The Quality Review team have completed their review of ebXML Message Service Specification v0.98b as submitted by the Transport, Routing and Packaging team on March 13th 2001.

We would like to congratulate the TRP team on producing such a professional effort and are pleased to 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:

- **Overview and context** – We feel the introduction and overview would benefit from presenting the development of this specification and its relationship with the ebXML requirements and Technical Architecture. For example, there should be a business level requirement to explain why and what differentiates this specification from other messaging systems, why SOAP on its own does not address the business need, the relationship between SOAP and SOAP plus Attachments, etc.

- **Relationship to SOAP** – The specification should clarify which attributes or features are dependant on SOAP (or SOAP plus attachments) and which are independent. For example, if the SOAP specification changed feature X would this affect ebXML Message Services? In addition this clarification may avoid the need to repeat SOAP specification. For example, statements like lines 239-240 may not be necessary.
• **Clarification of MSH, MSI scope and functionality** – The scope and functionality for the Message Service Handler [line 26-28] and the Message Service interface [Fig 6.1] needs to be presented in the context of the Business Service Interface of the ebXML Technical Architecture. Some of the features defined for the MSH appear to present like a Message Handling System and at other times like a Business Service Interface. For example, run-time validation of CPAs [lines 424-426], message sequencing [lines 594-597] and the traceheader functionality [lines 685-715]. Perhaps some schematics or diagrams would assist the reader (e.g. Figure 6-1 could be aligned with the text and improved). The introduction (lines 3-8) talks of a “ebXML Service Interface specification”, but we are not clear where this would fit in the framework.

• **General presentation comments** – We would like to see more schematics and diagrams to aide the reader. Large sections of this specification are (quite understandably) lists of attributes. Some of these could benefit from class diagrams and/or tables to assist the reader in their navigation. The Registry and Repository specifications provide an example of this. In addition, areas such as section 9 “Message Service Handler Services” could use some sequence diagrams.