Number	Date	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	IssueComment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
1	4/3	QRT	Overall	As with the previous version of this specification, our overall concern is the structure and readability of the document. Whilst we acknowledge the many improvements since the previous version, there still appears to be some duplication and redundancy of material. For example, Section 8.2 is highly redundant with much of section 6. For example: • "Binary collaboration" in lines 2202-2227 summarizes what appears in lines 694- 733. • The definition of "Business Partner Role" at lines 2248-2251 repeats verbatim lines 1334-1337. • "Business Transaction" is defined at both 2273-2280 and 1511-1518. In part this may be a feature of the structure the team have taken with this document. Currently, the approach is: • Section 6. Concept • Section 7. UML • Section 8. XML (DTD) – including cross-references. This places the same object in three sections and hence to need to duplicate explanations and definitions. Perhaps, these could be combined as: • Section 6.1 Concept • Section 6.1.1 UML • Section 6.1.2 XML (DTD) • Section 6.2 Concept • Section 6.2.1 UML • Section 6.2.2 XML (DTD)				Line 1518: changed "an" to "as". Line 2279: changed "an" to "as" Will leave UML and XML separated as is, so there will be duplication, but we will remove any contradiction or ambiguity between the two		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				etc… This may also avoid the "cut and paste" errors, for example the "an" instead of "and" mistake occurs in both 2279 and 1518.						
2	4/3	QRT	Overall	In addition, we note from the change log ("Issues list"), that there are some issues that appear to be unresolved. For example, there is some confusion about the use and value of REA models. The change log notes these as not adopted, yet does not explain why it would only be partial and why this would not be appropriate. More concerning is the fact that the Business Process Analysis team's documents still rely heavily on REA models, despite this resolution.				This (REA) is not a BPSS issue, it should be addressed by UMM and/or BP Analysis documents.		1
3	4/3	QRT	Headers	Should the date be January 2001?				Header changed to "April 2001".		1
4	4/3	QRT	Line 13	Please use International date formats.				Adopted.		1
5	4/3	QRT	Line 67, 77-81	No section numbers in table of contents.				Entries removed from TOC.		1
6	4/3	QRT	Line 264-270	If Specification Schema meets requirement then why use the Metamodel? If not, why use the Specification Schema?				In section 5.2.1.Distinguish between BP modeling and BP specification, and clarify that specification against BPSS is ebXML software interpretable while model against UMM metamodel is syntax neutral and non-interpretable.		1
7	4/3	QRT	Line 289 Figure 2	• "busines" is misspelled. • Some text is illegible in black and white print. • "Business Signal Definitions" should be "Common Modeling Objects" for				Spelling corrected, colors adjusted, dropped reference to common model elements, now just signals in text and figure		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
				consistency with text.						
8	4/3	QRT	Line 316	Has a difficult sentence construction with some missing and extraneous words. It possibly needs an example or analogy to clarify the meaning. The relationship of the Specification Schema to the UMM and its Metamodel should be unambiguously stated. Are the models produced from using the Specification schema different from those developed using UMM?				Relationship clarified in section 5.2.1 and again in start of section 6. Now distinguish between BP model and BP specification, and that production rules can produce same XML.		1
9	4/3	QRT	Line 328	If we have to say "where possible" then we may have a problem here – what kinds of constraints couldn't be represented in XML Schema?				Dropped references to constraints, now have W3C schema.		1
10	4/3	QRT	Line 333	Should say Chapter 11, not Chapter [11]				Corrected to "Chapter 8". See issue #90.		1
11	4/3	QRT	Line 345-347	Is the intention to say these signals are "universal".				Adopted wording.		1
12	4/3	QRT	Line 369 and 536	"two" should be "more". NB not confined to two flows.	line 253 - add the statement "A Business Transaction must have either one or two Document Flows associated with it, never zero, never more than two." line 369 "Each Business Transaction shall consist of either one or two predefined			Original text is correct as is, but clarified: Lines 369 and 536 now say: A business transaction consists of a Requesting Business Activity, a Responding Business Activity, and one or two Document Flows between them. A Business Transaction may be additionally supported by one or more Business Signals.		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
					Business Document Flows." line 536 "A Business Transaction consists of a Requesting Business Activity, a Responding Business Activity, and either one or two Document Flows between them."					
13	4/3	QRT	Line 390-391	Maybe "single" is a better term than "atomic". Examples of these types of activities would assist the reader.				Added examples "an atomic" changed to "a single".		1
14	4/3	QRT	Line 446	The comma after Schema should be a period.				Corrected.		1
15	4/3	QRT	Line 450	"to" should be "for"				Corrected.		1
16	4/3	QRT	Line 459	Expand acronyms when first used.				Corrected.		1
17	4/3	QRT	Line 461	BSI has not been explained yet.				Explanation added.		1
18	4/3	QRT	Line 479, 1298, 1865	"Specifically The" should be ""Specifically, the"				Corrected.		1
19	4/3	QRT	Line 484	Figure 4 is useful but doesn't match its caption.				Caption and text aligned		1
20	4/3	QRT	Line	The discussion describes things that don't				Specification rules		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
			488-504	appear in the figure, like "specification rules" and "production rules"				dropped, production rules added relates to UMM in this section, not to BPSS		
21	4/3	QRT	Line 502	There isn't any logical reason for requiring that what gets stored in the repository is XML. UML could just as easily be stored and a transformation into XML could be done only when it is needed.				Clarified XML in registry because needed by CPP/CPA		1
22	4/3	QRT	Line 529, 630, 691, 874	The word "semantics" is somewhat overloaded in ebXML, can we suggest you just say "UML diagram of …".				Adopted.		1
23	4/3	QRT	Line 585	Footnote is empty.				Fixed		1
24	4/3	QRT	Line 595	State which standards P2D comes from (may be ISO 8601).				Adopted: Yes it is.ISO 8601. Actually W3C Schema Part 2 Datatypes uses ISO 8601 for time related data types (e.g. duration). Since the W3C Schema version will use this we should state that the DTD version expects this, however, the DTD cannot validate the string, whereas W3C Schema can.		1
25	4/3	QRT	Line 621	Sounds odd to say that all business documents have unique structures when we know that they will be composed from reusable components, which means they will have substantial structural similarity. Suggest use the term "varying".				Changed "all have unique" to "have varying".		1
26	4/3	QRT	Line 694 -	Section 6.4.2.1 is a little hard to wade through. It might help to take the example (including a				This issue asked for the example part of 6.4.2.1 to		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
			773	diagram) starting at line 718 and give it a separate section like "Example".				be broken out with a spearate heading. Not done.		
27	4/3	QRT	Line 734-736	A CPA need not use an ebXML business process. ebXML can be incrementally adopted.				Clarified that ebXML CPP/CPA needs ebXML BPSS if it is to refer to any BP description at all		1
28	4/3	QRT	Line 737	"must" should be "could" (see point above).				See 27		1
29	4/3	QRT	Line 740	It would also help to put a separate section heading here for the issue about legally binding.				Adopted. Retain word isLegallyBinding, tighten text. Change word isSuccess to isPositiveResponse. Attribute will be optional and will be of type "expression". It is merely the responders assertion of what constitutes a positive response, it is not by itself a determinant of overall transaction success.		1
30	4/3	QRT	Line 749-755	Should be a non-normative note. It may also pay to reference the document "E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns".				Adopted. See issue #29.		1
31	4/3	QRT	Line 761	Is the intention to mean "legally" binding or the more practical "commercially" binding.				We are sticking with legally binding but have added more qualifying text. See issue #29.		1
32	4/3	QRT	Line 773	Extraneous quotes at end of paragraph				Corrected.		1
33	4/3	QRT	Line 841	Can these only be ebXML CPAs?				See 27		1
34	4/3	QRT	Line 918	It may be useful to bring sections 6.4.4.2 and 6.4.2.2 closer as they cover the same example				This issue asked for a re-order of the sample		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
				but are currently separated by intervening sections				syntaxes. (Not deemed as being a useful change.) In any event, it has not been done.		
35	4/3	QRT	Line 986-1027	Section 6.5 repeats a lot from 6.4.1.1 and elsewhere. It may be better to put this earlier and then the other somewhat disjointed sections might be made tighter				This issue asked for section 6.5 to be placed earlier in the document. 6.5 has been reworked to fit better with 6.6.		1
36	4/3	QRT	Line 1033	Specified shouldn't be capitalized				Corrected.		1
37	4/3	QRT	Line 1057	Do these UMM patterns form part of the ebXML specification? If so, they need to be described here. How do these relate to the "Catalog of Common Business Processes" and the "E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns"?				Clarified that patterns themselves are not part of ebXML, but parameters in support of them are provided as attributes in the BPSS Added reference to negotiation pattern under 6.1.(5)		1
38	4/3	QRT	Line 1075, 1077, 1081	Why have full-colon at the end of the section heading?				Deleted.		1
39	4/3	QRT	Line 1078-1079, 1083	Paragraphs should start on the left margin.				Corrected.		1
40	4/3	QRT	Line1109	Is the "need proper definition" a note to the editor?				Note has been dropped, and whole section on asynchronous has been dropped		1
41	4/3	QRT	Line 1151	What is meant by ebXML messages? Are these ebXML Message Service messages, messages containing ebXML content? Does it matter				Changed to say Business Documents Will do a general review of the use		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
				what the messages are?				of 'message'		
42	4/3	QRT	Line 1158-1159	Is this really what non-repudiation means? What about "no denying the sending of a document".				Lots of new explanatory text added. See issue #29.		1
43	4/3	QRT	Line 1174-1177	Repeats lines 987-990 (section 6.5)				Not done. Duplication maintained for emphasis of this key point		1
44	4/3	QRT	Line 1192	"is" should be "are"				Corrected.		1
45	4/3	QRT	Line 1250	Avoid putting content in the title. If this is also known as a "ProcessException", say so in the text.				Corrected.		1
46	4/3	QRT	Line 1518	"an in" should be "as in"				Corrected.		1
47	4/3	QRT	Line 1604	"the receipt must be non-reputable" should be "the receipt must be non-repudiatable". We understand "reputable" to mean "to have a good reputation, to be respected". Is that what is meant? -				Corrected.		1
48	4/3	QRT	Line 1630 and 1646	Does the business activity have to be "requesting commerce"? Could it be "requesting information" or other things... maybe it just wants to engage some entity in the complementary role, whatever that is.				Adopted: Now just described in terms of requesting/responding role.		1
49	4/3	QRT	Line 2407, Table betwee n 2679-2680 and 2697 and 2699 and	Is it ebXmlProcessSpecification or ebXMLProcessSpecification?				Corrected.		1

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
			2749							
50	4/3	QRT	Line 3011	If these signal structures are to be ebXML standards then there needs to be a discussion about intent, both now and in the future. What happens if ebXML adopts XML Schema before RosettaNet does and these signals are re-implemented by ebXML, only to have RosettaNet do them differently?				We are aligning with TRP signals, and they are in turn aligning with RosettaNet, see issue 75		1
51	4/3	QRT	Line 3184	Extraneous space before the word "UN/CEFACT".				Corrected.		1
52	4/3	QRT	Line 3230-3239	This is the wrong copyright statement. Should use the "ebXML" version.				Adopted		1
53	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 996 –	business transaction s/b capitalized (Business Transaction)				Adopted.		2
54	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 1004 –	same comment				Corrected.		2
55	4/4	Christopher Ferris	lines 1012-1018 –	this description makes no sense at all. Specifically: ... If no response ... role based on the receipt of a business signal. What business signal? Sent or received by whom? ... Regardless of which combination of ... is chosen and/or Response Document Flow is chosen, they always ... To what does "they" refer?				Adopted: clarified description of transition of control		2
56	4/4	Christopher Ferris	lines 1054-1056 –	why not assign them names with this specification? preferably, they will be named using an URI scheme, and even more so, as URNs				Actual Patterns are no longer part of the ebXML specification, so will not be named here. Will change type of attribute to be URI		2
57	4/4	Christopher Ferris	lines 1081-1100 –	I am still quite uncomfortable with this scheme. It does not permit a degree of flexibility that allows for a combination of persistent and transient security mechanisms. For instance, use of a persistent digital signature over the				Partially adopted: We are dropping the isSecureTransport We are sticking with the boolean because we		2

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				contents of the message (or on selected parts) to provide for authentication as well as integrity combined with a transient encryption of the message on the wire. Having "isSecureTransport" qualify the security characteristics of the Document Flow is IMHO, a poor design. I would much prefer that isConfidential, isAuthenticated and isTamperProof have the enumeration of "persistent", "transient" and "none" (default) such that valid combinations of security mechanisms might be applied.				believe business analysts are not yet security aware enough to distinguish the transient aspect, we are assuming persistent security or no security at all		
58	4/4	Christopher Ferris	lines 1108-1121 –	now I am VERY confused! Just because an asynchronous delivery channel is employed (such as SMTP) should not preclude the use of business signals. OTOH, a synchronous delivery channel can often (as in the case of HTTP) receive only a single "response". We (TP team and TR&P team) have recently established mechanisms to account for synchronous delivery channels. A "request" message can indicate whether a synchronous response is required, and the CPP/CPA can specify what manner of response will be returned synchronously (e.g. on the same channel on which the request was delivered, such as the HTTP 200 response). The response can be specified as being "signalsOnly", "signalsAndResponse", "responseOnly", or "none". What this means is that either the response message contains one or more of the business signals, the busines signals AND the response message combined, just the response message or "does not apply". I will grant that this is still a bit too loose for my tastes, but because the business signals are				No longer an issue, since we have dropped the isSynchronous attribute. See issue #40.		2

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				not treated as first-class messages in the BPSS, it becomes a little difficult to be more specific. In any event, the statement that "a partner role that initiates an asynchronous business transaction does not need to receive any business signals" is an inaccurate statement IMHO. It is also unclear from my perspective that there is any manner of constraint that even if this were true could be used to preclude the association of a "pattern" that involved business signals.						
59	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 1257 - ...	deal with the ...				Corrected.		2
60	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 1257 –	run-on sentence, big time				Split into two sentences.		2
61	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 1277- 1283 –	it isn't clear to me why a requesting role sends a *separate transaction* notifying the respondant that the transaction has been revoked. For me, what isn't clear is what relation the "transaction" has to the overall "conversation" a term used in CPP/CPA. It would seem to me that this might make for a difficult implementation.				Will clarify text: If one BusinessTransaction fails because the requestor cannot complete his (business) processing of the response, he sends a FailureNotification as a new BusinessDocument as part of a new BusinessTransaction, but optionally contained within the same BinaryCollaboration with a transition and guard that reflects the failure.		2
62	4/4	Christopher Ferris	general section 8.2 –	having the element/attribute descriptions alphabetized is actually quite difficult to follow. It would be preferable (IMHO) to have the descriptions follow the DTD "flow" from root element down through the descendant tree				We will keep the alphabetic sequence, but create a hyperlink from a table in DTD sequence to the alphabetic		2

Number	Date	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	IssueComment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
				with backward references when necessary.				documentation.		
63	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2168 –	I had asked that an optional version attribute be added to Attachment and DocumentType such that this metadata might be included in the Manifest to provide an external means that a receiving party might use to determine whether it was capable of processing the content. Please add a version attribute.				A version attribute can be added to DocumentSpecification (was Schema) and to Attachment. See also 71.		2
64	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2006 –	pattern is defined as CDATA. It probably should be constrained to be typed as an xsd:uriReference.				In the W3C Schema version it will be anyURI. uriReference was changed to anyURI		2
65	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2202 –	BinaryCollaboration element is missing the pattern attribute in the description (present in the DTD)				fixed		2
66	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2011 & 2216 –	timeToPerform is defined as CDATA in the DTD, but in fact has constraints that it be typed as an xsd:duration which "represents a duration of time. The value space of duration is a six-dimensional space where the coordinates designate the Gregorian year, month, day, hour, minute, and second components defined in § 5.5.3.2 of [ISO 8601], respectively." This should be noted at the very least.				Adopted: In the W3C Schema version it will be duration. In DTD version string will be formatted like duration		2
67	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2066 & 2300 –	see previous comment regarding timeToPerform				See Issue 66		2
68	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2096, 2097, 2107, 2108, 2529, 2530, 2553, 2554 –	both timeToAcknowledgeReceipt and timeToAcknowledgeAcceptance attributes also should be constrained to be of type xsd:duration. See previous comment on timeToPerform.				See Issue 66		2

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
69	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2399 –	refers to "SchemaName/DocumentType" which is either a typo or something which isn't at all clearly described. I am assuming that it should instead be "Schema/DocumentType"?				New namescope and reference rules adopted and described in section 8.3		2
70	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2401 –	DocumentType is indicated as having as a parent Schema and Attachment. Attachment is not defined as having any child elements other than Documentation. It would seem to me that DocumentType should be declared as having as parents Schema and DocumentFlow.				This issue asked for a change in parentage for DocumentType. I'm sure we discussed this, but I have no resolution recorded.		2
71	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2569 –	Previously, I had indicated that DocumentType should have a version attribute. I stand corrected, the Schema element should have an optional version attribute for the reason previously cited.				See Issue 63		2
72	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2583 & 2480-2499 –	Schema element is defined as having as a parent Package which appears to be incorrect based on the description of Package, but is consistent with the DTD. Which is correct? I am assuming that the DTD is correct.				Will move DocumentSpecification(n ew name) to root level (no longer under a Package), and fix documentation relative to Package accordingly.		2
73	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2745 –	the sample specification schema document is inconsistent with the DTD				We are replacing the example		2
74	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 3005 –	this section/table needs to be updated to reflect the PR XMLSchema specification. Specifically, timeDuration is now duration and recurringDuration has been eliminated and replaced with g* primitives. see latest version of the XMLSchema part 2 specification.				Issue no longer relevant, as section/table has been removed (see issue #123)		2
75	4/4	Christopher Ferris	section 9.2 – Busines s Signal Structur	please see the Acknowledgment element definition in the Message Service specification. We should try to reconcile this with the ReceiptAcknowledgment and AcceptanceAcknowledgment elements defined				Adopted with a variation. We will leverage TRP signals but allow them to carry the RNIF 1.1. signals as payload.		2

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
			es	in this section. At the very least, we should attempt to place some structure on the OriginalMessageDigest element. This will be necessary for interoperability. In addition, some consideration needs to be given to adding a timestamp to these elements as they may be sent in a message later than the actual recorded receipt or validation might suggest based solely on the timestamp of the message which carries these elements. please see the Message Service specification for our Error element. Some attempt at reconciling this element with that specified in the MessageService specification should be undertaken. defining the various codes used in the Exception element as #PCDATA does an injustice to interoperability. Specifically, at the very least some recommendation should be given as to use of URIs and preferably URNs for the various codes. At the very least, some scoping mechanism should be incorporated to at least provide an identification as to the "type" system which defines the codes used. See the Message Service specification. the Exception element does not conform to the element naming/capitalization conventions adopted by ebXML (upper camel case for elements) as some of the elements are named with lower camel case names.						
76	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 2695 –	I have a little bit, no make that lots, of trouble with this approach. While it might appear on the surface to be a reasonable approach to naming and name resolution, in practice, it will (I believe) be fairly difficult to a) enforce and b) realize in software. Because use of an				Stay with the current convention but also allow optional ID and IDREF attributes. The ID and IDREFs would be generated by tools and		2

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
				arbitrary attribute called 'name' rather than the built-in ID/IDREF converntion is used, there can be no enforcement by a standard XML parser or document builder (DOMImplementation) that a name is a) unique within some scope (document would be my preference rather than element scoping) b) a reference to a scoped name An additional concern is that this scheme might be confused with an xpath expression, which it clearly is not. However, in realizing a software component to resolve names under this scheme, use of an xpath engine might be employed, but it would be, IMHO, difficult to engineer because of the non-deterministic structure of any given "scoped name". An ID/IDREF-based approach would make it cleaner to implement a parser enforced validation of constraints and it would also make it clearer as to which 'name' attributes are intended to be identifiers and which are intended to be references to an identifier. In addition, it would make it trivial to resolve references because the parser would provide an index into the document tree based on ID.				could be non-human readable numerical values.		
77	4/4	Christopher Ferris	line 3174-3176 –	we should adopt a consistent representation for expressing dates/times that is consistent with XMLSchema. In addition, use of c14n'ed dateTime should be adopted whereever possible (e.g. represented as UTC) Thus, a dateTime is expressed as CCYY-MM-DDTHH:MM:SSZ.				Agreed, see issue 24, 66.		2
78	4/6	Paul Levine	165, 239	Remove "Unified"	UN/CEFACT Modeling Methodology (UMM)			Corrected.		3

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
79	4/6	Paul Levine	241-243	While the ebBPSS doesn't define Business Document structures, more detail should be shown in Figures 7 and 11 for Business Document, as in UMM.	"…and/or the Business Document model, composed from Business Information Objects, which may be based on ebXML Core Components specifications, as shown in Figures 7 and 11.			Wording adopted in section 5.2.1, but otherwise deferred to CC docs and BP analysis overview. Figures 7 and 11 not updated.		3
80	4/6	Paul Levine	258	Improved terminology	"Common Business Processes, and Business Information Objects …"			Adopted.		3
81	4/6	Paul Levine	264	Improve emphasis	"The Specification Schema is an additional view of the metamodel, provided to …"			Adopted.		3
82	4/6	Paul Levine	272	State Figure reference	"…Schema is shown in Figure 1."			Adopted.		3
83	4/6	Paul Levine	288	State Figure reference	"This is shown in Figure 2."			Adopted.		3
84	4/6	Paul Levine	292	State Figure reference	"As Figure 2 shows,…"			Adopted.		3
85	4/6	Paul Levine	297-298,	Need to clearly state what Specification Schema production rules are capable of doing.	State clearly what the ebBPSS			Modified Bullet text, and rewrote production rules		3

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
			349-351		production rules are for.			paragraph.		
86	4/6	Paul Levine	298	Dotted box should include Business Documents as part of ebBPSS	Add Business Documents to bullet list and include within dotted box			Changed box to read Business Document Definition, and as such box stays outside.		3
87	4/6	Paul Levine	302-305	Include Business Documents	"The Specification Schema does not by itself define Business Documents. It provides for Structured Documents which may be already existing Business Document specifications or ones composed from Business Information Objects, which may be based on Core Components. It also provides for Unstructured Documents supplied from some other source.			Moved paragraph to separate section, reference is now only to CC, Business Information Objects is not part of BPSS		3
88	4/6	Paul Levine	317	Insert "that"	"…Document that is…"			Adopted.		3

Nu mber	Date	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issue Comment	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
89	4/6	Paul Levine	316-319	This is a critical sentence. We need to make sure it's true.				Sentence moved and clarified in production rules section.		3
90	4/6	Paul Levine	333	Chapter 8	Change Chapter 11 to Chapter 8.			Corrected.		3
91	4/6	Paul Levine	362	State Figure reference	"…are shown in Figure 3"			Adopted.		3
92	4/6	Paul Levine	425	Refer to Business Information Objects	"..using Business Information Objects, which may be based on core component specifications, …"			Not adopted: Business Information Object is a UMM concept, not a BPSS concept		3
93	4/6	Paul Levine	439	Replace "have" with "has"	"…community has flexibility…"			Corrected.		3
94	4/6	Paul Levine	472-473	Refer to Business Information Objects	"…from Business Information Objects, which may be based on core component specifications."			Not adopted: Business Information Object is a UMM concept, not a BPSS concept		3
95	4/6	Paul Levine	473-474	Clarify that context is determined from the business process and information model	"…contexts, which are determined through top-down business process analysis, starting with requirements."			Not adopted: Top down analysis is a UMM concept, not a BPSS concept .		3
96	4/6	Paul Levine	484	State Figure reference	"Figure 4 illustrates this process."			Adopted.		3
97	4/6	Paul Levine	488-498	The UML Specification Schema isn't sufficient for specifying a business process and	Delete 488-498			Adopted: Lines deleted		3

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				information model. The XML Specification Schema should be the focus for CPP/CPA.						
98	4/6	Paul Levine	527	Follow 6.4.1 section heading with a reference for Figure 5.	Insert "Figure 5 illustrates a business transaction."			Adopted.		3
99	4/6	Paul Levine	566- 567	State Figure reference	"…Transaction are shown in Figure 6."			Adopted.		3
100	4/6	Paul Levine	581	Remove "a"	"…suggests that partners…"			Corrected.		3
101	4/6	Paul Levine	621	State Figure reference	"…for this is shown in Figure 7."			Adopted.		3
102	4/6	Paul Levine	628- 629	Change Document Type to Business Document and show more detail in relation to Business Document as in UMM.	Add construct in relation to Business Document as in Figure 9-12 of UMM. Also use this to clearly show relationships to Business Information Objects and Core Components as extended by context, from the ebXML Specification for the Role of Context in the Re-usability of Core Components and			Adopted. We will rename DocumentType to BusinessDocument. We will rename Schema to DocumentSpecification See updated DTDs suffixed 10_A.		3

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
					Business Processes (ebCNTXT)					
103	4/6	Paul Levine	640-648	Change Document Type to Business Document and add descriptive text of added construction as requested for 628-629	Will be happy to work with the team on drafting text if comment is accepted.			Adopted. See issue 102.		3
104	4/6	Paul Levine	689	Follow 6.4.2 section heading with a reference for Figure 8.	Insert "Figure 8 illustrates a binary collaboration."			Adopted.		3
105	4/6	Paul Levine	710-711	Make consistent with 393-396	"…Binary Collaboration, possibly within…"			Rejected. The difference is intentional, not inconsistent.		3
106	4/6	Paul Levine	821	Follow 6.4.3 section heading with a reference for Figure 9.	Insert "Figure 9 illustrates a multiparty collaboration."			Adopted.		3
107	4/6	Paul Levine	843	Make Transaction singular	"…Business Transaction Activities…"			Corrected.		3
108	4/6	Paul Levine	871	Follow 6.4.4 section heading with a reference for Figure 10.	Insert "Figure 10 illustrates a choreography."			Adopted.		3
109	4/6	Paul Levine	872-873 982-983	Terminal State should be Completion State	Change Terminal State to Completion State			Rename TerminalState to CompletionState (this is a UML diagram only issue, DTD does not have this element as it is abstract).		3
110	4/6	Paul Levine	903	'onInitiation' belongs to Transition	Change 'BusinessTransa ctionActivity' to 'Transition'			Corrected.		3
111	4/6	Paul	913	Insert 'is'	"IsConcurrant is			Corrected. Retain		3

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
		Levine			the…"			attribute isConcurrent and all associated text. UMM is unclear about meaning of this attribute, we believe it is for concurrent instances of the SAME transaction and as such> different from fork. BPSS will reflect it as such and distinguish it from fork. It should be clarified in UMM as well.		
112	4/6	Paul Levine	914	Insert 'the'	"It is at the business…"			Corrected.		3
113	4/6	Paul Levine	979	Statue Figure reference	"Figure 11 shows…"			Adopted.		3
114	4/6	Paul Levine	982- 983	Change Document Type to Business Document and show more detail in relation to Business Document as in UMM.	Add construct in relation to Business Document as in Figure 9-12 of UMM. Also use this to clearly show relationships to Business Information Objects and Core Components as extended by context, from the ebXML Specification for the Role of Context in the Re-usability of			Adopted. See issue 102.		3

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
					Core Components and Business Processes (ebCNTXT)					
115	4/6	Paul Levine	3147-3151	Similar to 488-498, the UML Specification Schema isn't sufficient for specifying a business process and information model.	Replace text with "Production rules are specified that governed the one-time generation of the DTD Specification Schema from the UML Specification Schema. The production rules are defined for concrete…"			Adopted.		3
116	4/8	William J. Kammerer	666	The documentType should show ="ebXML1.0/Purchase Order" (instead of PO Acknowledgement) since it is the RequestingBusinessActivity starting the whole transaction.

But this prompts me to ask a stupid question, inspired by an EDI document centric suggestion I gave someone on EDI-L at http://www.mail-archive.com/edi-l@listserv.ucop.edu/msg03097.html -i.e., how do you "signal" that a RequestingBusinessActivity has occurred when | | | | The inventory control example in the sample XML answers the question raised in this issue. | | 4 |

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
				the RequestingBusinessActivity documentType was never received? For example, what if you want to send a PO Acknowledgement to a manually called-in order? Would that have to be modeled with a separate business transaction, or is it assumed that an Order Entry system could trigger the successful completion of the RequestingBusinessActivity within the Business Service Interface?						
117	4/9	Jim Clark	225 thru 232	The BPSpec Schema should not be used to define Business Process Models	Remove any references that assert that the BP Specification Schema may be used for Business Process Modeling and affirm the requirement for ebXML Compliance, the model must conform to the semantics and structure of the UMM. Change line 238 from "recommended" to "required".			In section 5.2.1.Distinguish between BP modeling and BP specification. BPSS is used for the latter. Clarified compliance in section 5.1. Leave "recommended" as is. Propose to change TA accordingly.		5
118	4/9	Jim Clark	246 thru	The BPSpec Schema incorrectly defines the UMM Metamodel as a methodology	Change line 259 to "The UMM			Adopted		5

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
			262		Meta Model defines a set of business process viewpoints" and any other locations that assert the UMM Meta Model is a methodology.					
119	4/11	Bob Haugen	Various	One and only one metamodel. The firm agreement I seek is that the BPSS must be a strict subset of the UMM Metamodel, so that BPSS-compliant XML runtime business process specifications may be derived from UML models that conform to the UMM Metamodel. In other words, we need one and only one metamodel. This is an issue of conceptual integrity so everything fits together smoothly.				See issue #12.		6
120	4/11	Bob Haugen	Various	Integrity of transaction model, or, the ability to form legally binding contracts and enact legal events. The firm agreement I seek is that the BPSS must conform to the requirements for the commercial use of electronic document interchange of UN/ECE and the ABA. If the BPSS conforms to the business transaction semantics of the UMM Metamodel, then I believe this issue should be resolved as well. But I want to raise it in particular because I believe it is the most important business requirement on the BPSS. If we get the transactions right, the rest is gravy. If not, the rest doesn't work either.				We will (re-)introduce the DocumentEnvelope, but as an optional layer: A document flow can have a single BusinessDocument, or a DocumentEnvelope. Rename DocumentFlow to DocumentEnvelope AND align the attributes and semantics to be identical UMM and BPS. There was agreement to go ahead with this renaming, AND to move UMM towards alignment.		7

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
121	4/11	Bob Haugen	Various	Separate service levels for transactions and collaborations. Support for ebXML business transactions will be a great leap forward for the state of electronic business practice, and will handle many business scenarios. Support for collaborations, especially the BPSS multi-party design, splits, joins, etc. will be not only more difficult for software developers but also for business analysts. I recommend designating separate service or compliance levels for each degree of difficulty, so that simple transaction processors can be developed quickly and inexpensively. It's not that far beyond what people do now with RosettaNet PIPs.				No change required: We agreed this is an issue for a separate BSI whitepaper. But actually sections 6.6. and 6.7 already make this distinction		8
122	3/15	Karsten Riemer		RosettaNet signal dtd's In specschema 0.90 we had included RosettaNet RNIF 1.0 dtd's as the recommended dtd's for business signals. For specschema 1.0 we need to at the very least update these to the much simplified RNIF 2.0. A couple of questions before I do so: 1. Does UMM have a set of signal DTD's we should use instead. 2. RNIF 2.0. does not have an acceptanceAcknowledgement. Should I just clone the RNIF 2.0. receiptAcknowledgement? 3. Should we include the generic notification of failure? (This is not a signal, but a generic Business Document to notify another party				Resolved, see issue 75.		9

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				about a failure). 4. Does anyone in core components have suggestions how to use core components in any of these signals, they have tags like telephone number etc. in them. Attached are the two signals receiptAcknowledgement and exception, and the notificationOfFailure.						
123	4/11	William J. Kammerer	2978-3010	Completely unnecessary Datatypes are not referred to from any of the BP documents. Schema and DTD data types, and representation terms are supposedly going to be taken care of by Core Components. There's no need to parrot what's already in XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes, and is accepted wisdom.	Complete remove Section 9.1 Data typing, consisting of 9.1.1 Global Data types and 9.1.2 Local Datatypes.			Deferred to a later release.		10
124	3/28	Karsten Riemer	various	Inspired by Jamie Clark’s suggestion to look for a solution that preserves the current UMM mapping but achieve a better mapping to EDOC and future RosettaNet thinking I am making the following suggestion, which has several additional benefits listed below. Consider this a set of formal comments to spec schema v0.99 when the public review period closes (I am in Africa and may not be able to connect again). 1. BusinessTransaction to inherit from BinaryCoillaboration giving it two AuthorizingRoles and allowing definition and implementationof a standalone BusinessTransaction 2. DocumentFlow to to inherit from				Done.		11

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				BinaryCoillaboration giving it two AuthorizingRoles and allowing definition and implementationof a standalone DocumentFlow, i.e. support for a single message, in addition to the transaction support 3. BusinessTransaction to have N DocumentFlowActivities each using a DocumentFlow. This would in essence be a renaming of Requesting/RespondignBusinessActivity, and a relaxation that there must be only two of them.						
125	4/15	Neal Smith	180	The specification should also be provided as an XML Schema. Schema provides much stronger data typing and other advantages that make it the preferred format for ebXML.	The attached Schema is offered for consideration.			Adopted: Will include schema version		12
126	4/16	Neal Smith	2368 - 2387	Within DocumentFlow, DocumentType is an attribute, not an element.				Issues 126 - 129 asked for the documentation to be aligned with the DTD. Not done, but no DTD or schema changes are needed.		13
127	4/16	Neal Smith	2172	Attachment has a DocumentType attribute, included in the DTD but missing here.				fixed		13
128	4/16	Neal Smith	2136, 2175	The attribute "specification" is IMPLIED in the DTD at 2136. At 2175, it is called "Spec" and is REQUIRED.				fixed.		13
129	4/16	Neal Smith	2053, 2641, 2647	The attribute "waitForAll" has a default value of "true" in the DTD at 2053 in the DTD at 2136. At 2641, waitForAll is omitted from the attribute list. At 2647, waitForAll is documented as having a default value of "false".				fixed		13
130	4/17	James Bryce		Topic: Conformance of BPSS to the CEFACT N90 "UMM" metamodel				Resolution of general comments:		14

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
		Clark		General statement of issue: 1. EbXML requirements and TA documents recommend (use of "SHOULD") that business processes be logically modelled. The same documents require (use of "SHALL") any such modelling to employ CEFACT N90 UMM. 2. The BPSS references to the UMM are of varying clarity, perhaps reflecting the ambivalence of some drafters about the UMM. Commenters are understandably confused. The BPSS should unambiguously state what conformance to the UMM is required. 3. The BPSS should clearly identify the UMM version (e.g., N90 v9.1) to which conformance is required. If the authoritative version is not finalized by its owner (CEFACT TMWG?), the BPSS should state what assumptions if any are made about the final adoption, with or without changes, of the particular version in question. Specific instances: General (and Line 314-328): Any general references to 'metamodels' should be corrected to indicate that there is only one metamodel, that is logical in nature, not bound to a schema. This includes any remaining references to the 'business process and information metamodel' (which probably misleads readers into thinking there is a separate artifact, and should be deleted), and to the 'ebXML metamodel' (which should be considered candidates for a specific reference to the UMM, along with the manner if any in which the UMM constrains the process being references). Line 492: It is not clear to what the phrase "set				Propose change to TA to not require, but recommend UMM Minimize references to UMM from BPSS Yes, reference N90 v9.1 with caveat that it is not adopted yet, and if it changes, BPSS must be changed *separately* Resolution of specific instances: See new general description of relation to UMM (sections 5 and 6)		

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				of specification rules" refers. Line 499-501: It is not clear whether an XML expression of a transaction is logically constrained by the UMM, if not explicitly modeled in UML.						

131	4/17	James Bryce Clark		Topic: Transaction integrity and cardinality of document flows.
				
				General statement of issue:
				1. The UMM constrains logical transactions into two-party document flows composed either of a one-way transmission (as in a notification, where no response is required) or a two-way exchange (as in offer/acceptance, where a response is called for).
				2. This limitation accomplishes two things:
				    a. It permits an optimal upgrade path for users of widely-deployed EC/EDI formats using document-centric exchanges of X12 or EDIFACT messages (functional equivalents of paper documents). UMM allows those legacy documents to be encapsulated in logical wrappers that bear standardized transition and transaction control attributes.
				    b. The request-response paradigm forces transactions to be expressed in terms of bilateral exchanges. This permits simple logical resolution of the success or failure of each initiated transaction, in a manner highly isomorphic to a legal or auditing analysis of the contract. Nonconforming responses to a request are correctly evaluated as failures, requiring a new proposal ('counteroffer') and thereby avoiding recursive failure to resolve whether success has occurred. Requestors are permitted to specify the nature of responses,
								Resolution to specific instances:
								Both adopted
								
								Resolution to general issues: No action required, I believe the general issues were only raised in case "specific instances" not adopted.
								
								See issue #12.
										14

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				and the degree of security (e.g., nonrepudiation and receipt acknowledgment), but then required to abide by the result if the responder accurately conforms. Specific instances: Line 369-370: Reference to "one or two" document flows should be retained. Line 983: Cardinality of requesting and responding activities should be retained.						
132	4/17	James Bryce Clark		Topic: Transaction integrity and location of acknowledgement attributes. General statement of issue: 1. The UMM's request-response paradigm forces transactions to be expressed in terms of bilateral exchanges. This permits simple logical resolution of the success or failure of each initiated transaction, in a manner highly isomorphic to a legal or auditing analysis of the contract. 2. Nonconforming responses to a request are correctly evaluated as failures, requiring a new proposal ('counteroffer'), and thereby avoiding recursive failure to resolve whether success has occurred. 3. Requestors are permitted to specify the nature of responses, and the degree of security (e.g., nonrepudiation and receipt acknowledgment), but then required to abide by the result if the responder accurately conforms. The first principle permits requestors to issue binding offers, with a reasonable degree of certainty that they can constrain the terms of any contract formed by acceptance. (The parallel legal rule is that "the				Resolution to specific instances: All adopted (although need some clarification on specific suggested wording) BPSS will specify that requestor cannot send acceptanceAck Resolution to general issues: No action required, I believe the general issues were only raised in case "specific instances" not adopted. See issue #12.		14

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e-mail
				offeror is the master of the offer.") The second principle permits responders to rely on the enforceability of the formed contract, with a reasonably small risk that the requestor will repudiate by asserting a lack of agreement. (The parallel legal rules are that acceptance of a valid offer forms a contract, and the "mirror image" rule that makes any nonconforming acceptance a rejection and counteroffer.) 4. The logical conclusion that a bilateral transaction has succeeded should be independently deducible from the artifacts available to each side. (Giving one or the other the right to declare "success" or "failure" short of valid acceptance of a valid offer gives that party an unwarranted repudiation right.) 5. A responding party should not be entitled to require 'acceptance acknowledgement' confirmation from the requesting party of its responding signal. (Note that Figure 6 at line 570 correctly omits the relevant arrow.) There are no "business rules" against which to validate at that step: the responder knows whether he has sent a respond that conforms to the strictures specified by the requester. Specific instances: Line 571-579 Consider whether 'business signals" is the correct generic phrase for these acknowledgement attributes. If so, use them throughout. Line 578: Add to the sentence at 578, after "purpose": "s, relating to the processing and management of transaction document flows, prior to evaluation of their terms ". Line 580: Delete or refine the vague reference						

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				to the EDIFACT model TPA; delete the footnotes. Line 585: In place of the last five words of the sentence, insert "confirmed by the recipient as received as legible, prior to the application of any business rules or evaluation of its terms". Line 586: Delete or refine the vague reference to the EDIFACT model TPA; delete the footnotes. Line 585: At the end of the paragraph, insert the sentence: "The property '[[insert correct attribute]]' allows partners to agree that a [requesting] message should be pre-qualified by the recipient, i.e., confirmed by the recipient as being a valid answer under the business rules previously agreed, prior to the evaluation of its terms". Line 1044: Confirm that the attribute 'inIntelligibleCheckRequired (line 584) does not conflict with the parameter 'timeToAcknowledgeReceipt' here. Line 1240-1283: The ControlException and ProcessException signals should be evaluated as a source of inappropriate repudiation risk. They should only be available for use when the business signals require it (as described, e.g., in lines 1602-1608). Otherwise, must every responder hold back its shipment, after receiving RecieptAcknowledgement (from the requesting offeror) of its valid acceptance, until a time period elapsed without any ProcessException? If this risk remains, it should be noted in the document. Line 1617: The parameter 'timeToAcknowledgeAcceptance' should not be available to a responding document (and thus							

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				does not belong in this superclass). See general comment (5) above. Line 1624-1625: Consider a wellformedness rule requiring that any use of the 'timeToAcknowledgeAcceptance' parameter be accompanied by a URI or reference to the alleged business rules being invoked. (Otherwise, the asserter of business rules is free to apply what he likes, which may be equivalent to a unilateral right to repudiate.) Line 1671-1676: The "isSuccess" attribute on a Document Flow should not be available to deprecate the logical conclusion reachable from comparing the requesting and responding documents (or a time out event). Line 2357: [Additional occurrences of parameter definitions needing refinement.] Line 2363: [Additional occurrences of parameter definitions needing refinement.] Line 2385: [Additional occurrences of parameter definitions needing refinement.]						
133	4/17	James Bryce Clark		Topic: References to patterns General statement of issue: 1. The word "pattern" is overburdened in the BP documents. 2. Most frequently we use it to mean a logical set of business process components that is referenced (or invoked, so to speak) by a CPP. Such a 'pattern' may be simple (one atomic transaction, perhaps wrapped in a simple binary collaboration) or complex (a large concatenation of transactions among multiple parties, together with the conditional relationships between them).				Resolution to specific instances: All adopted Resolution to general issues: No action required, I believe the general issues were only raised in case "specific instances" not adopted		14

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				3. The explanation needs a bit of work. Specific instances: Line 439: Replace "using" with "user". Line 439: Replace "very different" with "an infinite number of specific". Line 440: After "collaborations", insert the following: "These specific combinations (which may be simple or complex, ranging from a single transaction to long logically-related chains of multiparty transactions) are referred to as 'patterns'. Patterns that express a commonly useful process can be re-used by others. The suggested practice of logical modeling using UMM, and the opportunity to make such modelled processes generally available to others through repositories, promote their re-use." Line 444. Revise to describe the N90 patterns simply as helpful examples of how the business signals interoperate. Lines 1029-1057: The use of the word "pattern" here varies. Sometimes (1040-42) it means a particular permutation of acknowledgement-attribute/business-signal settings. (This is a confusing use and should be rewritten.) Sometimes (1054) it means a set of components consisting of transactions and perhaps collaborations. (This use is consistent with the general BP vocabulary.) Sometimes (1057) it refers to the specific illustrative UMM N90 patterns that demonstrate certain permutations of the acknowledgement-attribute settings. (Those patterns should be described simply as helpful examples of how the business signals interoperate.)						

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
134	4/17	James Bryce Clark		Topic: Meaning of Nonrepudiation and Binding in Attributes General statement of issue: The phrases "nonrepudiation" and "legally binding" may be misunderstood by readers. The functionality provided by the relevant parameters is to create artifacts that provide a reasonable level of practical assurance of nonrepudiation, or binding nature -- not to deterministically reduce the risk in question to zero. Specific instances: Line 415: Delete "legally binding for" and insert "designated as legally binding between". Line 415: Insert after "two partners" the phrase ", or otherwise govern their collaborative activity." Line 415: Consider a "for example" cross-reference to the example/discussion of "binding" in the Patterns supporting document. Line 579: Consider a "for example" cross-reference to the example/discussion of "nonrepudiation" in the Patterns supporting document. Line 1609-1616: Rewrite to make it clear that what are produced by the referenced parameters are data artifacts, not abstract "audit controls." Line 1609-1616: Consider a "for example" cross-reference to the example/discussion of "nonrepudiation" in the Patterns supporting document. Line 2311, 2357, 2363: [Additional occurrences of parameter definitions needing				Specific instances adopted, and Jamie's own text included to address the general issue.		14

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
				refinement.]						
135	4/18	Bob Haugen	821	Line 821 section 6.4.3 Multi-Party Collaborations: Several issues about how this will work in practice: * What is the relationship of a multi-party collaboration XML document to the ebXML runtime CPA? * Who gets a copy of the multi-party collaboration document? Only some central party, or all participants? * Since the multi-party collaboration will be composed of several binary collaborations, what if the details of one binary collaboration should not be exposed to other participants of the multi-party collaboration?				Noted. Will be taken up when CPP/CPA move to multiparty support.		15
136	4/18	Bob Haugen		Followup to the discussion of ebXML business collaborations using non-ebXML documents: In some ebXML document, either the BPSS or some supporting document or appendix, there should be a clear statement of how to use ebXML business collaborations with business documents from other sources, including other XML formats like OAG, and also non-XML formats like X12 and EDIFACT.				Deferred to separate white paper (tbd), but partially illustrated in sample.		15
137	4/25	from BPE work		New renaming issues				Rename Requires-Precondition and ResultsIn-PostCondition		

Nu m ber	Dat e	Originator	Line	Issue	Suggestion for Change	Issu eCo mm ent	Reso lu tion Date	Resolution	Resol ved in versio n	URL of originat ing e- mail
								(Jim Clark to explore UMM alignment: UMM to rename Preconditions- Precondition PostConditions- PostCondition.)		

References

1   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-coord/200104/msg00000.html
2   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00013.html
3   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00015.html
4   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00017.html
5   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00018.html
6   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00025.html
7   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00026.html
8   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00027.html
9   http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200103/msg00068.html
10 http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00033.html
11 http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200103/msg00161.html
12 http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00054.html
13 http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00064.html
14 http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00083.html
15 http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200104/msg00096.html