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ECIMF Scope

Scope:
- Interoperability of different e-commerce frameworks
- Integration of internal business processes with external e-commerce interfaces

Methodology:
- Semantic mapping of corresponding concepts
- Process mediation between differing business process definitions
- Syntax mapping between differing message formats and transport protocols

Primary goal:
- e-commerce partners interoperability
ebXML, RN & OAG: scope

Current ebXML scope:
- no usable common Business Document definitions
- no usable common dictionary (CC)
- Well-specified BPSS, CPP/CPA and TRP
- Primary goal: **e-commerce partners interoperability**

Current RN scope:
- No Reg/Rep, discovery, CPP/CPA
- Continuing alignment with ebXML
- Well-specified BP, TRP, business messages
- Primary goal: **e-commerce partners interoperability**

Current OAG scope:
- TRP not in scope
- Well-specified business messages
- BP definitions: ? (loosely defined scenarios ????)
- Primary goal: **e-commerce applications interoperability**
RosettaNet & OAG

Common approach:
- Development of unified dictionary, message and business process definitions
- **Integration / interoperability achieved by partners’ full conformance to the common model**

Prerequisites:
- Integration of internal processes & applications to conform to the common interface (using unspecified means…)
- All parties MUST conform to the common framework in their external interfaces

Areas of concern:
- How to integrate internal processes to the required external interface?
RN & OAG: Conclusions

- RosettaNet and OAG bring a wealth of industry-specific, concrete and common models and scenarios
- ECIMF addresses topics that are prerequisites to integration of RN or OAGIS interfaces with internal processes and applications

CONCLUSION:
- Both RNIF and OAGIS should be considered as important reference frameworks to check the ECIMF concept
- Significant reuse of industry-specific models and scenarios will help ECIMF
- ECIMF can help businesses to integrate RN or OAG specifications with their internal applications/processes
ECIMF and ebXML

- Focus on Business Process Modeling and top-down approach
  - Formal methodology to model e-business interactions from BP to Message to Protocol levels
- Interoperability between differing specifications
  - Formal specification for achieving interoperability in case of different interfaces/preferences
    - ebXML: CPP/CPA
    - ECIMF: MANIFEST
  - Layered approach to interoperability
ebXML CPP: CPA formation

- **Prerequisites:**
  - Use of common semantics, BP model and syntax (based on e.g. ebBPSS)
  - Use of common business document formats (implied)

- **Areas of concern:**
  - How the “match” is defined and established?
    - ebCCP p. 85 describes only very simple example, where the BP specs don’t differ
  - How to “match” BPs based on different standards (e.g. RosettaNet PIP and OAG BOD)? (different semantics, models and interactions)
  - How to express message format transformations, if needed?
Interoperability: ECIMF approach

- Meta-framework for defining the transformation rules between similar Business Processes, but expressed using different frameworks
- Uses semantic alignment, process mediation and syntax mapping to ensure interoperability even between different frameworks
- Applicable also to integration of internal processes to external interfaces (which is a special case of differing frameworks)
- Areas of concern:
  - Complex – needs good tools to simplify the task for end-users
  - Partially overlaps with other approaches
  - Needs coordination with widely recognized methodologies, most of all with UMM
Interoperability: ECIMF vs. CPP/CPA approach

ebXML CPP/CPA
- Uses fixed (common) semantics
- Uses common BP specification for both parties
- Assumes that parties are able to (somehow) interface internal processes to the common BP
- Allows for negotiation of interoperability on the Role level (choosing from a list), and transport/packaging level (part of ECIMF Syntax level).

ECIMF
- Aligns the semantics of different frameworks
- Uses mediation between different BP specifications
- Can be applied to integrate internal processes with external interfaces
- Specifies transformations of different message formats, packaging and protocols
ECIMF and ebXML: conclusions

- Currently CPA addresses only simple cases of common models and semantics
  - It doesn’t specify formal process/approach to form CPA in case of differing semantics and process definition
  - It doesn’t specify more complex transformations between incompatible message formats and data elements
  - It doesn’t address the issue of interfacing internal processes to common external BP specifications
- ECIMF will address these issues by semantic mapping, process mediation and syntax mapping
- ECIMF could use extended CPP/CPA and BPSS to express the transformation rules

**CONCLUSION**: Alignment and close cooperation between ECIMF and ebXML (CPP/CPA & BP work) is very desirable and should benefit both projects.
Alignment of ECIMF with UMM

More and more frameworks use RUP and UMM
- RosettaNet and ebXML

UMM represents accumulated knowledge of many domain experts

UMM is based on widely accepted industry standard (RUP)

Current status:
- ECIMF: Semantics ↔ UMM: BOV + FSV
- ECIMF: Dynamics ↔ UMM: FSV + BOV + IFV
- ECIMF: Syntax ↔ UMM: IFV
Summary

- ECIMF project needs very close cooperation with ebXML, RosettaNet, OAG and TMWG
- All projects should benefit from the cooperation, because the strengths of one seem to match the weaknesses of others
- Significant reuse of concepts and experiences is expected, desirable and much welcome

Proposed action point:
Establish a task force team including representatives from each project to work on common strategy
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