ebXML Quality Review Group

Summary of Review of

ebXML Requirements Specification Version 1.04

Release Date: **19th March 2001**

Report prepared: 10th April 2001
Reviewers: Tim McGrath, Nagwa Abdelghfour, Jon Bosak, Stuart Campbell, Murray Maloney, Bob Glushko, Jim Werner, Ben Van De Walle

The Quality Review team have completed their review of the ebXML Requirements Specification as submitted by the ebXML Requirements Project Team on March 19th 2001.

We recommend that this document go forward for public review.

However, there are several comments we would like to see addressed before this material is finalised for voting. These are mainly editorial, but include some questions regarding the content.

In addition, there is a critical point that needs clarification as it affects the relevance of our comments. We are unsure of the intended final status of this document. Is this a revision of the ebXML guideline document voted on at the Brussel's plenary or is it an upgrading of this document to the status of a technical specification?

If it is the latter, then we must also promote the view that previous acceptance of this material is not a justification for retaining it in the final document.

The main issues we have with the content are:

- **Scope**
  We would also like to suggest that this document be extended to cover material where:
    - Current requirements have not been met because of lack of time,
    - Previously stated requirements have not been met and should be (or have been) removed because they now appear unreasonable, and
    - New requirements have been identified for the future.

  We are concerned that some valuable ideas and experiences may be lost if these issues are not documented. Whilst fragments of these occur throughout the ebXML documentation, we feel they could be provided here to form the basis of future developments in ebXML (part 2). This would conform to a

stated requirement of the Requirements team (lines 652-654). For guidance, the areas we feel should be flagged and included as part of this material are:

- Line 274

Provide a migration path from accredited EDI and developing XML business standards

- Line 311 and 646

A process and recommendation for ebXML conformance

- Line 419-420

The ebXML Registry and Repository shall support the concept of a network of registries and repositories that can intercommunicate via the interfaces specified

- Lines 451- 453

Common Expression - Common set of XML element names, attributes and common usage of those attributes, common approach to document structure

Common Security Implementations

- Line 709-12

glossary of terms specific to each business process to be modeled
glossary of XML tags
library of documents based on identified services and interactions
web site for ready access to glossaries

- **Security Requirements**

   Some of the requirements for security may not be reasonable (line 558-567) or specific enough (line 335) for conformance. We suggest this material (mostly in section 6.5 (lines 534-601) should be ratified against the risks identified in the Security Architecture Team's Risk Assessment document.

- **Project Management (lines 254, 936-943)**

   This material on this team should be either be removed or transferred to the Quality Review section. Since Vancouver, there has been no ebXML Project Management team and their monitoring role has been undertaken as part of Quality Review.

- **Section 6.4.2 Transport, Routing, & Packaging – Query ebXML servers (lines 476-477).**

   What is intended by this requirement? Is this the service defined by the Message Service specifications as "Message Service Handler Ping Service"?

- **Section 6.5 Security – Archiving (lines 549-550)**

   Is it practical for a requirement to enable semantic reconstruction where normal practice it is adequate to simply have access to the document?

- **Section 7 ebXML Technical Framework (figure 3-1, line 636)**

   This diagram should be brought into alignment with the ebXML Business Operational View and the Functional Service View from the Technical Architecture Specification.

- **Registry and Repository (lines 773-835)**
  Section 7.3 is inconsistent with other sections of the Technical Framework Requirements. It is far more precise, and may be too detailed. It create an inbalance with the material. Possibly it can be reduced by compressing the section on "Technical Specification Submission, Development and Support" (section 7.7.1 lines 784-811). Currently, this appears to be the major requirement of a Registry.

- **Consumer requirements of the B2C model**
  The statement on "out of scope" on lines 287-288 seems to contradict later requirements on providing for user interfaces. For example, the UN Layout Key (lines 362-371) and the Registry interface (lines 401-402).

- **Incremental adoption**
  It is not necessary that all business documents are encoded in XML (line 351).

- **Discovering a "party"**
  Is it the "party" that is discovered (lines 839-842)? There can, and will be, multiple profiles for specific process, regions, buyers and systems throughout one organisation.

- **General editorial comments**
  Line 5 – Most other documents just use the "ebXML" title.
  Line 51 – Remove Murray Maloney's name as he is part of the Quality Review team.
  Line 89, 104 – The name of this team is "Transport, Routing and Packaging".
  Line 99 - add 7.1
  Line 108,836,847 – The team is the "Trading Partner team". (no "s")
  Line 131- Add [Bra97] to Reference section.
  Lines 135, 212, 662-715 and throughout – should standardise on style for bullet points and punctuation used in lists.
  Line 141- many of these are references and should be in a separate, later Reference section (section 12. based on the standard ebXML template).
  Line 147 - Remove space before http to be consistent with line 144
  Line 150 - There is an unnecessary new line between 150 and 151
  Line 151, 155, 160, 561, 578, 708, 748, 751, 899 - Add reference links.
  Line 160 - Add [ISO 11179] to Reference section.
  Line 169,171 - These conventions appear irrelevant in this document.
  Line 208 - Replace "This" with "These".
  Line 212 - Should "is" be replaced by "MUST" to be consistent with line 219?
  Line 214 - Should "provides" be "SHALL provide" to be consistent with line 219?
  Line 216 - Should "maximizes" be "SHALL maximize" to be consistent with line 219?
  Line 219 – "shall" should be "SHALL" (good grief!)

Line 242 - "steering committee" should be "Steering Committee" to be consistent with line 251

Line 252 – There appears to be an extraneous space before Quality

Line 258 – Has an extra space at bullet start and is missing "the" in "Use of XML".

Line 259 - Should "approved" be "recommended"? What about approved as a candidate recommendation, is this included in this sense of approved? Also add [W3C] to the Reference section.

Line 261 – Suggest "open, interoperable" – you can be both but they are not synonymous.

Line 265-266 – Seems a very broad principle and needs a more specific definition to be useful.

Line 276 - If these are important principles they should be stated rather than referenced.

Line 286 - Add dashes in business to business to be consistent with line 261.

Line 286,841 - Add dashes to business to consumer to be consistent with line 262.

Line 292, 341, 412, 456, 531, 551, 555, 704, 747 - some of these notes may read better in the body part.

Line 296 - Add dashes to computer to computer for consistency with other uses.

Line 300 - Remove the space before the comma after "Openness".

Line 301 – Should add an "s" to "Signature" to be consistent with line 94.

Line 316 – There appears to be two spaces rather than one after "Small"

Line 323 – Is the term "superset" meaningful?

Line 328 – "core schemas" is not an ebXML term, what is meant by this? NB no apostrophe needed.

Line 360 – These terms should be hyphenated (have dashes) – "plug-and-play", "shrink-wrapped", "syntactically-neutral".

Line 387 – Should this be "XML 1.0 **[XML]**"?

Line 402, 408, 431, 503, 509, 514, 640, 890, 898 - Replace "must" with "MUST" to be consistent with line 129.

Line 419, 516, 518, 651, 660, 668, 704, 717, 737, 745 (twice), 758, 774, 785, 814, 837, 869, 871, 885, 919, 930, 937, 948, 993, 996 - Replace "shall" with "SHALL" to be consistent with line 129.

Line 423 – Is the word "context" correct or should it be "content"?

Line 432-433 – References to BizTalk and XML.ORG are un-necessary and may lead to misunderstanding. Suggest they are taken out.

Lines 427, 442, 468 - Replace "should" with "SHOULD" to be consistent with line 129.

Line 445 – Hyphenation is inconsistent with lines 443 and 447

Line 449 – Is this note necessary? XML specifications are not described elsewhere.

Line 455 – What is meant by "a common network layer"? Is it the Message Services? "network" may be a misleading term.

Line 473 – What is a "supporting messaging policy repository"?

Line 511 - Suggest starting a new paragraph beginning with "The ebXML technical . . .".

Line 524 - Should be a hyphen (dash) between "standards" and "based".

Line 551 - Should be capital "A" for "archiving" for consistency with other terms.

Line 559 - Is "section 2.6" mean to say "Section 6.5"?

Line 607-615 – Given this document will be voted at the final plenary, is this material now relevant?

Line 629, 642, 643 and 654 – Use inconsistent numeric references to previous sections. Maybe use the name as well as the number to prevent future misalignment.

Line 629,642 - Is "section one" meant to be "Section 5"?

Line 643,887 - Is "section two" meant to be "Section 6"?

Line 654 - Is "section 4" meant to be "Section 8"?

Line 657, 918 – The "Quality Review Support team" should be "Quality Review team".

Line 662 – The acronym "BPDS" is not used elsewhere in ebXML, suggest we use the full name instead.

Line 657-658 – This is actually the third bullet point in the list.

Line 674 - After "for-profit", add a comma and remove the "and".

Line 683 - Is this supposed to mean "interaction, services and categorizations" or "interaction and services, and categorizations"?

Line 692 – Should use double rather than single quotes to be consistent with line 687.

Line 701 – Should use lower case "i" in "Identifying" to be consistent with line 700.

Line 703 – Why are document deliverables stated in this section and no other?

Line 742 - "reuse" should be "re-use" as in line 692

Line 777 – This note could apply to any team's technical specification. Suggest it is removed.

Line 837, 869, 881 - *Project Team* should be in italics to be consistent with line 774.

Line 847 - There appears to be two spaces rather than one after "of".

Line 856 - Is it "run-time" or "runtime" (line 786).

Line 861 - There appears to be two spaces rather than one after "with".

Line 876-946 – Currently this section "8. ebXML Organisation and Procedural Requirements", sits between the sections on requirements and deliverables of each team. It may be more logical either before or after these two. Thus allowing the two team detailed sections to follow each other.

Lines 877, 881-882, 914, 915 – Should be "Executive Committee" not "executive committee".

Line 882 - Is "section 4.1" meant to be "Section 5.2.2"?

Line 885,930 - Add a colon after "shall".

Line 886 - Is "section 1" meant to be "Section 5"?

Line 888 - Is "section 3.1" meant to be "Section 6.1"?

Line 889 - Is "section 3" meant to be "Section 7"?

Line 892 - There should be a hyphen (dash) between "consensus" and "driven" to be consistent with line 895.

Lines 899, 901, 907 – Should use hyphenation (dash) between "long" and "term" to be consistent with line 266.

Line 898 - Is "Work Group" defined?

Line 902 - Needs only one comma after BizTalk

Line 926 - The QR Team would like to add to this section a paragraph stating:

"The quality review shall consider the following features of the candidate material:

- o Scope and alignment with ebXML vision
- o Completeness
- o Satisfies ebXML requirements
- o Consistency with Technical Architecture
- o Consistency with component naming rules
- o Addresses Security Risk Assessment document
- o Editorial quality, that is...
    - Uses ebXML template.
    - Adheres to the ebXML documentation style guidelines.
    - Uses consistent language (glossary).
    - Uses correct grammar.
    - Uses correct Spelling.
    - Avoids unsubstantiated rhetoric.
    - Contains no logical inconsistencies.
    - Contains no 'placeholders' for future content.
    - Provides adequate exposition and clarity of meaning.
    - Uses appropriate diagrams, examples and sample source code.
    - Maintains a structural integrity.
    - Avoids ambiguity.**"**

Line 953 - Would be more useful if the actual deliverables were itemised (and also included under the section 7).

Line 954 - Suggest that between "delivered" and "consist" add the word "SHALL".

Line 975 - Needs a comma after "above".

Line 975, 978 - Should "5-1" be "9-1"?

Line 980 and 981 - This figure needs an explanation (or should be removed).

Line 986 – The "Technical Coordination and Support Project team" is now "Quality Review team".

Line 988, 990 - Should "5-2" be "9-2"?

Line 991-992 – Is this figure complete? This section does not make much sense without it.

Line 1021 - Is an editorial note and should be removed.

Line 1031 - Add "2001" besides "2000" to be consistent with the footer at the bottom of each page