

Issues list for public review cycle 1 of Specification Schema.  
Version 0.90

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
1.	2/1	Dubray	<p>Split/Join</p> <p>Choreography needs full Split and join capability</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: Introduce SplitState to match the already existing JoinState (SyncState)</p> <p>DocumentChange: Describe when/how to use split/join in context of collaboration.</p>	S	<p>Sync is Join, we don't have specific split</p> <p>The UML construct for 'split' is a join</p>		<p>Resolved. New modeling elements Fork and Split introduced.</p> <p>Determined that the real issue is that we have no way of distinguishing between a split and a choice, where a split means splitting to two or more activities that will be performed in parallel, and a choice means splitting to two or more activities that are mutually exclusive. We agreed that the default behavior of the current (0.90)ability is a choice.), The new proposed Fork state will have a default behavior of split, transitions from a 'Fork', are assumed to lead to activities that are executed in parallel.</p>	0.95	1
2.	2/1	Leybovich	<p>Patterns</p> <p>Business Transaction pattern list can be simplified</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: NONE Document Change: Reduce documented patterns to just Request/Response, Notification, and Distribution. Remove all reference to Agents and associated pattern combinations. Document relationship between 'Employee' role and on one hand the authorization and on the other the 'user interface'.</p>	S	<p>A. 6 patterns b. 34 patterns</p>		<p>Resolved to drop all discussion of actual patterns in the document. Instead, add references to discussion of patterns in the UMM.</p>	0.95	2

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			Refer to UMM for any additional patterns. Make it very clear that ReceiptAck and AcceptanceAck are always optional. Describe how Contract formation in REA terms is the determinant of a 'CommercialTransaction' rather than the message exchange pattern chosen.						
3.	2/1	Chris Ferris	Document Model  Must enable simple use of externally (non-ebXML) specified XML documents as payload  PROPOSAL:  Modeling Change: Dropped the Entity/Attribute document model  Documentation Change: Describe relationship to CC context based Document model.	S			Adopted. New document model supports this, see 25		1
4.	2/1	QR team	Do not use word Attribute as an element name	E			Not an issue anymore since document model has been dropped. See #25.	0.95	1
5.	2/1	Sharma	Do not use word "Type" as an attribute name	E			Adopted. Now using name of element type that we are referencing.	0.95	1
6.	2/1	Riemer	Fix description of FROM and TO attributes for	E	Errata		Adopted. Fixed	0.95	1
7.	2/1	Riemer	Change word reliable transport to guaranteed delivery	E	Errata		Already done in 0.90	0.95	1
8.	2/1	Ferris	Alignment of BP secureTransport with TP/TRP secureTransport	E			Add new attribute values "Persistent" and "Transient".	0.95	1

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			<p>Change word secure transport to align with TP terminology</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: New attribute value for Persistent or nonPersistent secure transport.</p> <p>Document Change: Document relationship between BP and TP/TRP.</p>						
9.	2/1	Haugen	<p>Pre/Post, beginswhen/endswhen</p> <p>Need pre/post conditions on collaborations</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: Decide if introducing strings is a relevant resolution for spec schema (can strings drive software?). Decide whether these are activity level or protocol (BinaryCollaboration and BusinessTransaction) level. Decide whether EconomicEvent can be begins/endswhen. Decide whether endsewhen is an 'exit-trigger' or more like a 'result'.</p> <p>Documentation Change: Describe and illustrate by example a series of collaborations that are related by pre/post./begins/ends</p>	S			<p>Adopted:</p> <p>Introducing strings for 'pre' and 'post' but to call them 'Requires' and 'ResultsIn'.</p> <p>Also introducing strings for "Beginswhen" and "EndsWhen".</p> <p>Not sure if everyone understands that the string approach means one occurrence only.</p> <p>Strong dissenting vote from Cory, who feels that unless scope, identity, and semantics of the string is defined, this is no more than a comment, and has little worth.</p> <p>Agree that a recommended vocabulary/grammar should be provided, but not as part of SpecSchema.</p>	0.95	1

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
10.	2/1	Pogliani	Need full multiparty support with choreography	S		2/14	See # 53. Adopted: We are supporting transition across binary collaborations.	0.95	1
11.	2/1	Haugen	<p>Need minimal support for REA.</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: Add EconomicContract and EconomicEvent as new modeling elements.</p> <p>Introduce the following associations:</p> <p>BinaryCollaboration 'forms' EconomicContract</p> <p>EconomicContract 'governs' BinaryCollaboration</p> <p>BinaryCollaboration 'resultsIn' EconomicEvent</p> <p>Determine whether the following parallel associations are also needed:</p> <p>BusinessTransaction 'forms' EconomicContract</p> <p>EconomicContract 'governs' BusinessTransaction</p> <p>BusinessTransaction 'resultsIn' EconomicEvent</p> <p>Document Change: Describe the use of 'forms', 'governs' and 'resultsIn'. Include in an appendix as a reference the full REA model as per UMM BRV. Describe how Contract formation in REA terms is the determinant of a</p>	S			<p>Not adopted:</p> <p>Due to a majority concern that this would be only a partial REA implementation, and not valuable on it's own merits, we are dropping this proposal altogether. Strong dissenting vote from Karsten who feels it is a major loss for ebXML to not have any formal support for REA in any ebXML specification at all.</p>		3

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			'CommercialTransaction' rather than the message exchange pattern chosen.						
12.	2/1	Riemer	Need to expose and describe pattern selection	E			Adopted: Addressed in document, also see issue #2		4
13.	2/1	Riemer	Document use of each 'type' reference in the DTD	E			No longer an issue since new tag names are intuitive, see issue 5		4
14.	2/12	Casanave	<p>DocumentEnvelope</p> <p>Transaction should be expressed as DocumentSet exchange not envelope exchange</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: Merge DocumentEnvelope and DocumentSet into one modeling element called DocumentFlow. (Separately, UMM is merging ObjectFlow and DocumentEnvelope into one modeling element – we should agree on one common name for these two approaches) A DocumentFlow has one primary BusinessDocument and optionally a set of attachments.</p> <p>Document Change: Describe relationship between UMM and SpecSchema (if different). Describe relationship between DocumentFlow and TRP manifest.</p>	E		2/14	Adopted. New name is DocumentFlow, and its semantics is that of ObjectFlow, that is the state of a document as it is being transferred.		4
15	2/12	Ralph	Should spec schema be expressed	E		2/14	Not adopted: Design goal of simple, human		4

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
		Miller	in RDF or XMI rather than in a tailored DTD				readable XML is the priority. <resolution recorded by Bob Miller>		
16.	2/12	Casanave	DocumentEnvelope  DocumentSet and Document could be one recursive layer  See #14	E		2/14	See #14		4
17.	2/12	Casanave	Logical nested document model must be able to include binary data	E			No longer an issue, since document model has been dropped, see 25		4
18	2/12	Neal Smith	DTD or W3C schema, is the DTD unnecessarily big trying to do what schema could have done simpler	E		2/14	Not adopted: W3C Schema an option for next release.		4
19	2/12	Neal Smith Himagiri Mukkamala	Miscellaneous Errata				Adopted: Have been addressed in document text, no modeling changes required		4
20	2/13	Nita Sharma	Would like to model timed events	E	Send inventory report every midnight		No change required. Use recurring business transaction activity. Scheduling agreement, then scheduled recurring events against agreement	x	5
21	2/13	Nita Sharma	Rename To/From to ToRole/FromRole	E			Adopted: new names toAuthorizedRole, fromAuthorizedRole		5
22	2/13	Nita Sharma	Role alignment  Roles s/b different at Binary Collaboration and Transaction  PROPOSAL:  Modeling Change: RequestingRole and RespondingRole will exist at transaction level. AuthorizingRole	E	Is there a need to name roles at transaction level?		Not adopted: Majority ruled that the complexity of introducing roles at transaction level would be disruptive. However there is a mapping from the 'from' role on a BusinessTransactionActivity to the requesting activity in a transaction, and from the 'to' role to the responding activity.		5

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			<p>at Binary Collaboration level will 'perform' these transaction roles. BusinessPartnerRoles at MultiParty level will 'perform' these AuthorizingRoles. We need to decide whether recursive Binary Collaborations should have recursive AuthorizingRoles.</p> <p>Documentation Change: Describe and illustrate by example a recursion of Binary Collaboration.</p>						
23	2/13	Mike Adcock	<p>Document Model</p> <p>Should we have one or two document model</p> <p>See #25.</p>	S	<p>We assume that a static document definition (generated artifact) exists (in XML form?) and we point to it. We remove recursive info entity part of our model</p>		See #25. We are leaving CC model and BP model in their respective specs rather than merging.		4
24	2/13	Karsten Riemer	<p>DocumentEnvelope</p> <p>Should security be at doc level or at element level</p>	E			See #14 and #25		4

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			See #14						
25	2/12		Document Model  Remove document model, reference DTD (or schema) and element name.			2/14	Adopted. Old document model removed, now only have DocumentFlow, DocumentType, Schema and Attachment		4
26	2/12		Why not BPML?			2/14	Not adopted\ BPML was never directly proposed for ebXML. BPML focus is on internal processing, ebXML is on process among partners		4
27	2/12		Make ack messages compatible with RNIF 2.0			2/14	See #33.		4
28	2/12		Include sequence diagrams with exceptions in section 6.			2/14	Not adopted. See #2		4
29	2/14		Better explanation of relationship between model and XML Representation			2/14	Adopted: Explained in text, and in production rules.		4
30	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	General: The Business Process should support the use of third party XML messages without modification. I should be able to use OAGI BODs or my own XML messages without changing the associated DTDs.				Adopted, See #25.		6
31	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	General: Exceptions are based on RNIF 1.1. RNIF 2.0 only specifies a ReceiptAcknowledgement signal that includes validation at the level of ebXML's acceptanceAcknowledgement. They did this because the "I got the message but haven't validated it yet" was never used. Therefore	S			Resolved: Both a receiptAcknowledgement and an acceptanceAcknowledgement will continue to be allowed, both optional. IntelligibleCheck will continue to relate to receiptAcknowledgement.		6

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			the specification as it exists would be a step backward for the RosettaNet community.						
32	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	General: In section 11, there are no Exception sequence diagrams. These would be very useful to show the possible sequences of signal messages in various error conditions.	S			Not adopted: See issue #2		6
33	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 460: The requirement for always having a receiptAcknowledgement signal prevents a simple synchronous request and response business transaction. This precedence has been set by RosettaNet. Also some insignificant transactions (queryInfo, responseInfo) may not care to receive a receiptAcknowledgement. This precedence has been set by OAG and RosettaNet where they do not require the use of a receiptAcknowledgement type message.	S			Adopted: Will follow RosettaNet 2.0 exception structure. This will be changed to be optional. Fixed all text that previously suggested that receiptAcknowledgement is mandatory.		6
34	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 462, 509: If validation of the request is not required, how do I indicate a subsequent validation error? May want to make receiptAcknowledgement do parser level validation.	S			Not adopted: isIntelligibleCheckRequired continues to be optional. Use exception message if not validating upon receipt and subsequently erroring out.		6
35	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 556: ControlException does not have a corresponding DTD, there is just a DTD for Exception. What is the difference between	S			Adopted: Including RosettaNet 2.0 Exception structure allows flagging of error types. Error types can therefore be classified as being of class control or		6

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			Control and Process Exceptions. BusinessProtocolExceptions include situations such as validation and syntax which seems similar to ControlExceptions. When do I use one over the other?				business exception.		
36	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 494: There are more than two possible signal messages (receiptAcknowledgement, acceptanceAcknowledgement, Exception).	S			Adopted: Section will be updated.		6
37	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 501-503: The substantive acceptance can be either successful or failure.	S			Adopted: This was an error in the original text. Change “substantive acceptance” to “response”. e.g. The response, if present, will always result in the completion of the business transaction.		6
38	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 501-503: If present the substantive acceptance indicates the business level completion of the transaction but the actual transaction is complete when the final acceptanceAcknowledgement is received (if requested) from the originator in a two-way transaction and from the recipient in a one-way transaction.	S			Adopted: Clarified that whatever is the last message or signal required from responder will be the one to complete the transaction.		6
39	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 2120: According to a copy and paste of the DTD and example XML isSignatureEntity is an invalid XML attribute.	S			Not an issue anymore, isSignatureEntity was part of the now dropped info model, see #25		6
40	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 225: The “Business Process and Information Meta Model” is talked about but not referenced. Does this document/model exist someplace?	E			Adopted: Change to UMM Meta Model		6
41	2/13	Kurt	Line 322: I assume “UML	E			Adopted: Clarified text to explain they are two		6

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
		Kanaski	Specification Schema is the ebXML Specification Schema.				flavors of the Spec Schema DTD and UML.		
42	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 325: Is Business Process synonymous with Business Collaboration or is a Business Process composed of Business Collaborations?	E			Adopted: Clarified that A BP is one or more Collaborations.		6
43	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 455-469: The order of semantics for a business transaction should reflect the sequence of messages. Item 6 should include items 8 and 9 as sub-items.	E			Adopted: Clarified that order of messages is always fixed, inserted new figure to show this.		6
44	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 495: receiptAcknowledgement is also non-substantive	E			See #33. No longer an issue.		6
45	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 520-531: I see two basic styles of transactions one-way and two-way. Each can have specified attributes (non-repudiation, security, etc.). The application of these transactions with various attributes are commonly used in business transactions such as Request/Confirm for order creation, Query/Response for order status, Notification for shipment notification, Information Distribution for general purpose information dissemination. These pattern names are just examples, I don't see how they are part of the specification. If they are you will need to formally defined what the attributes are set to for each	E			Adopted: See #2		6

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			pattern.						
46	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 487, 542: According to Line 491 there can be only zero or one response, not a document set and not one or more.	E			Adopted: Clarified that one or more possible responses may be defined, but that there is at most one response at run time. Document set is no longer part of the model. (see #25)		6
47	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 546: timer value and well-formedness refers to a previous section?	E			Adopted: Moved section so it has proper reference		6
48	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 575-579: Wording and contradicts first bullet item.	E			Missed this one, should be fixed in final review.		6
49	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 598-601: When would the requesting role throw a business protocol exception and not send an exception signal? If the response document is invalid, I would think that an exception signal would be sent? Again, exception diagrams would help.	E			Adopted: Clarified that requesting role does not send exception signals, but may send a revocation of the business transaction as a separate, new transaction.		6
50	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 631: I don't see how Message transfer security is different than Document security, the later seems to cover all the needs.	E			Not adopted: Message transfer security refers to the document as it is being transferred. This release does not have security characteristics tied to the document itself.		6
51	2/13	Kurt Kanaski	Line 666: The signed copy of the receipt is sent in which signal message?	E			Adopted: Clarified that signed receipt uses the receiptAcknowledgement		6
52	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	General: UML extensions mechanism (the re-use and extension of UML meta-model elements) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be leveraged</li> </ul> Should be explicit as it would unify with the core UML concepts => more potential re-use of tools as well.				Not adopted: The UML specification schema is a virtual metamodel, not a UML profile. However, it has a direct, unambiguous mapping to the UML activity graph, class model, and collaboration model. A detail description of these mappings would make this document unnecessarily long and complex.		7

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
53	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	<p>Multi-Party Transactions and Nested Transactions.</p> <p>Line no 166 Being able to formally specify N-ary AKA multi-party collaborations (versus only binary) is a must.</p> <p>PROPOSAL (multi-party):</p> <p>Modeling Change: Allow transitions among BusinessActivity's across BinaryCollaborations within the scope of a MultiPartyCollaboration. Constraint is that both the BusinessActivity's the transition connects must have at least one BusinessPartnerRole in common.</p> <p>Document Change: Describe relationship between Binary and Multiparty collaborations.</p> <p>PROPOSAL (nested transactions):</p> <p>Modeling Change: Allow a flag that determines on a transition from a BusinessTransactionActivity to any BusinessActivity that the transition happens upon receipt of the Request, and a transition back</p>				Proposal adopted. We now support both transition across binary collaborations, as well as nested transactions.		7

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			<p>happens before the sending of the Response.</p> <p>Documentation Change: Describe and illustrate nested transactions and their transaction semantics.</p>						
54	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	<p>Line no 304 “Business Process Interaction Patterns”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent with UML definition of “Interaction”.</li> <li>• Should refer to UML “Collaboration Patterns”</li> <li>• Not consistent with terminology in line 2753</li> </ul>				Adopted: See #2. Since interaction patterns are no longer part of the specification schema, this inconsistency is no longer present here, but might still be in UMM		7
55	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	Line no 428 –Performs “Performs”: Shouldn’t meta-model element names be nouns rather verbs?				Not adopted: We chose the word Performs because it reads better in the XML version, and we wanted to preserve 1-to-1 name matching UML to XML.		7
56	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	Line no 428 - Collaboration The ebXML concepts of Multi-party Collaboration, Binary Collaboration and Business Transaction correspond to the UML concept of "Collaboration".				Not adopted: It is correct that binary and multiparty collaborations closely map to UML collaborations, but they are very constrained and we wanted to make that constraint explicit.		7
57	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	Line no 428 – Business Partner Example of a possible extension to the UML “ClassifierRole” that is used in a Collaboration				Not adopted: It is correct that business partner role and authorized role closely map to UML classifier role, but they are very constrained and we wanted to make that constraint explicit		7
58	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	<p>Requesting/RespondingBusinessActivity</p> <p>Line no 928-956 – Requesting Business Activity Though one might consider an</p>				<p>Not adopted. See #22</p> <p>We resolved that it is not necessary for a CPP to call out a role in a BusinessTransactionActivity definition, only in a BinaryCollaboration. So if you do want to be able to call out support for only</p>		7

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			<p>activity as an operation on which one can put constraints (like “TimeToAcknowledgeAcceptance”), we have some concerns about the usage of constraints on Action States versus using standard state charts with guards on transitions</p> <p>PROPOSAL:</p> <p>Modeling Change: Rename Requesting/RespondingBusinessActivity to RequestingRole/RespondingRole. A BusinessTransaction will have just two Roles and 1 or 2 DocumentFlows. All the timing and security parameters will reside in the RequestingRole/RespondingRole and/or in the DocumentFlow.</p> <p>Document Change: Discuss security/timing in terms of roles and documentflows. Describe mapping of role parameters to CPP/CPA. Discuss mapping of documentFlow parameters to TRP envelope.</p>				<p>one BusinessTransaction you would have to ‘wrap’ that transaction in a BinaryCollaboration with one BinaryCollaborationActivity and call out the role for that activity.</p> <p>Bob described the negotiation pattern and its sequence of ‘flip-flopping’ of roles, seller first being reuestor, then being responder. This example works fine with existing 0.90 and with proposed 0.99</p>		
59	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	<p>Impact on envelopes and headers</p> <p>The previous comments (see Example of a possible extension to the UML “Collaboration”) impact the “eBXML Transport, Routing and Packaging, Messaging Service Specifications”</p>				<p>Not Adopted: see #58</p> <p>However, we did adopt the term DocumentFlow, and dropped the term DocumentEnvelope which at least in name conflicted with TRP envelope</p>		7

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
60	2/13	Alain De Preter, SWIFT	The term “Business Signal” Could be confusing given the (different) semantics of a UML “Signal”.				Not Adopted: “Business Signal” is a UMM term, and would be too hard to bridge if we chose a different term.		7
61	3/6	Jamie Clark	Need IsBinding attribute				Adopted: introduced at business transaction activity level		8
62	3/6	Jamie Clark	XML DSIG vs. legal signature.		Issue was that one should not use DSIG to indicate isBinding		Adopted: see #61		8
63	3/6	Jamie Clark	map collaboration to legal contract				Not adopted: out of scope for Spec Schema, but will be addressed separately by analysis team		8
64	3/6	Jamie Clark	Business Process for CPA formation				Not adopted: out of scope for Spec Schema, but will be addressed separately by analysis team		8
65	3/6	Jamie Clark	unique id for collaboration states				Not adopted: out of scope for Spec Schema		8
66	3/6	Jamie Clark	Unique id for messages across collaborations				Not adopted: out of scope for Spec Schema		8
67	3/6	Jamie Clark	Message sequence number generation				Not adopted: out of scope for Spec Schema		8
68	2/23	Brian Hayes	Multiple comments				Adopted: Almost all of Brian’s comments were suggestions for better wording, and almost all were adopted		9
69	1/25	QR Team	The Quality Review team are still concerned about presentation and structural issues with this document and its ability to adequately communicate its content.				Adopted: Restructure and resequence of section 6, more pictures, step-by-step intro to the model		10
70	1/25	QR Team	The reference to “eXtended (sic.) Markup Language”(line 209).				Adopted: this was an error in original doc. Fixed		10
71	1/25	QR Team	The inclusion of material in the body more appropriately in the				Resolved to drop all discussion of specific patterns in the document. Instead, add references		10

Number	Date	Originator	Issue	Show-Stop Or Editorial	Issue Comment	Resolution Date	Resolution	Resolved in version	URL of originating e-mail
			appendix (lines 2091-2380).				to discussion of patterns in the UMM.  See issue #2.		
72	1/25	QR Team	The varying levels of detail in the table of contents.				Adopted: fixed as part of #71		10
73	1/25	QR Team	The repetition of lines 398-405 in three sections of the document (6.2, 6.3 and 7.6).				Adopted: consolidated		10
74	1/25	QR Team	The legibility of Figure 6-1 (line 429).				Adopted: now introduce the model step-by-step in smaller UML chunks with corresponding XML example		10

#### References

- 1 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200102/msg00009.html>
- 2 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200102/msg00023.html>
- 3 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200102/msg00004.html>
- 4 comments received during the Vancouver meeting.
- 5 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200101/msg00069.html>
- 6 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200102/msg00020.html>
- 7 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-bp/200102/msg00019.html>
- 8 Jamie Clark (looking)
- 9 email from Karsten with word doc "SpecSchemav.090Comment-BHayes" attached.
- 10 <http://lists.ebxml.org/archives/ebxml-coord/200101/msg00053.html>