

## ebXML Quality Review Group

### *Summary of Review of*

# ebXML Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement Specification v0.93

**Release Date: 19th March 2001**

Report prepared: 28th March 2001

Reviewers: Tim McGrath, Nagwa Abdelghfour, Jon Bosak, Stuart Campbell, Murray Maloney, Bob Glushko, Jim Werner, Ben Van De Walle.

Traceability Matrix prepared by Mike Rawlins.

The Quality Review team have completed their review of Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement Specification v0.93 as submitted by the Trading Partner team on March 21st 2001.

**We recommend that this specification go immediately for its second round of public review.**

The Quality Review team have identified some areas where the quality of this specification may be improved, both in its content and its presentation. These comments should be addressed as part of the public review process.

The key areas of comment from the Quality Review team relate to:

- **No Change or Disposition log provided** – Whilst the Quality Review team are satisfied that our earlier comments have been accommodated, we have no way of telling if there were any general public comments and whether they have been dealt appropriately or not. Given the high quality of this document, we consider this is most likely a clerical oversight. However, we would ask that these logs be provided as part of the public review material.
- **Use of ‘pseudo-XML’ examples** – The specification tends to use fragments of XML documents (with comments) to illustrate definitions (e.g. lines 456-481). This is not consistent with other specifications and we would suggest that the editors either use the actual DTD (or Schema) to show the structure or use a full example.

- **Forming a CPA from two CPPs** – Lines 175-176 talks of the section summarizing the “process of discovering a Party”. This section actually deals with post-discovery of a Party.
- **Reference to future or out of scope items** – Whilst these are often as notes and are non-normative, there is a risk they distract from the main points of the specification. For example lines 228-229, implies a mandatory feature of a suggested service. Such statements may distract the audience into believing this is a requirement. Some sections, for example lines 615-683 (section 7.3.4.5 ds:Reference Element), has more lines of NOTE: than content. This is not denying the value of these notes, but indicating the risk of confusing the reader with too much supplementary information..
- **General presentation comments** –
  - There are quite a few proofing, typographical errors, format and other inconsistencies for a document at this late stage in its approval cycle.
  - There are inconsistent numbers of spaces after a sentence.
  - Inconsistent use at the end of the line of commas and periods when listing items.
  - Replace Agreement with Agreement
  - Headers should say “March 2001” rather than “20 March, 2001” to follow Template.
  - Headers should say “ebXML” not “EbXML”.
  - Page 1 no time required 5:38 PM
  - Page 2 capital P in participants
  - Page 3
    - capital P in participants
    - Add section number 6.3 to How the CPA Works
    - Appears to be two spaces between CPA and Works
    - 7 and 7.1 and 8 and 8.1 are in italics / should not be
    - 7.3 e in Element should be lower case
    - 7.3.4 e in Element should be lower case
    - 7.3.13 e in Element should be lower case
    - 7.5 and ds:Signature should not be in italics
  - Page 4
    - 8.5 in italics / should not be
    - Conformance and Disclaimer do not line up with References
    - Contact Information should be section 12 as in Template
    - Appendix B n should be capital N in normative
  - Put a space before [ to be consistent throughout the document. Refer:  
 Lines 5,26,39,63,77,78,81,82,135,204,298,329,345,436,484,580,592,636,640,641,645  
 Lines 651,659,666,680,683,697, 742,835,890,917,1116,1134,1135,1176,1261,1267  
 Lines 1309,1317,1328,1413,1454,1481,1482,1490,1500,1574,1578,1595,1647, 1751  
 Lines 3325 (twice) and 3328.
  - Places where it appears to have two spaces rather than one:  
 L 110 after F

- L 177 after F
- L 271 after C
- L 272 after D and A
- L 275 after and
- L 498 after ServiceBinding
- L 527 after Process
- L 535 after id
- L 611 after the
- L 639 after be
- L 853 after Constituent
- L 932 after values
- L 990,995,1001,1006,1012,1017 after The
- L 1016 after 7.3.10.6
- L 1125 before and after endpoints
- L 1514 after Section
- L 1538 space after C and D
- L 1539 space after B
- L 1583 after one
- L 1639 after Start
- L 1692 after The
- L 1735 after The, before and after element
- L 1841 after F
- L 2996 before Version
- L 3275 after the
- L 3276 before then
- L before has

- o Places where the document appears to spacing gaps (not spaces) between some letters in the title:

L 231,552,922,994,1000,1054,1065,1264,1325,1335,1359,1395,1400,1410,1445,1471  
 L 1479,1684,1696,1705,1731,1734,1770,1789,1796,1839

- o The word “specification” after document name is redundant:

L 135,555,651,683

- o Should use lower case “e” in Element to be consistent with the rest of the document:

L 347,614,1093

- o Period at the end of the line required

L 1923,1925,1945,1950,1961,1963,1968,1971,1976,1979,1981

- o Line 5 remove – between Business and Process to be consistent with line 79
- o Line 73 e-business should be eBusiness to be consistent with Page 1 and Glossary
- o Line 79 missing [ before BPMSPEC
- o Line 106 capital p in parties

- Line 155 no dash in Glossary between trading and partner
- Line 186 capital P in parties
- Line 187 no dash between Party and A and Party and B to be consistent with Figure 2
  
- Line 190 Company A/B should be Party A/B for consistency
- Line 231 d in Implemented is not bold
- Line 241 document should not be in italics
- Line 255 runtime needs a dash to be consistent with line 254
- Line 262 runtime needs a dash to be consistent with line 254
- Line 280 Process-Specification should be in italics to be consistent with line 283
- Line 285 dash after Channels should not be bolded
- Line 289 remove extra line
- Line 290 unclear. Is there something missing after business?
- Line 338 alignment of Zero inconsistent with line 336 and 340
- Line 444 add REQUIRED to be consistent with line 448
- Line 455 section needs an introductory paragraph to be consistent with other sections
- Line 510 document should not be in italics
- Line 547 lower case d in certID to be consistent with line 544
- Line 585 REQUIRED needs to align with lines 584 and 586
- Line 616 xlink:href should be in italics
- Line 639 is it ds:Transform (lines 639,644) or ds:Transforms (lines 566, 678)?
- Line 657 period appears to be bolded
- Line 753 is packaging here supposed to be bold and italics
- Line 794 lower case c and t in Content-Type to be consistent with line 802
- Line 797 lower case c in Content-type to be consistent with line 802
- Line 829 attribute should not be in italics to be consistent with line 819
- Line 862 blank line after this one
- Line 918 example to be consistent with sections 7.3.8.1 and 7.3.8.2
- Line 965 lower case c in ChannelId to be consistent with line 964
- Line 987 space between an and IMPLIED
- Line 1041 lower case t in TransportId to be consistent with line 1044
- Line 1089 where is HTTPS referenced
- Line 1144 what is a “link-by-link” basis?
- Line 1146 is documentExchange supposed to be DocExchange ?
- Line 1171 remove space after reliable-
- Line 1309 period needed after ]
- Line 1318 space needed between elements and which
- Line 1350 should must be MUST (uppercase)
- Line 1488 ds:signature should not be italics to be consistent with line 1517
- Line 1514 s in see should be capital
- Line 1648 remove underscore after Start
- Line 1649 remove underscore after End
- Line 1724 remove “the” from “in a the Business Processes”

- Line 1725      *referenced by the* should not be in italics
- Line 1775      lead in paragraph needed as in other sections
- Period after ds:signature appears to be bolded
- Space after ), also 1778,1780,1782
- Line 1778      SignatueValue should be in italics
- Line 1780      3 appears to be in a different font or bolded
- Line 1826      “[)]” appear to be in a different font
- Line 1895      remove additional blank line
- Line 1909      where is HTMLENC referenced in the document?
- Line 1923      “Service” is in a different font
- Line 1993      [XMLSCHEMA] not in section 9
- Line 2038      add Phone to be consistent with line 2028
- Line 2056      lower case e in Email to be consistent with line 2039
- Line 3120      no space before Process
- Line 3170      elements should not be bold and in italics
- Line 3330      comma appears to be bolded
- Line 3367      needs a semi colon after involves
- Line 3370      2 appears to be bolded