

E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns [bpPATT]

Comment and change log from v 0.3 (.PDF version as posted for public review)

J B Clark 6 April - 26 April 2001

<i>Lines (in v0.3)</i>	<i>Unique ref.</i>	<i>Comment [source]</i>	<i>Rationale / need for work</i>	<i>Response</i>
Global	1	"[Nice.] but what happens next?" <i>[QRT]</i>	Patterns, as a phenomenon, need to be put in practical context	See response to comment 8.
86	2	What does [the negotiation pattern may be] "relied upon" [by CPA spec] mean? <i>[QRT]</i>	Clarify the need and the application	Deleted offending text. Describe CPA functionality in Section 7.2 more clearly as a non-normative example of the negotiation functionality.
90	3	Replace "users" with "implementers". <i>[QRT]</i>	Target audience is professionals. Consider whether user-friendly sidebars are necessary.	Done.
124, 181	4	Replace "atomistic" with "atomic". <i>[QRT]</i>	Reference is to the smallest components used to assemble patterns.	Replaced words.
127	5	Consider "commercially binding" versus "legally binding". <i>[QRT]</i>	"Legally binding" phrase has significance w/in BP Spec Schema., and is in common use in Legal EDI/EC community.	Explained distinction between the legal conclusion and the practical contract formation standard. Insert the references here to the legal model TPA and EDI documents relied on (reference moved from BPSS in response to BPSS comments).
142-49	6	These are instructions to Glossary author. <i>[QRT]</i>		Conformed document to intended final form; send an alignment letter to Glossary edit team.
178	7	Word "logic" is redundant. <i>[QRT]</i>	Reference is to "business logic interface"	Used "business service interface" throughout; contribute to Glossary if not already there.
185	8	Replace "Exhibit E" with "Appendix E"; and referenced appendix is missing from Analysis doc. <i>[QRT]</i>	Editors dropped the extended drop-ship scenario from the [Catalog].	Added the extended version as a real-life pattern example here. (This is the actual table being used by the BP PoC work.) Keep it conformed to the version used to populate the Worksheets and Catalog, and to the contract formation pattern provided here. "Drop ship" is an example of a moderately complex (real world) collaboration that can be accomplished within the strictures of the contract formation pattern.
245-46, 258-59, 269-70	9	"Document ID" or "message ID"? <i>[QRT]</i>	Should be "document ID" throughout -- and confirm its meaning under the TP spec.	Eliminated. Message identity issues left at TRP level; paired offers and acceptances are logically paired here by use of the BPSS object model.
292-93	10	If this negotiation pattern forms a CPA, where do you get the CPA to run it? <i>[QRT]</i>	QRT suggests, how about using recipient's CPP? (Note also Nickull's Jan 01 proposal.)	Added the QRT suggestion and referenced the Nickull business rule resolution tweak.
296, 303	11	Replace "business logic interface" with "business service interface". <i>[QRT]</i>		Done.
331-32	12	Fig 7.1 should be a sequence diagram not an activity diagram. <i>[QRT]</i>		Incorrect: Activity has branches and is highly recursion. A sequence diagram could map one case, but not the pattern.
344-347	13	"We think this document now forms an appendix to the CPP/CPA Specification" <i>[QRT]</i>	[What's "this document", the Patterns document, or the Nickull proposal referenced at these lines?]	This document is freestanding from CPA/CP, but references it as an example of a business problem that may be in part solved by a pattern set forth here. (If Duane's document does not survive as a public document, it may be appended here, but then Duane should be credited.)
Title	14	Pattern vs. patterns <i>[Haugen]</i>		See response to comment 8: leave as plural, and use drop ship scenario as another exemplary pattern (or set of patterns).
184-186	15	"Add the genericized drop ship pattern [as an] illustrat[ion] of pattern use" <i>[Clark]</i>		Calls for same solution as is suggested for comments 8 and 14 above.
Title	16	Return to original title "E Commerce Patterns" <i>[Clark]</i>		See response to comment 8.
188-219	17	Revise text about "nonrepudiation" and "legally binding" to explain use and distinction. Describe contract formation issues and contract negotiation issues separately. <i>[Clark]</i>		Done, in conjunction with response to comment 5.
Throughout	18	Conform any cross references to ebXML documents. <i>[Editorial]</i>	See 3 April 2001 McGrath e-mail.	Conformed.
Throughout	19	Conform defined terms to latest BPSS changes. <i>[Editorial]</i>	Particularly note business signal names and "document flow" vs "... envelope"	Conformed.

