of the scope in point 1 had been addressed.

On point 2 regarding SC2-D1 (Study of distribution media), the decision had been made that the Internet should be the primary distribution medium.

Chris Jones commented that bulky training data might need to be distributed on CD-ROM.

Didier Stevens commented that a distinction between new and existing (older) cars should be made.

John Chelsom agreed with comments from the floor that SC1-D2 said quite a lot more about the distribution media and he amended TC-016 accordingly.

Point 3: John Chelsom proposed that the specification of information structure had been met through the deliverable SC2-D5. There were no objections to this.

Point 4: industry-standard vocabularies. Chris Jones mentioned that the Ford lexicon did not map very readily to some other manufacturers. He proposed that as he would be making some recommendations to ISO to develop ISO 15031-2 further, he would recommend the OASIS Ford lexicon as a starting point. If anyone else wanted to submit something they should contact Sylvia Gotzen. Alternatively, each car manufacturer may make their recommendations directly to the convenor of ISO committee ISO TC22/SC3/WG1, Dr Wolfgang Bremer. Chris Jones further commented that he thought all agreed that ISO 15031-2 was suitable as far as it goes, and wanted to take it further. [ISO 15031-2: Road Vehicles - Communication between vehicle and external equipment for emissions-related diagnostics: Terms, Definitions, Abbreviations and Acronyms]

Point 5: John Chelsom said TC deliberately had not addressed features that should be in systems. Richard Shorter commented that the TC had not addressed pass-through programming. John Chelsom pointed out that the Specification allowed for the specification of a plug-in [a web browser software tool potentially available to users]. Chris Jones said there was a need to include access to information in manufacturers' tools. He envisaged that ACEA would meet with manufacturers to review information provision (technical access) on

a regular basis. Some information can only be obtained through the tools and not all can be put on a web site. AFCAR asked that manufacturers liaise with a group of tool manufacturers. Richard Shorter said it would be better to co-ordinate discussions at association level rather than with each and every tool manufacturer.

Point 6: John Chelsom accepted that the expectations from this part of the charter had not been met to the extent that had been first envisaged (i.e. hardware and operating systems are not specified). Chris Jones said they did want to establish some performance criteria (compare point 7).

Point 8: this related to a discussion to be had when dealing with next steps.

Point 9: two reference implementations had been completed. John Chelsom said that the source for the implementation shown at www.autorepair.eu.com can be made available.

7. Recommendations for implementation

7.1 Presentation by the Chair

The Chair said that he had met the ISO convenor Dr Wolfgang Bremer and talked about taking work forward. On behalf of the Commission, the Chair would be writing to him to request initiation of work in the ISO committee regarding the outputs of this TC. A short presentation will be made at the Motor Vehicle Emissions Group (MVEG) on 24 June so that experts from the Member States are aware of progress. The Chair would advise them to be ready to act on this work item in further discussions between the Commission and stakeholders in considering an appropriate proposal. The Chair added that in the short-term, the output of this OASIS TC would enable the finalisation of an interim report to the Council and European Parliament. A road map for future actions is at least possible to maintain impetus in this subject area. For the Commission services, DG Enterprise is chef de file but DG Competition is also interested in this subject area relating to their responsibility for the Block Exemption Regulation. The Commission will attempt to assign costs and effects to policy options reflecting possible implementation of the results of this TC. There would be consultations with all stakeholders in due course.

The implementation options were discussed (slides 4 to 6).

The Chair said that stakeholders should be prepared to start work in Brussels again, probably late 2003-early 2004.

Slide 7 presented some open questions for the European Commission to address.

One of the open questions is how long a period should be allowed before information must be made available. The Chair's slides are distributed with these minutes.

Dolf Lemerigts and Chris Jones discussed how the provision of repair information could be part of the type-approval scheme. Chris Jones suggested that it could be included in the type-approval scheme but the penalty for non-access to information within a reasonable period of time could be eventual withdrawal of type-approval.. He emphasised again that they want to see dialog between car and tool manufacturers.

7.2 Presentation by AFCAR

(Refer to slides.)

AFCAR presented an example of the practical use of OASIS standards. The presentation was made by Thomas Chieux, Günther Freund, and Ralph Mermagen.

It was explained that this was not an attempt to prescribe procedures, but an attempt to imagine how a system could be realised, based on the outputs from this OASIS TC.

AFCAR proposed verification of the proposed OASIS standard in a pilot-test, prior to publishing an improved standard on 31/8/03. This to be followed by project realisation by each manufacturer. AFCAR wants to take forward the OASIS project as an ISO standard. In the future, there should be access to manufacturers' web sites, either directly or via server (portal).

AFCAR considered conformance level 2 to be a minimum. Richard Shorter asked what was meant by this as it was not specified. This would be for discussion between manufacturers and AFCAR. Chris Jones said that an ISO standard would probably apply to new cars only (initially).

Prototyping was suggested. The phases would be:

- Build System conforming to the OASIS standards (program, database, meta data)
- Create data (using existing model)
- Realise "parallel route" on website.

Richard Shorter asked whether AFCAR were saying that manufacturers would have to reorganise their web sites.

Dick Klein invited members to investigate what manufacturers already have.

AFCAR wanted to learn from the users of the pilot, then go into production. . AFCAR thought that the implementation cost would be about €200,000, a figure which Peter Diettrich (BMW) and other manufacturers thought would be rather higher (i.e. €millions).

Richard Shorter said that the issue was about creating new meta data references to existing information packages. His estimate for just this was some €1,000,000. He asked whether it was expected that all independent repair shops would want to do all repairs regardless of cost. Chris Jones said that the bigger groups would be very keen to maintain their reputations.

Chris Jones said they wanted new tools should conform to OASIS standard.

Günther Freund admitted that his presentation was provocative. He wanted to know what impediments there were stopping manufacturers from realising the type of system so described.

Peter Diettrich suggested that maybe there should be another investigation by a third party (independent cost estimate by e.g. university), then one manufacturer should try to implement it. He accepted the process, but not the cost estimate. Thomas Chieux suggested that automatic classification systems should be looked at.

Chris Jones said they wanted an agreement on future actions to maintain the impetus.

8. OASIS procedures and timescales

The Chair returned to agenda item 3, after OASIS had been consulted regarding eligibility for voting. It was confirmed that 18 members (excluding the Chair and CSW) were eligible to vote in the TC. The Chair reported on a discussion with Patrick Gannon of OASIS whose opinion was that the output from this TC vote should be carried forward as an OASIS Technical Specification. Mr Gannon confirmed there should be no difficulty in releasing the Technical Specification to ISO for them to take it forward eventually as an ISO standard. The Chair noted that this depended on whether there was a successful vote at this meeting. If there was a negative vote, there was no obstacle to another TC being formed within the Members Section which could pick-up the existing technical specification and keep the work active. Jamie Clark said he agreed with what the Chair had said. He considered that the Technical Specification embodied a number of technologies which OASIS were keen on and, regardless of what happens in the TC, a number of people in OASIS could well pick up what has been done. It may well be the case that OASIS members may want to move forward the investigation of the technical implementation issues. So likely to hear from technologists, and perhaps other auto industry sectors (e.g., supply chain management of auto parts not relevant to emissions, and in regions other than EU) who will want to pick up this work. The Chair asked Jamie Clark what would happen if the TC elevated the specification to a Committee Specification. Jamie Clark said it would be sent off to the broader OASIS community, along with certain required certifications, and there would be a 30-day public comment process for feedback to be received. Thereafter, any appropriate modifications would be made and the specification would be submitted for a general OASIS membership vote.

Sylvia Gotzen asked what the implications were if the vote were negative. Jamie Clark said if anything was taken to ISO its history would be considered. So it is always helpful for a specification to be completed and accepted before proposing it as an ISO work item. But if this TC voted to stop at this stage, there was always a possibility of continuing the work by other OASIS members.

Chris Jones said that the timescale of existing OASIS memberships was perhaps against the committee. If it was able to publish a technical specification today then there was scarcely time for members to adopt comments within 30 days. Jamie Clark said he expected there to be OASIS members who would be able to continue with the work regardless, in this or a future committee. Chris Jones said that many saw their membership of OASIS expiring now, but he would like to know who intended to stay on and whether they were prepared to continue the work. Jamie Clark confirmed that if the present TC wanted to conclude its work today, it could vote to disband, with the result that the present TC would not take further actions with an unbalanced continuing membership. However, this would not prevent others from using the outputs of the committee as inputs for their work in another TC.

There was a 10 minute adjournment for discussions among the members.

The Chair then invited any further comments on procedures and timescales, before proceeding to the vote.

9. Vote on the Deliverables

The Chair clarified that members were voting as a Technical Committee. The Chair confirmed that the 18 voting members identified would only be voting on document SC2-D5, purely for approval as an office committee specification, and were not voting on any issues relating to implementation. Jamie Clark clarified that, if the document were approved as a committee specification, the TC could choose (by simple majority vote) separately to submit the document for approval as an organisation-level OASIS Open Standard.

The vote by members was taken as follows:

BMW – no
VW – no
CLEDIRA – yes RAC - yes
CECRA - yes
Honda - no
AIRC - yes
ACEA - no
EGEA - yes
Cognitran - no
CLEPA - abstain
Autodata - no
Ford - no
Facom - yes
JAMA - no
Toyota - no
AITFIA - yes
Eurotax - no

[Summary of the votes counted:

Yes - 7
No - 10
Abstaining - 1]

Under the OASIS rules of procedure, more than 25% of those members eligible to vote recorded a 'no' vote (10 out of 18) and, accordingly, a 'no' vote was recorded by the TC, and SC2-D5 was not adopted as an official committee specification.

Jamie Clark pointed out that it was possible to vote SC2-D5 other than to make it a committee specification: this would just require a simple majority.

The Chair asked the TC whether anyone wanted a vote on document as an output of the technical committee.

Since there was no positive reply to this proposal, no other votes were taken.

10. Next steps

The Chair said that use of the TC outputs remained a policy option (for the Commission) and invited inputs on costs and effects. The Chair confirmed that a new TC could be formed within the OASIS framework to take forward the work. The European Commission is going to move to take the lexicon to ISO, and will consider if it is appropriate to take the output of this TC to ISO.

The Chair concluded that the TC would therefore be disbanded.

There would be some tidying-up of deliverables and this would be arranged between TC members and CSW. The Chair recommended this be done over next couple of weeks. The Chair invited the floor for final statements/comments.

To confirm, the Chair therefore asked whether everyone agreed that the Technical Committee should be wound up at conclusion of meeting today. No objections were raised and so the TC is disbanded

A discussion between Jamie Clark and Sylvia Gotzen confirmed that this meant the TC had finished its work other than the tidying-up of documents.

John Chelsom summarised the remaining work. The minutes of today's meeting would be released by June 16th. A first draft would be released by the beginning of next week. Also to be released: corrections to minutes of last meeting; final versions of SC2-D5 and SC1-D4; the AIRC Use Case to be issued as SC1-019.

The Chair confirmed, on a request from the floor, as follows: a vote had determined that SC2-D5 was not accepted as a technical specification, and it remained just an output from the working group. Final revisions were to be made in the period up to 16th June.

Didier Stevens asked about the possibility of a new TC being formed. What was the value of the document now it had been rejected? Jamie Clark said that this community and the Commission would now move the issue forward into a political forum. Also some of the issues developed may be relevant to a broader audience. So, if three OASIS members agree to start a process [a new TC], it could be done. He said that any new project was more likely to be relevant to people developing tools than to be focused on legislative or regulatory outcomes. But it is an open system, so that will depend on the persons who elect to participate.

In bringing the meeting to a close, the Chair thanked CSW, in particular John Chelsom, for their efforts, and congratulated members for their work and active participations. Members would be notified of the next steps by the Commission services.