<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Num</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start Line</th>
<th>End Line</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>dont understand the need for a subtitle especially when doesnt seem to be an explanation of title</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>yet another format for this (--&gt;qa)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>section - not as per template</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The section for “Copyright statement” is not in the table of contents.</td>
<td>added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>misalignment of page number</td>
<td>corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>section - not in other specs (--&gt;qa)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Should mention incremental compliance and adoption of the various ebXML components.</td>
<td>added “it is anticipated that compliance with and adoption of the various ebXML components will be incremental, over time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>should be “semantic”.</td>
<td>corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>and throughout indented, not in other specs</td>
<td>Removed “on the internet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>You dont have to do ebXML via the internet</td>
<td>corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>“semantics” should be “semantic”.</td>
<td>Removed “and security”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>The use of word metamodel is ambiguous. If this is supposed to mean the UMM metamodel, it should say so, but ebXML does not provide UMM, nor the UMM metamodel. Text should be: commercial interoperability is provided by means of a specification schema for defining business processes and a core components and context model for defining Business Documents.</td>
<td>Changed to recommended text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Karsten Riemer</td>
<td>18-Apr-01</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>i am not aware ebXML will be used for the discovery of either products or services</td>
<td>Changed to business offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>“business process models” s/b “business-processSpecifications” (This is the term we are using for an instance of the BPSS).</td>
<td>Changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Karsten Riemer</td>
<td>18-Apr-01</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does it make sense to include the links to the related docs (as in status of this doc) in addition to the reference name and date? Also, some of the versions/dates are old. For example, “ebXML Business Process Specification Schema. Version 0.90. 01/17/2001. Context/Metamodel Group of the CC/BP Joint Delivery Team”. The latest version is 0.99 (I think). The same for the CC docs.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Larissa Leybovich</td>
<td>6-Apr-01</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also see item 9 for related comments.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Should also mention Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement and also the Security Risk Assessment documents.</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
section - not as per other specs (-->qa)

2 TBDs to be completed

use of 'heretofore' is scary - out of sync with other specs
The key objective should be: Describe how business
process modeling at ebXML leads to the production of a
business-process-specification against the BPSS. If this
document does not focus on this as the key objective, then
it is not an ebXML BP analysis document.
and throughout, generally everyone is using round bullets
(also --->qa)
the activities are not in the collaboration, they are in
implementing and executing the collaboration
then finally back to process definition’ - i dont understand
why
figure 6.1-1 and associated table : For each ‘activity’ list the
ebXML specification, not the ebXML team:
Process Definition: ebXML Specification Schema
Partner Discovery: ebXML CPP/CPA and ebXML RegRep
Partner Sign-up: ebXML CPP/CPA
Electronic Plug-in: ebXML CPP/CPA
Process Execution: ebXML CPP/CPA and ebXML Message
Service
Specifications are listed in the
documents section
in this narrative MAY should not be used this way
Is there a better term than “plug-in”? (See the Collaboration-
Protocol Profile and Agreement specification for a
description of this interface)
do not beleive this text is necessary or helpful - at least it
needs a ref

Lines are hidden on the diagram.
Some items in this table should be identified as “optional”.
Should there be references to TRP Message Services in the
“Electronic Plug-in”, “Process Execution” and “Process
Management” rows (for situations where ebXML Message
Services are used). Should there be references to Trading
Partner team’s Collaboration-Protocol Profile and
Agreement specification in the “Process Management” rows
(for situations where ebXML CPAs are used). The
UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) needs a
reference where it can be found.
31 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 233 process related information should be excluded - at best this should be in ebXML overview document
32 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 236 resource exchanges’ is a complete new and uncommon term and should be defined (or suggest to use more normal "buying and selling products and services")
33 QR 2-Apr-01 239 Since this is an overview of the analysis of business processes, the process-related information is defined following the colon. Why are only these collaborations defined?
(Bob Haugen) I don't understand the QR comment. The section is about defined economic elements, not defined collaborations. There is no intent in the section to limit the allowable or enumerated collaborations to some set; any collaborations listed are intended only as examples, not to be prescriptive. Maybe a note to that effect should be appended for the literal-minded.
34 239 Material has been included in support of the discussion on business collaborations.
35 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 240 to me all this 'economic ....' is wierd and uncommon and throughout, usage of capitalisation on bullets is inconsistent - most capitalise all
36 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 247 Why use the GAAP acronym – is it used elsewhere?
37 QR 2-Apr-01 250 remove add at bullet start
38 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 254 .... ebXML Economic Modeling Elements should be REA Economic Modeling Elements. They are (unfortunately) not ebXML Economic Modeling Elements. I will raise an issue (again), that they should be.
39 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 255 This whole para seems out of place and references a figure further on
40 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 255Wrong Figure number. Figure 8.3-2 is the
41 Larissa Leybovich 6-Apr-01 256 Figure 8.3-2 is actually 8.3-1. REA reference (in footnote) should also be in Section 12 – References. The REA website (www.reamodel.org) is “under construction”.
42 QR 2-Apr-01 256 Specification Schema has string attributes ResultsIn and Requires that may be used with a guided string syntax and naming convention, as suggested by Bob Haugen, to express that a BusinessTransaction or BinaryCollaboration ResultsIn an EconomicContract or EconomicEvent, or that it Requires a prior EconomicContract.
and 421-424: Remove these lines. It is irrelevant to an ebXML user what software might be developed against the UMM metamodel. Further, it is very inconsistent to say that we did not feel comfortable enough about the REA model to incorporate it in the specification schema for future automated software, but to say that we feel comfortable with the exact same model in UMM as the basis for future

44 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 260 261 automated software.

45 QR 2-Apr-01 262 The terms “Design time” and Runtime” need explanation Removed

46 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 263 left side text isn’t formatted correct (isn’t in pdf) TBD

would be help full to say the left side is partner 1 and the right is partner 2 Corrected

47 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 263 should package be payload TBD

48 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 263 How does this diagram relate to Figure 6.1-1.? Text needs Don’t know

49 QR 2-Apr-01 264 267 reformatting on left hand side Done

Change labels “Design Time and Runtime” to a smaller font so that they fit on the left-hand side of the figure nicer for better readability. Done

50 Larissa Leybovich 6-Apr-01 268 re footnote - i do not see this REA is being either well accepted, well review or published - i and anyone else i have spoken to has never heard of it Done

51 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 268 and throughout artefacts is an uncommon word which most wont recognise or be confused about "artifact" is common in the [TAS]

52 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 269 replace specifications/models for the defined business processes with business-process-specifications TBD

a. Insert word “documents” before “…are stored” in the first sentence. b. I would change the second sentence to be "These Business Libraries are residing in the ebXML compliant registries/repositories” to eliminate a duplicate usage of “contained”. Replaced

53 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 274 The business process modeling results in an ebXML business-process-specification which is referenced …. Changed

This implies all business processes are in CPPs and CPA, it should say “may be”. Corrected

54 Larissa Leybovich 6-Apr-01 274 276 remove the reference, it only leads to confusion (ebXML functional phases vs. the ‘activities’ in figure 6-1-1. Removed

55 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 278 mixes metamodels and models. S/b: ebXML Business Process Specification Schema defines how business processes are specified for ebXML…….The ebXML Changed

56 QR 2-Apr-01 278 279 Use document name not just acronym. Corrected

57 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 282 283 See comment 77

58 QR 2-Apr-01 282 Business Process Specification Schema enables an N/A

59 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 286 290 How do process models “specify interoperability”?
components from which …… components ????
The Metamodel, is it the UMM metamodel, or BPSS?
How does a metamodel specify a methodology? N/A
double sapce between metamodel and is
i suggest not to associate the meta model with semantics so strongly since gives immediate impression is more related to CCs
and section; the font change is unnecessary and uncommon and unexplained
I wonder if it makes sense to change the “….Business Information Objects can be composed of re- useable Business Information Objects” to “…Business Information Components can be composed of re- useable Business Information Objects…” since in the prior sentence we’d talked about the “Business Information Components” Are these interchangeable terms? Changed
s/b UMM metamodel Corrected
change “are required to” to “may” Corrected
the representations are non standalone - they should be completely dependant on each other
Figure 7-2-1: PartnerTypes s/b BusinessPartnerRole, Roles TBD
s/b AuthorizedRole
Some images overlap text on this diagram. The UMM is still finalizing the patterns with the possibility of reducing their number. Does it make sense to NOT list current(?) patterns here, so as to not introduce a confusion when design patterns are simplified? The BPSS had removed the reference to the design patterns for this exact reason. See Karsten’s/Jamie’s BPSS issues list for the resolution of this item. Changed
should can be may (MAY) Changed to title case
word signal is used but not introduced added ‘electronic’
word pattern is used but not properly introduced Removed sentence
s/b The ebXML Business Process Specification Schema is used to produce business-process-specifications. Business-process-specifications serve as …… Changed sentence
CPAs not defined but CPP is Defined
I think that we need a brief paragraph here that explains how to read this Figure 7.2-2, just like lines 321-326 explain how to interpret Figure 7.2-1. This particular figure is not intuitive and easily digestible for business people who are not familiar with the UMM document and conventions.

Figure 7.2-2. Remove the figure, it doesn’t illustrate an ebXML metamodel, and supports neither the preceding text, nor the following text Removed

88 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 331 Drop the entire paragraph about UML. It is not what the TA says, and the TA is likely to be changed on this topic anyway, and UML does not by itself ensure any consistent methodology. Removed

90 QR 2-Apr-01 334 Can we say “it is possible to compare models” – shouldn’t we say “it may be possible”. Using a consistent methodology does not ensure interoperability. N/A

92 Larissa Leybovich 6-Apr-01 337 339 What kind of the “Core Library” do we refer to? Is it Core Components or Business Library? N/A

93 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 338 Will ebXML define processes, or just a process catalog? N/A

94 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 339 there is no such thing as a core library is there possible-->probable N/A

95 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 339 Collaboration of business processes? I know that is the UMM way of thinking, but in reality it is awfully hard to differentiate collaboration and process, better off just using the word Business Process, or Business Collaboration, but be consistent. Or define before using. ebXML specschema does not have the notion of a business process, only multiparty and binary collaborations. Changed to Business Processes

96 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 348 Business Process Definition s/b Business-Process-Specification Changed

97 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 349 The team -->Such a processes re-engineering” should be “process re-engineering”. Changed

98 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 356 “operating business practices” is really awkward…) Corrected

100 Karsten Riemer 18-Apr-01 364 Drop the quote, it is not particularly enlightening (and ‘conduct of business’ Dropped quote; changed to

101 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 367 digra, is not described at all!!!! ‘conduct of business’

102 Stuart Campbell 16-Apr-01 367 how are two halves of diagram linked
figure 8-2-1: Does a business process contain anything other than collaborations? If not, we are just talking about recursive collaboration.

Shouldn’t there be a connection or relationship between Figure 8.2-1 and 8-2.2 (e.g. A Document inside a Transaction)?

Shouldn’t there be a connection or relationship between Figure 8.2-1 and 8-2.2 (e.g. A Document inside a Transaction)?

definitions vs. specifications vs. schemas???

how does this text relate to the diagram above

information component relates to CC but is not a term they use

Figure 8-2-2: Information Component?

documents-->business documents

ebXML does not currently have a document envelope, and if we re-introduce it there is no intention of requiring DUNs numbers.

attention --> to

business service interfaces is not defined yet

the message..interface seems out of place here and should be deleted

with them” to do what?

right text is undefined

Figure 8.2.3 and associated text: No need for an implementation diagram in an analysis document. Business analysts are not concerned with message envelopes and transport envelopes. (Is the picture ebXML correct anyway?)

Repeats line 236-251 (section 6.2) Removed

UMM metamodel

repeated REA reference in footnote

shouldn’t the top two horizontal arrows be reversed, the top right vertical arrow be reversed

this suggests arrows should go other way

If we are supposed to relate these to REA terms, then understanding of REA should be noted in the Caveats and Assumptions (section 5.3)

& 406, 413 (Bob Haugen) I think the reference for these terms should be changed from REA to UMM Economic Elements. I erred in using REA as a reference; the definitions are in UMM, which is an official reference for ebXML-BP.

what does 'typed' mean here

duality is not a common word - should be defined more
so what's the implication of this para

Figure 8.4.1: where is the business-process-specification produced? Is it the BP definition? If so, rename.

marketing and product management participate in requirements gathering for products, but not typically for processes. This sounds like the description of a software company.

Existing s/b “currently used”

UMM metamodel, + BPSS

controls is underfined

what other techniques?

and so who are the reviewers

“is” should be “are”.

i guess this is from idef, would be helpful to group the side in to input, output, resources, controls

doesn't say what diagram is about

Figure 8.4.2 output is business-process-specification, not definition

Figure 8.4.3 add business-process-specification as output

X12 and EDIFACT standards do not define business processes (except by loose implication). It is the various implementation guidelines and those with the knowledge to construct these guidelines that define the business processes. Is that what is meant by “associated business processes”?

footnote - this note adds no value

“involved” should be “involves”.

example would be helpful

Can we say “e.g. an ebXML Registry” to improve clarity?

SHOULD be a may

Isn’t ‘private’ redundant relative to ‘public’?

would like to see the specific option ‘company’ included

“and” should be “or” – they are not jointly owned.

Sentence does not scan.

Is “controlled” the same a “moderated”? Would that be a more recognisable term?

What is meant by saying specifications will be “recognized over time”?

Drop this whole section, it is not the purpose of this document to design the use of repositories. Don’t try to sneak a design preference into an overview document, keep it for design documents.

This section was suggested and validated by Jim Clark and Dave Welsh.
in general there is not introduction to the techy para

REF function not even really hinted at

What is a ‘general UML domain’?

what is a constricted domain

would it not be helpful to put UML/UMM somewhere in this diagram

Figure 8.4-5  Shouldn’t there be a link between “Business Process and Business Information Model” and “Registration”? Can we register models? (see line 539 as well)

UMM metamodel. But the purpose of an ebXML analysis process is to produce artifacts according to ebXML not according to UMM.

Does this imply these must be ebXML CPAs and not other trading agreements?

Section 9: I am not an expert on core components, and will not comment, but if this section is fully validated against core component specifications and philosophies, then this is where people should read about relationship between business process and core components, not in BPSS.

the whole principal of ebXML is surely that they would be composed of CCs!

im not convinced that BP and CC are using the same terminology here, also same for RR

i think this should be only in the CC spec

domain components will and should be the first source

This sentence uses to word “standard” too freely. Maybe use a word like “initiatives”.

xCBL is not a standard in the same sence as the others

it isnt the metamodel that specifies is it

Where are UMM complaint approaches described, I would like to use them.

I agree with the statement “Practical Experience ……”. It says something about UMM. It is too complicated and requires too much specialized expertise, why not simplify UMM rather than creating short-cuts and other aids to help people deal with the complexity? I mean this very seriously. A lot of good work has gone into the worksheets and editors, those simplified views should be the basis for a simplified UMM.

Should be section 10.1.1 “Analysis Worksheets and Editor”

Has an extraneous paragraph break.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>text fragment at end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>Diagram need moving to avoid splitting this sentence. Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>Diagram is inserted in sentence. more techy point; you will end up with a completely unlimited number of BP schemes - how will this be controlled. Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>diagram is inserted in sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>Should be re-numbered 10.1.2 (see comment above). Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>Repeats lines 643-650. Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>duplicate text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>2-Apr-01</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>Should reference the ebXML Glossary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>glossary should be at start (also qa issue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>not all new terms are in the glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It looks like the same documents are listed in &quot;4.3 Related Documents&quot; and &quot;12 References&quot; (with the same old dates). Does it make sense to list these documents in 2 locations or should we have just one place with the references to the Related Documents? I prefer to have the unnecessary reference References section that also includes the links to the Appendix: Specify that metamodel elements are in UMM not in ebXML. A separate table should be created for the context driving metamodel elements within the Specification Schema and within the Core Componens information and context model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Larissa Leybovich</td>
<td>6-Apr-01</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Industry sources = UN/CEFACT - this is a meaningless reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>end of page 1 is cutoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Karsten Riemer</td>
<td>18-Apr-01</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>an example column would be very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>these context should be the same as CC context paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>this should be so - at least not if you do your job right - should explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>this should be so - at least not if you do your job right - should explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>this should be so - at least not if you do your job right - should explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Larissa Leybovich</td>
<td>6-Apr-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>this should be so - at least not if you do your job right - should explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Stuart Campbell</td>
<td>16-Apr-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>this should be so - at least not if you do your job right - should explain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>