Change Log

Public-Review Comments to TP Specification, ver. 0.93

Commenter: Prasad Yendluri, Web Methods

1. Comment Type: Technical
    Issue:
    TP Specification does not include syncReplyMode
    Discussion:
    None needed
    Resolution:
    syncReplyMode has been added to the specification.

2. Comment Type: Technical
    Issue:
    Has thought been given to making the PartyId Type negotiable?
    Discussion:
    The point is that although both Parties need not use the same PartyId Type, a given Party may not be able to interpret all possible PartyId types. Anything in the CPP is negotiable, so no special words are needed for PartyId. A CPP can contain multiple PartyId elements under a given PartyInfo element.
    Resolution:
    We have changed the specification to state that a Party SHOULD list its PartyId elements in preference order, with the most preferred one first. This will aid a CPA composition tool in choosing the most acceptable PartyId for each Party. We have not provided a means for a Party to indicate what PartyIds it is capable of parsing. However, there is enough information to enable this to be resolved in the negotiation phase of CPA composition.

Commenter: Scott Hinkelman, IBM

3. Comment Type: Technical
    Issue:
    There are various difficulties with parsing the CPP and CPA samples with existing tools
    Discussion:
    None needed.
    Resolution:
    The schema and DTD have been modified

Commenter: various

4. Comment Type: Technical
    Issue:
    During the listserver discussion of Parsad Yendluri's comment on PartyId, there was discussion of whether the Registry should check that the PartyIds within the CPP belong to the purported owner.
    Discussion:

Policing the contents of a document is outside the scope of the Registry. However it should be expected that the Registry would validate the identity of any entity that submits a document to the Registry. Therefore, other Parties should be able to have confidence about the identity of the owner of the CPP and can then check the PartyIds in the CPP for correctness if desired.

Resolution:

No change needed.

Commenter: Farrukh Najmi, Sun

5. Comment Type: Technical

Issue:

The Registry interface specification was originally designed based on a UML model and the IBM tpaML proposal. There are difficulties mapping this design to the CPP and its link to the Process Specification Document.

Discussion:

Resolving this problem also involves input from the BP team and depends on areas of the Specification Schema that are still changing.

Resolution:

Discuss during the Vienna meeting.

Commenter: Duane Nickull, XML Global

6. Comment Type: Technical

Issue:

The CPP and CPA should adopt an inline "Party" schema so that ebXML Core Components can be contextually driven by geographical location.

Discussion:

Because of the uncertain state of the Core Components specifications, this topic has to be a futures topic. Meanwhile, the existing link can be resolved.

Resolution:

Discuss in Vienna

7. Comment Type: Technical

Issue:

When a company makes more than one CPP, how do we distinguish them? This will need globally unique identifiers.

Discussion:

The Registry provides the GUIDs. However, once a CPP has been signed, it is not possible for the Registry to insert a GUID inside the CPP without invalidating the signature. Further, the Registry should never modify content. However, the metadata about the CPP in the Registry include its GUID, which should serve the purpose of the comment.

Resolution:

Discussion of this point has been added to the specification.

Commenter: Karsten Riemer, Sun

8. Comment type: Technical

    Issue:

        Various proposals for aligning CPP-CPA terminology with the BP Specification Schema, and suggestions for improving the definitions of links between the CPP/CPA and the Business Process Specification document.

    Discussion:

        The BP and TP teams are discussing these questions.

    Resolution:

        Some terminology changes have been made in ver. 0.95; the rest will be incorporated before the Vienna meeting.

Commenter: Quality Review Team (Tim McGrath)

9. Comment type: Technical

    Issue:

        The CPP-CPA specification appears to prescribe the use of the BP Specification Schema as the only way to describe the business collaboration. This conflicts with the ebXML requirement that the ebXML specifications be able to be used separately as well as together.

    Discussion:

        The TP team agrees with this comment but more work needs to be done post-Vienna to generalize the links between the CPP/CPA and the business collaboration description and to provide additional normative text to allow other forms of description of the business collaboration. Discussion among TP, BP, and QR will be held during April.

    Resolution:

        Text will be added to the ver. 1.0 specification explaining that alternative descriptions of the business collaboration are allowed and suggesting how to do it. More detailed consideration of this subject is on the team's Post-Vienna agenda.