CWA 17025-109:2016

NBN

Business Interoperability Interfaces for Public Procurement in Europe - Architecture - Part 109: Guideline on the Concept of Core

Valid from 01-06-2016

ICS: 03.100.10, 35.240.20, 35.240.60

Bureau for Standarisation
Rue Joseph II 40 PO box 6
1000 Brussels

T. +32 2 738 01 11
F. +32 2 733 42 64
info@nbn.be

BTW BE0880.857.592
IBAN BE69 6790 0009 5178
BIC Code PCHQBEBB

www.nbn.be

CEN

WORKSHOP

AGREEMENT

CWA 17025-109

May 2016

ICS 03.100.10; 35.240.20; 35.240.60

English version

Business Interoperability Interfaces for Public Procurement in Europe - Architecture - Part 109: Guideline on the Concept of Core

This CEN Workshop Agreement has been drafted and approved by a Workshop of representatives of interested parties, the constitution of which is indicated in the foreword of this Workshop Agreement.

The formal process followed by the Workshop in the development of this Workshop Agreement has been endorsed by the National Members of CEN but neither the National Members of CEN nor the CEN-CENELEC Management Centre can be held accountable for the technical content of this CEN Workshop Agreement or possible conflicts with standards or legislation.

This CEN Workshop Agreement can in no way be held as being an official standard developed by CEN and its Members.

This CEN Workshop Agreement is publicly available as a reference document from the CEN Members National Standard Bodies.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Avenue Marnix 17, B-1000 Brussels

CWA 17025-109:2016 (E)

Contents Page

European foreword

CWA 17025-109, **Guideline on the Concept of Core** was developed in accordance with CEN-CENELEC Guide 29 “CEN/CENELEC Workshop Agreements – The way to rapid agreement” and with the relevant provisions of CEN/CENELEC Internal Regulations - Part 2. It was agreed on 2015-12-02 in a Workshop by representatives of interested parties, approved and supported by CEN following a public call for participation made on 2013-02-20. It does not necessarily reflect the views of all stakeholders that might have an interest in its subject matter.

The final text of CWA 17025 was submitted to CEN for publication on 2016-04-20. It was developed and approved by:

— Agency for public Management and eGovernment (DIFI), NO

— Agenzia delle entrate, IT

— ANAC, Autorità Nazionale Anticorruzione (formerly AVCP), IT

— Bundesverband Materialwirtschaft, Einkauf und Logistik e.V, DE

— Cloudia Oy, FI

— Columbus Denmark A/S (resigned per 2015-08-01), DK

— Consorzio CBI (resigned per 2014-11-17), IT

— Danish Agency for Digitisation (DIGST), DK

— Department of Health, UK

— Direction de l'information légale et administrative (DILA), FR

— Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI) TC (liason)

— Flowcanto, NL

— GS 1 in Europe

— Highjump Software (Former Evenex), DK

— ICEPRO, ISA

— Infoterm - International Information Centre for Terminology on behalf of CEN/WS/eCAT (liason)

— Invinet Sistemes 2003, ES

— Laszlo Ketszeri, HU

— Nets Norway AS, NO

— Nexus IT,ES

— Phast, FR

CWA 17025-109:2016 (E)

- PIANOo, NL
- Poste Italiane, IT
- Publications Office of the European Union (LU)
- Single face To Industry (SFTI), SE
- SOGEI (former Consip), IT
- Statens og Kommunernes Indkobs Service A/S (SKI A/S), DK
- University of Koblenz-Landau, DE
- University of Piraeus Research Center (UPRC), GR
- Western Norway Regional Health Authority, NO

It is possible that some elements of CWA 17025 may be subject to patent rights. The CEN-CENELEC policy on patent rights is set out in CEN-CENELEC Guide 8 “Guidelines for Implementation of the Common IPR Policy on Patents (and other statutory intellectual property rights based on inventions)”. CEN shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

The Workshop participants have made every effort to ensure the reliability and accuracy of the technical and non-technical content of CWA 17025, but this does not guarantee, either explicitly or implicitly, its correctness. Users of CWA 17025 should be aware that neither the Workshop participants, nor CEN can be held liable for damages or losses of any kind whatsoever which may arise from its application. Users of CWA 17025 do so on their own responsibility and at their own risk.

This CEN Workshop Agreement (CWA) has been drafted and approved by the Workshop on **Business Interoperability Interfaces for Public procurement in Europe (BII)**, phase 3.

CWA 17025 is part of a set of CWAs prepared by CEN WS/BII 3[1]:

CWA 17025:2016 Methodology and Architecture
CWA 17026:2016 Notification profiles and transactions
CWA 17027:2016 Tendering profiles and transactions
CWA 17028:2016 Catalogue profiles and transactions
CWA 17029:2016 Post-award profiles and transactions

CWA 17025 consists of:

CWA 17025-1 Overview and Architecture
CWA 17025-101 Conformance and Customization Methodology guideline
CWA 17025-102 Code List and Identifier Management specification
CWA 17025-103 Business Document and Envelope guideline
CWA 17025-104 Profile Architecture specification
CWA 17025-105 Conformance Registry specification
CWA 17025-106 Open Procurement Data report
CWA 17025-107 Message Level Response guideline
CWA 17025-108 Use of Digital Signature and Other Trust Services
CWA 17025-109 Guideline on the Concept of Core
CWA 17025-110 Profile Maintenance Process specification
CWA 17025-111 Capturing Business Requirements specification

[1] In order to ease the reading the CWAs provided by the CEN BII initiative, they are also made available on http://www.cenbii.eu together with explanatory notes and supporting material. The official version is however the version as published by CEN.

CWA 17025-112 Syntax Implementations Guideline Methodology guideline
CWA 17025-113 Business Rules Description Mechanism guideline
CWA 17025-114 Attachments Handling guideline
CWA 17025-115 Semantic Data Type guideline
CWA 17025-116 Glossary and Business Term Vocabulary
CWA 17025-203 BDE Syntax Implementation Guideline for Messaging Envelope
CWA 17025-207 UBL Syntax Implementation Guideline for Message Level Response

A detailed overview of all CWA 17025 parts can be found in CWA 17025 part 1.

The CEN Workshop members who have contributed to the development of this document are:

Name	Affiliation	Country
Jaap Van Der Marel	NEN	NL
Kornelis Drijfhout	PIANOo	NL
Chander Khoenkhoen	PIANOo	NL
Veit Jahns	BME and University of Duisburg-Essen	DE
Frank-Dieter Dorloff	BME and University of Duisburg-Essen	DE
Kerstin Wiss-Holmdahl	SFTI/SALAR	SE
Martin Forsberg	SFTI	SE
Jorg Richter	GEFEG	DE
Giovanni Paolo Sellitto	ANAC	IT
Rafaella Migliorini	SOGEI	IT
Antonia Caressa	Poste Italiane	IT
Andrea Caccia	DTCE	IT
Michael Dill	GEFEG	DE
Cécile Guasch	DIGIT - European Commission	BE
Marius Juganaru	DIGIT - European Commission	BE
Thomas Small	CEF - European Commission	BE
Ole Madsen	DIGST	DK
Bergthor Skulasson	NITA	IS
Jan Maeroe	Difi	NO
Jens Aabol	Difi	NO
Tim McGrath	Document Engineering Services Ltd	AU
Isabella Rapisarda	Consip	IT
Natalie Muric	The Publications Office of the European Union	LU
Siw Meckelborg	Difi	NO
Peter Borresen	Clearview Trade	DK
Sven Rasmussen	DIGST	DK
Tadeusz Rudnicki	GS1 in Europe	PL
Douglas Hill	GS1 in Europe	DK
Tomas Tluchor	GS1 in Europe	CZ
Laszlo Ketszeri	KELER	HU

CWA 17025-109:2016 (E)

This document was edited by:

Name	Role	Country
Oriol Bausa	Technical Editor	ES
Georg Birgisson	Technical Editor	IS
Jostein Frømyr	Vice-Chair CEN/BII	NO
Fred van Blommestein	Technical Editor	NL
Yildiray Kabak	Technical Editor	TR
Edmund Gray	Technical Editor	EI
Carmen Ciciriello	Technical Editor	IT

Introduction

The first CEN BII Workshop was established in May 2007 with the objective of harmonising electronic procurement in Europe. The CEN BII initiative, which now comprises a further two CEN Workshops, is a standardisation activity within CEN (European Committee for Standardisation). It provides a framework for interoperability in pan-European electronic transactions expressed as a set of technical specifications.

During the second phase of the initiative (CEN WS/BII 2) a set of technical specifications – “CEN BII Profiles” – were documented and published as five CEN Workshop Agreements (CWAs), which are currently used across Europe. The profiles are designed to facilitate effective public e-procurement based on a modular approach for implementation, with a focus on global interoperability.

The CEN BII profiles can be seen as “agreements” on message contents and business processes. The profile descriptions focus on core information elements that typically cater to the majority of user requirements applicable across Europe and lower the need for detailed bilateral agreements between the trading partners.

In its third phase (CEN WS/BII 3), which began in March 2013 with the approval of the business plan, the Workshop has focused on ensuring that all relevant aspects of e-procurement are covered, including additional business requirements coming from the new Public Procurement Directives and alignment to other standardization efforts in the area of electronic invoicing, as well as ensuring wider recognition and adoption of its deliverables.

More information about the CEN BII initiative can be found on www.cenbii.eu.

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance on how to decide what is "core" and what is not, and describe how the "core" is used to achieve interoperability and conformance. It should be used as a companion to CWA17025 Part 111 Capturing Business Requirements specification as it will help to ensure the requirements are appropriate. Once the requirements are gathered, this methodology can be applied to ensure the Information Requirement Models[2] are indeed Core.

1 Scope

The CEN WS/BII3 Workshop has recognised that to facilitate a high level of interoperability, there is a need to provide the capability to run business processes between disparate organisations using one or more transactions. This is achieved by defining the core set of information elements for each transaction in a defined business process, which are useful and understandable in all business scenarios in scope. Generally, the term core has a very broad meaning and exists for different types of objects (from semantic models to fruits). However in CEN WS/BII3, a single Core Information Requirement Model defines the business information considered to be:

— necessary to reach the business goals which are in scope.

— rich enough to represent a typical business transaction

— simple to implement without too much preparation and system adaptions

— fully understood by the receiver

— possible to reuse, extend and customize for more specific use cases

[2] Information Requirement Models are described in CWA 17025 Part 111 Capturing Business Requirements specification

Therefore there is no single Core for all transactions but a Core for each transaction that have elements in common. This is because one transaction may effectively imply a request for information and the response will provide the update.

The key exercise is to define and agree on the scope and business goals to ensure the transaction is produced from a methodology to ensure it is Core. The business goals can be translated into the business functions supported by the transaction. The considerations about implementation simplicity should be a leading principle. The number of goals for the Core Model will be a consequence of the stakeholders and their ambitions... A large group with diverging goals will jeopardize the principle of simplicity. It is therefore important that the members of the group have a common understanding of the principles of core and are willing to compromise.

A methodology to extend (customize) the transactions is also necessary to be in place. If the methodology is too complex to use or understand, the risk is that the stakeholders prefer to add all their specific requirements to the transaction, and by this approach risking the simplicity, instead of considering to add them to an extension at a later stage.

Defining BII Core Models has been a fundamental part of BII deliverables for the past six years and the Workshop has developed various models for transactions in both Post and Pre-Award scenarios[3].

This guide describes the methodology by which Core Information Requirement models (Core Models) are produced and therefore ensuring the resulting transactions are also Core.

2 Objectives of the BII Core approach

This approach is to use the methodology as defined in section 3 to produce Core Models. To be useful the Core Models will typically be the practical minimum set of information elements that supports the user requirements considered to be in scope.

It is important that the Stakeholders share the main objects/goals of the core. Therefore we need a methodology which will allow experts to gather all the requirements, which may be too many, but then apply principles which refine the model and simplify it. Experts will analyse the requirements and determine the most effective set of information elements to provide. This document takes the approach where by using simplification principles, the result will be a model that is most efficient in terms of the use of information elements and therefore easier to use / re-use, and easier to maintain.

2.1 As Simple as Possible

Having a broad set of Stakeholder requirements could make the Core Models elaborate and complex. Therefore we need an approach that will reduce the number of elements in a methodological way and yet does not lose sight of the original business requirements. This is done by a goal-driven process where the stakeholders need to agree on the scope and goals for the production of models so that they are Core. See also the section below on principles of simplification.

2.2 Sufficiently Functional

Each information element should be grouped according to its functionality. The experts analysing the model can then decide if the functionality supported by this information element either belongs to the transaction under consideration or should be covered by one or more new transactions. There may even be an existing transaction which covers the functionality and could be used instead and more effectively.

[3] ftp://ftp.cen.eu/public/CWAs/BII2/CWA16558/CWA16558-Annex-A-BII-Guideline-ProfileArchitecture-V2_0_0.pdf