

ebXML Technical Architecture Team

Summary of Disposition of Comments

ebXML Technical Architecture Specification

Version: (1.0) Release Date: 5th January 2001

Disposition Report prepared: 1th February, 2001

Reviewers: Brian Eisenberg, Duane Nickull

This document contains a detailed description of the disposition of all public comments submitted for the Technical Architecture Specification, including the comments provided by the Quality Review Team. The table below provides links to the ebXML mailing list archives for each comment submitted for review.

Date	Submitter	Submitter email address	Disposed	Comment URL
1/11/01	Tim McGrath	tmcgrath@tedis.com.au	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-coord/200101/msg00021.html
1/17/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00009.html
1/17/01	Duane Nickull	duane@xmlglobal.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00012.html
1/17/01	Tim McGrath	tmcgrath@tedis.com.au	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00013.html
1/18/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00015.html
1/17/01	Joaquin Miller	miller@joaquin.net	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00014.html
1/18/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00016.html

Robert 1/18/01	Cunningham	CunninghamR@MTMC.ARMY.MIL	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00017.html
1/18/01	Duane Nickull	duane@xmlglobal.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00020.html
1/18/01	Chris Ferris	chris.ferris@east.sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00024.html
1/18/01	Joaquin Miller	miller@joaquin.net	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00026.html
1/18/01	Chris Ferris	chris.ferris@east.sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00019.html
1/18/01	Joaquin Miller	miller@joaquin.net	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00025.html
1/19/01	Piming Kuo	piming.kuo@worldspan.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00031.html
1/20/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00033.html
1/20/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00034.html
1/18/01	Chris Ferris	chris.ferris@east.sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00018.html
1/18/01	Sally Fuger	sfuger@AIAG.ORG	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00021.html
1/20/01	Duane Nickull	duane@xmlglobal.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00023.html
1/21/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	Yes	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00036.html

1/22/01	Brian Eisenberg	briane@datachannel.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00038.html
1/26/01	Stuart Campbell	stuart.campbell@tieglobal.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00043.html
1/26/01	Mike Rawlins	rawlins@metronet.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00044.html
1/26/01	Bob Haugen	linkage@interaccess.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00046.html
1/28/01	John Petit	jpetit@kpmg.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00048.html
1/29/01	Karsten Reimer	kriemer@volcano.East.Sun.COM	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00050.html
1/29/01	Stefano Pagliani	stefano.pogliani@sun.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00052.html
1/29/01	Harold Hauschildt	hha@mosiac-ag.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200101/msg00053.html
12/28/01	Brian Eisenberg	briane@datachannel.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200012/msg00059.html
1/29/01	Martin Bryan	mtbryan@sgml.u-net.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-core/200101/msg00175.html
1/29/01	Martin Bryan	mtbryan@sgml.u-net.com	<u>Yes</u>	http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-core/200101/msg00177.html

NOTE: The disposition of each comment is contained in brackets with red font color and uses the following convention: [DISPOSITION:]

Quality Review Comments on Technical Architecture Specification V1.0

Footnote:

An earlier draft of this document contained a section “5.3 Design Conventions for ebXML Specifications”. This is a requirement for this document and appears to have been omitted in the latest version (possibly by error?). This section (or the subject matter of it) needs to be included in the next version.

[DISPOSITION: section 5.3 – line 225 - added section based on suggestions from Nikola and Brian posted to TA list]

The following are some of the editorial comments we believe should be addressed during the public review of this document.

Line 57. This “Summary of Contents of Document” should contain the contents of section 4.5 “Document Conventions”.

[DISPOSITION – removed section 4.5 – added section to summary of contents of Document]

Line 59-133. The Table of Contents should be Section 3 not 4.1.

[DISPOSITION: changed to section 3. Corrected numbering for all subsequent sections]

Line 179 –181. The use of uppercase for keywords (e.g. MUST, SHALL, etc.) is part of RFC 2119 to denote that wherever these terms appear they should be used in the context of the definitions in RFC2119. However, it appears that a global search and replace has been done on these terms to move them to UPPERCASE wherever they appear. On some occasions these keywords now appear out of context (e.g. lines 1334- 1342 Copyright Statement, line 468, and many more). These keywords should be replaced if they are not used in the correct context.

[DISPOSITION: editors made appropriate changes as suggested in subsequent comments and consulted RFC 2119 to get further clarification.]

Line 254. The term “interoperable” appears in several places and should be clearly defined, probably in the ebXML Glossary or in the Conformance section.

[DISPOSITION: Colin to add term to glossary]

Line 316-321. This paragraph reads better as the introduction to 7.1 rather than in the middle. In which case the last sentence can be removed.

[DISPOSITION: cut and pasted paragraph into 7.1 and removed last sentence]

Line 353. The sentence beginning “Figure 3...” should start a new paragraph.

[DISPOSITION: new paragraph created.]

Line 365. The word “industry” is too limiting, a better word would be “context”.

[DISPOSITION: industry changed to context.]

Line 386-388. The sentence does not read sensibly (needs copyediting).

[DISPOSITION: changed to “Business processes are created by applying the ebXML Modeling Methodology which utilizes a common set of business information and core components”]

Line 397-398. The sentence reads “In order to store the **models** in the *Registry*, they are converted to XML (e.g. XML DTD, Schema, etc.)”. It is not required that all models are in XML form. We suspect it should read “In order to store the **metamodels** in the *Registry*, they are converted to XML (e.g. XML DTD, Schema, etc.)”.

[DISPOSITION: line 397 – removed “developed by industry groups, SMEs, and other organizations. Changed model to Meta Model. Changed to: The Business Process and Information Meta Models MAY be stored in modelling syntax however, they MAY also be stored as XML syntax in the Registry.]

Line 403. DC 128 is not defined (or relevant??)

[DISPOSITION: deleted and removed from Normative References]

Lines 413-419. This list belongs in the Registry Specification or as a normative reference (in the latter case, there should be a default mechanism to guarantee interoperability).

[DISPOSITION: reviewed comments by Martin Bryan and David RR Webber, changed wording to satisfy concerns raised in comments. Because this issue related to other areas within ebXML (e.g. BP, and CC), the editors feel it is necessary to keep this wording in the specification. There currently are no plans to incorporate this functionality in the RegRep spec.]

Lines 435-445. These sub-sections are now un-necessary and their definitions can be incorporated into section 8.2.

[DISPOSITION: cut and pasted each overview sentence into their respective sections (7.2, 7.3, 7.4), changed numbering to reflect the removal of the Overview section.]

Lines 468 and 640. The term Trading Partner Profile is now Collaboration Protocol Profile.

[DISPOSITION: changed to Collaboration Protocol Profile]

Line 471 (and Line 939-Figure 16). What is an *ebXML Application*? Should it be *ebXML Business Service Interface*.

[DISPOSITION: changed Application to Business Service Interface. Assigned action item to Colin B. to ensure that this is defined in the ebXML glossary]

Line 481-483. This point is normative comment and should be a footnote to this section. The sections needs to explain why this statement is necessary, e.g. there is no 'run time' access to the Registry.

[DISPOSITION: originally added to clarify...will append as a NOTE to further clarify the section.]

Line 482. The word 'may' should be 'SHOULD'.

[DISPOSITION: changed]

Line 494. The term "SMEs and other organizations" may be too restrictive, possibly it could say "potential Trading Partners".

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Lines 502-506. This definition appears to be the same as a CPP. A suggestion is to change the last sentence to read, "ebXML defines the ability for this to be realized under the broad notion of a *Collaboration*." This could then make an introduction to this section.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted. CPA sentence (last one in paragraph) moved to CPA formal functionality]

Lines 556-560. This paragraph begins with a bullet point? It needs some introductory text to explain its context.

[DISPOSITION: reformatted to conform with other sections. Added sub title "Interface to Business Processes.]

Line 560. The terms "Roles" and "BP" need explanation.

[DISPOSITION: Added sentence to clarify..."The CPP contains essential information about the Trading Partner including, but not limited to, contact information, industry classification,

supported business processes, and interface requirements, and Messaging Service requirements. CPP's MAY also contain security and other implementation specific details..."]

Line 562. If there may be more than one CPA for a CPP then the phrase "the CPA for each", should say "any CPAs for each".

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted.]

Line 567-569. This paragraph appears somewhat self-defining. That is, a CPP defining the message that contains the CPP itself? It would benefit from an analogy (eg. "... in the same manner as a letter contain a name and address inside and outside the envelope.)

[DISPOSITION: sentence removed 567, because anything can be included in an ebXML payload, thus the sentence was redundant. Line 568 – "MAY" replaced with "SHOULD"]

Lines 571-585. We had difficult understanding this section in general. Therefore some comments may reflect our misunderstanding of the content.

[DISPOSITION: rewrote section to better clarify CPA interfaces. See updated section 8.1.5 for details.]

Lines 577-579. Sentence does not scan

[DISPOSITION: rewrote section to better clarify CPA interfaces. See updated section 8.1.5 for details.]

Lines 573-574. Is either redundant or misleading – does it imply all exchanges will use ebXML messaging?

[DISPOSITION: rewrote section to better clarify CPA interfaces. See updated section 8.1.5 for details.]

Lines 584-585. Is either redundant or misleading – if CPAs are in the registry they are just another ManagedObject, in reality CPAs are unlikely candidates for Registry items.

[DISPOSITION: while the first part is true in that a CPA just another managed object, there is a need to allow CPAs to be stored in a Registry as another type of managed object. It is likely that Trading Partners may wish to publish generic CPA's to help facilitate reuse.]

Line 587. There should be a comment about the situations where casual, informal or implied CPAs will exist.

[DISPOSITION: added sentence denoting this thinking.]

Line 618. The word 'executive' should be 'execute'.

[DISPOSITION: changed]

Line 635. We should not refer to anything as “legally binding”.

[DISPOSITION: removed “legally binding commerce...”]

Lines 647-650. This paragraph may benefit from an explanation of the benefits of using a single, consistent methodology, e.g. creates the potential for interoperable BP models.

[DISPOSITION: added sentence to explain the benefits. “One of the benefits of using a single, consistent modelling methodology is that it is possible to compare models to avoid duplication of existing Business Processes.”]

Line 658. The word “interpretation” makes this sentence meaningless. It may be better to use “representation”.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Lines 682-684. We could not follow the significance of this statement.

[DISPOSITION: deleted first paragraph.]

Line 723. Most of us technology dinosaurs were amused by the use of colour coding in these grey diagrams. It may be safer to use another convention.

[DISPOSITION: changed diagram to greyscale...] – Brian to swap out image...

Line 762. This statement may be misleading. Core Components SHALL be expressed in a syntax-neutral manner. These will have the capability of being expressed in XML form.

[DISPOSITION: changed to “Core Components SHALL be capable of being expressed in XML syntax.”]

Line 772. Will a Core Component be identified by a UID or GUID or is the unique identification something else?

[DISPOSITION: a UID is a more generic definition of the concept of unique identifiers, whereas a GUID is an application of the more generic UID concept.]

Line 780. We think the word “MAY” should be “SHALL”. If these things are not in the Registry how (and why) would ebXML use them?

[DISPOSITION: accepted]

Line 827. The word “is” should be “as”.

[DISPOSITION: accepted]

Lines 835-839. The TA spec should avoid specifying the structure of the Registry Information Model. The architecture should identify the functionality required of the Registry.

[DISPOSITION: this is the minimal functionality required of the RIM, not its exact structure. We have not modeled the RIM, but rather have outlined some of its functionality.]

Line 864. The word “messages” should be “services”.

[DISPOSITION: accepted]

Line 874. The sentence beginning, “The ebXML *Messaging Service* serves...” belongs on a new paragraph.

[DISPOSITION: accepted]

Line 885-887. The sentence needs re-writing to make it clearer.

[DISPOSITION: deleted sentence...clarification is provided in the registry specification.]

Line 889. Some of these points are not non-normative. Non-normative does not mean optional (it appears the “MAY” items for this section have been moved into here??).

[DISPOSITION: get recommendation from QRT or appropriate RegRep contact on what to do here.]

Line 939. The diagram (Figure 16) has “ebXML Applications”x

[DISPOSITION: term will be defined in ebXML glossary.]

Line 948-949. This sentence is redundant as a more detailed description is given in lines 961-969.

[DISPOSITION: deleted sentence]

Line 1009-1010. The use of the word “MAY” is not in alignment with the current TRP Message Services specification. This specification only allows for the use of MIME. (ref: Message Service Specification ebXML Transport, Routing & Packaging Version 0.8 10 November 2000, lines 198-205)

[DISPOSITION: changed MAY to SHALL]

Line 1019. The word “specified” should be “specifies”.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Lines 1041-1044. We could not understand this statement beginning “While conformance is a necessary...”. It reads as if to say: “conformance is not sufficient – what you need is conformance”!

[DISPOSITION: sentence deleted.]

Lines 1083-1087. How can we impose a SHALL on implementation testing, especially as there are no available test suites?

[DISPOSITION: changed SHALL to SHOULD]

Line 1096. The words “ebXML Infrastructure” should either be defined and italicised or written as “ebXML infrastructure”.

[DISPOSITION: italicised term and will append to glossary]

Lines 1102-1325. All of these scenarios are in need of significant updating to reflect changes in the document. The overview diagram (Figure 1. Line 261) could be extended to show each scenario.

[DISPOSITION:]

Lines 1326-1353. These clauses belong in the document body, before the Appendices (ie after section 11 and before line 1102)

[DISPOSITION: moved section before to appear before appendix.]

Comments from Nikola Stojanovic – 1/29/01

1) Line 175: Change to: DCE 1.1: Remote Procedure Call - UUID appendix.

BTW, full UUID reference is:

[DCE RPC] DCE 1.1: Remote Procedure Call. Open Group Technical Standard. [Document Number C706](#). [The Open Group](#) (Reading, UK: August, 1997). 737pp. Electronic edition, \$58.00. HTML edition on-line. UUIDs are specified in an [Appendix of the on-line edition](#). Registration is required to access the on-line material. C706 was formerly C309 [[CAE RPC](#)].

This is also an ISO standard. Maybe we should include full normative references and not only abbreviations?

[DISPOSITION: removed reference to DC GUID, UID is not the same as UUID, but rather a more generic way of introducing the concept of unique identifiers.]

2) Use exact spelling of ebXML all the time (never use EbXML or EBXML or ...).

[DISPOSITION: done]

3) Line 403: use UUID instead of GUID (GUID is Microsoft's term for UUID). This should be applicable to the whole spec (never use UID or GUID - no need for "or GUID"). In fact, if we use UID then stick to it and don't mention UUID or esp. GUID again.

[DISPOSITION: GUID is an application of the concept of a UID. UID is not the same as UUID.]

4) Line 403: there is no need for both UID and UUID. They should be the same mechanism. DCE RPC 1.1 - UUID is just one Recommended way to achieve global uniqueness of UIDs. There could be other ways to express Globally Unique IDs as well.

[DISPOSITION: GUID is an application of the concept of a UID. UID is not the same as UUID.]

5) Lines 409 - 419: Starting with "Existing ..." take all this out. It causes a lot of confusion. For wording and approach to UID concept I think we have 2 options.

<This is BizTalk approach>

Don't enforce DCE RPC 1.1 - UUID, but recommend it for all "Things" that need to be globally unique.

</This is BizTalk approach>

<This is UDDI, SIF, WebDAV,... approach>

Enforce DCE RPC 1.1 - UUIDs across the board for all "Things" that need to be globally unique.

</This is UDDI, SIF, WebDAV,... approach>

I always liked a second one better, but it looks like it might raise a lot of opposition. In that case we need at least BizTalk approach and wording would be something like this:

<New replacement for Lines 403 - 406>

Use of Universal Unique Identifiers (UUIDs), as per reference DCE RPC 1.1 - UUID, is a RECOMMENDED (Required?) way of providing this functionality.

</New replacement for Lines 403 - 406>

[DISPOSITION: GUID is an application of the concept of a UID. UID is not the same as UUID.]

6) Line 907: Change this to reflect 1) above.

[DISPOSITION: sentence removed.]

7) Line 921: I liked wording that we had prior to Tokyo and explanation why we have Header/Payload separation (<http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-architecture/200010/msg00013.html>). "Payload section (necessary for transport)" - this is not correct, ebXML TR&P doesn't care about payload.

[DISPOSITION: This section was reviewed by Rik Drummond during the Tokyo joint QR/TA review]

8) Line 998 - esp. Line 1009: MIME is not optional, it is required => don't put under non-normative and don't use MAY, but SHALL when referencing MIME and packaging. Also, we need to use the latest picture from the current MS spec (http://ebxml.org/project_teams/transport/private/ebXML_Message_Service_Spec_Version_0.92_NCM.pdf).

[DISPOSITION: wording changed to reflect this fact.]

9) Way too many SHALLs, MAYs, ... It would be better if we can get rid of many of these.

[DISPOSITION: We have carefully adhered to RFC 2119 and have extracted and removed as many of these as appropriate.]

Comments from Mike Rawlins – 1/22/01

Line Range: All

Comment:

A vast improvement over the version I reviewed last summer

Rationale:

More cohesive - contains all of the items essential for an architecture.

Suggested Change:

None

Line Range: 198-198

Comment:

phrase "proprietary integration approaches" in the context of EDI is unclear, since EDI syntax is not-proprietary. I'm not sure what you intend to say here.

Rationale:

Statement is confusing, and obscures the rationale.

Suggested Change:

Clarify your meaning.

[DISPOSITION: section agreed to by a wide audience. QR team helped draft section, thus our decision to leave it as is.]

Line Range: 190-216

Comment:

Lacking in several customary items usually listed as design goals. Also lacks explicit mention of SME's, though they are mentioned by implication.

Rationale:

Need more detail.

Suggested Change:

Add explicit mention of SMEs. Add other design goals, specific to the architecture in particular and not just overall ebXML, such as scalability, easily implementable, standards based. Or, include reference to particular goals or sections of Requirements Specification.

[DISPOSITION: ebXML design goals are in the requirements document, so we added a sentence with a reference to it]

Line Range: 275-275

Comment:

Bad grammar

Rationale:

Bad grammar

Suggested Change:

From "that the company is able to engage in" to "in which the company is able to engage".

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line Range: 289-289

Comment:

bad wording?

Rationale:

meaning unclear

Suggested Change:

change "who it wants" to "how it wants"

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line Range: 397-397

Comment:

Naive statement

Rationale:

May leave bad impression on reader. SMEs probably won't develop models (industry groups of SMEs might)

Suggested Change:

Omit "SMEs"

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line Range: 454-454

Comment:

need possessive sense

Rationale:

grammar

Suggested Change:

change "stored in it business profile" to "stored in its business profile"

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line Range: 649-650

Comment:

A mandate to use a specific modeling technique and language, i.e., UML, does not ensure a consistent methodology.

Rationale:

Statement is inaccurate.

Suggested Change:

Omit this statement, or change methodology to some other phrase that indicates your intention.

[DISPOSITION: new sentence added, also disposed of from QR comments – see above.]

Line Range: 662 and 667 - may be other instances

Comment:

I think you mean business process description or specification, and not just business process

Rationale:

Clearer meaning.

Suggested Change:
Add "specification" after "business process"

[DISPOSITION: change accepted as per QR team requests.]

Line Range: 682-684

Comment:
This statement is confusing.

Rationale:
Remove confusion.

Suggested Change:
I don't know what you intend here, so don't have a specific change. You need either more rationale and explanation for this statement, or need to remove it. On the face of it, it seems to be contradictory to say that the interfaces are outside the scope of ebXML.

[DISPOSITION: removed as suggested in QR review comments.]

Line Range: 845 and 874-875

Comment:
These statements appear to be contradictory.

Rationale:
Causes confusion and ambiguity.

Suggested Change:
I think you mean "transport" in 845 in the sense of a network stack (transport and the layers beneath it). Clarify that this is the sense in which transport is used. May also want to add in the same sentence that the transport *mechanism* is ebXML messaging, which is itself independent of the underlying network protocols as indicated in figure 16.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line Range: 961-969

Comment:
This seems to indicate that the messaging service layer is responsible for enforcing "rules of engagement" regarding the business processes and particular documents that trading partners use.

Rationale:
Clarify technical intent.

Suggested Change:

I may be wrong, but being payload neutral, I don't think that the messaging service is responsible for enforcing business rules of engagement (rules related to the BOV). If this is the case, you need to explicitly state that the messaging service enforces certain of the FSV rules, but not the BOV rules.

[DISPOSITION: modified sentence to indicate scope of messaging service layer.]

Line Range: ALL

Comment:

Requirement not met.

Rationale:

Need to meet requirement

Suggested Change:

ebXML Requirements Specification states that architecture must:

"Provide design guidelines for ebXML compliant messages"

This is not addressed in this version. Need to address it. Was this omitted by error in this version, or is it a separate document?

[DISPOSITION: this has already been done in the ebXML Messaging Service Spec, thus is not relevant to the TA spec.]

Line Range: ALL

Comment:

Though a vast improvement over previous versions, I still have reservations about the architecture adequately meeting the overall goals for: enabling interoperability between dissimilar, but ebXML compliant, XML implementations, supporting compatibility with existing Technology and EB standards and practices simplicity provide basic, low cost solutions appropriate for SMEs support ad hoc, informal exchanges minimizes costs for development, maintenance, and use

Rationale:

Need to meet requirements.

Suggested Change:

None at this point, since we are a bit late in the cycle. I will not vote against the document on this basis, but want to go on record with these reservations.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

Comments from Paul Levine – 1/26/01

Line range: 176

Comment: Should include UN/CEFACT Modeling Methodology (UMM)

Rationale: Even though this is still work in progress (to be finished in February 2001), it is the ebXML recommended business process and information modeling methodology that should be referenced on line 730

Suggestion for change: Add UN/CEFACT Modeling Methodology (UMM)

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 240

Comment: Change “parcel” to “bundle”

Rationale: It’s a given that the ebXML metamodel will be registered and stored. Business Process and Information Models need to be registered and stored so they can be shared/reused.

Suggestion for change: Change Meta Model to Model

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 274

Comment: Change “parcel” to “bundle”

Rationale: ISO/IEC 14662 defines the term “information bundle”, not “information parcel”

Suggestion for change: Change “parcel” to “bundle”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 286

Comment: Remove “that”

Rationale: Editorial

Suggestion for change: Remove “that”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 301

Comment: Add IEC

Rationale: Same as reference

Suggestion for change: Change ISO to ISO/IEC

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 355, Fig. 3

Comment: Business Library contains Business Information Object Classes and Business Processes

Rationale: Be consistent with line 313

Suggestion for change: Add Business Information Object Classes to the contents of the cylinder in Fig. 3

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 374

Comment: Change “parcel” to “bundle”

Rationale: ISO/IEC 14662 defines the term “information bundle”, not “information parcel”

Suggestion for change: Change “parcel” to “bundle”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 375

Comment: Change “messages” to “documents”

Rationale: “message” implies the data-centric paradigm

Suggestion for change: Change “messages” to “documents”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 377

Comment: No mention of common business processes

Rationale: The business library will contain common business processes as a starting point for modeling business processes

Suggestion for change: Add to line 377 the following proposed text: “Common business processes in the Business Library may be referenced in creating analysis and design artifacts.”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 385, 386, 608, 721

Comment: Replace “Business Objects” with “Business Information Objects”

Rationale: Make a clear distinction from a software business entity object

Suggestion for change: Replace “Business Objects” with “Business Information Objects”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 653

Comment: Replace “core” with “common

Rationale: Current terminology being used by the JDT Analysis/Methodology Group

Suggestion for change: Replace “core” with “common

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 730

Comment: Replace UML with UMM

Rationale: UML is a formal description technique. UMM is the UML-based methodology

Suggestion for change: Replace UML with UMM

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Line range: 799

Comment: Change “instances in which the Business Object occurs” to “instances of Business Information Objects in which the Core Component occurs”

Rationale: Section 9.3 is on Core Components, not Business Objects. Core Components should be

Suggestion for change: Change “instances in which the Business Object occurs” to “instances of Business Information Objects in which the Core Component occurs”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, changes made to document]

Comments from John Petit – 1/28/01

Many of my concerns have been addressed in previous comments, but here a few extra.

- Line 171: should be “EDI” in caps (occurs on line 300 as well)

[DISPOSITION: change rejected. The open-edi specification uses the lower case convention.]

- Section 4.4: Request that hyperlinks be added to the standards that are referenced. Either that, or provide more information on each one.

[DISPOSITION: change rejected, hyperlinks are not part of the ebXML document convention]

- Figure 4. The Registry Services Interface is depicted as a database somehow separate from the registry itself. Simply change the Registry Services Interface to a different shape other than the barrel database shape.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

- Line 473 “Semantic meaning” is redundant.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

- Line 607 “Business Documents are composed from re-useable business information components” This seems to imply that one can only use reusable components, when in fact they are only encouraged, not required. Simply change to “Business Documents can be composed from re-useable business information components.”

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

- Figure 12. This is minor. Sorry to be a pain in the ass about shapes, but could you make the database containers look a little more like database barrels? These look like someone stepped on them.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

- Line 959: “the ebXML Messaging Service SHALL meet business needs”, this statement seems a little presumptuous, and a difficult promise to fill!. It certainly cannot meet all business needs large and small. Perhaps change to “the ebXML Messaging Service is designed to meet business messaging needs...”

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted, SHALL changed to SHOULD]

- Line 1167 “from the Scenario 1.” Grammar- take “the” out

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

- Line 1231 “This a the scenario describing..” grammar. Change to “This is a scenario...”

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

- *Comment on Comments: I disagree with Stefano Pogliani’s comment to downplay UID references in the TA doc. The use of UIDs goes across several ebXML groups (CC, Registry, BP, etc) and UIDs are going to play a critical role in cross schema interoperability and semantics. As the TA doc should illustrate concepts that bridge several ebXML groups, UIDs should certainly be covered in the TA doc. In fact, I would like to see a bit more of an explanation of the UID mechanism for semantic translation of XML documents. Clearly this is something others would like to see as well as evidenced by the recent flurry of emails over the use of UIDs.*

[DISPOSITION: comments duly noted and taken into consideration and addressed in all comments on the subject of UID/GUID]

Comments from Stefano Pogliani – 1/29/01

Subject: RE: Comments on TA doc V1.0

- **From: Stefano POGLIANI <stefano.pogliani@sun.com>**
- **To: "Petit, John" <jpetit@kpmg.com>, ebxml-architecture@lists.ebxml.org**
- **Date: Mon, 29 Jan 2001 12:16:01 +0100**

John,

two words on your comment on my comments:

“...I disagree with Stefano Pogliani’s comment to downplay UID references in the TA doc. The use of UIDs goes across several ebXML groups (CC, Registry, BP, etc) and UIDs are going to play a critical role in cross schema interoperability and semantics. As the TA doc should illustrate concepts that bridge several ebXML groups, UIDs should certainly be covered in the TA doc. In fact, I would like to see a bit more of an explanation of the UID mechanism for semantic translation of XML documents.”

Clearly this is something others would like to see as well as evidenced by the recent flurry of emails over the use of UIDs."

My comments raise from the following:

1. If CC, BP and CPA would require explicitly to use the UIDs, then this may be an "architectural" thing.
In this case I would "move" the explanation of them outside of the RegRep since, as you note, it is a technology that spans different domains. At this point, I would make a paragraph somewhere saying that, whenever a Unique ID is required, then the GUID (or any other mechanism) will be used consistently and this same mechanism will be enforced by the RegRep.
2. If other teams do not need to explicitly reference UIDs, then it will be something inside the RegRep and it will be a technical implementation.

I am not saying to remove any and all of the occurrences of UID-related sentences. I am trying to say that this would need to be a fair small section that does not need to be repeated in too many places.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. See disposition of related comments regarding the UID/GUID issue.]

Comments from Martin Bryan – 1/29/01

Subject: Re: [Fwd: ebXML TA spec v1.0 - LAST CALL for public comments]

- *From:* Martin Bryan <mtbryan@sgml.u-net.com>
- *To:* "Blantz, Mary Kay" <mblantz@netfish.com>, ebxml-core@lists.ebxml.org
- *Date:* Mon, 29 Jan 2001 09:40:10 +0000

I note that in 9.2.3 the TA spec states:

"A Business Process instance MAY specify the constraints for exchanging business data with other Trading Partners. "

while in 9.2.2 the plural "constraints" is made singular in:

"A Business Process SHALL be comprised of an information model or XML-based representation of that model, that is capable of expressing the following types of information:

- Provide a context constraint that affects Core Components"

[DISPOSITION: corrected wording.]

Note also that 9.2.2 implies that one constraint can affect multiple core components. This is the first time I have seen this suggested.

I also note that 9.2.3 states:

"Accordingly, a Business Process document SHALL reference the Core Components directly or indirectly using a XML document with metadata (possibly DTD's or Schemas) that can be uniquely referenced."

What does "indirectly using a XML document with metadata" mean?

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

Comments from Martin Bryan – 1/29/01

Subject: Re: more: Re: Tag Languages, UID's etc.

- *From:* Martin Bryan <mtbryan@sgml.u-net.com>
- *To:* ebXML Core <ebxml-core@lists.ebxml.org>
- *Date:* Mon, 29 Jan 2001 08:50:59 +0000

I would remind you all of the following quote from the ebXML Technical Architecture, due for final approval today (29th January)

"In order to enable this functionality, the use of Unique Identifiers (UIDs) is REQUIRED for all items within an ebXML Registry System. UID keys are REQUIRED references for all ebXML content. Globally Unique Identifiers (DC 128 - GUID) MAY be used to ensure that Registry entries are truly globally unique, and thus when systems query a Registry for a GUID, one and only one result SHALL be retrieved."

GUIDs may be used. UIDs are required.

"To facilitate semantic recognition of Business and Information Meta Models, the Registry system SHALL provide a mechanism for incorporating human readable descriptions for Registry items.>

Note that human readable descriptions only apply to met models (whatever that means)

> Existing Business Process and Information Models (e.g. RosettaNet PIPs)

SHALL be assigned UID keys when they are registered in an ebXML compliant Registry system. These UID keys MAY be implemented in physical XML syntax in a variety of ways. These mechanisms include, but are not limited to:

- A pure explicit reference mechanism (example: URN:UID method),
- A referential method (example: URI:UID / namespace:UID),
- An object-based reference compatible with W3C Schema (example URN:complextype name), and
- A datatype based reference (example: ISO 8601:2000 Date/Time/Number datatyping and then legacy datatyping). "

There is, therefore, no requirement that GUIDs or UIDs be valid XML Path/Pointer locators (which is an error in my opinion). Note also the non-standard use of namespace qualifiers to UIDs, and the presumption that complextype names will be unique within the registry! What the last option is meant to imply is beyond me.

Personally I would not like to see this section (7.3) approved as it stands for a number of reasons:

a) it does not allow versioning of objects, so that you cannot update models, find all different versions of a model, distinguish which version applied at which time (despite what the third of the bulleted items implies)

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Note that when an object is modified, it becomes a new object. OO doesn't provide for versioning, and thus when objects are modified, they are assigned a new UID, thus becoming a new object.]

b) it requires different registries to ensure that a particular complextype name has not been assigned in another registry (you cannot distinguish which registry assigned the complextype name)

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. This is an implementation issue. All we require is that business information objects are uniquely identified.]

c) it requires different registries to agree what set of UIDs they assign as the UID is not associated with a registry name

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. URI's can be part of the path]

d) It only allows names to be applied to Meta Models, not to the names of objects defined using these metamodels.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Changes made to allow naming of objects.]

I would prefer to see references to UIDs made in the following form:

namespace:UID="UID::timestamp" or
UID="<http://www.myweb.org/registryID/UID::timestamp>"

In these examples the principle difference is that the namespace prefix, or the registry web address, act as qualifiers that allow users to distinguish between UIDs assigned in different places, while the timestamp allows them to distinguish between different versions of a model that are made a different times over the lifecycle of the metamodel.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Again, this an implementation issue and is beyond the scope of the TA spec. See the RegRep spec for detailed information on how to assign UIDs]

Comments from Harold Hauschildt – 1/29/01

Subject: RE: Comments on TA doc V1.0

- *From:* **Harald Hauschildt** <hha@mosaic-ag.com>
- *To:* 'Stefano POGLIANI' <stefano.pogliani@sun.com>, "Petit, John" <jpetit@kpmg.com>, "ebxml-architecture@lists.ebxml.org" <ebxml-architecture@lists.ebxml.org>
- *Date:* Mon, 29 Jan 2001 15:20:33 +0100

Hi Stefano, hi John, hi List!

I like to express my point of view to the UID-discussion below...I did that earlier during the review cycle...

The whole ebxml idea becomes much more clear at least to the (converter-)developers if the term UID/GUID would be explicit used within the TA doc.

To distinguish the concept of ebxml from other concepts (e.g. BizTalk), to proof that ebxml is not just another standard und to show to the world that we have learned from the past 20 years of EDI(fact) the term of UID/GUID should be described within the TA doc.

I agree with Johns comment that "UIDs are going to play a critical role in cross schema interoperability and semantics" and that the TA doc should covers this topic as a bridge between the different groups docs.

I agree also with John that "others would like to see [UID's covered by the TA doc] as well as evidenced by the recent flurry of emails over the use of UIDs"at least me.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. See disposition of related comments regarding the UID/GUID issue.]

Comments from Stefano Pagliani – 1/29/01

Harald,

if this is the opinion of the majority, I do not object.

I would only prefer to avoid that the TA document contains description of UIDs so many times.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. See disposition of related comments regarding the UID/GUID issue.]

Comments from Stuart Campbell – 1/26/01

Subject: RE: ebXML TA spec v1.0 - LAST CALL for public comments

- *From:* **Stuart Campbell** <stuart.campbell@tieglobal.com>
- *To:* 'Brian Eisenberg' <BrianE@DataChannel.com>
- *Date:* Fri, 26 Jan 2001 17:37:50 +0100

Title: **ebXML TA spec v1.0 - LAST CALL for public comments**

Dear Brian

Please see below comments on the ebXML TA spec v1.0 which i have read with vigour and without any preconceived views. They are divided into editorial (real low level stuff and non-editorial (clarification, open questions). Certainly i saw no show stoppers except for security.

[DISPOSITION: security is being dealt with in the TA Security Sub-team, who is chartered with generating a separate document addressing security issues related to the ebXML Framework.]

In general, i think the document is well written and in most areas fairly clear in the direction. The one exception is the area on security which is in essence surprisingly missing (with a weak explanation why) and a few sections (e.g. 631) which are so abstract and full of new undefined terms they are rather difficult to grasp.

Having also re-read the requirements specification i do not see major conflicts although the requirements specification for ebXML as a whole should itself be.

Although there are many editorial comments, i would class many as 'lack of clarification'. Most of these would be resolved with the inclusion of one or two example words (performed in some sections) since much terminology from many different areas is introduced. It should be noted that a definition section would be useful but is currently missing and whilst i appreciate a global glossary is being developed, and is necessary, these documents are not on the table now. I also think it very important you use the ebXML branding consistently (rather than EbXML, EBXML etc).

[DISPOSITION: comments noted, ebXML used instead of EBXML.]

The perspective i have read this from at a personal level is someone who has taken a background interest in ebXML and now as a more proactive adopter and supporter. From a TIE company perspective we are, of course, a well known supporter and committer to ebXML. Thus I would see myself as a secondary audience in the definitions used in the specification, although i personally would have thought that this document is, or should, have people like my self included in the primary audience. Finally i should clarify that my colleague Colin Barnham from TIE is our main expert in this group and that my involvement is to read it more from a neutral and unencumbered viewpoint.

I hope these comments are useful to you and your team (even if a little late). I am at your disposal if you require any clarifications.

Non Editorial

6: The version number should be far clearer - rather hidden way in a file name. Particularly on the first page and preferably on every page. This also applies to the status of the document

[DISPOSITION: done – added v1.0.1 to spec title]

148: Remove 'some' - automatically provokes thought 'whats hidden'

[DISPOSITION: done]

169-175 The source should be put on all of these - to identify how to get hold of them. eg 169 and 175. In particular i have no ideal where to even think about getting DC 128 GUID.

[DISPOSITION: DC GUID reference removed from TA spec.]

175 GUID - a label should be attached to give a hint what it is

[DISPOSITION: DC GUID reference removed from TA spec.]

254 This effectively says 'introduces the following concepts and architecture: a standardized business messaging service. At first view one can easily jump to the conclusion that this is a service 'run by ebXML' - i think it should be called a mechanism

[DISPOSITION: changed to framework]

260 This is perhaps more of a question. From the diagram and text there is a very strong inference that implementation/profiles etc are always stored on a registry which is not held by a business. From my understanding of discussions, as well as from a business viewpoint, i can well see registry implementations at company sites (which may or may link to the central repository network). This has advantages and disadvantages of course. I think this should be hinted at in the text/diagram and also the wider concept of a web of repositories rather than a single one since this is a first initial view of the architecture

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. This is a use case not and architecture diagram.]

373 There should be an additional sentence describing what are activity and sequence diagrams. This would then be consistent with the text in eg 374 and 370 section (plus others)

[DISPOSITION: added reference to UMM]

390 Unless i missed something, in the diagram CPA/CPD are undefined and are not used or defined in the text immediately after the diagram. These acronyms should be expanded since they have not yet been introduced

[DISPOSITION: comment accepted. Diagram changed to reflect this.]

407-section I think this is far too low level to be in an architecture specification. If they are included it would be better to give a physical example rather than an abstract example

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

421 Dependent on your view of life this can imply that not only the specifications and ebXML infrastructure should be geared towards multilingualism, but also any thing you eg trade in ebXML or eg dump in the repository. If the latter is taken then i as a user within one country (>90% of all traffic is national only) could infer that my 'content' should also be multilingually orientated. I do not believe this would be of benefit

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. This is a universal requirement of the ebXML Framework as specified in the Requirements document.]

499 This implies 'minimum and no more'. What i think it means as 'at a minimum but there may well be more'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Changed minimum to supported]

531-534. I (and thus others) really do not understand the difference between 1 (trading partner could do) and 2 (trading partner is capable of doing). If this 'distinction' is necessary it should be explained in more detail or the distinction and levels removed

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. This is clarified under the CPP and CPA sections of the document.]

576/578 I think this conflicts with 531/534 (or at least relationship is unclear) since it talks about the 'will' of cpa's is an abstract of 2 CPPs - ie is nothing else except for 'will'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. The was clarified in the disposition of the QR team comments]

589 Its says a CPA is negotiated after... this then conflicts with 531-534 which implies its more of a statement

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. CPP drives CPA negotiation.]

587 section. What has this paragraph got to do with non-normative. I assume at first this was ebXML conformant payload vs user customized extension. When i read the paragraph it talks about changing CPA (which is logical) but then also stops shorts at what should be done about them

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

617 nominal. Does this mean MANDATORY

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Removed nominal]

621 'standalone' implies to me 'no relationship between them' - is this true?

[DISPOSITION: Yes]

631 section. This is fairly unintelligible. There are a number of new terms introduced patters,signals etc some of which are undefined (eg signal) and are so abstract its hard to know what is meant. It would be useful to put one or two examples in at this stage even if the more formal explanation comes later

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Cleaned up section to better clarify.]

642 The diagram of 642 should perhaps be enhanced to include signals and to show any relationship between the lower and upper items in the box (as far as i understand there must be some since they are in the same box). Also put some text on the relationship lines to say what they mean.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Cleaned up section to better clarify.]

670 Choreography is used (i think maybe even once before) but it is not really explained

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Added example to clarify.]

682 I understand the statement but not the implication. Is this related to external applications?

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Removed statement.]

692 A 50 word sentence of terminology - help me understand this one - perhaps a diagram speaks a thousand words or at least 50 :-)

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. The was clarified in the disposition of the QR team comments]

701 It is un-obvious to me why this is 'MAY'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Changed to SHOULD]

649 says shall be UML for business process modelling whereas 729 says may. I guess this is because of the non-normative heading but i think it should be more explicit

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. The was clarified in the disposition of the QR team comments]

738 Can core components be nested. This paragraph suggests they cant

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Core Components can be nested. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

789 Can it be explained how the sentence relates to the heading of non-normative. Whats does it really mean?

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

800 The diagram should be extended to show core components can be nested. As it stands it suggests they can only be sequential

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Diagram reflects this nesting as an Aggregate Component. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

805 An example of a core component would be very informative at this stage

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

813 should be clear right at start that is a network of repositories - eg registries interface with other registries and users

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. The RegRep specification provides this level of detail.]

835 what does 'information associations' mean?

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

835 what does 'mutability' mean????

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

838 what does 'file representation type mean' ???

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

847 Im pretty surprised that there is a MAY here. For company repositories i could understand it but on the basis of a web of repositories which will invariably be needed for 'enabling a single global electronic market' i would have thought these should all be mandatory. In particular registry-registry interactions should be mandated for ebxml compliance

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

860 it suggests earlier that repository is not for human interactions - but in this sentence it suggests otherwise. Am i missing something?

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

942 Maybe its addressed elsewhere/at a lower level but for messaging and repository services should there be a hint at the capability and response times expect by such systems. In this document this should be hinted at to ensure it is addressed

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Implementation detail.]

1086 'vendor neutral organisation such as NIST and OASIS should'. This is a) be a MAY, b) not push certain bodies especially since these both bodies are largely US and does not create a global picture c)There is no reason for conformance suites not to be generated by other organisations (including vendors)

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Changed to SHOULD]

1092 This section seems to be missing. Its quite startling its not in the architecture specification.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Disposed of by Stefano's comments and updated appendix section.]

1250 If this scenario is so completely the same, why include it except widening the previous scenario

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Disposed of by Stefano's comments and updated appendix section.]

1250 I would like to see a scenario (which is different i think to scenario 4) where by there are three parties (no service provider) and where the transaction between two of them is totally dependant on the success of a transaction between the initiator and the third

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

Editorial

46:Klaus Naujoks name disappeared (may be true for others) between version 0.9 and this one!. If he contributed then i assume he should still be in!

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Klaus requested that his name be removed.]

59, 61 vs 114. A review thought the document should be made on the capitalisation of ebXML. In many case it is EBXML which i believe is incorrect

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Changes made]

138 There is no logical reason for MAY to be capitalised. I know this is in RFC rules but does this really apply to narrative overview text as well as technical text. Also in other sections

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Document harmonized with RFC 2119]

181: Is Bra97 needed - i automatically think 'what does this mean'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Part of the ebXML spec template.]

THROUGHOUT the document. In consistent use of capitals/lower case in the bullets - eg cf 329-331 to 338-340

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Changed made accordingly]

268-268 In essence this text is covered in 282 and is unnecessary, but at least it may be worth considering moving the 1st text

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

459 Shouldn't the arrows from the registry to the libraries be two way

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

491 Remove the square bracket section in title – unnecessary

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. done]

493-508 i think this section could be better phrased since its only when you get to 508/508 you really understand the relationship and then you wonder want the first part of the second paragraph means

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

510/527 Why is the word 'formal' needed - this implies there is also some informal functionality. On 587 its says 'non-non normative' which i presume is supposed to be the opposite of formal. It would be more logical to use either formal/informal or normative/non-normative

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

581 'Business Process document' - is this the right terminology since it hasnt been defined

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

584 for first stored say 'placed' so sentence reads better

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

619 what does 'other' mean

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

613 presumably 'design viewpoint'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

744 ':go-together is superfluous

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

783 I dont this this makes sense. How can a component interface with a element?

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

824 This statement is unnecessary. It has already been defined at the start and is also lacking in other areas such or business process/core components etc

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

827 Should probably be a comma after 'granularity'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

832 'are display' to 'would result in'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

843 would be of benefit to add (presumably) 'this is not part of ebXML and would be through individual vendors'

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
909 Does this reference need to be more explicit in the list of references
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
925 This doesn't show any relationship, just a set of blocks
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
937 Should be explicit and insert VAN - this will be important to EDI users who often like the trust and reliability they give
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
1019 Should be 'specifies' and Should probably be 'section' not 'clause'
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
1019 The introduction to this section is nice and informative. it would be of great benefit if it were adopted in other sections
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
1037 This is a real get out clause. You are either conformant to ebXML or not (even considering all the may's etc). This should be tightened up and we should have confidence in our activities
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]
1071 Extra space at start of bullet
[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort]

Comments from Karsten Reimer – 1/29/01

Subject: Tr: Comments on TA spec v1.0 - LAST
CALL for public comments

- *From:* "agrangard@nycall.com" <anders.grangard@edifrance.org>
- *To:* ebXML-Architecture List <ebxml-architecture@lists.ebxml.org>
- *Date:* Mon, 29 Jan 2001 10:14:14 +0100

----- Original Message -----

From: Karsten Riemer - Sun IR Development <kriemer@volcano.East.Sun.COM>
To: <BrianE@DataChannel.com>; <anders.grangard@edifrance.org>
Cc: <kriemer@volcano.East.Sun.COM>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2001 3:37 AM

Subject: Comments on TA spec v1.0 - LAST CALL for public comments

> Anders or Brian, please forward to TA team, since I cannot send to that list.

>

> To the TA team, here are my comments on TA spec v1.0.

>

> In general this document has come a long way since its first state,

> I appreciate all the hard work that has been done.

>

> I divide my issues into two groups, showstoppers and editorial.

> Showstopper means I cannot vote YES to approve TA spec v1.0. unless they are

> addressed. Editorial means I would like to have them addressed, but would vote

> YES even if they were not.

>

> Showstoppers:

>

> Section 7 is not about a reference model, it is about the UMM. It could be

> removed entirely. The concepts of BOV and FSV and the list of artifacts in

> figure 3 relate only to UMM. You do not need to know anything about BOV and

> FSV in order to understand the ebXML architecture, nor to be able to implement

> ebXML. If the section is kept in any form, it MUST be titled "ebXML

➤ recommended methodology".

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Title modified.]

>

> Line 299: Word reference model should be changed to methodology. ebXML does

> not have a reference model or reference architecture, or if it does someone

> needs to tell us what it is, and we need to make a normative reference to it.

>

[DISPOSITION: we are defining the ebXML Reference architecture as adopted from the open-edi ISO spec.]

> Line 301: ISO 14662 is NOT the reference model or reference architecture for

> ebXML, whereas it may be for UMM.

>

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

- > Section 8 adds more confusion than value. Remove entire section. It doesn't
- > provide any new information that is not covered in section 6 or 7, but
- > introduces the same information in a different way that makes users wonder if
- > they are looking at the same or something different. The word "phase" is
- > confusing.
- >

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Consensus disagrees with your statement.]

- > All references to Business Object need to be changed to the term agreed upon
- > by executives in Tokyo, namely "Business Information Object" (or any
- > subsequent executive override of that term that I may not be aware of).

Lines:

- > 385, 387, 721, 799, 1014, Figure 12, and probably more places
- >

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

- > All references to "object classes" should be removed, changed, or qualified to
- > be UMM related only. Lines: 313, 319, and probably more places
- >
- > Line 613: drop "objects and"
- >

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Terms qualified as UMM terms..]

- >
- > Editorial:
- >
- > Drop capitalization of MAY, SHOULD, etc. In many cases re-phrase to avoid
- > those words.
- >

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Consensus disagrees with your statement, and the STC requires us to conform to the ebXML specification template.]

- > If any part of section 7 is kept: lines 323-348 add more confusion than value.
- > Remove entire block of lines.
- >
- > If section 7 is dropped, Figure 4 in section 7 should be moved to section 6 as
- > an illustration of how ebXML architectural components satisfy the scenario

and

> bullets 1-7 in lines 237-258

>

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Consensus disagrees with your statement.]

> If section 8 is kept: Figure 6 list of registry content is wrong and

> inconsistent with other diagrams and text. Also, Figure 6 shows an odd

> triangle interaction that I do not understand.

>

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Consensus disagrees with your statement.]

> section 9.2.4: drop section altogether or make the picture illustrate the text

> which talks about context

>

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Consensus disagrees with your statement.]

> Line 671 and line 704: Replace "Metadata" with "Information Model" or

> "Business Document Definition"

>

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

> Line 674: could be continued by line 677 as an example of metadata

>

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

> Line 692: drop sentence starting with "Accordingly". Or if you keep it must

> correct that CPA supports more than the business transactional layer, it

> supports the collaboration layer as well.

>

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

> Line 513: I believe a party can register any number of profiles, not just one.

>

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

> Line 604: drop sentence starting "The sequence..."

>

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

> Line 606: use consistent language, what is a Business Information Component?

>

[DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

- > Figure 11: needs updating to stay consistent with same figure in Bp Spec
- > Schema doc, as recommended by QR.
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Figure changed.]
- > Line 226: Replace "conceptual model" with "possible scenario"
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]
- > Line 760: what technical needs does a core component capture?
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed. Removed "technical"]
- > Line 229: Replace "System Component" with "Architecture Component"
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]
- > Line 776 and 778: Replace "Business Process" with "Business Document"
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]
- > Figure 14: put ellipses (...) after CORBA to show that list is not exhaustive
- > nor normative.
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]
- > Line 878 and 881: what does published mean?
- > [DISPOSITION: means published to the Registry.]
- > Comment to QR comment about line 397-398: No, we are not talking about
- > metamodels. All business processes that are used to drive CPA, and
- > subsequently to configure message exchange must be in XML. Other models that
- > are used for related modeling work are stored in XMI.
- >
- > Line 1143: A CPA does not have legal terms and conditions, that is why we are
- > not using the word trading partner agreement.
- >
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]
- > Line 1151, 1153, 1155, 1211, 1213, 1215, 1309, 1311, 1313 (and maybe other
 - places): replace "granting" with "ensuring"
 -
- [DISPOSITION: changed accepted. Wording changed.]

Comments from Bob Haugen – 1/26/01

Joe and other architects,

I think it would be very valuable for the architecture document to describe a logical runtime software protocol stack for ebXML. This would be a suggestion or explanation, not necessarily normative. However, it could be used to define service levels for compliance.

The idea would be to (at least) describe how we think such a protocol stack would look. Many circular arguments have happened in ebXML mailing lists and meetings because of different mental models of such a stack.

Several people have attempted to describe such a stack, including those on the CC list of this email. Here below are Jim and Scott's sketches. I would add to Jim's layers, Scott's layers which might be titled "adapters to internal business applications" and "internal business applications", not because they are part of ebXML, but because integration with internal systems is important and we should show how it will probably happen and where the boundary of ebXML lies. (If you don't know what is outside of the scope, the scope is essentially undefined.)

<Jim Clark>

1. Collaboration Layer. This layer provides business collaborations and actions that act either on or with accompanying information.
2. Business Transaction Layer. This layer provides transaction monitoring for the management of business interactions and exchanges that perform a unit of work. Either all parties to the transaction commit to the unit of work or they all roll back to a previous state before the transaction was started.
3. Business Service Layer. This layer provides business resources that perform business related functions.
4. Business Agent Layer. This layer provides communication interfaces for user and machine agents.
5. Message Delivery Layer. This layer provides reliable, asynchronous and scaleable information delivery.
6. Network Transfer Layer. This layer provides information transfer between uniquely named network resources.

</Jim Clark>

<Scott Hinkelman>

last week in Boston between TP and BP, like other times, we roughly discussed the following conceptual layers:

Application (perhaps an existing non-collaborating application)
Application Collaboration Adapter (makes an existing non-collaborating app collaboration)
Middleware (supports behavior needed to for BP Signals, etc)
MSH (packaging, etc)
Transport (http, etc)
</Scott Hinkelman>

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. Proposed stack diagram to be included as Appendix B. Currently an outstanding issue being discussed by Jim Clark, Duane Nickull, and Bob Haugen. Changes forthcoming.]

Comments from Stefano Pagliani – 1/17/01

Subject: Comments on Technical Architecture
Specification v1.0

- *From:* **Stefano POGLIANI** <stefano.pogliani@sun.com>
- *To:* ebxml-architecture@lists.ebxml.org
- *Date:* Wed, 17 Jan 2001 15:37:52 +0100

Hello everybody,

attached is the list of comments on the TA V1.0 document.
Please, do not hesitate to ask me for further clarifications on the comments I made.
Also, sometimes I used very "direct" verbs: they are not meant to impose my thinking, but just as a way of writing down.

Best regards and congratulations for the document

EbXML Technical Architecture
Comments to the Version 1.0, of January, 4 2001.
Comments from Stefano Pagliani, Sun Microsystems

I would modify the schedule within Chapter 9 as follows:

- 9.1 Core Components
- 9.2 Business Process
- 9.3 Trading Partner
- 9.4 Message Service

9.5 RegRep

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

Line 208.

Remove the "object-oriented" reference. "Component-oriented" is enough for the scope of the architecture and XML doesn't prescribe object orientation. In addition, we may think that old-legacy Cobol application could become ebXML-compliant without requiring any OO. The sentence can read "XML might enable more open, more loosely-coupled, and more component oriented systems than EDI".

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Further the QR team provided help on drafting this section, and thus the editors decided to retain the wording.]

Line 251 (and bullet 5 in general).

I think that this bullet should introduce the name of the CPA as the one which "implements" such arrangements herein described. This would make the further reading more easier by positioning the CPA piece in the context.

[DISPOSITION: added "the execution of"]

Line 266.

Remove the "It SHOULD be noted that". The use of "SHOULD" does not add anything to the meaning of the sentence.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 267.

change the full-stop after participation with a semi-colon (-> "...participation; ebXML compliant....")

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

Line 270, Line 271.

Change the first sentence into the following : "Company A then submits its own *Business Profile Information* (including implementation details and reference links) to the *ebXML Registry*".

The items I put in parenthesis (implementation details and reference links) are already the "Business Profile Information" and the way the sentence was previously written implies a duplication.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 273.

"...as well as its supported business processes" should be changed into "...as well as its supported business scenarios".

This in order to introduce the "business scenarios" concept that is referenced by a "these" in the next sentence.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 276.

It is not clear from this sentence "who and how" verifies the format and the scenarios. I think it should be made clear if it is announced.

[DISPOSITION: this is a high level use case scenario intended to introduce readers to the ebXML Framework. comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

Line 281.

Change "...in a business transaction using..." into "...in a business scenario using..."

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 281-282.

The sentence "Company B acquires a shrink-wrapped application that is ebXML compliant" should be changed into "Company B acquires an ebXML compliant shrink-wrapped application".

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 282 thru 284.

Remove the whole sentence starting at "Company A knows..."

This sentence is a repetition of a concept previously between lines 275 and 277.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 286.

Typo. "...in that the scenario Company B..." should be "...in that scenario, Company B..."

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 287.

Remove the end of the sentence "ebXML compliant software interface".

This end-of-sentence implies that there is some automatic negotiation capability in the infrastructure. But this is not specified anywhere else. So, it is misleading.

[DISPOSITION: automatic negotiation is currently under discussion within the TP project team. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to include this statement.]

Line 289.

Remove the end of the sentence "on who it wants to conduct business transactions with Company A".

The end-of-sentence is confusing the reader. The first part of the sentence is enough to understand the idea.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 292 thru 294

Remove the end of the sentence starting from "which then triggers..." up to "...(Figure 1, step 5)". The sentence should simply read as "Company A accepts the business agreement."

Again, the part to be removed implies that there is some automatic negotiation capability in the infrastructure. But this is not specified anywhere else. So it is misleading.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 310.

Change "...of the *ebXML Reference Model* is..." into "of the *ebXML Architecture Reference Model* is...".

[DISPOSITION: disposed of as per Karsten Reimer's comments.]

Line 326 and 328.

The spacing between the lines is too important. These empty lines should be removed to enhance readability and to be consistent with the rest of the document.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 339.

"Service Interfaces.". What is really meant here? Is "Service Interfaces" or "Business Service Interfaces" ?

Anyway, even if they are specified in the Glossary (?) these two terms are very similar and, perhaps, require a better explanation when they are used, at least the first time they are used. Here I do not understand what "Service Interfaces" stands for, what is the meaning.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted – glossary to define Business Service Interface.]

Line 345

"User Application interfaces". I do not understand what these interfaces are.

I think it is required a little bit of explanation of what is meant here.

[DISPOSITION: application removed to better clarify meaning]

Line 367

The spacing between the lines is too important. These empty line should be removed to enhance readability and to be consistent with the rest of the document.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 379 and 380.

The part "which MAY be accomplished by applying object-oriented principles" should be removed from here and, eventually, added at the end of the paragraph (line 383). It is a "detail" and does not deserve foreground.

[DISPOSITION: added reference to UN/CEFACT Modeling Methology to clarify context.]

Line 385.

Missing comma after ebXML. Should read "In ebXML, interoperability..."

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 390 – Figure 4.

Some comments of this picture.

"Applications" ("internal business application" and "shrink-wrapped application") are pre-existent, they do not get defined at the same time of the ebXML infrastructure. For this reason, the two "Build" arrows in the middle of the figure are out of scope. I would remove them

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. The FSV defines the generic process for building and deploying ebXML applications and services and how to utilize ebXML components. Figure 1 provides more of a use case.]

On the other end, the "Business Service Interface"s need to be built when implementing the ebXML infrastructure. "Build" arrows should point to them

"Register CPP" blocks and "Retrieval of Profiles..." arrows. It seems that the CPPs are sent/received automatically by the applications. This implies automatic negotiation which is not specified anywhere else. In effect these arrows should not go to the "applications" but to another box representing "Company A" (an "Company B").

It is important to distinguish what a "Company X" does (which implies human activity to screen the information) from what the legacy does (which implies the execution of software to properly realize the CPA).

[DISPOSITION: automatic negotiation is currently under discussion within the TP project team. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to include this statement.]

So, I would add the two "Company A" and "Company B" boxes, I would re-direct some arrows as explained before and I would use different line-patterns to distinguish "messaging transfer" which is exploited automatically by the ebXML infrastructure from "human browsing and storing".

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. The FSV defines the generic process for building and deploying ebXML applications and services and how to utilize ebXML components. Figure 1 provides more of a use case.]

Line 390 – Figure 4.

The picture does seem too much explained. A lot of focus in the explanation is given to the RegRep, but the picture is dealing with the "Functional Service View" which is more complex and wide than the single RegRep. Some explanation is definitely required here.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. The FSV defines the generic process for building and deploying ebXML applications and services and how to utilize ebXML components. Figure 1 provides more of a use case.]

Line 395 and 396.

Remove the part of the sentence "is an important part of ebXML."

Everything is important but, in the context of Figure 4 (which describes the dynamic of implementing the ebXML infrastructure), the RegRep is not at all the most important part. I would change the lines as follow : "As illustrated in Figure 4 above, the *ebXML Registry* system serves as the storage facility for the ..."

[DISPOSITION: change accepted...added reference to Core Components, and Collaboration Protocol Profiles]

Line 400 thru 420 (yes, all 21 lines!!!)

They should be removed. In the TA document I do not see any need to write a book on GUID/UUID. This is something that will be dealt with by the RegRep Specification. In this context it is not important at all, it does not add anything to the explanation and imposes a "technical implementation" in a context (the technical architecture) which is at a different level. If really something should be said, it should be "All items stored in the RegRep SHALL be uniquely identified."

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Further, the notion of using unique identifiers is a central part of ebXML functionality, especially in the RegRep, BP, and CC specs.]

Line 421 and 422.

Remove the sentence "A UID reference is ...mechanism."

It is irrelevant (see previous comment).

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Further, the notion of using unique identifiers is a central part of ebXML functionality, especially in the RegRep, BP, and CC specs.]

Line 450.

"...a copy of the ebXML specification".

Specification of what? I think that a Trading Partner may require the "Business Process" definitions of the BPs referenced by some other partner's CPP... Saying "specification" is too generic here.

[DISPOSITION: changed to "ebXML Framework Specifications...cleaned up other wording to further clarify. See inline changes.]

Line 452.

"..studies the ebXML specification...".

See previous comment. Which specifications are we talking about ?

[DISPOSITION: sentence removed]

Line 454.

The part in parenthesis "(stored in it business profile)" should be changed into "(stored in their business profiles)"

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 459.

The following part of the sentence "...system and a *Business Service Interface*" should be changed into "...system and a *Trading Partner*".

The use of "Business Service Interface" implies some automatic negotiation capability in the ebXML infrastructure that is not defined anywhere else.

[DISPOSITION: automatic negotiation is currently under discussion within the TP project team. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to include this statement.]

Picture 5.

Change the box "ebXML Business Service Interface (Application)" with a box labelled "Trading Partner" (see previous comment).

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Refer to glossary definition for BSI clarification.]

Line 466 and 467.

The first sentence of the paragraph should read as follows: "A *Trading Partner* can now begin the process of discovery and retrieval (Figure 6 below)".

I have removed the reference to the "Business Service Interface" since, used in this context, implies automatic negotiation, which is not specified anywhere else.

[DISPOSITION: automatic negotiation is currently under discussion within the TP project team. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to include this statement.]

Line 469, 470 and 471.

The whole sentence starting at "Requests for updates..." until "...by and ebXML Application" should be removed. The sentence implies that the Business Service Interface is able to automatically talk to the ebXML RegRep and that is able to take initiatives autonomously. This is not specified anywhere else and, thus, is misleading.

What I think is to be said, is that the ebXML RegRep should support such functionalities (update, create etc), not the Business Service Interface nor the ebXML Application.

[DISPOSITION: automatic negotiation is currently under discussion within the TP project team. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to include this statement.]

Figure 6.

The two boxes labelled "ebXML Business Service Interface (Application)" should be labelled

"Trading Partner" instead. Otherwise there is the assumption of automatic negotiation. See previous comment.

[DISPOSITION: automatic negotiation is currently under discussion within the TP project team. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to include this statement.]

Line 481, 482 and 483.

The sentence "If it becomes necessary..." until "...Discovery and Retrieval Phase." should be removed.

There is no need to use the RegRep at runtime or, at least, it has never been specified anywhere else. This is misleading.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. There might be a case where a generic CPA might be called from the registry at runtime.]

Figure 7.

In the explanation of such Figure (which is missing...) I would try to make sure that 2 words are spent on the choreography of the exchange. An ebXML CPA is a choreographed set of Commercial Transactions which are linked together by a well-defined choreography and not only by the TR&P layer. The risk of not properly insisting on this is that customers will understand that ebXML is about "one off" messages.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted "for example..." sentence added]

Line 499.

The reference to "Business Service Interface" should, in reality, be to the "Messaging Service".

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. Further, this goes beyond the scope of the Messaging Service.]

Paragraph between line 502 and Line 508.

Whilst the previous paragraph (494-500) deals with the CPP, this one should deal with the CPA. Actually, a part from the difference in the acronym (CPA instead than CPP) this paragraph looks too much like the previous one and seems a repetition. It would be necessary to exploit the specificity of the CPA here.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. The goal of this section is to introduce the concepts of the CPP and CPA]

Line 512

The reference to the "Service Interface" is not clear. What is really meant by "service interface" in the context of this sentence?

[DISPOSITION: changed to Business Service Interface. See glossary for further explanation.]

Line 513.

The sentence "Each *Trading Partner* SHALL register one and..." is too restrictive. Each partner may register more than one CPP (think to big organizations where each department may register a different CPP...).

[DISPOSITION: changed as per QR team review.]

Paragraph between Line 519 and Line 525.

It seems to be a duplication of the previous paragraph (line 511 thru 517), but I think this

paragraph is better written and more clear than the previous one. So, my suggestion is to choose between the two paragraphs and not to include both.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted. Changed as per QR team review.]

Line 529.

The reference "(2) the *Business Process* (application) requirements...". Why "application" ? The Business Process may be realized by interfacing to existing applications, but I do not think that the Business Process "is the application".

[DISPOSITION: removed application.]

Line 530 to 555 (yes, all of that including the Figure 8 and Figure 9).

I would move all of this section into a new section (9.1.2 Conceptual View) and position it immediately after the introduction.

[DISPOSITION: This is specific to CPA's. The intro section deals with CPPs and CPAs] Figure 8.

The "3 level view of the CPA" is drawn but is not explained. I mean, in these 3 layers, where is the CPA, where is the CPP ? Also, what does "possibility" mean as opposed to "Capability"? This is well defined in the CPA documents, but here is shown without any explanation.

[DISPOSITION: This is an abstract view of how to arrive at a CPA. Changes made as per suggestions]

Paragraph 9.1.4 (CPP Interfaces)

This paragraph should be moved, at position 9.1.3 (i.e. In section 9.1, first all CPP related stuff are described, then all CPA related).

[DISPOSITION: This goes against the logical ordering of sections which was agreed to by the QR/TA joint review during the Tokyo meeting.]

Line 558:

Remove "Business Process:" from the beginning of the line

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 558.

Change "The CPP must be ..." into "The CPP MUST be ..."

[DISPOSITION: changed to SHALL]

Line 559.

Change "The CPP must also reference..." into "The CPP MUST also reference..."

[DISPOSITION: changed to SHALL]

Line 560.

Change "...that BP that the user is capable..." into "...a Business Process that the Partner is capable..."

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 562.

Change "The CPP must be ..." into "The CPP MUST be..."

[DISPOSITION: changed to SHALL]

Line 562 and 563.

This whole sentence seems to imply that the CPP should be able to reference the CPA. But this is not possible since the CPP comes before the CPA and, perhaps, independently of it. It also introduces a circular dependency (the CPA should be able to reference the CPP...)

[DISPOSITION: change accepted. Removed sentence.]

Line 565.

Change "The CPP must be.." into "The CPP MUST be .."

[DISPOSITION: changed to SHALL]

Line 567.

Change "The CPP must be.." into "The CPP MUST be .."

[DISPOSITION: changed to SHOULD]

Line 568 and 569.

The sentence "A CPP may also describe binding details that are used to build an ebXML message header." what does it mean? I think that if the meaning is that the CPP should describe which lower-level protocol is to be used and which security constraints should apply, then this should be more clearly stated (perhaps with a little narrative example)

[DISPOSITION: disposed of as per QR Team review]

Paragraph 9.1.5 (CPA Interfaces).

This paragraph should be moved, at position 9.1.4 (i.e. In section 9.1, first all CPP related stuff are described, then all CPA related).

[DISPOSITION: This goes against the logical ordering of sections which was agreed to by the QR/TA joint review during the Tokyo meeting.]

Line 573 and 574.

What is the meaning of this sentence? Which is this "software component" that is referenced in the sentence?

[DISPOSITION: disposed of as per QR Team review]

Lines 576 thru 579.

This paragraph is a very complex explanation of the Figure 8. It should not appear here (as mentioned before) and should be more readable than this.

[DISPOSITION: disposed of as per QR Team review]

Line 602.

The end of the sentence "...with other *Trading Partners* in shared *Business Processes*." should be changed into "...with other *Trading Partners* in shared collaborations.". The use of "Business Process" is repeated in the sentence and a BP cannot describe a BP...

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 605.

The end of the sentence ", messaging and security considerations." should be removed. It is perhaps true that the physical protocol and the security adds something to the choreography, but this is a technical detail. The choreography is mainly defined by the BP.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 647 thru 650.

The sentence includes a contradiction. It reads as follows. "No language is mandated, but if one is used it should be UML", i.e. "either you do not speak or if you speak you should speak english".

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort. This statement means that you don't have to model in order to generate BPs (e.g. by simply creating BP schemas or document instances), BUT if you do model, use UML. This section agreed to by the ebXML executive.]

Lines 658, 662, 666 and 667.

All the "SHALL" should be changed into "is". This is NOT a requirement document, it is the explanation of the Technical Architecture. The TA is based on things that have been already specified.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort.]

Line 674.

"May reference supporting *Metadata*" should be changed into "References to supporting *Metadata*"

[DISPOSITION: change accepted...sentence deleted]

Line 675 thru 677.

The last 3 bullets are, logically, part of a different bulleted list because they do not deal with "types of information" (as the initial 4 bullets) but with the capabilities of the BP.

[DISPOSITION: accepted added "Business Processes:"]

Line 705, 706 and 707

The sentence "The mechanism for interfacing..." until "... GUID for each component." should be removed.

The TA document is not the place for implementation details such as UID/GUID.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort . This statement explains the scope for UIDs.]

Line 711.

The two "*Registry mechanism*" should actually be "*Registry instance*"

[DISPOSITION: changed to "service"]

Line 717 and 718

The last part of the sentence, from "and therefore each.." to the end should be removed.

The TA document is not the place for implementation details such as UID/GUID.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort . We need to specify when UID/GUIDs need to be used.]

Line 831, 832 and 833

The idea behind the use of UID and GUID should be expressed in a different form, by avoiding mentioning explicitly UID and GUID.

[DISPOSITION: comment duly noted. After some thought and discussion the editors decided that, on-balance, the request did not warrant the effort . This statement explains the general concept and rationale for using unique identifiers. A UID is the generic term, whereas a GUID is a specific application of the UID concept.]

Line 836.

The part of the sentence "..., and describe each registered item,..." should be replaced by "..., and describe it, ..."

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 842.

The "*Registry Client*" should be replaced by "*Registry Interface*". The human interaction is built on the Registry interface and is, by itself, a Registry Client !

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 845.

The "Registry interface" should be "*Registry Interface*" (italics)

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 849 and 851.

The "Registry Client" should be "*Registry Client*" (italics)

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 864.

Remove "SHALL". The messages have already been defined, this is not a requirement document.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Lines 878 and 881.

Remove "MAY". I do not think that there is any other place where BP and CC can be registered...

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 900.

Remove "MAY". It has been said in the previous line that these services MAY be deferred... so there is no need to reiterate the use of MAY.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Line 906 and 907.

The discussion of GUID/UID is not pertinent to the TA document.

[DISPOSITION: removed sentence]

Line 810 thru 912 (all the Registry part).

No mention is made here on the "Repository Information Model" which is an important and distinctive part of the RegRep. A couple of words, a little paragraph on this ?

[DISPOSITION: All discussion is being bundled under the Registry umbrella.]

Line 917.

Change "shall PROVIDE" into "provides". It is a statement, it does not need to be reinforced nor this is a requirement document.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 942, 946, 948, 951, 954, 957 (twice), 961, 991 and 995.

All "SHALL" should be removed. This is not a requirement document and the TR&P has well defined all of the things herein mentioned.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 948 and 949.

The sentence "It SHALL also utilize and..." until "...(CPA)." should be removed. The same concept is expressed, in a more clear way, later (line 961 and following)

[DISPOSITION: change accepted.]

Line 1009.

The "MAY be packaged" should be changed into "is packaged".

There is no more decision here, the discussion and decision has been taken. It is not a requirement document.

[DISPOSITION:]

Line 1096 and 1099.

The word "SHALL" should be removed. Again, there is no more discussion on this, the specs are well on their road and the TA is not a requirement document.

[DISPOSITION: change accepted]

Attached is also a new version of Appendix A, with correct (hope so) wording for the TPA and with correct indentation of bulleted lists.

[DISPOSITION:]

Miscellaneous Comments Disposition

Disposition #	Submitter	Line Number(s)	Comment Reference	Disposition
1	Duane Nickull	45	n/a	Added Matt McKenzie to TA participant list
2	QR team	228	doc QR TA review	removed caps for "may" and required"
3	QR team	230	doc QR TA review	changed MAY to can
4	QR team	249	doc QR TA review	removed caps for "MAY"
5	QR team	252	doc QR TA review	changed MAY to can
6	QR team	266	doc QR TA review	removed "It should be noted that"
7	QR team	268	doc QR TA review	removed caps for "MAY"
8	QR team	468	doc QR TA review	removed caps for "MAY"
9	QR team	470	doc QR TA review	replaced "are also methods that SHALL" with "SHOULD"
10	QR team/Chris Ferris/Stefano Pagliani	513	doc QR TA review	replaced "SHALL register one and only one" with "MAY register one or more"
11	QR team	515	doc QR TA review	replaced "which MAY include (but is not limited to)" to "including"
12	QR team	521	doc QR TA review	replaced "optionally include" to "also contain"
13	QR team	522	doc QR TA review	replaced "SHALL" with "SHOULD"
14	QR team	538	doc QR TA review	removed caps for "MAY"
15	QR team	586	doc QR TA review	replaced "must" with "SHOULD"
16	QR team	562,565,567,	QR TA review doc QR TA review	replaced "must with "SHALL"
16	QR team	568	doc QR TA review	changed may to "MAY"
17	QR team	576	doc	CPA and Trading Partner italicized

18 QR team	QR TA review 576 doc	CPA CPP and Trading Partner italicized
19 QR team	QR TA review 577 doc	Trading Partner italicized
20 QR team	QR TA review 578 doc	Trading Partner italicized
21 QR team	QR TA review 581 doc	CPA italicized
22 QR team	QR TA review 581 doc	Business process italicized
23 QR team	QR TA review 584 doc	word also removed, CPA italicized, MAY capitalized
24 QR team	QR TA review 616 doc	Meta Model italicized
25 QR team	QR TA review 621 doc	UML italicized
26 QR team	QR TA review 654 doc	May to lower case
27 QR team	QR TA review 701 doc	MAY changed to SHOULD
28 QR team	QR TA review 777 doc	Core Components italicized
29 QR team	QR TA review 861 doc	SHALL replaced with SHOULD
30 QR team	QR TA review 900 doc	MAY removed "include" to "includes"
31 QR team	QR TA review 906 doc	May to lower case
32 QR team	QR TA review 909 doc	May to lower case
33 QR team	QR TA review 936 doc	May to lower case
34 QR team	QR TA review 1007 doc	OPTIONAL to lower case
35 QR team	QR TA review 1012 doc	B2B business transaction italicized
36 QR team	QR TA review 1014 doc	Business Objects changed to Business Information
37 QR team	QR TA review 1083 doc	EbXML changed to ebXML
38 QR team	QR TA review 399 doc	removed will changed to "allows"
39 QR	175, 403 QR TA review doc	removed DC 128 from Normative References
40 Mike Rawlins	TA discussion 454 list	add s to it "its"
41 Duane Nickull	554 Comments	added small section dealing with CPA negotiation
42 Duane Nickull	594 Comments	A CPA negotiation protocol SHALL be defined.

43	John Petit	473 comments	deleted semantic
44	John Petit	957 comments	deleted "SHALL meet business needs, consequently..."
45	Martin Bryan	675 comments	replaces bullet with ". Provide contextual constraints for the use of Core Components"
			replaced with " <i>A Business Process</i> MAY be constructed as an <i>Information Meta Model</i> or an XML representation of that model. Business Processes are capable of expressing the following types of information:"
46	Martin Bryan	667 comments	replaced sentence with "Accordingly, the interface between the Business Process, its Information Meta Model, and the CPA, is the part of the Business Process document. This MAY be instantiated as an XML document representing the business transactional layer of the Business Process and Information Meta Model. "
47	Martin Bryan	692 Comments	added UN/CEFACT Modeling Methodology to Normative References and reference on line 730
48	Paul Levine	176, 388, 730 Comments	removed "Meta" per Paul's request
49	Paul Levine	240 Comments	changed "parcel" to "bundle"
50	Paul Levine	274 Comments	removed "that"
51	Paul Levine	286 Comments	added ISO/IEC reference
52	Paul Levine	301 comments	added "Business Information" to cylinder figure 3
53	Paul Levine	355 comments	changed "parcel" to "bundle"
54	Paul Levine	374 Comments	changed messages to documents
55	Paul Levine	375 Comments	added sentence "Common Business Processes in the Business Library MAY be referenced during the process of creating analysis and design artifacts. "
56	Paul Levine	377 Comments	changed "Business Objects" to "Business Information"
57	Paul Levine	385, 386, 608, 721 Comments	replaced "core" with "common"
58	Paul Levine	653 Comments	replaced "Business Object" with "...instances of Business Information in which the Core Component occurs"
59	Paul Levine	799 Comments	added sentence to clarify CPP-CPA negotiation - "The CPA-CPP specification includes a non-normative appendix that discusses CPA composition and negotiation and includes advice as to composition and negotiation procedures"
60	Marty Sachs	section 8.1.3 comments and email discussion	

61	Mike Rawlins		275	comments	replaced "that the company is able to engage in" with "in which the company is able to engage"
62	Mike Rawlins		289	comments	replaced "who" with "how"
63	Mike Rawlins	682-689		comments	removed sentence, as it is not clear. (also recommended by QRT)
64	Mike Rawlins	961-969		comments	changed parties to Trading Partners, added - "but not limited to"
65	Mike Rawlins		845	comments	replaced sentence with "The Registry Interface SHALL be designed to be independent of the underlying network protocol stack (e.g. HTTP/SMTP over TCP/IP). Specific instructions on how to interact with the Registry Interface SHALL be contained in the payload of the ebXML Message. "
66	Mike Rawlins		667	comments	done as per QRT suggestions
67	Mike Rawlins		222	comments	added reference to goals section of the Requirements document.
68	Martin Bryan Stuart		396	comments	removed "Meta" changed sentence to "It serves as the storage facility for the Business Process and Information Models and the XML-based representations of those models"
69	Campbell Stuart		148	comments	removed "some of"
70	Campbell Stuart		254	comments	added "framework" to clarify, changed parties to Trading Partners
71	Campbell Stuart		373	comments	added " (as defined in the UN/CEFACT Modeling Methodology specification) "
72	Campbell Stuart		373	comments	modified diagram to expand CPP and CPA definitions...
73	Campbell Stuart		617	comments	removed nominal
74	Campbell Stuart		631	comments	cleaned up wording to better clarify paragraph
75	Campbell Stuart	631-641		comments	changed sentence to read "This information serves as the primary input for the formation of Collaboration Protocol Profiles (CPP's) and CPA's. "
76	Campbell Stuart		670	comments	added example - (e.g. the choreography of necessary message exchanges between two Trading Partners executing a "Purchasing" ebXML transaction.) replaced with " - References to Business Process and Information Models or Business Documents (possibly DTD's or Schemas) that add structure to business data."
77	Reimer Karsten		671	comments	

		replaced with " A Business Process document SHALL reference the Core Components directly or indirectly using a XML document that references the appropriate Business and Information Models and/or Business Documents (possibly DTD's or Schemas). "
Karsten 78 Reimer	704 comments	
Karsten 79 Reimer	674 comments	removed "May reference supporting Metadata." changed to "This MAY be instantiated as an XML document representing the business transactional and collaboration layers of the Business Process and Information Meta Model. "
Karsten 80 Reimer	692 comments	
Karsten 81 Reimer	604 comments	removed sentence, as it is not accurate
Karsten 82 Reimer	606 comments	changed term to "Business Information Objects"
Karsten 83 Reimer	figure 11 comments	updated figure from latest spec...
Karsten 84 Reimer	604 comments	changed "conceptual model" to "use case scenario"
Karsten 85 Reimer	760 comments	removed "technical"
Karsten 86 Reimer	229 comments	changed "system" to "architecture"
Karsten 87 Reimer	776,778 comments	changed process to document