

ebXML Quality Review Group

Summary of Review of

ebXML Registry Services Specification v0.88

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 ebXML Registry Services v0.88 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.

However, we have concerns with some of the changes made to this document since its previous review. Whilst there has been significant modification and expansion to this document, we feel this might have caused inconsistencies with some of the original material.

The evidence that leads to this concern is:

- The apparent mandating of ebXML Message Services (lines 287-288, 342). However, it does not appear in the Conformance section (lines 350-366) and this statement is not in alignment with the Technical Architecture, ebXML Requirements or the recent discussion on this matter.
- The 'implicit' CPA (line 401-409) needs to be put in perspective of the ebXML architecture. For example, whether the 'implicit' CPA is an ebXML compliant Collaboration Protocol Agreement or not. If so, there should be a XML document defined for this. Is it mandatory? If it is not mandatory then how can the relevant agreements be established and documented? Is this aligned with the work of the TP team?
- The ebXML concept of 'incremental' compliance appears to be compromised. The references to the ebXML Message Services and Collaboration Protocol

Agreement imply that there is no option for using Registries without one or both of these.

- Is the Deprecate Objects protocol (lines 715-721) seen as a workaround to the lack of version control (lines 490-492)? If so, this should be stated.
- The “Content Based Ad Hoc Query” section (lines 2442-2500) is out of scope for this specification. It should either be moved to a non-normative appendix or published as a separate discussion paper.
- Alignment with status and content of other specifications. For example the use of StatusResult (lines 960 to 962) and digital signing of message headers (lines 2636-2637) with the Message Services specification.
- Alignment with ebXML Requirements. The ebXML Requirements Traceability matrix of this (and the related Registry Information Model specification) reveals some points in need of clarification:
 - Several functional requirements are not addressed, but mentioned as future work, for example lines 392-393 postpone the requirements for:
 - A repository being referable within another repository
 - Support the intercommunication between registries and repositories
 - A registry intercommunicating within another repository
 - Support the distributed repository conceptThe Registry Repository team should acknowledge this deferral in their Caveats and Assumptions section.
 - How does the Registry intend to authenticate itself to clients?
 - Archiving is addressed by implication, but not clearly.
 - How does the Registry support reuse of core components?(A copy of the Requirements Traceability Matrix is available with this report)

The QR team have discussed some of these issues with the Registry Repository team and feel confident they will be addressed as part of the public review process.

In addition, we have identified some editorial issues that the Registry Repository team may wish to consider...

- Lack of stated document and naming conventions
- Lack of definitions before words introduced (Registry, services, session, clients, slots, interface, Associations, Classifications, URN, RIM binding, leftargument, Callback, ExternalLinks, Packages, ExtrinsicObject, IntrinsicObject, DTD, etc)
- Semantic rules (e.g. lines 1006-1110) need flow charts or other visual assistance for clarity
- Is January 2001 correct for page headers?

- Glossary
 - Need a reference to the ebXML Glossary
 - Words found in glossary need to appear in italics
- Words in italics (Objects, Documents names, Interfaces) should be changed not to conflict with Glossary terms.
- Table of Contents does not follow Document Template
 - Section 10, 11, 12 should be before Appendix
 - Table of Contents should be section 3, section 3 should be section 4, etc.
- Font size too small for examples with shaded background (e.g line 564)
- All diagrams should have a label “Figure . . .”
- Sections should begin on a new page
- Inconsistencies in terms
 - Registry clients vs Registry Clients vs RegistryClient (line 260, 303 and 412)
 - Should be a dash between Collaboration and Profile to be consistent (line 323)
 - Interfaces vs interfaces with lower case “i” (line 364 and 369)
 - Registry Architecture vs registry architecture (line 371 and 378)
 - Service vs service (line 476 and 477)
 - Id in different font (line 524)
 - Registry vs registry (line 249 and 529)
 - UUID vs uuid (line 536 and 545)
 - *deletionScope* in italics (line 732) and not on line 735
 - *depth* in italics (line 793) and not on line 795
 - RegistryEntries vs Registry Entries (line 730 and 804)
 - Section vs section (line 844 and 853)
 - Rim and [RIM] (line 696 and 841)
 - Appendix and appendix (line 788 and 843)
 - *Registry filter* in italics (line 851) and not on line 852
 - *Predicate clause* in italics (line 852) and not on line 854
 - Precidate Clauses vs predicate clauses (line 854 and 2040)
 - leftargument vs left argument (line 1968 and 2056)
 - *name* in italics (line 2244) and then not on line 2245.

In addition, we have encountered a range of minor edits as follows...

- Lines 32-61
Inconsistent use of comma, short and long dashes between name and company
- Lines 262-272 and 3956-3978
Actual names of documents needed and versions and consistent descriptions
- Line 264 and 3964
Business Domain Model does not exist
- Line 339 and 340
‘trading relationship’ is less binding than ‘partnership’.
- Line 356 and 357

- Include reference to Appendix A
- Line 371-372
Figure 1 may be better between these paragraphs.
- Line 388,389
Figure 1 is too small to be legible.
- Line 428-429
Maybe use explanations to illustrate how these interfaces can be shown.
- Line 756
Remove “it is” after the “As such”.
- Line 761
Use of [8.1] for section 8.1 inconsistent within document
- Line 762,763,765
“shall”, “optional”, “must” should in capitals to be consistent with section 3.2
- Line 836
The phrase “below” can be confusing, a more precise location or section is preferred.
- Line 819 and 2222 and 2536 and 2619 and 2670
Use consistent and more appropriate bullet point (not “??”).
- Line 2690
Maybe have an introduction and explanation for these DTDs
- Lines 3266-3286
Sentences need periods at the end.
- Line 3284
Blank line not needed.
- Lines 3836
Sentence needs a period at the end.
- Lines 3862-3864 and 3937-3941
Text does not align with left margin.
- Lines 3266-3286
Sentences need periods at the end.
- Line 4
Remove Working Draft to be consistent with other documents
- Line 254
[Bra97] not in References section
- Line 363
“Bootstrapping” not defined
- Line 383
“an” should “a”
- Line 411
Suggest “Since” rather than starting a sentence with “Because”
- Line 414
add “the” between “to” and “Registry”
- Line 416
is “transport protocol” needed after communication?
- Line 425
Diagram should be prefaced by an explanation of the contents of Figure 2
- Line 442
Where are these on the diagram in line 425?
- Line 443
What does “approves” mean, also definitions for “Associations”, “Classifications” and “slots”
- Line 449
Add “the” between “on” and “Registry”

- Line 450 Definitions for namePattern
- Line 451 Appears to be two spaces before “By”
- Line 470 add “client” between “the” and “callback” to be consistent with line 463
- Line 472 mentions query but what about retrieval as in diagram line 425
- Line 483 remove “in the current version of”.
- Line 500 remove period after “details”
- Line 511 1 is better written as “one”.
- Line 519 What is an “arbitrary” object?
- Line 526 introduce UUID first time, needs definition
- Line 558 add “s” between Object and Request to be consistent with line 551
- Line 702 should “add” be “remove”?
- Line 773-775 re-word for clarity
- Line 781 example needed of wildcard pattern
- Line 817 font different than line 723
- Line 863 Adhoc QueryRequest or AdhocQueryRequest (one word or two)?
- Line 876 maybe use RIM Binding and diagram to be consistent with line 1397
- Line 946 indicate number(s) of subsections
- Line 962 TRP specification not the accurate document reference (ebXML Message Service Specification)
- Line 964 Diagram needs title and should go on line 968.
- Line 1093, 1096 Is it AuditableEventFilter or AuditableEventsFilter?
- Line 1130 What is a UNSPSC?
- Line 1171 “registry Package” should be “RegistryPackage” to be consistent with line 1178
- Line 1178, 1552 objectType should have capital O to be consistent with line 1195
- Line 1201 Diagram should have title and go on line 1205
- Line 1249 Should “year” read “since the beginning of the year” to be consistent with line 1254?
- Line 1262-1264 Re-word sentence to make more meaningful (e.g. put in a context)
- Line 1373 capital “N” in “name” to be consistent with line 1196
- Line 1374 capital “N” in “name” to be consistent with line 1196
- Line 1375 should p in parent be P?
- Line 1381 urn in double quotes to be consistent with line 1248
- Line 1397 HasMember in italics to be consistent with line 1289
- Line 1451 sentence repeats line 1444
- Line 1461 inconsistent “As”, is there a space between “as” and “Source” and “Target” or not?

- Line 1464 Diagram needs a title and should be on line 1468
- Line 1547 capital c in country?
- Line 1556 capital t in timestamp?
- Line 1565 urn in double quotes
- Line 1877 no space after “warning”
- Line 1919 what is a NIST?
- Line 1926 two dashes before code should be long dash to be consistent with line 1909
- Line 1927 no space before urn
- Line 1934 put in double quotes and end with period
- Line 2339 xpath or XPATH?
- Line 2397 two spaces rather than one before WHERE
- Line 2415 missing “)” at the end of statement
- Line 2426 missing “)” at the end of statement
- Line 2429 missing “)” at the end of statement
- Line 4001 place RFC 2130 before RFC 2277

It is understood the following material will be removed from the body of this specification (but please note)...

- Line 2443 remove blank line for consistency with line 2439
- Line 2482 is “path” needed before expression?
- Line 2530 a rather than A
- Line 2597 font too small
- Line 2598 font size different than line 2512