

Comment Num	Commenter	Date	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Disposition
1	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	3		dont understand the need for a subtitle especially when doesnt seem to be an explanation of title	Removed
2	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	14	19	yet another format for this (-->qa)	TBD
3	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	23		section - not as per template	TBD
4	QR	2-Apr-01	83		The section for "Copyright statement" is not in the table of contents.	added
5	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	83		misalignment of page number	corrected
6	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	85		section - not in other specs (--->qa)	TBD
7	QR	2-Apr-01	105	130	Should mention incremental compliance and adoption of the various ebXML components.	added "it is anticipated that compliance with and adoption of the various ebXML components will be incremental, over time."
8	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	105		and throughout indented, not in other specs	TBD
9	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	108		You dont have to do ebXML via the internet	Removed "on the internet"
10	QR	2-Apr-01	116		"semantics" should be "semantic".	corrected
11	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	119		ebXML doesnt have a security model	Removed "and security"
12	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	121		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.	Changed to recommended text
13	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	127		i am not aware ebXML will be used for the discovery of either products or services	Changed to business offering
14	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	129		"business process models" s/b "business-process-specifications" (This is the term we are using for an instance of the BPSS).	Changed
15	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	139		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.	TBD
16	QR	2-Apr-01	140	165	Also see item 9 for related comments. Should also mention Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement and also the Security Risk Assessment documents.	Included

17	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	140		section - not as per other specs (-->qa)	TBD
18	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	162		2 TBDs to be completed	Completed
19	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	170	172	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	Removed
20	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	180		(also --->qa)	Done
21	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	182		and throughout, suggest page break on major sections	Done
22	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	192		the activities are not in the collaboration, they are in implementing and executing the collaboration	Changed
23	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	197		then finally back to process definition' - i dont understand	Removed 'then finally back to process definition'
24	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	201	224	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	Specifications are listed in the documents section
25	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	203	223	Service	Changed to lower case
26	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	206		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)	Have not identified one
27	QR	2-Apr-01	213		do not beleive this text is necessary or helpful - at least it needs a ref	TBD
28	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	224		Lines are hidden on the diagram.	Does not print that way ???
29	QR	2-Apr-01	229	231	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.	Don't understand the comment with respectto optional. This is not a prescriptive list.
30	QR	2-Apr-01	233	234		

31	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	233	process related information should be excluded - at best this should be in ebXML overview document	Since this is an overview of the analysis of business processes, the process-related information It is defined following the colon.
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
33	QR	2-Apr-01	239	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.	See comment 35
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	TBD
36	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	247		
37	QR	2-Apr-01	250	Why use the GAAP acronym – is it used elsewhere?	
38	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	254	remove add at bullet start 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.	Removed
39	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	255	This whole para seems out of place and references a figure further on	Noted
40	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	255		figure moved
41	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	256	Wrong Figure number. Figure 8.3-2 is the Figure 8.3-2 is actually 8.3-1. REA reference (in footnote) should also be in Section 12 – References. The REA web site (www.reamodel.org) is “under construction”.	Figure numbers corrected
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.	Figure numbers corrected
43	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	258		

					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.	Removed
45	QR	2-Apr-01	262		The terms "Design time" and Runtime" need explanation	TBD
46	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	263		left side text isnt formatted correct (isnt in pdf)	Corrected
47	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	263		would be help full to say the left side is partner 1 and the right is partner 2	TBD
48	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	263		should package be payload	Don't know
49	QR	2-Apr-01	264	267	How does this diagram relate to Figure 6.1-1.? Text needs reformatting on left hand side	Done
50	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	268		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
51	Stuart Campbell	16-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	
52	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	269		and throughout artefacts is an uncommon word which most wont recognise or be confused about	"artifact" is common in the [TAS]
53	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	274		replace specifications/models for the defined business processes with business-process-specifications	Replaced
54	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	274	276	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".	Changed
55	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	278		The business process modeling results in an ebXML business-process-specification which is referenced	Changed
56	QR	2-Apr-01	278	279	This implies all business processes are in CPPs and CPA, it should say "may be".	Corrected
57	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	282	283	remove the reference, it only leads to confusion (ebXML functional phases vs. the 'activities' in figure 6-1-1.	Removed
58	QR	2-Apr-01	282		Use document name not just acronym.	See comment 77
59	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	286	290	mixes metamodels and models. S/b: ebXML Business Process Specification Schema defines how business processes are specified for ebXML.....The ebXML Business Process Specification Schema enables an	
60	QR	2-Apr-01	291		How do process models "specify interoperability"?	N/A

61	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	296		components from which components ????	
62	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	298		The Metamodel, is it the UMM metamodel, or BPSS?	
63	QR	2-Apr-01	298	299	How does a metamodel specify a methodology?	N/A
64	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	298		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	Corrected The semantics assure like comparisons of processes, not just CC
65	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	298		and section; the font change is unecessary and uncommon and unexplained	TBD
66	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	298		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
67	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	304	308	Business Information Components?	Changed to title case
68	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	305		s/b UMM metamodel	Corrected
69	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	309		change "are required to" to "may"	Corrected
70	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	311		artefacts as before	See before
71	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	316		the representations are non standalone - they should be completely dependant on each other	
72	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	317		Figure 7-2-1: PartnerTypes s/b BusinessPartnerRole, Roles s/b AuthorizedRole	TBD
73	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	318		Some images overlap text on this diagram.	N/A
74	QR	2-Apr-01	320		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.	?
75	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	323		should can be may (MAY)	
76	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	323		word signal is used but not introduced	added 'electronic'
77	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	324		To help BPSS no longer is accompanied by a set of patterns, they reside in UMM	Removed sentence
78	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	325		word pattern is used but not properly introduced	
79	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	326		s/b The ebXML Business Process Specification Schema is used to produce business-process-specifications. Business- process-specifications serve as	Changed sentence
80	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	327		What is the "full" specification?	N/A
81	QR	2-Apr-01	327	329	CPAs not defined but CPP is	Defined
82	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	328			

				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.	N/A
83	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	329		
84	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	329	This graphic is not described at all!!!	N/A
85	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	329	what is BRV	N/A
86	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	329	single transactions VS collaborations	N/A
87	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	329	what is BTV	N/A
				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
89	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	333	Inconsistent use of the convention for capitalising SHOULD, etc...	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
91	QR	2-Apr-01	336	What kind of the "Core Library" do we refer to? Is it Core Components or Business Library?	N/A
92	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	337	339 Will ebXML define processes, or just a process catalog?	N/A
93	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	338	there is no such thing as a core library is there	N/A
94	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	339	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	Changed
98	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	356	"processes re-engineering" should be "process re-engineering".	Corrected
99	QR	2-Apr-01	361	Drop the quote, it is not particularly enlightening (and "operating business practices" is really awkward...)	Dropped quote; changed to 'conduct of business'
100	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	364		
101	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	367	digra, is not described at all!!!!	
102	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	367	how are two halves of diagram linked	

103	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	369		figure 8-2-1: Does a business process contain anything other than collaborations? If not, we are just talking about recursive collaboration.	TBD
104	QR	2-Apr-01	369	375	Shouldn't there be a connection or relationship between Figure 8.2-1 and 8-2.2 (e.g. A Document inside a Transaction)	TBD
105	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	370		definitions vs. specifications vs. schemas???	TBD
106	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	370		how does this text relate to the diagram above	TBD
107	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	373		information component relates to CC but is not a term they use	TBD
108	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	375		Figure 8-2-2: Information Component?	TBD
109	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	376		documents-->business documents	TBD
110	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	377		ebXML does not currently have a document envelope, and if we re-introduce it there is no intention of requiring DUNs numbers.	TBD
111	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	379		attention --> to	TBD
112	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	380		business service interfaces is not defined yet	TBD
113	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	380		the message..interface seems out of place here and should be delted	TBD
114	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	382		with them" to do what?	TBD
115	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	386		right text is undefined	TBD
116	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	388		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?)	TBD
117	QR	2-Apr-01	390	397	Repeats line 236-251 (section 6.2)	Removed
118	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	392		UMM metamodel	
119	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	397		repeated REA reference in footnote	
120	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	397		shouldnt the top two horizontal arrows be reversed, the top right vertical arrow be reversed	
121	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	402		this suggests arrows should go other way	
122	QR	2-Apr-01	403	414	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.	
123			403			
124	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	406		what does 'typed' mean here	
125	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	414		duality is not a common word - should be defined more	

126	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	421		so whats the implication of this para	
127	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	429		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	
128	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	432	435	company.	
129	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	443		existing s/b "currently used"	
130	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	445		UMM metamodel, + BPSS	
131	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	445		controls is underfined	
132	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	446		what other techniques?	
133	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	450		and so who are the reviewers	
134	QR	2-Apr-01	451		"is" should be "are".	
135	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	452		i guess this is from ideo, would be helpful to group the side	
136	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	452		in to input, output, resources, controls	
137	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	454		doesn't say what diagram is about	
138	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	459		Figure 8.4.2 output is business-process-specification, not definition	
139	QR	2-Apr-01	471	473	Figure 8.4.3 add business-process-specification as output	
140	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	475		X12 and EDIFACT standards do not define business	
141	QR	2-Apr-01	480		processes (except by loose implication). It is the various	
142	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	481		implementation guidelines and those with the knowledge to	
143	QR	2-Apr-01	486		construct these guidelines that define the business	
144	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	486		processes. Is that what is meant by "associated business	
145	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	488		processes"?	
146	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	489		footnote - this note adds no value	
147	QR	2-Apr-01	491		"involved" should be "involves".	Corrected
148	QR	2-Apr-01	493	494	example would be helpful	
149	QR	2-Apr-01	498		Can we say "e.g. an ebXML Registry" to improve clarity?	Changed
150	QR	2-Apr-01	511	512	SHOULD be a may	
151	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	513	527	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.	Corrected
					Sentence does not scan.	?
					Is "controlled" the same as "moderated"? Would that be a	
					more recognisable term?	Changed to moderated
					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	This section was suggested and
					sneak a design preference into an overview document, keep	validated by Jim Clark and Dave
					it for design documents.	Welsh

152	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	513		in general there is not introduction to the techy para	
153	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	515		REF function not even really hinted at	
154	QR	2-Apr-01	522		What is a "general UML domain"?	
155	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	524		what is a constricted domain	
156	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	529		would it not be helpful to put UML/UMM somewhere in this diagram	
157	QR	2-Apr-01	531		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)	Linked
158	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	537		UMM metamodel. But the purpose of an ebXML analysis process is to produce artifacts according to ebXML not according to UMM.	
159	QR	2-Apr-01	539	540	Does this imply these must be ebXML CPAs and not other trading agreements?.	
160	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	541		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.	
161	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	552		the whole principal of ebXML is surely that they would be composed of CCs!	
162	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	552		im not convinced that BP and CC are using the same terminology here, also same for RR	
163	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	552		i think this should be only in the CC spec	
164	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	570		domain components will and should be the first source	
165	QR	2-Apr-01	586	587	This sentence uses to word "standard" too freely. Maybe use a word like "initiatives".	Changed
166	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	587		xCBL is not a standard in the same sence as the others	
167	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	589		it isnt the metamodel that specifies is it	
168	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	621		Where are UMM complaint approaches described, I would like to use them.	
169	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	622		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.	
170	QR	2-Apr-01	633	641	Should be section 10.1.1 "Analysis Worksheets and Editor"	Corrected
171	QR	2-Apr-01	635	636	Has an extraneous paragraph break.	Corrected

172	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	635		text fragment at end	
173	QR	2-Apr-01	639	640	Diagram need moving to avoid splitting this sentence.	Corrected
174	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	639		diagram is inserted in sentance more techy point; you will end up with a completely unlimited umber of BP scheams - how will this be controlled	
175	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	639		Should be re-numbered 10.1.2 (see comment above).	Done
176	QR	2-Apr-01	642			
177	QR	2-Apr-01	652	659	Repeats lines 643-650.	Removed
178	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	652		duplicate text	
179	QR	2-Apr-01	660		Should reference the ebXML Glossary.	
180	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	660		glossary should be at start (also qa issue)	
181	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	660		not all new terms are in the glossary It looks like the same documents are listed in "4.3 Related Documents" and "12 References" (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 References section that also includes the links to the unnecessary reference	
182	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01	661			
183	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	662		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	
184	Karsten Riemer	18-Apr-01	714		Industry sources = UN/CEFACT - this is a meaningless reference	
185	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	716		end of page 1 is cutoff	
186	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	716		an example column would be very helpful	
187	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	716		these context should be the same as CC context paper Messaging and Enveloping Conceptual View. The figure for the REA economic elements is figure 8.3-1.	
188	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01	716		this should be so - at least not if you do your job right - should explain	
189	Larissa Leybovich	6-Apr-01				
190	Stuart Campbell	16-Apr-01				