

## ebXML Quality Review Group

### *Summary of Review of*

# ebXML Registry Information Model v.0.60

**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

The Quality Review team have completed their review of ebXML Registry Information Model v0.60 as submitted by the Registry Repository team on March 19th 2001.

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

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

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

- **Separation between content and meta-data** – Whilst many of our original concerns about this issue have been addressed, these are some instances where the model still attempts to define the behaviour of content rather than meta-data. For example, the table between lines 631-632 defines an association type of “Extends”, which appears to be describing the action against the target object.
- **Relationship between RegistryEntry and Organization** – The specification should clarify whether the only means of referencing an organization with an entry in the Registry is via an auditable event (refer Figure 1 between lines 274-275).
- **Alignment with Registry Services** - Definitions of terms (Section 6) and Conformance (section 5.6) should be aligned with Registry Services.
- **General presentation comments** –
  - Glossary
    - Need a reference to the ebXML Glossary

- Words found in glossary need to appear in italics
  - Ideas for clarification of meaning:
    - Lines 220-221 is a tautology, what does it mean?
    - Lines 265 “Public” maybe should say “Summary” or “High-level”.
  - Is January 2000 correct for page date?
  - No reference to naming conventions, when to use italics, bold etc.
    - Confusing in some areas
    - Inconsistent with other documents
    - Document names in italics and not
    - Attributes, objects, instances, etc.
    - Using [11.4] for Section 11.4
  - What is in italics should be changed not to conflict with Glossary terms
    - Table of Contents
    - Section 7 words in heading are in italics and not in the body
  - Sections should begin on a new page to be consistent with other documents
  - Collaboration-Protocol has a dash in between to be consistent with other documents
  - Section 2
    - Inconsistent use of comma, short and long dashes between name and company
    - Table of Contents inconsistent with Document Template and other documents
    - Table of Contents should be section 3,
  - Section 3.2
    - Should include Document and a Naming Conventions
  - Section 3.4
    - Actual names of documents needed and versions and consistent descriptions
    - Do not say “under development”
    - Business Domain Model does not exist (see also line 907)
    - Applies to References section (section 13) as well
  - Sections 10 and 11
    - Registry Entries same thing as RegistryEntries or not
  - Section 12
    - Are there enough spaces between the section number and title?
  - Copyright page uses incorrect version (still uses “Internet society”), see revised template at...
- [http://www.ebxml.org/project\\_teams/technical\\_coord/ebxml\\_document\\_template.doc](http://www.ebxml.org/project_teams/technical_coord/ebxml_document_template.doc)
- Periods needed at the end of each sentence:
    - Table at line 580
    - Table at line 587
    - Bullet points between lines 763 – 770
  - Replace the word “chapter” with “ section” in lines 293, 313, 317, 325, 329, 351, 353, 511, 797
  - Use consistent bullet points, e.g. “?? “ on line 790 and 792
  - Line 7 Use international date formats
  - Line 7 Remove Working Draft to be consistent with other documents

- Line 8 Remove line 5 to be consistent with other documents
- Line 103 “d” in “Defined” should be lower case
- Line 113 “Pre” rather than “Pred”
- Line 190 [Bra97] not in References section
- Line 326 space before User
- Line 331 needs a space before PostalAddress
- Line 410 “d” in “Defined” should be lower case
- Line 520 refernce should be reference
- Line 569 is “See Also:” suppose to be here?
- Line 577 remove line
- Line 585 remove line
- Line 590 remove line
- Line 745 appears to be two spaces rather than one before Japan
- Line 780 slots should be Slots to be consistent with line 777
- Line 849 remove partial line
- Line 951 rather than 2000, should be 2000 & 2001 (to match footer)