



# Issues List for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Version 3.0

Working Draft 20, 26 June 2007

**Document Identifier:**

ebms\_issues-3.0-wd-20

**Location:**

[http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg\\_abbrev=ebxml-msg](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg_abbrev=ebxml-msg)

**Technical Committee:**

OASIS ebXML Messaging Services TC

**Chair:**

Ian Jones, British Telecommunications plc <[ian.c.jones@bt.com](mailto:ian.c.jones@bt.com)>

**Editor:**

Pete Wenzel, Sun Microsystems <[pete.wenzel@sun.com](mailto:pete.wenzel@sun.com)>

**Abstract:**

This document catalogs issues for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Specification V3.0, which is developed by the OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Technical Committee. It is intended to record specific issues that potentially need to be implemented as changes or additions to a specification.

**Status:**

This document was last revised or approved by the TC on the above date. The level of approval is also listed above. Check the current location noted above for possible later revisions of this document. This document is updated periodically on no particular schedule.

Technical Committee members should send comments on this specification to the [ebxml-msg@lists.oasis-open.org](mailto:ebxml-msg@lists.oasis-open.org) list. Others should use the comment form at [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/form.php?wg\\_abbrev=ebxml-msg](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/form.php?wg_abbrev=ebxml-msg).

For information on whether any patents have been disclosed that may be essential to implementing this specification, and any offers of patent licensing terms, please refer to the Intellectual Property Rights section of the OASIS ebXML Messaging Services TC web page (<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ebxml-msg/ipr.php>).

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85

---

# Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	5
2 Technical Deliverable Issues.....	6
2.1 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR01.....	6
CORE-1 Issue (Closed).....	6
CORE-2 Issue (Closed).....	6
CORE-3 Issue (Closed).....	6
CORE-4 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-5 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-6 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-7 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-8 Issue (Closed).....	8
CORE-9 Issue (Closed).....	8
CORE-10 Issue (Closed).....	8
CORE-11 Issue (Closed).....	9
CORE-12 Issue (Closed).....	9
CORE-13 Issue (Closed).....	9
CORE-14 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-15 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-16 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-17 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-18 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-19 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-20 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-21 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-22 Issue (Closed).....	12
CORE-23 Issue (Closed).....	12
CORE-24 Issue (Closed).....	12
CORE-25 Issue (Closed).....	13
CORE-26 Issue (Closed).....	13
CORE-27 Issue (Closed).....	13
CORE-28 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-29 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-30 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-31 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-32 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-33 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-34 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-35 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-36 Issue (Deferred).....	15
CORE-37 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-38 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-39 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-40 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-41 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-42 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-43 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-44 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-45 Issue (Closed).....	18
CORE-46 Issue (Closed).....	18
CORE-47 Issue (Closed).....	19
CORE-48 Issue (Closed).....	19
CORE-49 Issue (Closed).....	20
CORE-50 Issue (Closed).....	20

86	CORE-51 Issue (Closed).....	20
87	CORE-52 Issue (Closed).....	20
88	CORE-53 Issue (Closed).....	21
89	CORE-54 Issue (Closed).....	21
90	CORE-55 Issue (Closed).....	22
91	CORE-56 Issue (Closed).....	22
92	CORE-57 Issue (Closed).....	23
93	CORE-58 Issue (Closed).....	23
94	CORE-59 Issue (Closed).....	23
95	CORE-60 Issue (Deferred).....	24
96	CORE-61 Issue (Deferred).....	24
97	CORE-62 Issue (Deferred).....	24
98	CORE-63 Issue (Deferred).....	24
99	CORE-64 Issue (Closed).....	25
100	CORE-65 Issue (Closed).....	25
101	CORE-66 Issue (Closed).....	25
102	CORE-67 Issue (Closed).....	26
103	CORE-68 Issue (Closed).....	26
104	CORE-69 Issue (Closed).....	26
105	CORE-70 Issue (Closed).....	27
106	CORE-71 Issue (Closed).....	27
107	CORE-72 Issue (Closed).....	28
108	CORE-73 Issue (Closed).....	28
109	CORE-74 Issue (Closed).....	28
110	CORE-75 Issue (Deferred).....	29
111	CORE-76 Issue (Closed).....	29
112	CORE-77 Issue (Closed).....	29
113	CORE-78 Issue (Closed).....	30
114	CORE-79 Issue (Closed).....	31
115	CORE-80 Issue (Closed).....	31
116	CORE-81 Issue (Closed).....	31
117	CORE-82 Issue (Closed).....	31
118	2.2 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR01.....	31
119	CORE-83 Issue (Partially Deferred).....	31
120	CORE-84 Issue (Closed).....	32
121	CORE-85 Issue (Closed).....	32
122	CORE-86 Issue (Closed).....	32
123	CORE-87 Issue (Closed).....	33
124	CORE-88 Issue (Closed).....	33
125	CORE-89 Issue (Closed).....	33
126	CORE-90 Issue (Closed).....	34
127	CORE-91 Issue (Closed).....	34
128	CORE-92 Issue (Closed).....	34
129	CORE-93 Issue (Closed).....	34
130	CORE-94 Issue (Closed).....	35
131	CORE-95 Issue (Closed).....	35
132	CORE-96 Issue (Closed).....	35
133	CORE-97 Issue (Closed).....	36
134	CORE-98 Issue (Closed).....	36
135	CORE-99 Issue (Assigned-Conformance Profile).....	36
136	CORE-100 Issue (Closed).....	37
137	CORE-101 Issue (Closed).....	37
138	CORE-102 Issue (Closed).....	37
139	CORE-103 Issue (Closed).....	38
140	CORE-104 Issue (Deferred).....	38
141	CORE-105 Issue (Pending Edit).....	38

142	CORE-106 Issue (Closed).....	39
143	CORE-107 Issue (Closed).....	39
144	CORE-108 Issue (Closed).....	39
145	CORE-109 Issue (Deferred).....	40
146	CORE-110 Issue (Closed).....	40
147	CORE-111 Issue (Closed).....	40
148	CORE-112 Issue (Closed).....	40
149	CORE-113 Issue (Closed).....	41
150	CORE-114 Issue (Closed).....	41
151	CORE-115 Issue (Open).....	41
152	CORE-116 Issue (Closed).....	42
153	CORE-117 Issue (Partially Deferred).....	42
154	CORE-118 Issue (Deferred).....	42
155	CORE-119 Issue (Closed).....	42
156	CORE-120 Issue (Closed).....	43
157	CORE-121 Issue (Closed).....	43
158	2.3 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR02.....	44
159	CORE-122 Issue (Closed).....	44
160	CORE-123 Issue (Closed).....	44
161	CORE-124 Issue (Closed).....	45
162	CORE-125 Issue (Closed; Pending Conf Prof Edit).....	45
163	CORE-126 Issue (Closed).....	45
164	2.4 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR02.....	47
165	CORE-127 Issue (Assigned).....	47
166	CORE-128 Issue (Closed).....	48
167	CORE-129 Issue (Deferred).....	48
168	CORE-130 Issue (Closed).....	48
169	CORE-131 Issue (Pending Review).....	49
170	APPENDIX A. Revision History.....	50
171	APPENDIX B. Contributors.....	52
172	APPENDIX C. Notices.....	53
173		

---

# 1 Introduction

174

175 This document catalogues issues for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services (ebMS) Version 3.0, which is  
176 developed by the OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Technical Committee. It is intended to record  
177 specific issues that potentially need to be implemented as changes or additions to a specification.

178 Each issue includes the following information:

- 179 • A unique *issue ID*, such as CORE-42. This appears in the section heading. The possible categories  
180 are **CORE** for the Part 1 Core Features specification, ....
- 181 • A *short name* for the issue. This appears in the section heading. (Not used.)
- 182 • The issue's *status*. This appears in the section heading. The possible statuses are **Open** for issues  
183 that still need a resolution, **Assigned** for open issues awaiting specific proposals, **Deferred** for  
184 issues that we have put off dealing with until a future specification or revision, **Pending (Edit,**  
185 **Review)** for issues that we have resolved but that remain to be implemented, and **Closed** for  
186 issues that have a resolution and require no further action (for example, because the resolution has  
187 been implemented or because no action at all is necessary).
- 188 • The *source* of the issue, indicating where it was first raised or reported.
- 189 • The assigned *owner* of the issue. This person is responsible for proposing options and a preferred  
190 resolution.
- 191 • An arbitrarily long *description* of the issue, including any discussion history.
- 192 • The *resolution* of the issue, once this information is available. It should include the date and  
193 circumstances of the resolution.

---

## 194 2 Technical Deliverable Issues

195 The following are issues related to the ebXML Messaging Services 3.0 technical deliverables.

### 196 2.1 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR01

197 The following are issues related to the assertions and protocol and their governing schemas. They were  
198 received during Public Review 01.

#### 199 CORE-1 Issue (Closed)

200 **Source:**

201 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
202 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

203 **Owner:**

204 Unassigned

205 **Description:**

206 The response example message in 5.3.1 has the collaborationInfo in the wrong place (line 1520-  
207 1524)

208 **Resolution:**

209 07/12/2006, agree example incorrect. Fixed in WD 14.

#### 210 CORE-2 Issue (Closed)

211 **Source:**

212 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
213 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

214 **Description:**

215 The mustunderstand and version on the message element are in the same namespace  
216 according to the xsd but in different ones according to the docs

217 **Owner:**

218 Hamid

219 **Resolution:**

220 07/12/2006, examples incorrect.  
221 Possibly addressed by new schema in WD 17.

#### 222 CORE-3 Issue (Closed)

223 **Source:**

224 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
225 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

226 **Description:**

227 In the ebMS Header example (line 1151) contains a PartInfo element with a scheme and  
228 description element. These are \*not\* in the schema in the same document. In 5.2.1.13 there is  
229 information that it is allowed to use these elements in the same namespace

230 **Owner:**

231 Hamid

232 **Resolution:**

233 07/12/2006, XSD is missing partinfo.  
234 New schema in WD 17.

235 **CORE-4 Issue (Closed)**

236 **Source:**

237 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
238 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

239 **Description:**

240 In the example in 5.2.1.3 and the docs of 5.2.1.4 there is a reference to a type attribute. This  
241 attribute is not in the docs (PartyId is not an xmltype)

242 **Owner:**

243 Hamid

244 **Resolution:**

245 07/12/2006, XSD and text need updating.  
246 New schema in WD 17.

247 **CORE-5 Issue (Closed)**

248 **Source:**

249 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
250 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00001.html>

251 **Description:**

252 The xsd in the doc contains nothing about the  
253 eb:Messaging/eb:UserMessage/eb:MessageProperties element

254 **Owner:**

255 Hamid

256 **Resolution:**

257 07/12/2006, XSD needs realignment.

258 **CORE-6 Issue (Closed)**

259 **Source:**

260 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
261 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00001.html>

262 **Description:**

263 The eb:Messaging/eb:UserMessage/eb:PayloadInfo element is required according to the xsd, but  
264 in 4.3 line 866 it says the element is absent in the "Default P-Mode.businessCollaboration"

265 **Owner:**

266 Hamid

267 **Resolution:**

268 07/12/2006, XSD needs realignment

269 **CORE-7 Issue (Closed)**

270 **Source:**

271 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
272 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00001.html>

273 **Description:**

274 The 'default' values in 4.3 all end with a period. These should not be a part of the value and thus  
275 removed

276 **Resolution:**

277 07/12/2006, Remove periods. Fixed in WD 14.

278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323

## CORE-8 Issue (Closed)

**Source:**

Yangsun Park, KorBIT <ysplays@postech.ac.kr>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00004.html>

**Description:**

ebMS 3.0 seems to get more flexibility to adopt other existing specifications than ebMS 2.0 specification.

I understand P-Mode is on the context. MEP and MPF give basic view for connect messaging to business scenario and give solution for some technical problem. I give you brief comments on new concepts in ebMS 3.0, pulling, MEP, MPF, P-Mode.

I agree with that "pulling" is very useful for small businesses to operate ebMS endpoint especially under condition of dynamic IP addresses. But, some implementation issues are concerned. The system may not handle the workload of pulling when messaging with many business partners or processing lots of messages.

(This is out of the scope of this specification, but I think it's worth to consider.)

**Resolution:**

07/12/2006, Discussed, decided not an actionable comment. Closed with no action.

## CORE-9 Issue (Closed)

**Source:**

Yangsun Park, KorBIT <ysplays@postech.ac.kr>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00004.html>

**Description:**

In the specification, there's no mention how to manage the pulling; how the system manages the messages when messages are already sent to MSH and the pulling request is delayed with known reason. For using MEP, the agreements between partners should be described in CPA, but there's nothing mentioned on the spec about it. It is recommended to suggest how business partners can use the MEP or to reference CPA specification at least. P-Mode is related to the implementation issues, but the configuration information seems to affect the business scenario. It seems to be natural the p-mode is integrated to the CPA.

**Owner:**

Jacques; Dale to review.

**Resolution:**

07/12/2006, Clarify that pull/push is not dynamic, but decided upon submission, according to agreement. Clarify P-Mode relationship with CPA.

11/29/2006, Addressed in P-Mode Model 0.81. (0.82 included in WD 16.)

12/19/2006, Further changes proposed by Jacques at  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>

02/07/2007, Substantial changes in this area, rendering comment now obsolete. Agree to close. Additional text in Section 3.1 included in WD 17.

## CORE-10 Issue (Closed)

**Source:**

Yangsun Park, KorBIT <ysplays@postech.ac.kr>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00004.html>

**Description:**

In case of MPF, it is also needed to consider how to handle the unexpected situations. If using queue to implement the MPF system, there can happen problem when several business partners

324 pull message from same MPF queue.

325 **Owner:**

326 Jacques/Hamid (draft text already exists).

327 **Resolution:**

328 07/12/2006, Substantive issue: Solution is to secure MPFs, so that only authorized partners can  
329 pull from respective "queues". Think more about options.

330 11/29/2006, Addressed in P-Mode Model 0.81 & Message Authorization draft, to be included in  
331 WD 16.

332 **CORE-11 Issue (Closed)**

333 **Source:**

334 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
335 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

336 **Description:**

337 Line 210-214: add note that also multiple payloads, possibly of different MIME types, can be  
338 transported in a single ebMS message (important advantage in some applications)

339 **Resolution:**

340 07/12/2006, included in WD 14.

341 **CORE-12 Issue (Closed)**

342 **Source:**

343 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
344 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

345 **Description:**

346 Line 290 Change:

347 `"/x:MyHeader/x:SomeProperty/@value1"`

348 To

349 `"/x:MyHeader/x:SomeProperty/@attribute1"`

350 **Resolution:**

351 07/12/2006, Fixed in WD 14.

352 **CORE-13 Issue (Closed)**

353 **Source:**

354 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
355 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

356 **Description:**

357 Line 294:

358 The prefix "wssswa" is defined in [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/16672/wss-v1.1-spec-os-SwAPProfile.pdf)  
359 [open.org/committees/download.php/16672/wss-v1.1-spec-os-SwAPProfile.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/16672/wss-v1.1-spec-os-SwAPProfile.pdf) with the value  
360 "http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/oasis-wss-SwAPProfile-1.1.xsd" rather than "http://docs.oasis-  
361 [open.org/wss/2004/XX/oasis-2004XX-wss-swa-profile-1.0.xsd"](http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/2004/XX/oasis-2004XX-wss-swa-profile-1.0.xsd)

362 (The URL doesn't resolve to an actual XSD at the doc.oasis-open site though).

363 **Resolution:**

364 07/12/2006, Fixed in WD 14.

365 **CORE-14 Issue (Closed)**

366 **Source:**

367 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
368 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

369 **Description:**

370 Line 309: These definitions seem to assume that the terms "Producer" or a "Consumer" are  
371 reserved for Endpoints and cannot be used for Intermediaries. Is that correct?

372 **Resolution:**

373 07/12/2006, Correct. Clarify that submit/deliver operations occur only once per message  
374 lifetime. Any actions performed by an intermediary will be defined in different terms. Fixed in  
375 WD 14.

376 **CORE-15 Issue (Closed)**

377 **Source:**

378 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
379 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

380 **Description:**

381 Line 322: "There are two types of ebMS Messages:" Are these types exclusive? If a message  
382 has both eb:SignalMessage and eb:UserMessage elements, what is its type? A pull request  
383 could at the same time push a UserMessage. Is that allowed?

384 **Resolution:**

385 07/12/2006, Having both types of message units in a single message is not precluded by the  
386 schema & Core. However, such cases are out of Core's scope. Possibly state this explicitly;  
387 look for and remove any other occurrences that imply only one or the other may be present.  
388 Conformance issue: Do implementations need to support this or not? Need to be more explicit?  
389 Solution: State in core that sensible combinations/bundling MAY be done; conformance profile  
390 (in advance of Part 2, Advanced Features) would specify explicitly.  
391 [Updates to Messaging Model in WD 14 may address this; are they complete?]  
392 Addressed by Bundling Options proposal from Jacques & Hamid. Included in WD 15.

393 **CORE-16 Issue (Closed)**

394 **Source:**

395 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
396 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

397 **Description:**

398 Line 323: The definition does not say which entity initiates a Signal Message, whereas the  
399 definition of User Message does.

400 **Owner:**

401 Pete

402 **Resolution:**

403 07/19/2006, Signals are initiated by either MSH. Updates to Messaging Model in WD 14 make  
404 this even more unclear, and new definition is incorrect in the case of PullRequest signal.  
405 (State that signal generation is implementation-dependent?)  
406 Fixed in WD 15, Section 2.1.3.

407 **CORE-17 Issue (Closed)**

408 **Source:**

409 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

410 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

411 **Description:**

412 Line 342: "receive and process error messages associated"

413 should this be:

414 "receive and process Signal Messages associated"?

415 **Owner:**

416 Pete

417 **Resolution:**

418 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14, but also strike "associated with previously sent messages";

419 not accurate for PullRequest signal? Further resolved in WD 15.

420 **CORE-18 Issue (Closed)**

421 **Source:**

422 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

423 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

424 **Description:**

425 Line 352: "enough message data" -> "enough message (meta)data"? (some of the data needed  
426 may not end up in the actual message)

427 **Resolution:**

428 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

429 **CORE-19 Issue (Closed)**

430 **Source:**

431 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

432 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

433 **Description:**

434 Line 382-383: Formatting (no new paragraph)

435 **Resolution:**

436 07/19/2006, Cited text rewritten in WD 14. No longer an issue.

437 **CORE-20 Issue (Closed)**

438 **Source:**

439 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

440 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

441 **Description:**

442 Line 364: Section 2.2

443 **Resolution:**

444 07/19/2006, No problem found at cited line.

445 **CORE-21 Issue (Closed)**

446 **Source:**

447 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

448 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

449 **Description:**

450 Line 489: "responses to these." -> "responses to these requests."

451 **Resolution:**  
452 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 453 **CORE-22 Issue (Closed)**

454 **Source:**  
455 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
456 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

457 **Description:**  
458 Line 495, Message Pulling: It looks like this mechanism can be used to select a particular  
459 mailbox. Could this be generalized to a mechanism where the Initiator wants to retrieve a  
460 response to a particular message? The Responder could have a database of RefToMessageId  
461 values of messages waiting to be pulled. The requested message may not be the first in the  
462 queue.  
463 Could the Initiator provide additional filtering information, e.g. only retrieve message less than 1  
464 MB in size? This would increase the value for SMEs that have limited bandwidth connections.  
465 Or should the Initiator/Responder negotiate policies about which message to put in which  
466 Message Partition based on criteria like size?  
467 Is there only one message being pulled for each PullRequest / MPF?

468 **Owner:**  
469 Hamid (for schema changes)

470 **Resolution:**  
471 07/19/2006, Potentially substantive issue. Regarding last point, need to clarify that a single  
472 message is pulled each time. Don't disallow more complex selection mechanism; enable it by  
473 inserting a schema extension point in PullRequest element, but leave its use to profiles.  
474 11/29/2006, Addressed by changes to be included in WD 16. Implementations could also filter  
475 messages on Sender side, assigning different classes of messages to different MPFs.  
476 New schema in WD 17.

## 477 **CORE-23 Issue (Closed)**

478 **Source:**  
479 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
480 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

481 **Description:**  
482 Line 509: Uses the "P-Mode" concept that hasn't been introduced at this point.

483 **Resolution:**  
484 07/19/2006, Agree; insert forward reference to Processing Modes section. Fixed in WD 14.

## 485 **CORE-24 Issue (Closed)**

486 **Source:**  
487 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
488 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

489 **Description:**  
490 Line 527: Is there no From/To PartyInfo in a Pull Request? How does the Responder know who  
491 is pulling? An initiating MSH may operate on behalf of multiple Parties (or a single Party with  
492 multiple IDs). Is there a need to be able to specify a "To" (pulling messages sent "to"). Or is an  
493 MPF always unique for a particular PartyId? [Related to CORE-10.]

494 **Resolution:**  
495 07/19/2006, No action needed in specification; provide details in implementation notes. (Access

496 control to MPF is based on data other than PartyId.)

## 497 **CORE-25 Issue (Closed)**

### 498 **Source:**

499 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
500 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 501 **Description:**

502 Line 533 and 548: While it is a non-normative example, it may be clearer to change these to  
503 something like:

504 "<eb:MessageId>UUID-4@receiver.com</eb:MessageId>"

505 "<eb:MessageId>UUID-5@sender.com</eb:MessageId>"

506 "<eb:RefToMessageId>UUID-4@receiver.com</eb:RefToMessageId>"

### 507 **Resolution:**

508 07/19/2006, Change to sender.example.com, receiver.example.com. Cite RFC 2606. Fixed in  
509 WD 14.

## 510 **CORE-26 Issue (Closed)**

### 511 **Source:**

512 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
513 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 514 **Description:**

515 Line 640, section 3.4.1: It is not clear from this text (and earlier, line 479-480), whether the  
516 concept of MPFs makes sense outside the context of Pulling. When A pushes messages of two  
517 types to B, is there any benefit in using MPFs?

### 518 **Owner:**

519 Pete

### 520 **Resolution:**

521 07/19/2006, Similar to other comments received. No change in spec. MPF could be used for  
522 push as well as pull. Note in spec that MPF may be useful for reasons other than identifying a  
523 pull queue.

524 Fixed in WD 15, Section 3.4.1.

## 525 **CORE-27 Issue (Closed)**

### 526 **Source:**

527 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
528 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 529 **Description:**

530 Line 681, no distinct addressing for MPFs. Priority handling (other than queues at sender and  
531 receiver) often also depends on networking management equipment with bandwidth  
532 management (packet shapers). Those products classify network traffic based on source/target  
533 IP addresses, URIs, port numbers. So some mechanism to associate MPFs with distinct  
534 addresses (statically or dynamically) would be useful.

### 535 **Owner:**

536 Ian (to request clarification)

### 537 **Resolution:**

538 07/19/2006, Clarify – dynamic is a problem static binding via to and from. Seems orthogonal and  
539 possible, but requires more information; follow-up.

540 11/29/2006, Related to CORE-22. This functionality is left to implementation. Out of scope of

541 specification.

## 542 **CORE-28 Issue (Closed)**

### 543 **Source:**

544 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
545 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

546

547 Line 786:

548 "the the ebXML Application." -> "the ebXML Application."

### 549 **Resolution:**

550 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 551 **CORE-29 Issue (Closed)**

### 552 **Source:**

553 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
554 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 555 **Description:**

556 Line 887:

557 "Because either packaging option can be used, implementations MUST support non-multipart  
558 messages."

559 Should this be:

560 "Because either packaging option can be used, implementations MUST support both multipart  
561 and non-multipart messages." ?

### 562 **Resolution:**

563 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 564 **CORE-30 Issue (Closed)**

### 565 **Source:**

566 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
567 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 568 **Description:**

569 Line 901:

570 "parts. containing additional" -> "parts containing additional"

### 571 **Resolution:**

572 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 573 **CORE-31 Issue (Closed)**

### 574 **Source:**

575 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
576 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 577 **Description:**

578 Line 903: "requires an XML content." -> "requires XML content."

### 579 **Resolution:**

580 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

581 **CORE-32 Issue (Closed)**

582 **Source:**

583 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
584 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

585 **Description:**

586 Line 918: "Package contain a type" -> "Package contains a type"

587 **Resolution:**

588 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

589 **CORE-33 Issue (Closed)**

590 **Source:**

591 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
592 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

593 **Description:**

594 Line 965: "Namespace declaration" -> "A namespace declaration"

595 **Resolution:**

596 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

597 **CORE-34 Issue (Closed)**

598 **Source:**

599 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
600 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

601 **Description:**

602 Line 1030: "the namespace for" -> "the namespace prefix for"

603 **Resolution:**

604 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

605 **CORE-35 Issue (Closed)**

606 **Source:**

607 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
608 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

609 **Description:**

610 Line 1079: "there MUST NOT be additional Payload Containers."

611 Does this mean the ebMS 3.0 specification precludes composition with other SOAP protocols  
612 that want to attach data? (Somewhat theoretical question, admittedly).

613 **Resolution:**

614 07/19/2006, Agree. State that there SHOULD NOT be additional attachments, but if there are  
615 any, they are outside the scope of MSH processing. MSH MUST NOT process data that is not  
616 referenced by PayloadInfo. Fixed in WD 14.

617 **CORE-36 Issue (Deferred)**

618 **Source:**

619 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
620 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

621 **Description:**

622 Line 1119 and 1148: "Both eb:UserMessage element and eb:SignalMessage element MAY"

623 Does this mean  
624 "Both a eb:UserMessage element and a eb:SignalMessage element MAY"  
625 or  
626 "Both eb:UserMessage elements and eb:SignalMessage elements MAY" ?  
627 If the spec allowed multiple eb:UserMessages, it could easily support batch/unbatch operations.

628 **Resolution:**  
629 07/19/2006, changes in WD 14 should now allow this; ambiguity removed. But further discussion  
630 of multiple UserMessages is deferred to Part 2.

### 631 **CORE-37 Issue (Closed)**

632 **Source:**  
633 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
634 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

635 **Description:**  
636 Line 1159 and 1165: Not sure why "(no change beside renaming)" is there.

637 **Resolution:**  
638 07/19/2006, Agree to remove. Fixed in WD 14.

### 639 **CORE-38 Issue (Closed)**

640 **Source:**  
641 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
642 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

643 **Description:**  
644 Line 1192: "cid:foo", note that "foo" has to be a MIME content ID, i.e. "foo@example.com".

645 **Resolution:**  
646 07/19/2006, Agree to replace with well-formed CID. Fixed in WD 14.

### 647 **CORE-39 Issue (Closed)**

648 **Source:**  
649 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
650 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

651 **Description:**  
652 Line 1225: this allows for payloads not in the message, but line 1386 doesn't.

653 **Resolution:**  
654 07/19/2006, Agree Line 1385 needs updating – payload may be external. Fixed in WD 14.

### 655 **CORE-40 Issue (Closed)**

656 **Source:**  
657 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
658 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

659 **Description:**  
660 Line 1230: Why is the element "timestamp" in lower case? eb:Timestamp would be more  
661 consistent?

662 **Resolution:**  
663 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

664 **CORE-41 Issue (Closed)**

665 **Source:**

666 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
667 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

668 **Description:**

669 Line 1253: What is the semantics of multiple PartyId elements in a From (or To)? EbMS requires  
670 these to be alternative names for a single organizations. Has this requirement be dropped in  
671 ebMS 3? If yes, that should be specified explicitly.

672 Note: various people have struggled to squeeze hierarchical addresses (Company/  
673 Division/Unit/ Employee) in the ebXML PartyId field.

674 **Resolution:**

675 07/19/2006, Add back text from ebms V2 about multiple synonymous partyIds. Fixed in WD 14.

676 **CORE-42 Issue (Closed)**

677 **Source:**

678 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
679 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

680 **Description:**

681 Line 1311: "If a CPA is referred to and a receiver determines that a message is in conflict with  
682 the referred CPA, the appropriate handling of this conflict is undefined by this specification."

683 What does this mean for ebCPPA 3.0? Should it have a normative ebMS3 binding that defines  
684 how this is handled in an interoperable way?

685 **Resolution:**

686 07/26/2006, Add the error message raised is EBMS:0003 valueinconsistent. [EdNote: It already  
687 said that. Removed the conflicting text quoted above.] Fixed in WD 14.

688 **CORE-43 Issue (Closed)**

689 **Source:**

690 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
691 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

692 **Description:**

693 Line 1320: "a profiling exercise" -> "profiles using this specification"

694 **Resolution:**

695 07/26/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

696 **CORE-44 Issue (Closed)**

697 **Source:**

698 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
699 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

700 **Description:**

701 Line 1382: "(see Section , for details)" missing reference.

702 **Owner:**

703 Ian

704 **Resolution:**

705 07/26/2006, Agree, add reference. [EdNote: What is the proper reference that defines the "id"  
706 attribute? XML Schema?]

707 12/21/2006 email from Pete at

708 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00026.html>  
709 Current best practice is to reference the xml: namespace  
710 (<http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace>), which now defines an xml:id attribute. Its  
711 specification is found in <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml-id/>, "xml:id Version 1.0", W3C  
712 Recommendation 9 September 2005.  
713 01/03/2007: Agreed to reference the above spec. Need exact text to include in Section 5.2.3.12,  
714 and inclusion in schema.  
715 Fixed in WD 17. Requires inclusion in schema?

## 716 **CORE-45 Issue (Closed)**

### 717 **Source:**

718 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <[lists@sonnenglanz.net](mailto:lists@sonnenglanz.net)>  
719 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 720 **Description:**

721 Line 1386: "The PartInfo element is used to reference either a MIME attachment or an XML  
722 element within the SOAP Body, according to the value of the href attribute, described below."  
723 Line 1215 mentions URL-identified payloads too. Does the spec allow this or not? Not according  
724 to line 1391-1393.

725 Note: there may be a case for disallowing URI payloads, i.e. requiring all payloads to be in the  
726 message. The semantics of a URI in a PayloadInfo not in the MIME envelope is unidentified.  
727 Should the receiving MSH attempt to download the payload from the Internet? What if it can't  
728 access it?

729 More useful would be some sort of ebXML Signal or extension protocol for downloading/pulling  
730 large attachments separately from the main message is useful. E.g. if there are two attachments,  
731 a 40 KB XML document and a 160 MB PDF file, it would be nice if the first can be pushed and  
732 the second pulled on demand and based on some combination of MessageId and Content-Id.

### 733 **Owner:**

734 Pete

### 735 **Resolution:**

736 07/26/2006, Agree, Duplicate of CORE-39. Partially fixed in WD 14. [EdNote: Still need to  
737 define and describe error condition in which external reference cannot be resolved, although  
738 much of the behavior around how (or even whether) to resolve a reference is implementation-  
739 dependent.]

740 May need a P-Mode attribute to specify whether or not external URIs are to be resolved?

741 11/29/2006, Disagreement as to whether anything needs to be done here; alternative is to leave  
742 complete handling of external references to implementations.

743 02/07/2007, Agree to include "unresolvable external reference" (type of ebms processing error).

## 744 **CORE-46 Issue (Closed)**

### 745 **Source:**

746 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <[lists@sonnenglanz.net](mailto:lists@sonnenglanz.net)>  
747 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 748 **Description:**

749 Line 1405: Schema element. Does this mean that the receiving MSH must validate the  
750 payload? If not, why does the message handler need to carry this information?

### 751 **Owner:**

752 Pete

### 753 **Resolution:**

754 07/26/2006, Simplify this paragraph to remove optional/should confusion. 2nd add sentence at

755 end of 1414 that this is metadata and its processing is not mandated.  
756 Done in WD 16.

## 757 **CORE-47 Issue (Closed)**

### 758 **Source:**

759 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
760 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 761 **Description:**

762 Line 1415: Instead of Description, there are use cases for allowing extensible metadata about  
763 payloads. E.g. to get the MIME type, you now have to find the MIME part. Sometimes it makes  
764 sense to have that in the PayloadInfo. If the attached payload is XML Encrypted, PayloadInfo  
765 could reveal the "real" datatype. If the payload is a TIFF image, the PayloadInfo could provide  
766 meta-data.

### 767 **Owner:**

768 Ric

### 769 **Resolution:**

770 07/26/2006, We are missing the description element in the schema in the appendix. (Discussion  
771 on extensibility points.) Need to add a note that other metadata may be added as an extension  
772 point, as key-value pairs.

773 09/27/2006, agreed to accept Ric's proposal posted at  
774 [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/email/archives/200609/msg00017.html)  
775 [msg/email/archives/200609/msg00017.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/email/archives/200609/msg00017.html)

776 Included in WD 15.

777 However, he points out that we may need some extra clarification to guide/warn implementors  
778 about what metadata extensions should be put where. Also, schema requires updating to reflect  
779 these changes.

780 11/29/2006, Unsure of utility of providing pre-encryption MIME type. No need to define  
781 additional specific properties. (Left to profiling, or potential Part 2 work.) Propose to close with  
782 no further action.

783 12/06/2006, Ric agrees to close.

## 784 **CORE-48 Issue (Closed)**

### 785 **Source:**

786 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
787 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 788 **Description:**

789 Line 1425: eb:version="2.0" ?

### 790 **Owner:**

791 Ian

### 792 **Resolution:**

793 07/26/2006, Agree; correct. [EdNote: Don't see a problem here. This refers to a payload schema  
794 version, for which "2.0" may be valid. "3.0" is correctly used where eb:version refers to ebMS  
795 3.0.]

796 08/30/2006, Further issues: Line 1414, @version should be OPTIONAL. Examples do not  
797 contain required @namespace. Schema does not define the eb:Schema element at all; PartInfo  
798 is incomplete.

799 12/06/2006, Pending schema completion and alignment of examples with schema.

800 New schema in WD 17.

801 **CORE-49 Issue (Closed)**

802 **Source:**

803 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
804 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

805 **Description:**

806 Line 1452: "However, ebMS message can" -> "However, ebMS messaging can"

807 **Resolution:**

808 07/26/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

809 **CORE-50 Issue (Closed)**

810 **Source:**

811 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
812 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

813 **Description:**

814 Line 1650: Is this list exhaustive? If ebMS is composed with other SOAP protocols, can they be  
815 escalated too?

816 **Owner:**

817 Pete

818 **Resolution:**

819 07/26/2006, List is exemplar – this is correct for part 1, need to clarify the wording. – Part 2 we  
820 have left for later – suggestion any error raised outside MSH is an implementation decision.

821 08/30/2006: Note that it is not an exhaustive list. Also, addressing should not be included.

822 Included in WD 16.

823 **CORE-51 Issue (Closed)**

824 **Source:**

825 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
826 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

827 **Description:**

828 Line 1669: "reported in a log l" -> "reported in a log in"

829 **Resolution:**

830 07/26/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

831 **CORE-52 Issue (Closed)**

832 **Source:**

833 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
834 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

835 **Description:**

836 Line 1830-1833. How can a containing element eb:Messaging be encrypted while a contained  
837 element eb:PartyInfo is not? An example would help here ..

838 **Owner:**

839 Pete

840 **Resolution:**

841 07/26/2006, Need re-write and clarify what is going on 1st sentence OK, recommend partInfo  
842 unencrypt ok, routing is another issue!

843 08/30/2006, Can make recommendations here, but the actual runtime encryption policy needs to

844 be agreed between parties. Should specify elements to be encrypted in P-Mode.security.  
845 02/07/2007, Latest P-Mode drafts include list of encrypted parts.  
846 03/06/2007, See proposed text in WD 17, Section 7.4.

## 847 **CORE-53 Issue (Closed)**

### 848 **Source:**

849 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
850 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 851 **Description:**

852 Line 2406-2423, section 8.2.3: If both security and reliability are used, there is presumably a  
853 required processing order of the security and reliability headers? Where is this specified?

### 854 **Owner:**

855 Pete

### 856 **Resolution:**

857 07/26/2006, Figure 7 addresses this – add note to this section referring back to fig 7.  
858 Included in WD 16.

## 859 **CORE-54 Issue (Closed)**

### 860 **Source:**

861 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
862 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 863 **Description:**

864 Line 2448-2452: The semantics of ack was NOT clearly a delivery semantics in ebMS2. The  
865 ebMS3 specification is more precise in defining At-Least-Once as a delivery contract. But the  
866 specification still allows the option of acknowledging a message that is not delivered, e.g. in case  
867 of a packaging error that is detected after the reliability processing of a received message, where  
868 only the generation of an error is required. Shouldn't the spec tighten-up the requirements for  
869 acks, or at least provide a conformance profile that requires a tighter semantics? Should this  
870 type of difference be documented more clearly?

871 Is there a contract P-Mode property that allows partners to specify this level semantics of  
872 Reliability (including or not successful "Deliver")?

873 When RM-Deliver is executed before Deliver, there may be issues in the case of failover.  
874 Suppose the MSH system (or the interface from the MSH to the enterprise system) crashes, and  
875 processing is transferred to a standby system, that system may want to have all messages  
876 delivered in some previous time interval (e.g. 15 minutes if the standby system needs a few  
877 minutes to come to service) redelivered, even though they have already been acknowledged.  
878 This in order to get any messages possibly stuck between the MSH and the enterprise system  
879 before the crash.

880 Is this supported by either the WS-R or WS-RM specifications? If not, could ebMS3 add some  
881 support here?

882 Line 2499-2502: It is worth pointing out that the order of RM-Deliver and Deliver could be  
883 different.

### 884 **Owner:**

885 Jacques

### 886 **Resolution:**

887 07/26/2006, Correct – semantic definition should be left to the P-Mode. Is ack and error a bad  
888 thing? Delivery that is restricted to the RM module is what is intended can we make this clear?

889 12/06/2006, Latest P-Mode draft fully addresses semantics of acknowledgment. To be included  
890 in WD 16. No further action required.

891 **CORE-55 Issue (Closed)**

892 **Source:**

893 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
894 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

895 **Description:**

896 Line 2637, Section 10: There are some constraints between Reliable Messaging and ebXML  
897 processing. E.g. all messages in a WSRM sequence should be in the same ebXML conversation  
898 and CPAlid. Where are these constraints specified? How are they enforced in an  
899 implementation if it uses non-ebXML aware generic RM processors?

900 **Owner:**

901 Jacques

902 **Resolution:**

903 12/06/2006, Sequence assignment issue covered in Section 8.2.2 of WD 15. Also addressed by  
904 P-Mode appendix (reliability.inorder.scope parameter). Latest P-Mode draft improves on this, to  
905 be included in WD 16.

906 **CORE-56 Issue (Closed)**

907 **Source:**

908 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
909 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

910 **Description:**

911 There is now no ebXML concept of Message Ordering. Can organizations still use the ordering  
912 features of the underlying RM specifications? E.g. certain service/action/cpaid/conversationid  
913 initiate new sequences, and others terminate them. Is there a way to specify this correlation.

914 Partners may want to specify that certain Service/Action combinations, with a new  
915 ConversationID and in the same Cpaid, are to be performed in-order. How do they specify this,  
916 and how does the ebMS processor know about this?

917 **Owner:**

918 Jacques

919 **Resolution:**

920 09/06/2006: Allow mapping between ebMS conversation and RM sequence.

921 1. Add in P-Mode:

922 \* PMode[1].Reliability.InOrder.Scope: this parameter is a string that defines the set of messages  
923 that must be ordered, if appropriate. For example, a value of "{eb:ConversationId}" means that  
924 all messages that share the same ConversationId in a conversation initiated by a message such  
925 as those subject to this P-Mode leg (typically, with Service/Action as specified in  
926 PMode[1].UserInfo), must be ordered.

927 2. Add in 8.2.2 (latest draft) after L1517, a third bullet item:

928 "\*\* Have sufficient control on which RM sequence is used when submitting a message (RM-  
929 Submit), so that an RM sequence may be mapped to an ebMS conversation  
930 (eb:ConversationId)."

931 (Above 2 edits complete in WD 15.)

932 Also need to specify that order of Messages received must be maintained all the way through to  
933 the receiving application. Give example depicting Scope syntax, to allow choosing various types  
934 of headers.

935 12/06/2006, Contract is between RMP & RMP. MSH behavior is specified in 8.2.2, under "In-  
936 Order ebMS Delivery". Additional Inorder.Scope usages are listed in latest P-Mode draft, to be  
937 included in WD 16. Others are left to implementers to define.

938 **CORE-57 Issue (Closed)**

939 **Source:**

940 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
941 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

942 **Description:**

943 Line 2730: "This become a" -> "This becomes a"

944 **Resolution:**

945 Editorial. Fixed in WD 14.

946 **CORE-58 Issue (Closed)**

947 **Source:**

948 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
949 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

950 **Description:**

951 Line 2851 and 2858: These examples have invalid Content-Ids (no "@" sign).

952 **Resolution:**

953 Editorial. Fixed along with CORE-38 in WD 14.

954 **CORE-59 Issue (Closed)**

955 **Source:**

956 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
957 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

958 **Description:**

959 SyncReply module in ebMS2: A mapping from the CPA properties for SyncReply to P-Modes  
960 would be useful, for the existing ebMS2 users looking at ebMS3.

961 **Owner:**

962 Jacques

963 **Resolution:**

964 09/06/2006: (belongs in compatibility section proposal); to appear in WD 15.

965 CM4) MEP mapping rules (between V2 and V3):

966 These rules define how V2 header elements that control the MEP in use and its mapping to the  
967 underlying protocol, map to V3 and vice versa. Also define how CPA elements that control ebMS  
968 V2 MEPs map to P-Mode parameter and vice-versa.

969 (a) In V3: One-Way / Push, with no ebMS signal and no reliability acknowledgments on the  
970 response (back-channel), will map to V2 message sending with syncReplyMode=none in the  
971 CPA (and no SyncReply element in eb2 header).

972 (b) In V3: One-Way / Push, with possibly ebMS signal and reliability acknowledgments on the  
973 response (back-channel), will map to V2 message sending with syncReplyMode=  
974 mshSignalsOnly in the CPA (and SyncReply element in eb2 header).

975 (c) In V3: Two-Way / Sync, with no ebMS signal and no reliability acknowledgments on the  
976 response (back-channel), will map to V2 message sending with syncReplyMode= responseOnly  
977 in the CPA (and SyncReply element in eb2 header). The V2 response refers to the request using  
978 RefToMessageId.

979 (d) In V3: Two-Way / Sync, with possibly ebMS signal and reliability acknowledgments on the  
980 response (back-channel), will map to V2 message sending with syncReplyMode=  
981 signalsAndResponse in the CPA (and SyncReply element in eb2 header). The V2 response  
982 refers to the request using RefToMessageId.

983 (e) In V3: Two-Way / Push-and-Push will map to two One-way in ebMS2, where the second

984 message refers to the first one using RefToMessageId. Each one of the two messages is  
985 handled as in (a) or (b).  
986 Latest draft of this entire section included in WD 15.

## 987 **CORE-60 Issue (Deferred)**

### 988 **Source:**

989 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
990 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 991 **Description:**

992 ebMS2 has a Message Status service. This seems to have disappeared? Was it considered not  
993 useful? It seems quite relevant in multi-hop. Do any of the underlying specifications provide this  
994 functionality?

### 995 **Owner:**

996 Pete

### 997 **Resolution:**

998 09/06/2006: Not in scope of Core spec. Add to where Core lists additional features that may be  
999 described in a future specification.  
1000 Note appears in Section 8.2.4 of WD 14.

## 1001 **CORE-61 Issue (Deferred)**

### 1002 **Source:**

1003 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
1004 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 1005 **Description:**

1006 ebMS2 has a Ping service. What happened to it?

### 1007 **Resolution:**

1008 09/06/2006: Test message is almost completely defined in Default P-Mode. "Discard" rule  
1009 already exists in 5.2.1.8. We may define a more complete test service (whether/how it responds,  
1010 correlates response test message, etc.) in future spec.

## 1011 **CORE-62 Issue (Deferred)**

### 1012 **Source:**

1013 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
1014 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 1015 **Description:**

1016 ebMS2 had a section C Supported Profiling Services. It would be quite useful to have a similar  
1017 table that maps these profiles to ebMS3 with WS Security.

### 1018 **Resolution:**

1019 09/06/2006: Could specify these profiles in terms of P-Mode.Security. Not in Core spec; belongs  
1020 in Conformance Profile or similar document.

## 1021 **CORE-63 Issue (Deferred)**

### 1022 **Source:**

1023 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
1024 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 1025 **Description:**

1026 ebMS2 had a section 6.6 with reliable messaging combinations. When Part II adds support for  
1027 multi-hop, it would be useful to review how this could be mapped to ebMS3 with WS-R or WS-

1028 RM.

1029 **Resolution:**

1030 09/06/2006: Defer until we define multi-hop functionality in a future specification.

1031 **CORE-64 Issue (Closed)**

1032 **Source:**

1033 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

1034 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1035 **Description:**

1036 Section 3 introduces a 'message pulling' feature on the SOAP level to overcome limitations  
1037 such as availability of static IP I find it strange that one would need such a feature, since ebMS  
1038 2 already provides SMTP/POP3 based transport which already covers such a need. The main  
1039 issue with this is shifting responsibilities. A sender is now required to keep the message available  
1040 for the recipient on his server, rather than dropping it in the realm of the recipient when ready.  
1041 This blurs the division of responsibility and leads to issues with message turnaround times.

1042 **Resolution:**

1043 09/06/2006: Message Pulling offers a richer feature set (decisions about what to pull and when).  
1044 SPAM and opaqueness of mail infrastructure are issues. However, SMTP binding is still  
1045 available. Message structure is transport-independent. Close with no action.

1046 **CORE-65 Issue (Closed)**

1047 **Source:**

1048 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

1049 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1050 **Description:**

1051 Section 2.2 introduces 'message exchange patterns', which attempt to tightly couple business  
1052 process with a particular message exchange. This shouldn't be part of ebMS as it introduces too  
1053 much dependency between process and messaging. The problems with sync and async  
1054 messaging modules wrt to MEP already indicate you're not on the right path here. Please stick to  
1055 the reftomessageid for linking messages and allow business process to design the message  
1056 patterns for the process. All we need to do here is making sure people 'can' relate messages if  
1057 they need to.

1058 **Owner:**

1059 Jacques

1060 **Resolution:**

1061 09/06/2006: Have dissociated ebMS MEP from SOAP binding. Addressed by Messaging Model  
1062 section changes of WD 14.

1063 **CORE-66 Issue (Closed)**

1064 **Source:**

1065 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

1066 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1067 **Description:**

1068 Section 5,7,8 - changing the header formats to comply with WS\*. The main issue is backwards  
1069 compatibility. While I learned from Jacques that SwA is still the way to go, moving critical  
1070 information about in the SOAP Envelope will require recoding at the core. This will hamper  
1071 migration from ebMS 2 to ebMS 3 environments, if not block them completely, leaving the  
1072 communities on an island and requiring implementers to maintain two versions.

1073 **Owner:**  
1074 Jacques  
1075 **Resolution:**  
1076 09/06/2006: Addressed by backward-compatibility section. Insert as Appendix to Core. Appears  
1077 in WD 15.

## 1078 **CORE-67 Issue (Closed)**

1079 **Source:**  
1080 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>  
1081 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1082 **Description:**  
1083 Processing Modes: Having a concise set of data for processing modes is a good idea. In the  
1084 past, we've seen people struggle with CPA's to configure their MSH's. Whether or not we need a  
1085 'formal' PM document is another issue, I believe the content is already inside the ebMS2 [3?]  
1086 spec, it just needs to be elevated into a concise document essentially detailing the various  
1087 parameters that one may set.

1088 **Owner:**  
1089 Jacques

1090 **Resolution:**  
1091 09/06/2006: Believed to be addressed by P-Mode model draft, included in WD 15.  
1092 [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/download.php/20048/PMODE-model-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/download.php/20048/PMODE-model-3.doc)  
1093 [3.doc](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/download.php/20048/PMODE-model-3.doc)

## 1094 **CORE-68 Issue (Closed)**

1095 **Source:**  
1096 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>  
1097 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1098 **Description:**  
1099 Conformance Profiles: Using a conformance profiles document separate from the main spec or  
1100 embedding it doesn't make a lot of difference. However, allowing choice on things like the  
1101 version of SOAP or WSS introduces options that may hamper interoperability on the larger  
1102 scale. IMO, It would be in the interest of the market (both developers and users) to fix versions  
1103 of underlying protocols as much as possible in order to avoid flexibilities that may divide the  
1104 market. Even when e.g. SOAP 1.2 is backwards compatible with SOAP 1.1, it is better to decide  
1105 on SOAP 1.1 or SOAP 1.2, rather than leaving it open. It simply reduces the number of  
1106 \*possible\* interoperability issues and the amount of test sets we need to add for interoperability.  
1107 If ebMS 3 doesn't decide on SOAP 1.1 or 1.2, it probably also doesn't decide pro or against  
1108 SOAP 1.3, which may be not so backwards compatible. This extends to all the underlying  
1109 protocols, and the combinatorial exponent of them.

1110 **Resolution:**  
1111 09/13/2006: Partially addressed through the use of Default P-Modes and predefined  
1112 Conformance Profiles. However, the TC has consciously decided \*not\* to eliminate some  
1113 options from the core specification, leaving them to end-user agreement. Note that receiving  
1114 software stacks may be able to process various choices automatically. See Section 1.3 for  
1115 reference to externally defined Conformance Profiles. Agreed to close with no further action.

## 1116 **CORE-69 Issue (Closed)**

1117 **Source:**  
1118 Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyclonecommerce.com>  
1119 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200605/msg00000.html>

1120 **Description:**  
1121 It would be useful to combine the MEP cases with the reliability, error, fault into a table that  
1122 provides an overview of the protocol message exchanges.

1123 **Owner:**  
1124 Jacques/Hamid; Dale to review

1125 **Resolution:**  
1126 09/13/2006: Considered to be an editorial issue, since all normative detail is already present in  
1127 the spec.  
1128 12/06/2006, Appears in a well-structured format under ebMS 2-3 mapping appendix (CM4: MEP  
1129 Mapping Rules). Propose to close with no further action, pending review and confirmation by  
1130 Dale.  
1131 12/11/2006, See updated proposal from Jacques at  
1132 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/21470/MEP-binding-cases-2.pdf>  
1133 Latest revision appears as new Appendix E of WD 17.

## 1134 **CORE-70 Issue (Closed)**

1135 **Source:**  
1136 Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyclonecommerce.com>  
1137 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200605/msg00000.html>

1138 **Description:**  
1139 The MEP definitions do not map well to business transactions as defined in ebBP or in UMM. A  
1140 request-response pattern should not require fundamentally different ebMS MEPs depending on  
1141 how it binds to the underlying protocol.  
1142 It is unclear how the MEPs that were available in ebMS2, map to V3 MEPs.

1143 **Owner:**  
1144 Jacques

1145 **Resolution:**  
1146 09/13/2006: First part of issue (MEP binding) addressed in WD 14. Second part (v2-v3  
1147 mapping) addressed in draft Compatibility Appendix; see "CM4" section, to be included in WD  
1148 15.

## 1149 **CORE-71 Issue (Closed)**

1150 **Source:**  
1151 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1152 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1153 **Description:**  
1154 Section 2.2 MEPs: This section is useful but the problem is how far to go. The document  
1155 mentions the use of eb:RefToMessageId but not conversationId and does not talk about the  
1156 relation in time between the various messages. So I am not sure what role this section plays in a  
1157 document on the messaging standard. I suspect that ebBP or some such would be a better place  
1158 to talk of these things in terms of the structure of transaction patterns?

1159 **Owner:**  
1160 Jacques

1161 **Resolution:**  
1162 09/13/2006: Clarify transaction pattern binding and enforcement in MEP Modeling section?  
1163 Believe this has been addressed in Messaging Model Rationale (Section 2.2.1 of WD 14) and P-  
1164 Mode data model appendix. Agreed to close with no further action.

1165 **CORE-72 Issue (Closed)**

1166 **Source:**

1167 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1168 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1169 **Description:**

1170 Section 3 - Message Pulling: If the challenges can be met then I see this as a great step forward  
1171 for ebXML ms3.0.

1172 In our current communities we have been moving to ebXML ms2.0 from a mechanism based on  
1173 XML posted over http with responses being polled by the client.

1174 The moment we explain that we are moving to push push many of our partners respond with "it  
1175 wont work".

1176 Our intention would not be to move to an exclusive push pull model but rather when outbound  
1177 messages fail to be received we would take those messages and requeue them such that they  
1178 could be pulled by a partner as part of their recovery process.

1179 **Resolution:**

1180 09/13/2006: Closed; no action required.

1181 **CORE-73 Issue (Closed)**

1182 **Source:**

1183 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1184 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1185 **Description:**

1186 Section 4 - Processing Modes: I think this concept is a very good one. Not sure why the default  
1187 P-Mode has no reliability. My view of ebXML ms is that a key feature is reliable messaging.

1188 **Owner:**

1189 Pete

1190 **Resolution:**

1191 09/13/2006: Add note to indicate that default P-Mode is not designed for business use, but rather  
1192 for initial connectivity testing. Already exists at beginning of Section 4.3; add to that note that  
1193 reliable messaging protocol is also not included by default.

1194 Included in WD 15.

1195 **CORE-74 Issue (Closed)**

1196 **Source:**

1197 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1198 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1199 **Description:**

1200 Conformance Profiles: Having choices is good however we are in a very diverse community  
1201 (using ebMS solutions from three different vendors in the community plus an open source  
1202 implementation and three home grown ones).

1203 When it came to interop even our use of ebXML CPA/CPD threw some of them.

1204 It would be useful to try and come off the fence here even if it is to make a stand on the default  
1205 first port of choice for all the commercial vendors.

1206 **Resolution:**

1207 09/13/2006: Closed, as duplicate of CORE-68.

## 1208 **CORE-75 Issue (Deferred)**

### 1209 **Source:**

1210 Anonymous

### 1211 **Description:**

1212 ebMS3 introduces the message pulling feature with a notion of channel (MPF): Important issue  
1213 for some of our (very) small partners, to pull on our B2B-Hub. Features of the queue mgmt,  
1214 which seems important for us: Timeout, when queues will not be requested.

1215 What's about the sending of the ack? Is there any spec, e.g. new http-request or the same  
1216 request?

1217 If client sends a request, a sync acknowledge must specified! Or do you guess, that the  
1218 acknowledge should requested by the client on the same way like described above?

### 1219 **Resolution:**

1220 09/13/2006: Ack/sync issues already addressed in Pull Mode section. Regarding queue  
1221 management and timeout, could address via an MSH status signal, to be defined in Part 2.  
1222 These features may be implementation-dependent, therefore out of scope of the specification.

## 1223 **CORE-76 Issue (Closed)**

### 1224 **Source:**

1225 Anonymous

### 1226 **Description:**

1227 ebMS3 Message Exchange Patterns (MEP): We don't understand the advantage to put the MEP  
1228 in a CPA, because we see this feature inside the BPSS specs. Obviously most tools don't  
1229 support BPSS, but this can not be the reason for changing the specs. Can you clarify the need  
1230 for this?

### 1231 **Resolution:**

1232 09/13/2006: Closed as duplicate of CORE-71.

## 1233 **CORE-77 Issue (Closed)**

### 1234 **Source:**

1235 Anonymous

### 1236 **Description:**

1237 ebMS3 uses Web Services standards at wire level: Missing backward compatibility is not  
1238 acceptable from our point of view. Just the migration of existing partner from EDIFACT or other  
1239 protocols to ebMS is a hard work. When we have to migrate our new ebMS2-based community  
1240 to ebMS3 again, the partner won't accept.

1241 We see the advantages of using WebService Standards, but when somebody will use WS-  
1242 Reliability/WS-ReliableMessaging, he will use WebService at all and not ebMS. Question: Does  
1243 OASIS guess to harmonize both specifications, ebMS and WS?

1244 ebMS3 Introduces Processing Modes (P-Modes). Same question as above (no. 2): Is this part of  
1245 BPSS or ebMS? Firstly we suggest to differ between technical parameters like level of security,  
1246 reliability and process specs like MEP. Pre-build process specs containing technical parameters  
1247 make CPA generation easier. CPA structure becomes less complex.

### 1248 **Owner:**

1249 Jacques

### 1250 **Resolution:**

1251 09/13/2006: Backward compatibility issue addressed in Compatibility section (to be appendix of  
1252 WD 15).

1253 WS vs. ebMS is a FAQ; need to educate that ebMS is not an alternative to WS-\*; it \*is\* a WS

1254 extension module that adds business value (messaging middleware functionality). Clarify this in  
1255 Introduction section.

1256 09/27/2006: Agreed to text proposed by Jacques, with modification by Pete, for inclusion in WD  
1257 15:

1258 "1.3 Web Services and Their Role in an eBusiness Messaging Framework

1259 A major design choice in V3, is the specification of the MSH and its associated processing rules  
1260 as a Web Service. The intent is to make use of other relevant Web Services specifications that  
1261 fulfill certain messaging requirements, and build upon that base by adding what is necessary for  
1262 a complete eBusiness messaging service. For example, the message security and reliability  
1263 requirements are met through the use of other Web Services standards and their  
1264 implementations; and [something about what eb:Messaging adds in terms of business value].  
1265 ebMS 3 brings this all together into a single, coherent framework.

1266 The message SOAP body has been freed for business payload. The ebMS header is just a  
1267 SOAP extension among others. As a result, V3 is significantly more compliant than V2 with the  
1268 SOAP processing model, and apt at composing Web services standards that are defined as  
1269 SOAP extensions. Compliance of V3 with future WS-I profiles - in particular BP 1.2, BP 2.0 and  
1270 RSP profiles - will be an objective in subsequent releases, as it is expected that these profiles  
1271 will be natively supported by most SOAP platforms.

1272 Compliance with Web services standards does not remove the rationale behind an internet-  
1273 based messaging middleware. Often, document-centric eBusiness and eGovernment exchanges  
1274 need to clearly dissociate messaging functions from the way these messages are consumed on  
1275 the back-end. Such consumption may take place according to various models, as mentioned in  
1276 1.1. The use of [SOAP] message header elements that represent standard business metadata  
1277 (user or company ID, business conversation, business service and action, etc.), is a key feature  
1278 for supporting a decoupled binding with back-end business processes. At the same time,  
1279 experience has demonstrated that the messaging layer must be more supportive of business  
1280 transactions: messages are parts of basic choreographies that map to higher-level business  
1281 exchanges between partners. To this end, V3 supports a notion of message exchange pattern  
1282 (MEP) the properties of which (reliability, security, binding to underlying transport, error handling,  
1283 and other quality of service aspects such as timing, etc.) are controlled in a contract-based  
1284 manner by the message producer and consumer layers."

1285 P-Modes issue: Possibly already clarified by P-Mode section updates? [EdNote: Is this covered?  
1286 Confirm before fully closing issue.]

1287 12/06/2006, Agree that this has been addressed as completely as possible in ebMS core; refer  
1288 also to P-Mode/CPA mapping in a future version of CPP/A spec.

## 1289 **CORE-78 Issue (Closed)**

### 1290 **Source:**

1291 Anonymous

### 1292 **Description:**

1293 ebMS3 Conformance profiles are specified separately from the core specification:

1294 Question: Does OASIS guess, that CPA will become less complex, while removing specifications  
1295 like WS Security, SOAP and reliability in a "conformance profiles"? Why does the main  
1296 specification not guarantee interoperable implementations (also in ebMS2). It should! Do you  
1297 differ between ebMS and CPPA in this context? Sure ebMS by its own doesn't guarantee, but in  
1298 conjunction with CPPA it does!

### 1299 **Resolution:**

1300 09/20/2006: CPA will not be less complex; even though ebMS 3.0 refers to WS-\* specs for  
1301 security and reliability, the operational parameters of those underlying specs still need to be  
1302 specified. Believe the remainder of the comment has been addressed by P-Mode and  
1303 Conformance Profile definitions. Conformance Profiles have been defined in a document  
1304 separate from the core specification, so that they can be revised independently of the core.

1305 **CORE-79 Issue (Closed)**

1306 **Source:**

1307 Anonymous

1308 **Description:**

1309 No application interface has been specified (none was in ebMS2 either). We agree it should not  
1310 be part of the specification. We guess this should be the tasks of the tools supplier.

1311 **Resolution:**

1312 09/20/2006: Comment noted. No action required.

1313 **CORE-80 Issue (Closed)**

1314 **Source:**

1315 Anonymous

1316 **Description:**

1317 No Routing or multi-hop feature is specified (at least in Part 1): For us neither Multi-Hop nor WS-  
1318 Addressing is an important issue!

1319 **Resolution:**

1320 09/20/2006: Comment noted. Multihop support is scheduled for a Part 2 of the core  
1321 specification. No action required at this time.

1322 **CORE-81 Issue (Closed)**

1323 **Source:**

1324 Anonymous

1325 **Description:**

1326 No status request message has been specified (at least in Part 1), like it was in ebMS2: Not  
1327 necessary for us!

1328 **Resolution:**

1329 09/20/2006: Comment noted. Status request support is scheduled for a Part 2 of the core  
1330 specification. No action required at this time.

1331 **CORE-82 Issue (Closed)**

1332 **Source:**

1333 Anonymous

1334 **Description:**

1335 Error generation has been specified, but the way errors should be reported is not: We agree, it  
1336 should not be part of the ebMS how to report errors.

1337 **Resolution:**

1338 09/20/2006: Comment noted. Methods of error reporting are subject to partner agreement.  
1339 Options are now well documented in Error Handling section. No further action required.  
1340

1341 **2.2 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR01**

1342 The following issues were received after the close of Public Review 01.

1343 **CORE-83 Issue (Partially Deferred)**

1344 **Source:**

1345 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,

1346 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1347 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1348 **Description:**

1349 CDC's PHIN Messaging System (PHINMS), which is based on ebMS 2.0. PHINMS uses XML  
1350 Encryption and XML DSIG standards for payload level encryption and signature. This software is  
1351 described at <http://www.cdc.gov/phn/software-solutions/phinms/index.html>.

1352 CDC's PHINMS extended ebMS 2.0 to handle:

1353 1) very large (in Gb range) payloads using chunking

1354 **Owner:**

1355 Jacques (for P-Mode addition)

1356 **Resolution:**

1357 12/06/2006: Chunking functionality to be addressed in future (Part 2) specification (Deferred).

1358 Agree to provide a "max message size" P-Mode. Liaise with CPP/A to request such a  
1359 parameter.

1360 12/19/2006: See proposal in email from Jacques at

1361 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>  
1362 included in WD 17.

1363 02/07/2007: Also addressed by latest P-Mode drafts, in WD 17.

1364 **CORE-84 Issue (Closed)**

1365 **Source:**

1366 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1367 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1368 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1369 **Description:**

1370 CDC's PHINMS extended ebMS 2.0 to handle:

1371 2) push/pull type interactions via a gateway (to handle sites that wanted to receive by polling the  
1372 gateway)

1373 **Owner:**

1374 Raja to review

1375 **Resolution:**

1376 12/06/2006, believe Pull functionality addresses this requirement. Close, pending review by  
1377 Raja.

1378 **CORE-85 Issue (Closed)**

1379 **Source:**

1380 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1381 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1382 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1383 **Description:**

1384 a) Is ebMS 3.0 designed to interoperate (over the wire) with ebMS 2.0?

1385 **Resolution:**

1386 12/06/2006, Agree that ebMS 2-3 mapping appendix answers this question.

1387 **CORE-86 Issue (Closed)**

1388 **Source:**

1389 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,

1390 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1391 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1392 **Description:**

1393 b) Is interoperability with WS-Reliable Messaging a future goal of ebMS?

1394 **Resolution:**

1395 12/06/2006, Note that this is not a matter of interoperability, but rather composability and usage  
1396 of this lower-level specification. Believe the WS-ReliableMessaging binding section answers this  
1397 question.

1398 **CORE-87 Issue (Closed)**

1399 **Source:**

1400 Dale Moberg <dmoberg@us.axway.com>  
1401 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00022.html>

1402 **Description:**

1403 I notice that Role is still not a required element in the ebMS header.

1404 I would like the schema to require its use as unnecessary interoperability problems can be  
1405 avoided by requiring the element.

1406 Also, when ebMS is used with CPPA (and when CPPA is connected with BPSS), it promotes  
1407 integration by including the Role element.

1408 If the CPPA and BPSS are not used, it is easy to just default Role to something like Requester or  
1409 Responder.

1410 **Owner:**

1411 Hamid (for schema)

1412 **Resolution:**

1413 01/03/2007: Agreed to adopt Jacques' (in 12/7 email) suggestion to define a single "dummy"  
1414 Role value, for use when no CPA, BP, P-Mode, or other profile specification is in effect:

1415 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ebxml-msg/defaultRole>

1416 Included in WD 17.

1417 **CORE-88 Issue (Closed)**

1418 **Source:**

1419 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1420 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>

1421 **Description:**

1422 12/06/2006 Meeting: Need to expand P-Mode.Security parameters to include more details, such  
1423 as algorithms, key sizes, etc.

1424 **Owner:**

1425 Ric

1426 **Resolution:**

1427 01/03/2007: Addressed by PMode-model-83 changes by Ric & Jacques.

1428 Included in WD 17.

1429 **CORE-89 Issue (Closed)**

1430 **Source:**

1431 Editor

1432 **Description:**

1433 Section 1.3: Complete EdNote.

1434 **Owner:**  
1435 Pete  
1436 **Resolution:**  
1437 Removed in WD 16.

### 1438 **CORE-90 Issue (Closed)**

1439 **Source:**  
1440 Editor

1441 **Description:**  
1442 Section 1.7: EdNote; "wsswa" namespace prefix does not appear in examples. Should it be  
1443 used, or removed?

1444 **Owner:**  
1445 Ric

1446 **Resolution:**  
1447 12/29/2006: Ric recommends removal in email at  
1448 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00027.html>  
1449 01/03/2007: Agree to remove from namespace prefix table. Done in WD 17.

### 1450 **CORE-91 Issue (Closed)**

1451 **Source:**  
1452 Editor

1453 **Description:**  
1454 Section 5.3.3: Confirm whether or not example is redundant and (if not), whether it is schema-  
1455 conformant.

1456 **Owner:**  
1457 Pete

1458 **Resolution:**  
1459 12/13/2006: Remove one example, and refer to it from the other location. Also give example of  
1460 "bundled" Error + User Message, and move Section 5.2.1 to end of Section 5.2.  
1461 Bundling section is now 5.2.4; new example in 5.3.4, in WD 17.

### 1462 **CORE-92 Issue (Closed)**

1463 **Source:**  
1464 Editor

1465 **Description:**  
1466 Appendix B: Resolve EdNote; is additional text needed?

1467 **Owner:**  
1468 Jacques

1469 **Resolution:**  
1470 12/19/2006: Proposal from Jacques at  
1471 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>  
1472 02/07/2007: Accept proposal (update to latest WSRM draft), included in WD 17.

### 1473 **CORE-93 Issue (Closed)**

1474 **Source:**  
1475 Editor

1476 **Description:**  
1477 Section E.2.5: Requires completion.

1478 **Resolution:**  
1479 12/13/2006: Resolved by latest Compatibility Appendix draft, to appear in WD 16.

## 1480 **CORE-94 Issue (Closed)**

1481 **Source:**  
1482 Editor

1483 **Description:**  
1484 Appendix H: Requires completion.

1485 **Owner:**  
1486 Pete

1487 **Resolution:**  
1488 Appears up-to-date, as of WD 17 and prior.

## 1489 **CORE-95 Issue (Closed)**

1490 **Source:**  
1491 Editor

1492 **Description:**  
1493 Replace Figure 15 (P-Mode Structure) with image of better resolution. Fix quotation marks.

1494 **Owner:**  
1495 Pete

1496 **Resolution:**  
1497 Need to obtain image source from Jacques.  
1498 Included in WD 18.

## 1499 **CORE-96 Issue (Closed)**

1500 **Source:**  
1501 Editor

1502 **Description:**  
1503 Replace Section 7.11.2 (which was carried over from ebMS2) with best current approach for  
1504 fulfilling nonrepudiation of receipt requirements. Include non-normative reference to BPSS  
1505 Receipt Ack signal.

1506 **Owner:**  
1507 Dale (Ack schema), Jacques (Packaging text)

1508 **Resolution:**  
1509 10/04/2006: Ian to discuss nonrepudiation requirements with ebXML Joint Committee.  
1510 02/21/2007: Much discussion about interaction between BP, CPA and Messaging layers to solve  
1511 nonrepudiation of receipt. What is now Section 7.12.2 solves this requirement, or very nearly so,  
1512 (possibly subject to reordering of signed elements), but we would need to define an  
1513 Acknowledgment Signal Message. [Monica advises to check nonrepudiation definition in  
1514 eBusiness Patterns document from original ebxml.org.]  
1515 Edits and example included in WD 17.

1516 **CORE-97 Issue (Closed)**

1517 **Source:**

1518 Editor

1519 **Description:**

1520 EdNote: Update Section B.2 as WS-ReliableMessaging spec progresses; also need intro text at  
1521 beginning of section.

1522 **Owner:**

1523 Jacques

1524 **Resolution:**

1525 12/13/2006: Also remove reference to MakeConnection feature, which is not needed within the  
1526 context of our usage.

1527 12/19/2006: See proposal from Jacques at  
1528 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>

1529 02/07/2007: Accept proposal. Included in WD 17.

1530 **CORE-98 Issue (Closed)**

1531 **Source:**

1532 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>  
1533 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00028.html>

1534 **Description:**

1535 Issue with example ebMS Message Headers

1536 line 851 - Section 5.2.2 eb:Messaging Element Specification

1537 line 1044 and 1096 - Section 5.3.1 UserMessage Example

1538 The eb:Service element has a value of QuoteToCollect. QuoteToCollect is not a URI type, so  
1539 the eb:Service element should have a type attribute. Or the element value should be changed to  
1540 a URI. To be consistent with 5.2.3.8 possibly the example should be changed to look like

1541 <eb:Service>urn:services:SupplierOrderProcessing</eb:Service>

1542 Or to be consistent with the Secured Message Examples

1543 <eb:Service type="someType">QuoteToCollect</eb:Service>

1544 **Owner:**

1545 Editor

1546 **Resolution:**

1547 01/03/2007: Agree to fix examples. Also add example of @type alternative usage in Section  
1548 5.2.3.8.

1549 Done, in WD 17.

1550 **CORE-99 Issue (Assigned-Conformance Profile)**

1551 **Source:**

1552 Sasha Schlegel <sacha\_oasis@schlegel.li>  
1553 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200702/msg00013.html>

1554 **Description:**

1555 In this discussion, signature and encryption were identified as two key functions, and the order in  
1556 which they occur. It was noted that ebMS 3.0 no longer specifies the default configuration as was  
1557 defined in ebMS 2.0.

1558 ebMS 2.0 has two defaults:

1559 a) encrypt first, then sign. As a Note in section 4.1.4.5

1560 b) the Reference for the actual ebMS 2.0 SOAP message XML digital signature was set in

1561 Section 4.1.3.

1562 **Owner:**  
1563 Pete

1564 **Resolution:**  
1565 02/14/2007:  
1566 a) Confirm existence of requirement to encrypt before signing. Prefer to keep order specified in  
1567 Section 7.6 (sign before encrypt).  
1568 b) Include reasonable defaults in Gateway conformance profile:  
1569 If signing, sign all payloads & headers that are available prior to signing.  
1570 If encrypting, include all Payloads & Messaging header at minimum.

## 1571 **CORE-100 Issue (Closed)**

1572 **Source:**  
1573 Jacques Durand, 02/14/2007 Conference Call

1574 **Description:**  
1575 Notes that in Hamid's draft schema, Role is required in FromParty, but optional in ToParty.

1576 **Owner:**  
1577

1578 **Resolution:**  
1579 Should be required in both. Schema fixed by Dale; included in WD 17.

## 1580 **CORE-101 Issue (Closed)**

1581 **Source:**  
1582 Pete

1583 **Description:**  
1584 Validate all XML example text against schema.

1585 **Owner:**  
1586 Ric

1587 **Resolution:**  
1588 Results of Ric's validation efforts are in  
1589 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/24071/ExampleReview.html>  
1590 Errors that were not an intended result of leaving incomplete XML "stubs" in examples (in order  
1591 to illustrate simple structure or unrelated features) have been corrected in WD 23 & WD 24.

## 1592 **CORE-102 Issue (Closed)**

1593 **Source:**  
1594 Pete

1595 **Description:**  
1596 F.2.6, "...mappings between CPA & P-Mode are defined in a separate Appendix." Do we still  
1597 plan to include such an additional appendix?

1598 **Owner:**  
1599

1600 **Resolution:**  
1601 03/07/2007: Agreed that this should be done in a separate document, not needed in core spec.  
1602 Note to that effect in spec.  
1603 Done in WD 18.

1604 **CORE-103 Issue (Closed)**

1605 **Source:**

1606 Pete, 12/20/2006 Conference Call

1607 **Description:**

1608 Disagree with requirement in 7.7 to support Username token.

1609 **Owner:**

1610 Pete

1611 **Resolution:**

1612 12/20/2006, Agreed to remove REQUIRED keywords, as this is a user/conformance profile point.

1613 Complete in WD 17.

1614 **CORE-104 Issue (Deferred)**

1615 **Source:**

1616 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1617 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1618 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200702/msg00031.html>

1619 **Description:**

1620 Within the CDC PHINMS, we have a feature called "delayed retry". This is done by a "Message  
1621 Sender" when a "Message Receiver" is down for an extended period of time (i.e., after a certain  
1622 number of retries are unsuccessful). Basically, the message is kept in a cache and we attempt it  
1623 after a long delay (say a few hours or a day). This is useful to handle network failures.

1624 I realize that regular retries using the same conversation ID etc are part of the spec. Is the above  
1625 kind of delayed retry part of the "guaranteed delivery" specification? If not, it may be a useful  
1626 addition.

1627 **Owner:**

1628

1629 **Resolution:**

1630 02/21/2007, Jacques is aware of similar requirements and expressed concern that the underlying  
1631 reliability specifications do not specify the retry rules and this may lead into very implementation  
1632 specific requirements. Any solution is not simple as the basic Reliability specs do not support  
1633 this multiple level re-tries and de-duplication. This is probably not solvable in the core but may  
1634 be addressed in Part 2.

1635 02/28/2007, Raja confirmed that the interpretation that we had previously discussed was correct,  
1636 that this was a second level retry that may be sent as a second message after a delay but with  
1637 an additional reference. This item was discussed and several options discussed the main issues  
1638 is the limitation of the underlining reliable messaging specifications. The TC believes that this is  
1639 a useful value add feature and that we should investigate a method for inclusion if possible as an  
1640 additional feature supported by part 2 and additional conformance profiles as this could be a  
1641 processing control and not wire protocol problem and solution.

1642 **CORE-105 Issue (Pending Edit)**

1643 **Source:**

1644 Jacques Durand

1645 **Description:**

1646 Track progress of WS-RX specs.

1647 **Owner:**

1648 Pete

1649 **Resolution:**  
1650 03/07/2007: Update reference in B.2 to latest WS-RX specs.  
1651 Reference WSRM 1.1 CD 7, 03/01/2007 in WD 18.  
1652 Update reference again to CS or OS version if available prior to our release.  
1653 CS cited in WD 23.

## 1654 **CORE-106 Issue (Closed)**

1655 **Source:**  
1656 Jacques Durand

1657 **Description:**  
1658 Receipt Signal requires a good example.

1659 **Owner:**  
1660 Pete

1661 **Resolution:**  
1662 Added Section 7.9.3 example in WD 18.  
1663 Note that a message/part referencing issue remains.

## 1664 **CORE-107 Issue (Closed)**

1665 **Source:**  
1666 Pete Wenzel

1667 **Description:**  
1668 Permanent Namespace URI and Schema Location URL needed. Currently specified identifiers  
1669 will not be resolvable, as we have no ability to serve documents from the stated location.

1670 **Owner:**  
1671 Pete

1672 **Resolution:**  
1673 Replaced namespace URI with "http://docs.oasis-open.org/ebxml-msg/ebms-3.0" and  
1674 schemaLocation with "http://docs.oasis-open.org/ebxml-msg/ebms-3.0/schema/ebms-header-  
1675 3\_0.xsd", per recent convention. Done in WD 18.  
1676 Revised with version-capable scheme in WD 19.  
1677 Note that a RDDDL document (containing an index to specifications and schema files) should be  
1678 placed at the namespace location.

## 1679 **CORE-108 Issue (Closed)**

1680 **Source:**  
1681 Pete Wenzel  
1682 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00017.html>

1683 **Description:**  
1684 Need reference to ASC X12 Registry for party identification schemes.

1685 **Owner:**  
1686

1687 **Resolution:**  
1688 05/18/2007: Agreed to add an informational reference to the latest CPP/A 2.1 Draft, which  
1689 contains explicit details on party identification schemes. The 3 type schemes already mentioned  
1690 (carried over from ebMS 2.0) will remain, but hyperlink references will be removed if they don't  
1691 point to useful information about the registries. Done in WD 23.

1692 **CORE-109 Issue (Deferred)**

1693 **Source:**  
1694 Pete

1695 **Description:**  
1696 Need more explicit instructions for making Receipt References correspond to the original  
1697 message's Referenced parts. RFC 2392 MID/CID schemes are somewhat, but not precisely,  
1698 relevant. See specification Section 5.2.3.3 and Example Section 7.9.3.

1699 **Owner:**  
1700

1701 **Resolution:**  
1702

1703 **CORE-110 Issue (Closed)**

1704 **Source:**  
1705 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>  
1706 <http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200703/msg00031.html>

1707 **Description:**  
1708 1541 - @type: This REQUIRED attribute indicates how the parties send and receiving the  
1709 message will interpret the value of the reference.  
1710 Notice that the @type is a REQUIRED attribute of eb:AgreementRef. The example at line 1536  
1711 does not include the @type attribute. All the examples I have looked at that contain the  
1712 eb:AgreementRef element do not include the REQUIRED @type attribute.  
1713 Either the samples should be updated or @type should be changed to OPTIONAL. It would  
1714 probably make sense to add wording along the lines of what is in the spec for eb:Service/@type.  
1715 Line 1555 - There is no restriction on the value of the type attribute. If the type attribute is not  
1716 present, the content of the Service element MUST be a URI (see {RFC2396}). Etc.

1717 **Owner:**  
1718 Editor

1719 **Resolution:**  
1720 03/21/2007, Agreed to follow eb:Service method; optional @type, but if omitted, content must be  
1721 a URI. Updated in WD 19.

1722 **CORE-111 Issue (Closed)**

1723 **Source:**  
1724 Pete

1725 **Description:**  
1726 Messaging/@version identifier should be removed. It needlessly complicates implementation by  
1727 allowing changes in processing semantics, which must then be coded into an application to  
1728 trigger on this version string. Prefer the alternative of versioning built into the namespace URI.

1729 **Owner:**  
1730

1731 **Resolution:**  
1732 03/28/2007: Agreed; removed in WD 19.

1733 **CORE-112 Issue (Closed)**

1734 **Source:**  
1735 Pete

1736 **Description:**  
1737 According to 5.2.2.12, PayloadInfo contains @xml:id and @eb:version attributes. These appear  
1738 to be extraneous; neither schema nor examples contain these attributes.

1739 **Owner:**  
1740

1741 **Resolution:**  
1742 03/28/2007: Agreed; Attributes' descriptions removed in WD 19.

## 1743 **CORE-113 Issue (Closed)**

1744 **Source:**  
1745 Pete

1746 **Description:**  
1747 5.2.2.13 states that eb:PartInfo/Schema/@namespace is REQUIRED, yet it does not appear in  
1748 the schema or examples. Propose making it OPTIONAL and add it to the schema. Also clarify  
1749 that eb:PartInfo/Schema/@version is also OPTIONAL (only @location is REQUIRED).

1750 **Owner:**  
1751

1752 **Resolution:**  
1753 03/28/2007: Agreed. Fixed in WD 19.

## 1754 **CORE-114 Issue (Closed)**

1755 **Source:**  
1756 Pete  
1757 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00018.html>

1758 **Description:**  
1759 Are current extension points ("any" elements/attributes) sufficient to support anticipated new  
1760 features? For example, to support payload packetization, need to specify "part x of y"  
1761 parameters. Extension to UserMessage, PayloadInfo, or PartInfo? Perhaps use  
1762 MessageProperties or PartProperties instead?

1763 **Owner:**  
1764

1765 **Resolution:**  
1766 05/18/2007: No use cases to support UserMessage schema extensions; agreed to close with no  
1767 action.

## 1768 **CORE-115 Issue (Open)**

1769 **Source:**  
1770 Pete

1771 **Description:**  
1772 Need a RDDDL index of documents. See <http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrn/200702> for an  
1773 example.

1774 **Owner:**  
1775

1776 **Resolution:**

## 1777 **CORE-116 Issue (Closed)**

1778 **Source:**

1779 Dale Moberg <dmoberg@us.axway.com>  
1780 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200703/msg00049.html>

1781 **Description:**

1782 ebMS 2.0 conformance should be required in Gateway Conformance Profile.

1783 **Owner:**

1784

1785 **Resolution:**

1786 05/04/2007: Addressed in Conformance Profiles Adjunct document, beginning with draft 05.

## 1787 **CORE-117 Issue (Partially Deferred)**

1788 **Source:**

1789 Sacha Schlegel <sacha@schlegel.li>  
1790 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200703/msg00053.html>

1791 **Description:**

1792 Is SMTP supported as a first class transport protocol in ebMS 3.0?

1793 **Owner:**

1794

1795 **Resolution:**

1796 04/11/2007, Agreed to revise note at end of SMTP binding appendix to reflect current level of  
1797 support. Done in WD 20.

## 1798 **CORE-118 Issue (Deferred)**

1799 **Source:**

1800 David Webber <david@drw.info>  
1801 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00004.html>

1802 **Description:**

1803 Describe how MTOM relates to ebMS 3.

1804 **Owner:**

1805

1806 **Resolution:**

1807 04/11/2007, Agreed that use of SOAP1.2+MTOM is a profiling issue; to be specified in a  
1808 conformance profile.

## 1809 **CORE-119 Issue (Closed)**

1810 **Source:**

1811 Jacques Durand <JDurand@us.fujitsu.com>  
1812 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00016.html>

1813 **Description:**

1814 suggest the following renaming:  
1815 Message Partition Flow --> Message Partition Channel  
1816 MPF --> MPC  
1817 Schema: @mpf --> @mpc  
1818

1819 In 2.2.3:  
1820 MEP Channel Binding -> MEP Transport Channel binding (these channels are lower level)  
1821 MEP Transport Binding -> MEP Transport Protocol binding

1822 **Owner:**  
1823

1824 **Resolution:**  
1825 04/18/2007: Agreed; updates made in WD 20.

## 1826 **CORE-120 Issue (Closed)**

1827 **Source:**  
1828 Kazunori Iwasa <kiwasa@jp.fujitsu.com>  
1829 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00018.html>

1830 **Description:**  
1831 The related work "related to" section in the first page may describe the following specs:  
1832 SOAP1.1, SOAP1.2, WS-Security specs, WS-Reliability1.1, WS-RM CS, and ebMS2.0  
1833 and remove "replaces or supercedes" section.

1834 **Owner:**  
1835

1836 **Resolution:**  
1837 04/18/2007: Agreed; Updated in WD 20.

## 1838 **CORE-121 Issue (Closed)**

1839 **Source:**  
1840 Hamid Ben Malek <HBenMalek@us.fujitsu.com>  
1841 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00021.html>

1842 **Description:**  
1843 Issue 1: On page 77 (lines 3172 to 3179), the documentation mentions only PullRequest and  
1844 Errors within a SignalMessage and does not mention the newly added Receipt signal.  
1845 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1846

1847 Issue 2: On page 78, line 3193, the schema defines the element "ErrorDetail" with a capital letter  
1848 E (which is correct). In the spec, line 2038, the ErrorDetail is written with a lower case e (as  
1849 errorDetail). This should be corrected. [Also @shortDescription is an attribute, not element.]  
1850 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1851

1852 Issue 3: this is similar to issue 2. On line 3196, the schema defines an attribute called  
1853 "RefToMessageInError". This attribute should be written with a lower case r as  
1854 "refToMessageInError" (page 51, line 2035 is using the attribute with a lower case r).  
1855 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1856

1857 Issue 4: On page 41, line 1505, the spec declares the element "AgreementRef" as being  
1858 optional. However the schema (line 3165 does not say it is optional). Schema needs to be  
1859 corrected here.  
1860 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1861

1862 Issue 5: On page 39, line 1393, the example is showing the element service with a type attribute.  
1863 However, the schema (on line 3266) declares the element service as a simple element (does not  
1864 have any attributes). If the spec is correct in this case, then the schema needs to add such an  
1865 attribute to the service element, otherwise remove the "type" attribute from the example.

1866 **04/18/2007: Service should have @type attribute; fixed in WD 21.**

1867

1868 Issue 6: In the schema (page 77, line 3127), it is declared: attributeFormDefault="unqualified".  
1869 This means that an attribute within a local element should not be qualified (local element is any  
1870 element that resides as a child or grandchild of the element <eb:Messaging>). However, in the  
1871 spec (page 39, line 1407) displays an example where the "location" attribute is qualified. The  
1872 same thing goes for the attribute "version" which is being qualified in the example, while the  
1873 schema says that it should not be qualified.

1874 **04/18/2007: Agreed that eb: namespace attributes must be unqualified; fixed in WD 21.**

1875

1876 Issue 7: The spec on page 38, line 1350, says that the SOAP mustUnderstand attribute is  
1877 REQUIRED, but the schema on page 79 (lines 3332-3333) says the attribute is optional. One of  
1878 them should be changed (either the spec or the schema).

1879 **04/18/2007: Agreed that this is a choice; one or the other MUST be present, but**  
1880 **impossible to specify this in schema; fixed with schema notations in WD 21.**

1881

1882 Issue 8: This is just a suggestion. Currently the schema says attributeFormDefault="unqualified"  
1883 (meaning that attributes within local elements should not be qualified). However, I suggest that  
1884 we add a sentence to the spec (at the beginning of the "Packaging" section that says that  
1885 attributes could be qualified or unqualified (that is we accept both forms), and in the schema  
1886 documentation we mention that too. This would ensure that if an implementation is qualifying  
1887 attributes, while another implementation does not, they would still be able to read each other.

1888 **04/18/2007: Same resolution as #6 above.**

1889 **Owner:**

1890

1891 **Resolution:**

1892 Resolved as shown in-line above; changes appear in WD 21.

## 1893 **2.3 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR02**

### 1894 **CORE-122 Issue (Closed)**

1895 **Source:**

1896 Pete

1897 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00019.html>

1898 **Description:**

1899 Need to include references to HTTP 1.1 and SMTP (both normative).

1900 **Owner:**

1901

1902 **Resolution:**

1903 05/16/2007: Agreed; included in WD 23.

### 1904 **CORE-123 Issue (Closed)**

1905 **Source:**

1906 Pete

1907 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00020.html>

1908 **Description:**

1909 Constant URIs for all MEPs and other identifiable features are needed (some are missing, or  
1910 appear as seemingly non-normative example text).

1911 **Owner:**  
1912

1913 **Resolution:**  
1914 05/18/2007: Agreed to add as proposed by Pete (minus duplicates noted by Jacques).  
1915 Absence of @mpc and mpc=".../defaultMPC" is already described as semantically equivalent.  
1916 Changes appear in WD 23.

## 1917 **CORE-124 Issue (Closed)**

1918 **Source:**  
1919 Pete Wenzel, (05/16/2007 TC Call).

1920 **Description:**  
1921 G.2, G.3 are duplicated in the separate Conformance Profiles Adjunct.

1922 **Owner:**  
1923

1924 **Resolution:**  
1925 05/16/2007: Agreed to remove G.2 and G.3, maintain them instead in the Conformance  
1926 Profiles Adjunct. Done in WD 23.

## 1927 **CORE-125 Issue (Closed; Pending Conf Prof Edit)**

1928 **Source:**  
1929 Pete Wenzel, Sun Microsystems <pete.wenzel@sun.com>  
1930 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00011.html>

1931 **Description:**  
1932 Currently only one Role in D.3.3, PMode[1].BusinessInfo.Role.  
1933 Since both parties play a Role, we need to capture them both, perhaps as PMode.Initiator.Role  
1934 and PMode.Responder.Role, or else similarly named parameters under PMode.BusinessInfo.

1935 **Owner:**  
1936

1937 **Resolution:**  
1938 05/16/2007: Agree to add Initiator.Role and Responder.Role to D.3.1, remove from D.3.3.  
1939 Also update in Conformance Profiles Adjunct (template and instances).

## 1940 **CORE-126 Issue (Closed)**

1941 **Source:**  
1942 Pim van der Eijk, OASIS <pim.vandereijk@oasis-open.org>  
1943 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00039.html>

1944 **Description:**  
1945 Line 2875:  
1946 Typo: line has two commas.

1947 **Corrected in WD 23.**

1948 Line 2895-2898:  
1949 "This response is sent back reliably over the response leg of the same SOAP Request-response  
1950 MEP instance that carried the previous message."

1951 This seems to be refer to the specific case of an ebMS Transport Channel Binding of type  
1952 "Sync"?

1953 **Yes; clarify that this applies to underlying protocol response only.**  
1954 **05/18/2007: Agreed with Jacques' recommendation to revise sentence to simply "This**

1955 **response is then sent back reliably." Corrected in WD 23.**

1956 Request and response messages in a Push-and-Push message exchange can also both be sent  
1957 reliably. If the assumption is that sending an asynchronous response message reliably is like  
1958 sending an asynchronous request or one way message reliably and needs no special discussion,  
1959 then it would be useful to state this explicitly at this point.

1960 If RM-SubmitResponse is not used for asynchronous ebMS response messages, then its name is  
1961 too general, something like RM-SubmitSyncResponse would be more accurate.

1962 **The term is defined by WS-Reliability, and applies only to the RM-level messages, not**  
1963 **ebMS MEP-level.**

1964 Line 2908:  
1965 Related to earlier comment. Does this diagram also cover the second leg in a Request-Reply  
1966 MEP with a channel binding Two Way/Push-and-Push and Two Way/Pull-and-Push?

1967 **Agreed; clarify in Figure 10 description that Response of a 2-way push-and-push actually**  
1968 **maps to an RM-Submit (in opposite direction of Request message leg). Corrected in WD**  
1969 **23.**

1970 Line 2966  
1971 "the MSH" -> "the sending MSH"

1972 **Corrected in WD 23.**

1973 Line 2971:  
1974 "generatedand" -> "generated and"

1975 **Corrected in WD 23.**

1976 Line 2982:  
1977 "a failure do deliver must cause" -> "a failure to deliver MUST cause"

1978 **Corrected in WD 23.**

1979 Line 2984:  
1980 "may be notified" -> "MAY be notified"

1981 **Corrected in WD 23.**

1982 Line 3025-3027:  
1983 This will not work in case of multi-hop messaging, where the SOAP fault or HTTP response  
1984 failure is received by an intermediary, which will often not have enough information or no  
1985 channel to propagate this error back to the original ebMS sender.

1986 **Note in WD 23 that this only applies when no intermediaries are present.**

1987 Line 3042:  
1988 "periodic sending of status request ebMS signal (defined in Part 2 of this specification)" ->  
1989 "periodic sending of status request signals (as may be defined in a future Part 2 of this  
1990 specification)" Reason: Part 2 does not yet exist, so some caution is good when referring to it.

1991 **Corrected in WD 23; reviewed all mentions of forthcoming parts.**

1992 Line 3045:  
1993 There is no section on reliability of the Two Way Push-and-Push and Two Way Pull-and-Push. If  
1994 they are covered by section 8.3.1, a sentence stating this could be added at line 3048.

1995 **Partially addressed by resolution to 2908 comment above; also state in 8.3.1 that it**  
1996 **applies to other MEPs. Done in WD 23.**

1997 Similarly, there is no section on the Two-Way Push-and-Pull and Two-Way Pull-and-Pull. If  
1998 these are covered by section 8.3.2, a similar textual addition would be useful.

1999 **Agreed; done in WD 23.**

2000 Line 3062  
2001 "workflow": confusing term perhaps.

2002 **Agree; changed to "message processing flow" in WD 23.**

2003 Line 3115:  
2004 Formatting issue (should not be bullet)  
2005 **Corrected in WD 23.**  
2006 Line 3065, Figure 12, Reliability Ack  
2007 Would this reliability Ack be a standalone message? Some explanation might be useful.  
2008 **8.3 already refers to Appendix E, which clarifies the handling of acks. Additional**  
2009 **clarification added in WD 23.**  
2010 Figure 13/14, second Reliability Ack.  
2011 Idem.  
2012 **As above.**  
2013 Line 3433, "OrderedDelivery: No Restriction".  
2014 Should there be some text here about a restriction among ConversationId and Group  
2015 membership? It seems okay to reuse a group for multiple conversations, but messages that are  
2016 part of a single conversation should not be in multiple groups (or rather concurrently active  
2017 groups: a conversation could start in one group, and continue in later one if that group is  
2018 terminated).  
2019 **Mapping between ebMS sequence and reliability conversation/group is done in**  
2020 **PMode.Reliability.{Start|End}Group.**  
2021 Line 3559-3561:  
2022 "Any pair of sequence lifecycle message (CreateSequence/CreataSequenceResponse,  
2023 CloseSequence/CloseSequenceResponse, TerminateSequence/TerminateSequenceResponse)  
2024 MUST be exchanged over a single HTTP request-response."  
2025 Does this mean that any use of WS-ReliableMessaging (in ebMS3) is tied to the HTTP protocol?  
2026 Can this MUST be relaxed to a SHOULD? Some ebMS end users have and prefer an all-  
2027 asynchronous setup for their messaging (today ebMS2), is this not possible with ebMS3?  
2028 **Relax MUST to SHOULD; refer generically to two-way underlying protocol, rather than**  
2029 **HTTP. Done in WD 23.**  
2030 Line 3458, section B.2  
2031 Should there be some text here about correlation of use of ConversationId and Sequences? It  
2032 seems okay to reuse a sequence for multiple conversations, but messages that are part of a  
2033 single conversation should not be in different sequences (or rather concurrently active  
2034 sequences: a conversation could start in one group, and continue in later one if that group is  
2035 terminated).  
2036 **See 2973. Ability to map ConversationId to Sequence must be supported, but in practice**  
2037 **is optional (P-Mode Policy).**  
2038 Line 3865, figure 15.  
2039 This is an example of a Two-Way MEP, but the PMode.MEP in the figure says  
2040 "200704/oneWay".  
2041 **Corrected in WD 23.**

2042 **Owner:**  
2043

2044 **Resolution:**  
2045 04/25/2007: Decisions as noted in-line above; included in WD 23.

## 2046 **2.4 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR02**

### 2047 **CORE-127 Issue (Assigned)**

2048 **Source:**  
2049 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>

2050 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00029.html>

2051 **Description:**

2052 Stated schema location does not resolve.

2053 **Owner:**

2054 Pete

2055 **Resolution:**

2056 Link on "docs" site to be created when next CD of spec is uploaded.

2057 **CORE-128 Issue (Closed)**

2058 **Source:**

2059 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>

2060 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00033.html>

2061 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00031.html>

2062 **Description:**

2063 Case of "Timestamp" and "ConversationId" element names in schema are incorrect.

2064 Specification text and examples are correct.

2065 **Owner:**

2066

2067 **Resolution:**

2068 05/23/2007: Agreed that these are typographic errors that should be corrected in the schema.

2069 Schema corrected in WD 23.

2070 **CORE-129 Issue (Deferred)**

2071 **Source:**

2072 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>

2073 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200705/msg00033.html>

2074 **Description:**

2075 Unnecessary xsd:sequence groups in schema forces ordering of elements.

2076 **Owner:**

2077

2078 **Resolution:**

2079 05/23/2007: Agreed to defer decision.

2080 **CORE-130 Issue (Closed)**

2081 **Source:**

2082 Jacques Durand, 05/23/2007 TC Call

2083 **Description:**

2084 Replace textual reference to future WS-I profiles.

2085 Current:

2086 "Compliance of ebMS 3 with future WS-I profiles - in particular BP 1.2, BP 2.0 and RSP profiles  
2087 - will be an objective in subsequent releases, as it is expected that these profiles will be natively  
2088 supported by most SOAP platforms."

2089 Proposed:

2090 "Compliance of ebMS 3 implementations with the latest version of WS-I profiles - once approved  
2091 as final material by the organization - will be addressed in the definition of conformance profiles  
2092 that are adjunct to this specification (see Appendix G)."

2093 **Owner:**

2094 **Resolution:**

2095 05/23/2007: Approved proposed wording. Included in WD 24.

2096 **CORE-131 Issue (Pending Review)**

2097 **Source:**

2098 Pim van der Eijk, OASIS <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

2099 <http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200706/msg00000.html>

2100 **Description:**

2101 (Various editorial comments.)

2102 **Owner:**

2103 **Resolution:**

2104 06/22/2007, Included in WD 25.

2105

## APPENDIX A. Revision History

<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>What</b>
WD 01	22 Aug 2006	Pete Wenzel	Initial draft. Recorded resolutions reached through 26 July 2006 meeting. Noted which appear in WD 14.
WD 02	23 Aug 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-45 from 23 Aug 2006 meeting.
WD 03	30 Aug 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-55 from 30 Aug 2006 meeting.
WD 04	06 Sep 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-67 from 06 Sep 2006 meeting.
WD 05	13 Sep 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-77 from 13 Sep 2006 meeting.
WD 06	20 Sep 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-82 from 20 Sep 2006 meeting.
WD 07	03 Oct 2006	Pete Wenzel	Resolutions from 27 Sep 2006 meeting, and closure of issues whose resolutions are included in Core Spec WD 15.
WD 08	05 Dec 2006	Pete Wenzel	Updated status and resolutions, as of 29 Nov 2006 meeting. Fixed hyperlinks in Table of Contents.
WD 09	13 Dec 2006	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 06 Dec 2006 meeting.
WD 10	14 Dec 2006	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 13 Dec 2006 meeting and Core Spec WD 16.
WD 11	03 Jan 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 03 Jan 2007 meeting, and proposals posted in last month.
WD 12	07 Feb 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 07 Feb 2007 meeting.
WD 13	07 Mar 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 28 Feb 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 17.
WD 14	19 Mar 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 14 Mar 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 18. Divided into PR01 and Post-PR01 sections, in anticipation of PR02.
WD 15	27 Mar 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 21 Mar 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 19.
WD 16	18 Apr 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 11 Apr 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 20.

<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>What</b>
WD 17	24 Apr 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 18 Apr 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 21 & 22.
WD 18	22 May 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 18 May 2007 meeting, close of Public Review 02, further comments, and Core Spec WD 23.
WD 19	23 May 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 23 May 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 24.

2107

2108

---

## **APPENDIX B. Contributors**

2109

2110

## APPENDIX C. Notices

2111 OASIS takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that  
2112 might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or  
2113 the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it  
2114 represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on OASIS's procedures with  
2115 respect to rights in OASIS specifications can be found at the OASIS website. Copies of claims of rights  
2116 made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an  
2117 attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by  
2118 implementors or users of this specification, can be obtained from the OASIS Executive Director.

2119 OASIS invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications,  
2120 or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to implement this  
2121 specification. Please address the information to the OASIS Executive Director.

2122 **Copyright © OASIS Open 2006. All Rights Reserved.**

2123 This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that  
2124 comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published  
2125 and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright  
2126 notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document  
2127 itself does not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to OASIS,  
2128 except as needed for the purpose of developing OASIS specifications, in which case the procedures for  
2129 copyrights defined in the OASIS Intellectual Property Rights document must be followed, or as required  
2130 to translate it into languages other than English.

2131 The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by OASIS or its successors  
2132 or assigns.

2133 This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and OASIS  
2134 DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY  
2135 WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS  
2136 OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR  
2137 PURPOSE.

2138