Message	Source	Comments	Resolution
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/email/archives/200811/msg00005.html	Orit Levin Microsoft	1. When reviewing the submitted version I noted that one of the earlier comments has been omitted. It has been suggested in the past that the paragraph below should be removed from the text because SCA is only one of the approaches to be looked at and therefore shouldn't be singled out.	Accepted
		2. 2. I also noted that the "Out of scope" section has been "significantly reduced". I agree that probably the original text was not very clear	Accepted. No need to specify what the Telecom MS will do next at this stage. This can be done in the FAQ about the TC.
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/email/archives/200811/msg00004.html	Jeff Mischkinsky Oracle	I also do not understand why this needs to be done under RAND mode	RAND is a valid OASIS IPR mode.
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/email/archives/200811/msg00003.html	Jeff Mischkinsky Oracle	yes. So i'm wondering exactly how it will produce anything but CD's.	Accepted

| http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/email/archives/200811/msg00002.html | Jacques Durand fujitsu | 1. The TC apparently is not supposed to produce specifications, but rather "analysis, requirements" documents. Is there any reason for operating in RAND terms (unless some future rechartering is expected, that will produce actual specs)? | RAND is a valid OASIS IPR mode |

		2. "Develop a requirement document for recommended Web Services (and REST) extensions to address the Gaps ...". It seems the requirement doc will go as far as "recommending extensions" which means actually hinting at solutions, or at least defining the directions of future solutions? Could then the nature of these "extensions" be better defined in the charter? E.g. are we talking of (a) "profiling" or configuring existing SOA stacks for specific TEL use, or (b) developing specific WS on top of them, or (c) "extending" the functionality of these stacks with native functionality that goes beyond (a) and (b)? In other words, I see this as part of defining the scope of activities: what will be the technical scope of the solutions implied by the requirements down the road? My concern is: the scope of activity and deliverables should more explicitly allow for solutions outlines / directions (if not full fledge specifications of these solutions), as I guess at some point when "requirements" meet concrete SOA environments (and concrete specs like WSDL, BPEL), the separation between "requirements" from "solution outlines / options" is blurred.	Need to understand the extensions and how they can be done in a unified fashion. Technical scope of the requirements should be addressed in the document. As such, the requirement document will provide a road map for future work to be done in this area.

		3. Audience for this TC: "The output of this work will have direct benefits for the use of the Web 2.0 and SOA in Telecom. " Should this be interpreted that only Telecom professionals are invited or will benefit? Could there be a line on possible interest from SOA middleware providers, as this is about requirements for their products?	The output of the work does not exclude Middleware providers. Added **middleware vendors and IT application developers** to the list.
		4. Scope of work: there is 1.a but not 1.b section. Missing 1.b?	Accepted. Will incorporate in the updated charter.
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/email/archives/200811/msg00001.html	Enrico Ronco Telecom Italia	1) Deliverables to be produced within the TC In the proposed Charter the deliverables awaited are the following (Section 1.c): 1. Use Cases and Gap Analysis document; July 2009 2. Security, threats and Risk analysis; November 2009 3. Requirements document that addresses the issues that are identified in item 1; November 2009. Given all this, the proposal is to modify the expected deliverable set of the SOA-TEL OASIS TMS TC into the following one: 1. Use Cases and Gap Analysis Document; July 2009 – NO CHANGE 2. Analysis document for addressing identified issues – November 2009 3. Requirements document that addresses the issues that are identified in item 1 - November 2009	Accepted
		2) First TC meeting start date In section **(2)(b)** it is mentioned that the first TC meeting date would be January 12, 2009, which is a Monday. If possible,	Accepted. Start Tuesday for 2 days at least.

		could this starting date be moved to January 13 (Tuesday)? Moreover, if the F2F "format" will be finally confirmed, could it be "granted" that the meeting will be structured on at least 2 (or 3) days?	
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/email/archives/200810/msg00005.html	BoB Natale Mitre	1. Please change "Operational Support Systems" to "Operations Support Systems". The latter is the historically correct expansion of "OSS".	Accepted
		2. In the list of efforts which follows "For example, for the Telecom service layer:", please add: - ITU-T Recommendation Y.2234, "Open Service Environment Capabilities for Next-Generation Networks", which aims "to enable enhanced, flexible service creation and provisioning". (I would recommend inserting that reference prior to the existing reference to the OMA OSE.)	Accepted