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2.2 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR01
1 Introduction

This document catalogues issues for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services (ebMS) Version 3.0, 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.

Each issue includes the following information:

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

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

2.1 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR01

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

**CORE-1 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

**Owner:**
Unassigned

**Description:**
The response example message in 5.3.1 has the collaborationInfo in the wrong place (line 1520-1524)

**Resolution:**

**CORE-2 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

**Description:**
The mustunderstand and version on the message element are in the same namespace according to the xsd but in different ones according to the docs

**Owner:**
Hamid

**Resolution:**
07/12/2006, examples incorrect.
Possibly addressed by new schema in WD 17.

**CORE-3 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

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

**Owner:**
Hamid

**Resolution:**
07/12/2006, XSD is missing partinfo.
New schema in WD 17.
CORE-4 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

Description:
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 attribute is not in the docs (PartyId is not an xmltype)

Owner:
Hamid

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

CORE-5 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

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

Owner:
Hamid

Resolution:
07/12/2006, XSD needs realignment.

CORE-6 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

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

Owner:
Hamid

Resolution:
07/12/2006, XSD needs realignment

CORE-7 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>

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

Resolution:
CORE-8 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Yangsun Park, KorBIT <ysplays@postech.ac.kr>

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>

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
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>

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
pull message from same MPF queue.

Owner:
Jacques/Hamid (draft text already exists).

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

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

**CORE-11 Issue (Closed)**

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

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

Resolution:
07/12/2006, included in WD 14.

**CORE-12 Issue (Closed)**

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

Description:
Line 290 Change:
"/x:MyHeader/x:SomeProperty/@value1"
To
"/x:MyHeader/x:SomeProperty/@attribute1"

Resolution:

**CORE-13 Issue (Closed)**

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

Description:
Line 294:
(The URL doesn't resolve to an actual XSD at the doc.oasis-open site though).

Resolution:
CORE-14 Issue (Closed)

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

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

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

CORE-15 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Resolution:
07/12/2006, Having both types of message units in a single message is not precluded by the schema & Core. However, such cases are out of Core's scope. Possibly state this explicitly; look for and remove any other occurrences that imply only one or the other may be present. Conformance issue: Do implementations need to support this or not? Need to be more explicit? Solution: State in core that sensible combinations/bundling MAY be done; conformance profile (in advance of Part 2, Advanced Features) would specify explicitly.

[Updates to Messaging Model in WD 14 may address this; are they complete?]
Addressed by Bundling Options proposal from Jacques & Hamid. Included in WD 15.

CORE-16 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Pete

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

Fixed in WD 15, Section 2.1.3.

CORE-17 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description:

Line 342: "receive and process error messages associated"

should this be:

"receive and process Signal Messages associated"?

Owner:
Pete

Resolution:

07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14, but also strike "associated with previously sent messages"; not accurate for PullRequest signal? Further resolved in WD 15.

CORE-18 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:

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

Resolution:


CORE-19 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:

Line 382-383: Formatting (no new paragraph)

Resolution:


CORE-20 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:

Line 364: Section 2.2

Resolution:

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

CORE-21 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:

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

CORE-22 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Line 495, Message Pulling: It looks like this mechanism can be used to select a particular mailbox. Could this be generalized to a mechanism where the Initiator wants to retrieve a response to a particular message? The Responder could have a database of RefToMessageId values of messages waiting to be pulled. The requested message may not be the first in the queue.

Could the Initiator provide additional filtering information, e.g. only retrieve message less than 1 MB in size? This would increase the value for SMEs that have limited bandwidth connections.
Or should the Initiator/Responder negotiate policies about which message to put in which Message Partition based on criteria like size?

Is there only one message being pulled for each PullRequest / MPF?

Owner:
Hamid (for schema changes)

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

CORE-23 Issue (Closed)

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

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

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

CORE-24 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Resolution:
07/19/2006, No action needed in specification; provide details in implementation notes. (Access
control to MPF is based on data other than PartyId.)

**CORE-25 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

**Description:**
Line 533 and 548: While it is an non-normative example, it may be clearer to change these to something like:

"<eb:MessageId>UUID-4@receiver.com</eb:MessageId>"
"<eb:MessageId>UUID-5@sender.com</eb:MessageId>
<eb:RefToMessageId>UUID-4@receiver.com</eb:RefToMessageId>"

**Resolution:**

**CORE-26 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Owner:**
Pete

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

Fixed in WD 15, Section 3.4.1.

**CORE-27 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Owner:**
Ian (to request clarification)

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

11/29/2006, Related to CORE-22. This functionality is left to implementation. Out of scope of
CORE-28 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Line 786:
"the the ebXML Application." -> "the ebXML Application."

Resolution:

CORE-29 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Line 887:
"Because either packaging option can be used, implementations MUST support non-multipart messages."  
Should this be:
"Because either packaging option can be used, implementations MUST support both multipart and non-multipart messages." ?

Resolution:

CORE-30 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Line 901:
"parts. containing additional" -> "parts containing additional"

Resolution:

CORE-31 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Resolution:
CORE-32 Issue (Closed)
Source: Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description: Line 918: "Package contain a type" -> "Package contains a type"

CORE-33 Issue (Closed)
Source: Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description: Line 965: "Namespace declaration" -> "A namespace declaration"

CORE-34 Issue (Closed)
Source: Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description: Line 1030: "the namespace for" -> "the namespace prefix for"

CORE-35 Issue (Closed)
Source: Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description: Line 1079: "there MUST NOT be additional Payload Containers."
Does this mean the ebMS 3.0 specification precludes composition with other SOAP protocols
that want to attach data? (Somewhat theoretical question, admittedly).
Resolution: 07/19/2006, Agree. State that there SHOULD NOT be additional attachments, but if there are
any, they are outside the scope of MSH processing. MSH MUST NOT process data that is not
referenced by PayloadInfo. Fixed in WD 14.

CORE-36 Issue (Deferred)
Source: Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description: Line 1119 and 1148: "Both eb:UserMessage element and eb:SignalMessage element MAY"
Does this mean
"Both a eb:UserMessage element and a eb:SignalMessage element MAY" or
"Both eb:UserMessage elements and eb:SignalMessage elements MAY"?
If the spec allowed multiple eb:UserMessages, it could easily support batch/unbatch operations.

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

CORE-37 Issue (Closed)
Source:
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description:
Line 1159 and 1165: Not sure why "(no change beside renaming)" is there.
Resolution:

CORE-38 Issue (Closed)
Source:
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description:
Line 1192: "cid:foo", note that "foo" has to be a MIME content ID, i.e. "foo@example.com".
Resolution:
07/19/2006, Agree to replace with well-formed CID. Fixed in WD 14.

CORE-39 Issue (Closed)
Source:
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description:
Line 1225: this allows for payloads not in the message, but line 1386 doesn't.
Resolution:
07/19/2006, Agree Line 1385 needs updating – payload may be external. Fixed in WD 14.

CORE-40 Issue (Closed)
Source:
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>
Description:
Line 1230: Why is the element "timestamp" in lower case? eb:Timestamp would be more consistent?
Resolution:
**CORE-41 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

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

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

**CORE-42 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

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

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

**CORE-43 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Resolution:**

**CORE-44 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Owner:**
Ian

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

12/21/2006 email from Pete at

01/03/2007: Agreed to reference the above spec. Need exact text to include in Section 5.2.3.12, and inclusion in schema.

Fixed in WD 17. Requires inclusion in schema?

CORE-45 Issue (Closed)

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

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

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

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

Owner:
Pete

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

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

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

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

CORE-46 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Pete

Resolution:
07/26/2006, Simplify this paragraph to remove optional/should confusion. 2nd add sentence at
end of 1414 that this is metadata and its processing is not mandated.

Done in WD 16.

**CORE-47 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**

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

**Description:**

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

**Owner:**

Ric

**Resolution:**

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


Included in WD 15.

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

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

12/06/2006, Ric agrees to close.

**CORE-48 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**

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

**Description:**

Line 1425: eb:version="2.0" ?

**Owner:**

Ian

**Resolution:**

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

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

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

New schema in WD 17.
CORE-49 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Resolution:

CORE-50 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Pete

Resolution:
07/26/2006, List is exemplar – this is correct for part 1, need to clarify the wording. – Part 2 we have left for later – suggestion any error raised outside MSH is an implementation decision.
08/30/2006: Note that it is not an exhaustive list. Also, addressing should not be included.
Included in WD 16.

CORE-51 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Line 1669: "reported in a log I" -> "reported in a log in"

Resolution:

CORE-52 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Pete

Resolution:
07/26/2006, Need re-write and clarify what is going on 1st sentence OK, recommend partInfo unencrypt ok, routing is another issue!
08/30/2006, Can make recommendations here, but the actual runtime encryption policy needs to
be agreed between parties. Should specify elements to be encrypted in P-Mode.security.

02/07/2007, Latest P-Mode drafts include list of encrypted parts.

03/06/2007, See proposed text in WD 17, Section 7.4.

CORE-53 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Pete

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

CORE-54 Issue (Closed)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Owner:
Jacques

Resolution:
07/26/2006, Correct – semantic definition should be left to the P-Mode. Is ack and error a bad
thing? Delivery that is restricted to the RM module is what is intended can we make this clear?
12/06/2006, Latest P-Mode draft fully addresses semantics of acknowledgment. To be included
in WD 16. No further action required.
CORE-55 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Jacques

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

CORE-56 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
There is now no ebXML concept of Message Ordering. Can organizations still use the ordering features of the underlying RM specifications? E.g. certain service/action/cpaid/conversationId initiate new sequences, and others terminate them. Is there a way to specify this correlation. Partners may want to specify that certain Service/Action combinations, with a new ConversationID and in the same CpaId, are to be performed in-order. How do they specify this, and how does the ebMS processor know about this?

Owner:
Jacques

Resolution:
09/06/2006: Allow mapping between ebMS conversation and RM sequence.
1. Add in P-Mode:
   * PMode[1].Reliability.InOrder.Scope: this parameter is a string that defines the set of messages that must be ordered, if appropriate. For example, a value of "{eb:ConversationId}" means that all messages that share the same ConversationId in a conversation initiated by a message such as those subject to this P-Mode leg (typically, with Service/Action as specified in PMode[1].UserInfo), must be ordered.
2. Add in 8.2.2 (latest draft) after L1517, a third bullet item:
   "** Have sufficient control on which RM sequence is used when submitting a message (RM-Submit), so that an RM sequence may be mapped to an ebMS conversation (eb:ConversationId)."
   (Above 2 edits complete in WD 15.)

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

12/06/2006, Contract is between RMP & RMP. MSH behavior is specified in 8.2.2, under "In-Order ebMS Delivery". Additional Inorder.Scope usages are listed in latest P-Mode draft, to be included in WD 16. Others are left to implementers to define.
**CORE-57 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

**Description:**
Line 2730: "This become a" -> "This becomes a"

**Resolution:**

---

**CORE-58 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Resolution:**

---

**CORE-59 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Owner:**
Jacques

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

CM4 MEP mapping rules (between V2 and V3):

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

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

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

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

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

(e) In V3: Two-Way / Push-and-Push will map to two One-way in ebMS2, where the second
message refers to the first one using RefToMessageId. Each one of the two messages is
handled as in (a) or (b).
Latest draft of this entire section included in WD 15.

**CORE-60 Issue (Deferred)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

**Owner:**
Pete

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

**CORE-61 Issue (Deferred)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

**Description:**
ebMS2 has a Ping service. What happened to it?

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

**CORE-62 Issue (Deferred)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

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

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

**CORE-63 Issue (Deferred)**

**Source:**
Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>

**Description:**
ebMS2 had a section 6.6 with reliable messaging combinations. When Part II adds support for
multi-hop, it would be useful to review how this could be mapped to ebMS3 with WS-R or WS-
Resolution:
09/06/2006: Defer until we define multi-hop functionality in a future specification.

CORE-64 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Gait Bozman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

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

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

CORE-65 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Gait Bozman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

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

Owner:
Jacques

Resolution:

CORE-66 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Gait Bozman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

Description:
Section 5,7,8 - changing the header formats to comply with WS*. The main issue is backwards compatibility. While I learned from Jacques that SwA is still the way to go, moving critical information about in the SOAP Envelope will require recoding at the core. This will hamper migration from ebMS 2 to ebMS 3 environments, if not block them completely, leaving the communities on an island and requiring implementers to maintain two versions.
CORE-67 Issue (Closed)

Owner: Jacques


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

Owner: Jacques

Resolution: 09/06/2006: Believed to be addressed by P-Mode model draft, included in WD 15.


CORE-68 Issue (Closed)

Owner: Jacques

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

Source: Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

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

Source: Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

CORE-69 Issue (Closed)

Owner: Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyconecommerce.com>

Resolution: 09/13/2006: Believed to be addressed by P-Mode model draft, included in WD 15.

Source: Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyconecommerce.com>
Description:

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

Owner:

Jacques/Hamid; Dale to review

Resolution:

09/13/2006: Considered to be an editorial issue, since all normative detail is already present in the spec.


Latest revision appears as new Appendix E of WD 17.

CORE-70 Issue (Closed)

Source:

Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyclonecommerce.com>

Description:

The MEP definitions do not map well to business transactions as defined in ebBP or in UMM. A request-response pattern should not require fundamentally different ebMS MEPs depending on how it binds to the underlying protocol.

It is unclear how the MEPs that were available in ebMS2, map to V3 MEPs.

Owner:

Jacques

Resolution:

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

CORE-71 Issue (Closed)

Source:

Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>

Description:

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

Owner:

Jacques

Resolution:

09/13/2006: Clarify transaction pattern binding and enforcement in MEP Modeling section?

Believe this has been addressed in Messaging Model Rationale (Section 2.2.1 of WD 14) and P-Mode data model appendix. Agreed to close with no further action.
CORE-72 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>

Description:
Section 3 - Message Pulling: If the challenges can be met then I see this as a great step forward for ebXML ms3.0.
In our current communities we have been moving to ebXML ms2.0 from a mechanism based on XML posted over http with responses being polled by the client.
The moment we explain that we are moving to push push many of our partners respond with "it wont work".
Our intention would not be to move to an exclusive push pull model but rather when outbound messages fail to be received we would take those messages and requeue them such that they could be pulled by a partner as part of their recovery process.

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

CORE-73 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>

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

Owner:
Pete

Resolution:
09/13/2006: Add note to indicate that default P-Mode is not designed for business use, but rather for initial connectivity testing. Already exists at beginning of Section 4.3; add to that note that reliable messaging protocol is also not included by default.
Included in WD 15.

CORE-74 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>

Description:
Conformance Profiles: Having choices is good however we are in a very diverse community (using ebMS solutions from three different vendors in the community plus an open source implementation and three home grown ones).
When it came to interop even our use of ebXML CPA/CPP threw some of them.
It would be useful to try and come off the fence here even if it is to make a stand on the default first port of choice for all the commercial vendors.

Resolution:
09/13/2006: Closed, as duplicate of CORE-68.
CORE-75 Issue (Deferred)

Source: Anonymous

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

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

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

Resolution:
09/13/2006: Ack/sync issues already addressed in Pull Mode section. Regarding queue management and timeout, could address via an MSH status signal, to be defined in Part 2.

These features may be implementation-dependent, therefore out of scope of the specification.

CORE-76 Issue (Closed)

Source: Anonymous

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

Resolution:

CORE-77 Issue (Closed)

Source: Anonymous

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

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

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

Owner: Jacques

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

WS vs. ebMS is a FAQ; need to educate that ebMS is not an alternative to WS-*; it *is* a WS
extension module that adds business value (messaging middleware functionality). Clarify this in
Introduction section.

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

“1.3 Web Services and Their Role in an eBusiness Messaging Framework

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

ebMS 3 brings this all together into a single, coherent framework.

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

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

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

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

**CORE-78 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Anonymous

**Description:**

ebMS3 Conformance profiles are specified separately from the core specification:

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

**Resolution:**

09/20/2006: CPA will not be less complex; even though ebMS 3.0 refers to WS-* specs for security and reliability, the operational parameters of those underlying specs still need to be specified. Believe the remainder of the comment has been addressed by P-Mode and Conformance Profile definitions. Conformance Profiles have been defined in a document separate from the core specification, so that they can be revised independently of the core.
CORE-79 Issue (Closed)

Source: Anonymous

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

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

CORE-80 Issue (Closed)

Source: Anonymous

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

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

CORE-81 Issue (Closed)

Source: Anonymous

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

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

CORE-82 Issue (Closed)

Source: Anonymous

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

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

2.2 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR01

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

CORE-83 Issue (Partially Deferred)

Source: Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,
Description:
CDC's PHIN Messaging System (PHINMS), which is based on ebMS 2.0. PHINMS uses XML Encryption and XML DSIG standards for payload level encryption and signature. This software is described at http://www.cdc.gov/phin/software-solutions/phinms/index.html.

CDC's PHINMS extended ebMS 2.0 to handle:
1) very large (in Gb range) payloads using chunking

Owner:
Jacques (for P-Mode addition)

Resolution:
12/06/2006: Chunking functionality to be addressed in future (Part 2) specification (Deferred).
Agree to provide a "max message size" P-Mode. Liaise with CPP/A to request such a parameter.
02/07/2007: Also addressed by latest P-Mode drafts, in WD 17.

CORE-84 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
CDC's PHINMS extended ebMS 2.0 to handle:
2) push/pull type interactions via a gateway (to handle sites that wanted to receive by polling the gateway)

Owner:
Raja to review

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

CORE-85 Issue (Closed)

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

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

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

CORE-86 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,
Description:
b) Is interoperability with WS-Reliable Messaging a future goal of ebMS?

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

CORE-87 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Dale Moberg <dmoberg@us.axway.com>

Description:
I notice that Role is still not a required element in the ebMS header.
I would like the schema to require its use as unnecessary interoperability problems can be avoided by requiring the element.
Also, when ebMS is used with CPPA (and when CPPA is connected with BPSS), it promotes integration by including the Role element.
If the CPPA and BPSS are not used, it is easy to just default Role to something like Requester or Responder.

Owner:
Hamid (for schema)

Resolution:
01/03/2007: Agreed to adopt Jacques' (in 12/7 email) suggestion to define a single "dummy" Role value, for use when no CPA, BP, P-Mode, or other profile specification is in effect:
http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ebxml-msg/defaultRole
Included in WD 17.

CORE-88 Issue (Closed)

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

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

Owner:
Ric

Resolution:
01/03/2007: Addressed by PMode-model-83 changes by Ric & Jacques.
Included in WD 17.

CORE-89 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Editor

Description:
Section 1.3: Complete EdNote.
Owner: Pete
Resolution: Removed in WD 16.

**CORE-90 Issue (Closed)**

Source: Editor
Description: Section 1.7: EdNote; "wsswa" namespace prefix does not appear in examples. Should it be used, or removed?
Owner: Ric
01/03/2007: Agree to remove from namespace prefix table. Done in WD 17.

**CORE-91 Issue (Closed)**

Source: Editor
Description: Section 5.3.3: Confirm whether or not example is redundant and (if not), whether it is schema-conformant.
Owner: Pete
Resolution: 12/13/2006: Remove one example, and refer to it from the other location. Also give example of "bundled" Error + User Message, and move Section 5.2.1 to end of Section 5.2.
Bundling section is now 5.2.4; new example in 5.3.4, in WD 17.

**CORE-92 Issue (Closed)**

Source: Editor
Description: Appendix B: Resolve EdNote; is additional text needed?
Owner: Jacques
02/07/2007: Accept proposal (update to latest WSRM draft), included in WD 17.

**CORE-93 Issue (Closed)**

Source: Editor
Section E.2.5: Requires completion.


**CORE-94 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:** Editor

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

**Owner:** Pete

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

**CORE-95 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:** Editor

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

**Owner:** Pete

**Resolution:** Need to obtain image source from Jacques.

Included in WD 18.

**CORE-96 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:** Editor

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

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

**Resolution:** 10/04/2006: Ian to discuss nonrepudiation requirements with ebXML Joint Committee.

02/21/2007: Much discussion about interaction between BP, CPA and Messaging layers to solve nonrepudiation of receipt. What is now Section 7.12.2 solves this requirement, or very nearly so, (possibly subject to reordering of signed elements), but we would need to define an Acknowledgment Signal Message. [Monica advises to check nonrepudiation definition in eBusiness Patterns document from original ebxml.org.]

Edits and example included in WD 17.
**CORE-97 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:**
Editor

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

**Owner:**
Jacques

**Resolution:**
12/13/2006: Also remove reference to MakeConnection feature, which is not needed within the context of our usage.
02/07/2007: Accept proposal. Included in WD 17.

**CORE-98 Issue (Closed)**

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

**Description:**
Issue with example ebMS Message Headers
- line 851 - Section 5.2.2 eb:Messaging Element Specification
- line 1044 and 1096 - Section 5.3.1 UserMessage Example
The eb:Service element has a value of QuoteToCollect. QuoteToCollect is not a URI type, so the eb:Service element should have a type attribute. Or the element value should be changed to a URI. To be consistent with 5.2.3.8 possibly the example should be changed to look like
  <eb:Service>urn:services:SupplierOrderProcessing</eb:Service>
Or to be consistent with the Secured Message Examples
  <eb:Service type="someType">QuoteToCollect</eb:Service>

**Owner:**
Editor

**Resolution:**
01/03/2007: Agree to fix examples. Also add example of @type alternative usage in Section 5.2.3.8.
Done, in WD 17.

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

**Source:**
Sasha Schlegel <sacha_oasis@schlegel.li>

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

ebMS 2.0 has two defaults:
- a) encrypt first, then sign. As a Note in section 4.1.4.5
- b) the Reference for the actual ebMS 2.0 SOAP message XML digital signature was set in
Section 4.1.3.

**Owner:** Pete

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

**CORE-100 Issue (Closed)**

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

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

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

**CORE-101 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:** Pete

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

**Resolution:** Results of Ric's validation efforts are in http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/24071/ExampleReview.html

Errors that were not an intended result of leaving incomplete XML "stubs" in examples (in order to illustrate simple structure or unrelated features) have been corrected in WD 23 & WD 24.

**CORE-102 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:** Pete

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

**Resolution:** 03/07/2007: Agreed that this should be done in a separate document, not needed in core spec.

Note to that effect in spec.

Done in WD 18.
CORE-103 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Pete, 12/20/2006 Conference Call

Description:
Disagree with requirement in 7.7 to support Username token.

Owner:
Pete

Resolution:
12/20/2006, Agreed to remove REQUIRED keywords, as this is a user/conformance profile point.
Complete in WD 17.

CORE-104 Issue (Deferred)

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

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

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

Owner:

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

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

CORE-105 Issue (Pending Edit)

Source:
Jacques Durand

Description:
Track progress of WS-RX specs.

Owner:
Pete
Resolution:
Reference WSRM 1.1 CD 7, 03/01/2007 in WD 18.
Update reference again to CS or OS version if available prior to our release.
CS cited in WD 23.

CORE-106 Issue (Closed)

Source: Jacques Durand
Description: Receipt Signal requires a good example.
Owner: Pete
Resolution: Added Section 7.9.3 example in WD 18.
Note that a message/part referencing issue remains.

CORE-107 Issue (Closed)

Source: Pete Wenzel
Description: Permanent Namespace URI and Schema Location URL needed. Currently specified identifiers will not be resolvable, as we have no ability to serve documents from the stated location.
Owner: Pete
Revised with version-capable scheme in WD 19.
Note that a RDDL document (containing an index to specifications and schema files) should be placed at the namespace location.

CORE-108 Issue (Closed)

Source: Pete Wenzel
Description: Need reference to ASC X12 Registry for party identification schemes.
Owner:
Resolution: 05/18/2007: Agreed to add an informational reference to the latest CPP/A 2.1 Draft, which contains explicit details on party identification schemes. The 3 type schemes already mentioned (carried over from ebMS 2.0) will remain, but hyperlink references will be removed if they don't point to useful information about the registries. Done in WD 23.
**CORE-109 Issue (Deferred)**

**Source:** Pete

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

**Owner:**

**Resolution:**

---

**CORE-110 Issue (Closed)**

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


**Description:**

1541 - @type: This REQUIRED attribute indicates how the parties send and receiving the message will interpret the value of the reference.

Notice that the @type is a REQUIRED attribute of eb:AgreementRef. The example at line 1536 does not include the @type attribute. All the examples I have looked at that contain the eb:AgreementRef element do not include the REQUIRED @type attribute.

Either the samples should be updated or @type should be changed to OPTIONAL. It would probably make sense to add wording along the lines of what is in the spec for eb:Service/@type.

Line 1555 - There is no restriction on the value of the type attribute. If the type attribute is not present, the content of the Service element MUST be a URI (see (RFC2396)). Etc.

**Owner:** Editor

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

---

**CORE-111 Issue (Closed)**

**Source:** Pete

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

**Owner:**

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

---

**CORE-112 Issue (Closed)**

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

03/28/2007: Agreed; Attributes' descriptions removed in WD 19.

**CORE-113 Issue (Closed)**

Source: Pete

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


**CORE-114 Issue (Closed)**

Source: Pete


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

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

**CORE-115 Issue (Open)**

Source: Pete

Description: Need a RDDL index of documents. See http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrn/200702 for an example.
CORE-116 Issue (Closed)

Source: Dale Moberg <dmoberg@us.axway.com>

Description: ebMS 2.0 conformance should be required in Gateway Conformance Profile.

Owner:

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

CORE-117 Issue (Partially Deferred)

Source: Sacha Schlegel <sacha@schlegel.li>

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

Owner:

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

CORE-118 Issue (Deferred)

Source: David Webber <david@drrw.info>

Description: Describe how MTOM relates to ebMS 3.

Owner:

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

CORE-119 Issue (Closed)

Source: Jacques Durand <JDurand@us.fujitsu.com>

Description: suggest the following renaming:
Message Partition Flow --> Message Partition Channel
MPF --> MPC
Schema: @mpf --> @mpc
In 2.2.3:
MEP Channel Binding -> MEP Transport Channel binding (these channels are lower level)
MEP Transport Binding -> MEP Transport Protocol binding

Owner:

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

CORE-120 Issue (Closed)
Source:
Kazunori Iwasa <kiwasa@jp.fujitsu.com>

Description:
The related work "related to" section in the first page may describe the following specs:
SOAP1.1, SOAP1.2, WS-Security specs, WS-Reliability 1.1, WS-RM CS, and ebMS2.0
and remove "replaces or supercedes" section.

Owner:

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

CORE-121 Issue (Closed)
Source:
Hamid Ben Malek <HBenMalek@us.fujitsu.com>

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

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

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

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

Issue 5: On page 39, line 1393, the example is showing the element service with a type attribute.
However, the schema (on line 3266) declares the element service as a simple element (does not
have any attributes). If the spec is correct in this case, then the schema needs to add such an
attribute to the service element, otherwise remove the "type" attribute from the example.
04/18/2007: Service should have @type attribute; fixed in WD 21.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Owner: Pete
Resolution: Resolved as shown in-line above; changes appear in WD 21.

2.3 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR02

CORE-122 Issue (Closed)

Source: Pete
Description: Need to include references to HTTP 1.1 and SMTP (both normative).

Owner: Pete
Resolution: 05/16/2007: Agreed; included in WD 23.

CORE-123 Issue (Closed)

Source: Pete
Description: Constant URIs for all MEPs and other identifiable features are needed (some are missing, or appear as seemingly non-normative example text).
Resolution:
05/18/2007: Agreed to add as proposed by Pete (minus duplicates noted by Jacques).
Absence of @mpc and mpc="/defaultMPC" is already described as semantically equivalent.
Changes appear in WD 23.

CORE-124 Issue (Closed)

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

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

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

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

Source:

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

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

CORE-126 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Line 2875:
Typo: line has two commas.
Corrected in WD 23.
Line 2895-2898:
"This response is sent back reliably over the response leg of the same SOAP Request-response MEP instance that carried the previous message."
This seems to be refer to the specific case of an ebMS Transport Channel Binding of type "Sync"?
Yes; clarify that this applies to underlying protocol response only.
05/18/2007: Agreed with Jacques' recommendation to revise sentence to simply "This
Request and response messages in a Push-and-Push message exchange can also both be sent reliably. If the assumption is that sending an asynchronous response message reliably is like sending an asynchronous request or one way message reliably and needs no special discussion, then it would be useful to state this explicitly at this point.

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

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

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

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

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

Corrected in WD 23.

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

Corrected in WD 23.

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

Corrected in WD 23.

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

Corrected in WD 23.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Agreed; done in WD 23.

Line 3062
"workflow": confusing term perhaps.

Agree; changed to "message processing flow" in WD 23.
Formatting issue (should not be bullet)
Corrected in WD 23.

Would this reliability Ack be a standalone message? Some explanation might be useful.

8.3 already refers to Appendix E, which clarifies the handling of acks. Additional clarification added in WD 23.

Figure 13/14, second Reliability Ack. Idem.

As above.

Should there be some text here about a restriction among ConversationId and Group membership? It seems okay to reuse a group for multiple conversations, but messages that are part of a single conversation should not be in multiple groups (or rather concurrently active groups: a conversation could start in one group, and continue in later one if that group is terminated).

Mapping between ebMS sequence and reliability conversation/group is done in PMode.Reliability.{Start|End}Group.

"Any pair of sequence lifecycle message (CreateSequence/CreateSequenceResponse, CloseSequence/CloseSequenceResponse, TerminateSequence/TerminateSequenceResponse) MUST be exchanged over a single HTTP request-response."

Does this mean that any use of WS-ReliableMessaging (in ebMS3) is tied to the HTTP protocol? Can this MUST be relaxed to a SHOULD? Some ebMS end users have and prefer an all-asynchronous setup for their messaging (today ebMS2), is this not possible with ebMS3?

Relax MUST to SHOULD; refer generically to two-way underlying protocol, rather than HTTP. Done in WD 23.

Should there be some text here about correlation of use of ConversationId and Sequences? It seems okay to reuse a sequence for multiple conversations, but messages that are part of a single conversation should not be in different sequences (or rather concurrently active sequences: a conversation could start in one group, and continue in later one if that group is terminated).

See 2973. Ability to map ConversationId to Sequence must be supported, but in practice is optional (P-Mode Policy).

This is an example of a Two-Way MEP, but the PMode.MEP in the figure says "200704/oneWay".
Corrected in WD 23.

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

2.4 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR02

CORE-127 Issue (Assigned)

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

Description:
Stated schema location does not resolve.

Owner:
Pete

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

CORE-128 Issue (Closed)

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

Description:
Case of "Timestamp" and "ConversationId" element names in schema are incorrect.
Specification text and examples are correct.

Owner:

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

CORE-129 Issue (Deferred)

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

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

Owner:

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

CORE-130 Issue (Closed)

Source:
Jacques Durand, 05/23/2007 TC Call

Description:
Replace textual reference to future WS-I profiles.

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

Proposed:
"Compliance of ebMS 3 implementations with the latest version of WS-I profiles - once approved as final material by the organization - will be addressed in the definition of conformance profiles that are adjunct to this specification (see Appendix G)."
CORE-131 Issue (Pending Review)

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

Description: (Various editorial comments.)

Owner:
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