Comment Resolution from Member Review of
ArtifactIdentificationRequirements-v1.0-wd-15
Month of July 2005

Sorted by Disposition

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
1	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.1, line 5, Artifact Identifier: does not conform to Section 3.2 "Artifact Type" or Section 4 "Required Metadata for Artifacts". Suggested Artifact Identifiers (depending on response to p. 1, line 2):ArtifactIdentification-v1.0-spec-wd-15 ArtifactIdentificationRequirements-v1.0-req-wd-15 ArtificateIdentification-v1.0-guidelines-wd-15	Document name has changed; should be consistent now.	Accept
2	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.10, lines 264-271, Artifact Type: Appendix C lists several other types, and these should be included here. A more complete list, with standard abbreviations, is better than a minimal list in this case. Suggested additions: o Conformance Tests - "tests" [or "ct"] o Interoperability - "interop" o Whitepaper - "wp" o Test Assertions - "tests" [or "ta"]	Added with some variations.	Accept
3	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.12, lines 329 and 343-344: "artifactName" and "descriptiveName" both talk about using a "descriptive name". "artifactName" itself is not listed in Section 5. Suggestion: Change lines 328-329 as follows: Each artifact MUST contain the ArtifactIdentifier consisting of the following components expanded below: artifactName:[tc]=[product]-[productVersion]-[artifactType]-[stage]-[descriptiveName]-[revision]	Editing appears to have addressed this.	Accept
4	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.13, lines 369-371, Common conventions: mention explicitly that underscores MUST NOT be used with reason that they are hard to see in browser links. Suggestion: Change line 369 to say: "Within components, spaces and underscores MUST NOT be used."	Changed to explicitly permit listed characters.	Accept
5	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.13, line 390, ArtifactIdentifer: Why is "tcShortName" not part of the ArtifactIdentifier? This does not agree with p. 12, line 332.	Limited metadata in file name; OASIS TC Admin told us that "product" is the important component for IPR policy. Correct the referred line, added explanatory text to explain why not.	Accept
6	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.14, line 395, DescriptiveName: says "MUST be included if no other metadata is included in the ArtifactName", yet earlier sections said that other components such as "product", "version", etc. MUST be included in the Artifact Name." Suggestion: Remove "if not other metadata is included in the ArtifactName."	This is completely reworded.	Accept
7	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.14, line 401: should a URN contain a value for "Form"? I can understand a URL, since a physical document in some specific format will be located there, but a URN is an identifier and not a pointer to a specific document with a specific format.	URN should not have "form"; accept	Accept
8	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.15, line 449: typo: "desriptiveName" should be "descriptiveName" in two places.	Fixed.	Accept

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
9	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.16, lines 480-485: is "document-id" the same as "descriptiveName"?	Clarify that this is RFC 3121 notation; tie in with descriptiveName	Accept
10	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.16, lines 480 and 482: these two variations differ only in that the first has "tc:[tc-id]" as the prefix, while the other has "specification:[specification-id]" as the prefix. It is hard to believe that only tc-id is needed in one place, and only "specification-id" in another. Please justify. Line 508 says "Form ONE (with the TC identified with the Product) should be deprecated." This suggests that perhaps "specification:[specification-id]" was mistakenly omitted from Form One.	This is historical; RFC 3121 says what is repeated here. Accept as editorial suggestion; improved reference to RFC 3121.	Accept
11	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.17, line 512: RFC 3122 is titled "Extensions to IPv6 Neighbor Discovery", which is probably not an OASIS naming RFC. Also, Normative References does not include either [RFC 3121] or [RFC 3122] (or whatever the second should be).	Correct: 3120 is the intended informative reference to Namespace for XML.org. RFC 3121 is in the Normative references; 3122 (really 3120) is not relevant.	Accept
12	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.18, line 578: append "other" to the specified path.	Append :[other].	Accept
13	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.19, line 585: [version] should specify whether "v2.0" or "2.0", etc. is to be used for [version] here. I recommend "2.0" form.	Stated more clearly and consistently.	Accept
14	Anderson	12-Jul	Structural change	metadata items and either explicit or implies formats are described in three places: 3.2 Name Component Definitions (says "definitions are in the order used as name components"), 4. Required Metadata for Artifacts, and 5.3 "Constructing Specific Artifact Identifiers. Distinction between "artifactName" and "ArtifactIdentifier" is not clear. Why two things? o Do not distinguish between the artifact identifier and artifact name, and use one name. Both should match the filename under which the artifact is stored, except that the file name should have -[language]-[format] appended. Section 5.3 suggests that perhaps the file name also differs in having the [tcShortName}- prefixed. o Combine Sections 4 and 5.3. Remove "definitions are in the order used as name components" from the introduction to section 3.2. o Have a chart like Appendix C be the normative form, with the textual descriptions as explanation of the chart. The chart can indicate which components are required for different types of identifiers (if there	Restructuring and comments are well-taken. Many structural changes. All of these have been addressed, except that Appendix C was not made normative.	Accept
15	Jesperson	28-Jul	Section 4 Normative	Do it	Done.	Accept
16	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	220. Definition of an Artifact. Is a URN or Namespace URI considered to be an artifact? They aren't mentioned in the definition	No. Re-review. URN/Namespace URIs are in here because of the relationship to the metadata.	Accept
17	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	227-229 . What is the purpose of the Artifact Name definition? I could not see where it is used, and the document contains a large number of "name" concepts (Artifact Identifier, Artifact Name, Filename, Structured Name, Product, Descriptive Name) so it would be helpful to remove one.	Substantial rewrite should make this more clear. Terminology simplified.	Accept

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
18	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	271. Many Web services specifications include WSDL files. Could we have an artifact type for them?	Yes. Done.	Accept
19	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	328-329. Line 328 talks about ArtifactIdentifier, but 329 contains the words artifactName: [descriptive name], which looks wrong to me. I would have expected it to say artifactIdentifier: [as defined in section 5]	Corrected. Substantial rewrite should make this more clear.	Accept
20	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	336. Does productVersion always include the leading letter v (i.e. v1.0), or never include it, or is it optional? The syntax given at 336 and 643 doesn't seem to permit the v, yet the examples in 686 include a v.	Not included. Examples fixed.	Accept
22	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	519. Please make it clear that .html is not required on a Namespace URL (even though it is required to point at a RDDL document). Also to help people construct their schema location and import statements, we should have a convention that allows you easily to deduce the location from the URI. At the moment some specs use the URL of the schema as the URI for the namespace. Presumably we can no longer doing this if the Namespace URI has to be the URL for the RDDL document (or have I misunderstood this?) So how about saying that the pure URI (with no suffix) points at the RDDL, and the URI with .xsd or .wsdl suffix points at the actual schema/wsdl document	Made clear. Namespace section rewritten; RDDL mandate removed.	Accept
23	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	674. Appendix C is hard to read on the screen as it is rotated through 90 degrees. Does it have to be like this?	I've rotated it properly for viewing in the updated Acrobat file. Various versions of Word treat such wide tables differently.	Accept
24	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	686. The examples talk about Part, but this isn't mentioned elsewhere in the document.	Removed references to Part except to point out where an OASIS TC has structured their documents in that manner.	Accept

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
25	Moberg	27-Jul	RDDL as only target is a problem	Basically I objected to the _requirement_ that RDDL be at the end of a URL. I would prefer to see either XSD or RDDL at the end of URL, and since the RDDL approach has little established base, use a parameter or something similar as a qualifier to get a RDDL that is associated with a namespace URL. (Possibly something like http://mynamespacedomain.topleveldomain/myspecification?rddl (parameter syntax is probably off, no time to check) The reason for allowing schemas as being at the URL is that this is an established practice (even if nonuniveral) and people expect to GET something browseable by entering the namespace URL.	Allow schema as target; RDDL requirement removed.	Accept
26	Orosz	27-Jul	Detail	lines 9 and 10. The scheme component is missing from the URLs. Is it http or something else?	http scheme inserted.	Accept
27	Orosz	27-Jul	Detail	line 512. RFC 3122 is titled "Extensions to IPv6 Neighbor Discovery for Inverse Discovery Specification." This must be a typographical error.	Correct: 3120 is the intended informative reference to Namespace for XML.org. RFC 3121 is in the Normative references; 3122 (really 3120) is not relevant.	Accept
28	Pilz	12-Jul	Detail	Lines 328-329 of draft 15 state: Each artifact MUST contain the ArtifactIdentifier as described in these guidelines: artifactName: [descriptive name] Why does the first line say "ArtifactIdentifier" and then call out the label of the metadata as "artifactName"? I'm not sure if this data is supposed to be a descriptive name (e.g. "Web Service Reliable Messaging Protocol Core Specification") or an identifier (e.g. "ws-reliablemessaging-v1.0-spec-wd-01.pdf"). Is there a typo here?	Substantial rewrite should make this more clear. Terminology simplified.	Accept
29	Pilz	12-Jul	RDDL target issues	Section 6.1 of draft 15 outlines the use of namespace declarations that use a URL that resolves to a RDDL document. Lines 521-522 state: All such OASIS-defined http scheme namespaces MUST resolve to an OASIS server, in particular oasis-open.org. I think we need to work out some of the details on where this RDDL document should live in HTTP space. For example I wouldn't want a reference that looked like: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg_abbrev=ws-rx&ns=ws rm I *would* like a reference that looked like: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ws-rx/wsreliablemessaging-01-protocol.html In other words, I think the RDDL documents that serve as the resolution points for XML namespace declarations should be treated as near-permanent (like the charter of a TC) and avoid the use of parameters etc. Obviously this is going to require co-ordination with the people that run the OASIS website. The other issue is that there needs to be more detail about which of the metadata components should be used in the construction of this URL. I winged it above and used [product] [schemaVersion] [artifactType	Allow schema as target; RDDL requirement removed.	Accept

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
30	Robinson	19-Jul	Be consistently an example	1. If the AIR specification document was treated as an artifact that was itself consistent with the proposed artifact identification requirements, for example as enumerated in section 5.5.4. [452, 453]: "Artifacts whose form is Adobe PDF, Microsoft Word, or OpenOffice MUST contain the Required Metadata values on their cover page as defined in the OASIS-supplied templates." This would then provide a concrete example of required metadata. As it is, the examples in Appendix C do not relate back to the normative descriptions in section 4. For example, Appendix C describes the metadata identifier "Owner" whereas section 4 describes a metadata element "tcShortName" [line 332]	We used the new template; the metadata is present on the logical "title page". OASIS staff will determine how metadata is expressed if it's not described in this document. Generally the direction is document properties/metadata. Terminology in Appendix C needs to be updated for consistency.	Accept
31	Robinson	19-Jul	RDDL as only target is a problem	line 519: "Each namespace defined as a URL MUST resolve to a RDDL document." Why have such a normative constraint? MAY would be OK, but it should also be acceptable for a namespace URI to resolve directly to an XML schema document, for example. I assume there is some fairly standard form of a RDDL document envisioned - an example RDDL would be helpful.	Allow schema as target; RDDL requirement removed.	Accept
32	Robinson	19-Jul	wsdl ArtifactType	An ArtifactType of "wsdl" would be useful	Done.	Accept
33	Wachob	18-Jul	Don't use "URL"	1) The term "URL" is used throughout the document. Is this intended to mean HTTP URI or URI in general? I don't think the term "URL" should be used at all - either "HTTP URI" or "URI" should be used.	Done.	Accept
34	Wachob	18-Jul	Section 6 confusing	2) I find section 6 confusing - is it just defining a URN namespace? I was surprised to see this section here. Perhaps more of a roadmap for the document or a refactoring of sections 5,6, and 7 would help. It seems like sections 6 and 7 should be children of section 5 - that is, they seem to be peers of section 5.4 (filenames). We have, in essence 3 ways to identify/name documents: filenames, HTTP URIs, and URNs. Each form of identifier is based on required metadata. Expressing this in section 5 would be helpful.	Refactoring and structural changes should improve this.	Accept
35	Walsh	23-Jun	Need Requirements	This document isn't a "requirements" document in the sense that engineers usually use that word. It is a "mandate" document or a "guidelines" document. Are the actual requirements articulated anywhere? I can think of a few: - URIs for OASIS artifacts must be stable - URIs for OASIS artifacts must be persistent - URIs for OASIS artifacts should be predictable but I wonder if the TAB had others in mind as well.	You're right; title is changed, and these are inserted as goals in the introduction.	Accept
37	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 5.5.1 Who creates the URIs for default product web pages?	OASIS Staff.	Accept
38	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 5.5.1, lines 434-437 and 441-443 These sets of nearly adjacent lines appear redundant. Suggest the editor reword things a bit here.	Rewritten for clarity.	Accept
39	Walsh	15-Jul	Enforce machine readable metadata via XHTML	Second, require that every TC provide all of this data in a machine readable form. I propose that the most straightforward way to do this is to require that the normative version of each specification be expressed in XHTML and to require that the "title page" of that XHTML document contain this metadata in a form that is both visible to the reader and can be extracted by a tool.	Partial accept - meta tags in XHTML/HTML are still required; this is a template issue. The TC Process requires "PDF and HTML"; proposed changes to the TC Process aren't part of this document.	Accept
40	Walsh	15-Jul	Global	Change URL to URI.	Done.	Accept
41	Wenzel + Maler	24-Jun	Name of Document	"OASIS Artifact Standard Identification Scheme"	Accept, with added "for Metadata". Avoids the OASIS acronym, and gives OASISfM ("oasis-foom"?).	Accept

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
47	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	395 "A DescriptiveName must be included if no other metadata in included in the ArtifactName". This seems to contradict 384 which says that the format for ArtifactIdentifier is a structured name. If the intention is to allow an ArtifactIdentifier to be either a Descriptive Name OR a Structured Name (as implied by non-normative appendix B), then you should say this explicitly at the start of 5.3 and not introduce the idea in the middle of the definition of a structured name.	This should be more clear after restucturing and rewriting.	Accept
50	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	421. "The filename MUST be descriptive as to the document title". You don't define the term 'Document Title'. Can we just delete this sentence?	Deleted.	Accept
51	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	455/463. These sentences would seem to completely replace 5.4.1. Also if you permit ArtifactIdentifiers for files to contain Form then these sentences should say "including the literal period and Form" rather than "followed by the literal period and form".	Rewritten for clarity.	Accept
52	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	551. In order to avoid long and unwieldy URIs, the WSN and WSRF TCs use the Technical Committee tree to contain their Namespace URIs and the corresponding XML Schema and WSDL artifacts. We would wish to continue doing this - and in any case some of these artefacts span multiple products. It's not clear from the document whether this would be permitted or not (the actual specs that own the artefacts live in the [product] tree).	Wording added to state that namespace URIs SHOULD be under product; per RFC 2119, this means "do it unless you have a good reason not to and you've thought about it." [paraphrase]	Accept
54	Pilz	12-Jul	Detail	Lines 343-344 state: Each artifact MUST contain an identifier defined by the TC that is a DescriptiveName for the artifact.descriptiveName:[tcDefinedDescriptiveName] Why should we have to specify a descriptive name if "artifactName" were already a descriptive name?	Terminology corrected.	Accept
60	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Sections 5.5.3-5.5.6 I think there's too much detail here. Given the variety of possible ancillary artifacts, I doubt that there's much value in trying to pin down a few possibilities.	Simplified and restructured.	Accept
63	Anderson	12-Jul	Detail	p.1, line 2: Title: this is not a specification of "Requirements", but an actual specification or guidelines. Suggested title: "Artifact Identification 1.0"	But that would make it "AI"! Title has changed to eliminate "requirements".	Accept
64	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	374. Why has the use of underbar been prohibited in a product name? We use it today in WSN, e.g. ws_base_notification. The trouble with mixed case is that we would end up with three consecutive upper case letters, e.g. WSBaseNotification which doesn't look good, or we have to artificially lower the case of the B, i.e. WSbaseNotification, which again looks odd. I understand there might be a concern about mixing hyphen and underbar in an identifier, but I think that looks ok: ws_base_notification-1.3-spec-pr-01	Gone back and forth. Underscores used in URI components are not generally distinguishable from spaces (legal in URIs). Current draft 18 permits.	Accept
62	Walsh	15-Jul	XHTML only	Mandate XHTML with metadata as only normative form	New guidelines will require XHTML. Current mandate is "html and Acrobat."	Accept in part
65	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 2, lines 212-214 I suggest that it is better to leave existing identifiers as the unique identifiers for the relevant artifacts. Creating aliases can't do anything but cause confusion.	Parallel tree; IT issue. Inbound links aren't the issue, maintaining "old" URIs is. This is up to OASIS IT	Accept in part

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
58	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 3.2, lines 315 and 316 I'll reiterate what I said above: having more than one normative format is unacceptable. That said, I think requiring TCs to produce specific, proprietary non-normative formats is a mistake. I suggested that the requirement be that the TC produce the document in a normative format with a note that they are encouraged to produce such other, non-normative alternatives as they think would be beneficial.	The two required formats (listed as HTML and PDF) are in the TC Process. I would not object to XHTML being the single required format, with PDF as a required additional. But what if the PDF isn't normative? Some developers will work from the PDF. Perhaps the PDF could be automatically created by the acrobat web capture tool? Logically there is one prose specification with two (actually three) realizations: editable form, generated PDF, generated HTML. The generated forms should have the same content (quality issue). Besides, this document can't address the normative form issue. Coming mandate is for XHTML, not HTML.	Accept in part.
68	Anderson	12-Jul	Omission	Omission: Conventions for titles of documents. Suggestion: o All words except prepositions and internal articles capitalized. o First line of title should be consistent with "product" plus "artifact A38type" plus "descriptive name" followed by ProductVersion with no preceding "v" or "V" or "Version". Example: XACML Profile for Role Based Access Control 2.0 o Second line of title should be non-abbreviated [Stage] [Revision] "," [Date] where [Date] is in DD MMMM YYYY format: Example: Working Draft 15, 30 June 2005	This is a template issue. Forwarded to Mary McRae, as TC Adminstrator lead on templates.	Forward
56	Walsh	15-Jul	Approach to Metadata fundamentally wrong	See 20050715 Walsh.pdf	Address amount of metadata; last component of URI should be the focus, rather than "file name".	Further Discussion
21	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	393. This line says that Stage may be omitted for schemas, but MUST be included for all other types. Since the list of types is not exhaustive this seems a bit harsh (for example the exemption for schemas should apply also to WSDL). Could we replace this with a list of types for which the Stage MUST be included (Catalog, Conformance Criteria, Errata, Guidelines, Profile, Requirements, Prose Specification)?	Moved this direction	Partial accept
36	Walsh	15-Jul	Add metadata	8. An Editor (or Editors) Name (or Names) 9. A Date 10. A Copyright 11. Some sort of IPR statement 12. Links to any appropriate feedback URIs or email addresses	Many of these added (#11 and #12 not). #11 is included in the template, #12 is in the template. The document specifies only minimal metadata, and allows for evolution.	Partial Accept
42	Breininger	20-Jul	Avoid packing filenames with too much info	I am concerned about the approach taken to pack the file name with a great amount of detail, which makes for long file names and URI/URLs. I understand the desire to make it easy to identify an artifact and information about it from the file name, but there is a point at which packing too much information into the file name makes it difficult to construct and to use. If something is complex to use chances are it will not be used, or will be used incorrectly, further complicating the process of identifying and locating artifacts.	Moved this direction; TC-defined names are an alternative. Disambiguation is the goal, not stuffing all metadata in the name.	Partial Accept

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
43	Breininger	20-Jul	Keep file names simple and easy to use without complexities or cryptic abbres	Metadata is used to provide information about an artifact. Metadata can be attached to the artifact itself (MS Properties, XHTML, etc.) and/or it can be used and accessed from a registry database. This provides the capability to provide all kinds of information related to an artifact (dates, versions, revisions, topics, groups, title, etc. etc.) and provides a capability as well for discovering and locating an artifact from a variety of discovery points (titles, dates, authors, subjects, descriptions, etc.). Makes sense to use metadata for describing and identifying all the information about an artifact, and keep the file names themselves simple and easy to use and understand, without complex structure or cryptic abbreviations in the naming conventions.	Consider. Idea is to put enough metadata into final component of URIs to disambiguate products of different TCs. Simple and easy to use and understand is a goal, but don't know which abbreviations are cryptic. Is this in the eye of the beholder? Current version allows TC-defined names	Partial Accept
45	Maler	24-Jun	General	"Publication Rules" has worked well for W3C; at least, that's what I think they call them... Since this is meta-stuff -- it's about the business of OASIS more than about the business of creating standards -- it's nice to keep it a little different. If you want to reflect that there are (I assume) some SHOULDs along with the MUSTs, you can call it something like "OASIS Artifact Rules and Guidelines"	Partial accept - getting a bit closer to this.	Partial Accept
48	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	401. "A value of Form SHALL be used only for files, URLs, URNs.." Are there any other kinds of artifact (if not, this sentence would seem to be redundant)? Also it isn't clear whether Form is required for these kinds of artifact or not. I would strongly oppose having to put .html onto a Namespace URL. If it is a prose document that exists in multiple formats (.pdf and .doc for example) are these considered to be distinct artifacts - which would imply that their identifiers contain Form - or are they different renderings of the same artifact - in which case they would have presumably have an identifier without a Form	Partially done. Still an issue in document.	Partial Accept
49	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	414. Why is revision required for a filename but not for an ArtifactIdentifier? I assumed that the reason for omitting it from the ArtifactIdentifier is that you don't want to have to include it on an OASIS standard - but then why require it for the filename? Also why is language not allowed in a filename? It would simplify things if 5.4.1 just said that for a Spec or Prose document the Filename MUST be identical to the ArtifactIdentifier (with a Form if not already included)	Revision is omitted for OASIS Standard; language is optional in filename. Adopted suggested wording for Filename and ArtifactIdentifer (with the expanded def of ArtifactIdentifier).	Partial Accept
53	Orosz	27-Jul	General	First some general comments. I found the document overly complex and somewhat difficult to read. It appears to have far-reaching consequences for all future OASIS TC work. As such, I believe it needs at a minimum, more concrete examples. I think a set of concrete examples based on a fictitious OASIS TC and standard would be very useful, and aid in understanding how these requirements would apply to a specific OASIS TC and standard.	Structure was more complex than it needed to be. The clearer separation of the metadata and exposition of metadata addresses this issue. Further examples will be produced by OASIS staff and reviewed as part of turning these recommendations into policy.	Partial Accept
69	Robinson	19-Jul	Template useful	2. How and where must this required metadata appear on the cover page of a spec? A candidate updated spec template would be useful.	This is a template issue. Forwarded to Mary McRae, as TC Adminstrator lead on templates.	Partial Accept. Updated document templates already guided by this document.
55	Robinson	19-Jul	form required in XHTML, SGML, XML filetypes	Sections 5.5.2 and 5.5.3: XHTML and SGML/XML filetypes are the only filetypes for which there is no mandatory requirement stated for the filename itself to include a "form", although per section 5.3 (line 401) a "form" must be included in the artifact identifier in the metadata within the artifact. Is this by design or is there an assumption that filenames for these types should include an appropriate "form" as do other filetypes?	Reworded considerably; form is expected (and I hope it says so).	Recirculate.

ID	Source	Date	Short Form	Comment	Recommendation	Disposition
44	Kramer	7-Jul	End of life	Should document naming (persistent URLs) allow for "end of life"? Rather than withdrawing a document (http error) the URL might instead point at a click through page which 1) indicates document status and 2) links to replacement if any. There would be value in standardizing such a place holder page.	Forwarded to Staff; TAB working on related area.	Reject
46	Mniblett	14-Jul	Detail	336 (and 643). Why is the period and minor value optional? All examples I have seen include the minor value even if it is zero, e.g. 1.0. It would make things more consistent if they were mandatory.	See no compelling reason to require. Format is still parsable.	Reject
57	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 3.2, lines 269 and 271 Don't abbreviate. There's no significant savings in using "req" instead of "requirements" or "spec" instead of "specification" and the abbreviated forms can only cause confusion for non-native English speakers.	This makes the URI component(s) MUCH longer, with little value added. We've tried to use common abbrs.	Reject
59	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 5.5.3 Structured comments are evil. Just say no.	They are, unless you can't insert the information otherwise. Proposed XHTML as the coming HTML-like format, which addresses this--some formats don't allow for useful metadata.	Reject
67	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 5.2, lines 373 and 374 This requirement is actively hostile to TCs that conduct business in languages that don't use the ECMA-6 character set. That seems to be in direct conflict with the TC Process document that allows TCs to nominate the language in which they will conduct business. If a TC does it's business in Ethiopic, it should be allowed to publish Ethiopic document identifiers. How these are mapped to filenames on the OASIS servers is not the TCs problem. (In fact, RFC 3987 answers this question)	We have not advanced to RFC 3987 yet…future direction. Nothing precludes a TC using a non-ECMA-6 character set for additional artifact names/aliases, but the ECMA-6 are required. Reject as stated.	Reject
61	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 6.3 Is this really valuable? Most of the test releases that I've produced have used the final identifier or something very similar to it for namespace names and such. That's what helps users test the releases. Having this foreign URN-based approach seems bound to confuse users.	The proposal was solicited by and discussed with uddi-spec and wsrp; this is what they're comfortable with. TCs may manage their subspaces as desired.	Reject-workaround
66	Walsh	15-Jul	Detail	Section 3.2 I don't see any guidelines for the publication of beta or other public test releases.	Covered as WD, or TC can create alternate (TCdefinedNames).	Reject-workaround