

# UDDI Version 2.00 Data Structure Reference

## Errata 3

### 5 July 2002

**Errata Document Version Number:**

2.03.2

**Editor:**

Claus von Riegen, SAP AG

Copyright © 2001-2002 by Accenture, Ariba, Inc., Commerce One, Inc., Fujitsu Limited, Hewlett-Packard Company, i2 Technologies, Inc., Intel Corporation, International Business Machines Corporation, Microsoft Corporation, Oracle Corporation, SAP AG, Sun Microsystems, Inc., and VeriSign, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

## Contents

<b>ERRATA 1</b>	<b>4</b>
All elements in a publisherAssertion must be specified.	4
ISO 3166 tModel name.	4
Attribute added to relatedBusinessList response document to indicate direction.	4
Typos and formatting glitches.	4
<b>ERRATA 2</b>	<b>5</b>
instanceParms content must not be an XML string.	5
New UNSPSC tModel.	5
Empty <categoryBag/> and <identifierBag/> elements not allowed	5
Effect on existing service projections when projected service is deleted.	5
Typos and formatting glitches.	6
<b>ERRATA 3</b>	<b>7</b>
Behaviour of tModel references in address structures.	7
useType attribute in phone and email elements now optional.	7
publisherAssertion optional in publisherAssertions response messages.	7
Clarifying the requirement and the valid codes for the xml:lang attribute.	7
Formatting of name elements in tModel structure.	8
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>9</b>

## Introduction

This document contains the errata to the Open Draft of the [UDDI V2.00 Data Structure Reference](#). The errors and requests for clarification covered by this Errata were brought to the editors' attention during the review of the Open Draft of that document. Once the review period is completed and the specification becomes final, the changes given below will be factored into the final document.

As additional errors and requests for clarification are dealt with during the review period, additional editions of this document may become necessary. Because of this, users of the Open Draft Data Structure Reference should verify that they have the latest version of the Errata.

## Errata 1

### All elements in a publisherAssertion must be specified.

The text of the specification is not clear that all elements of a publisher assertion must be specified. The following sentence has been added to the end of section 9:

All three parts of the keyedReference – the tModelKey, the keyName, and the keyValue – are mandatory in this context. Empty (zero length) keyName and keyValue elements are permitted.

### ISO 3166 tModel name.

The name for the tModel that represents the ISO 3166 taxonomy for geographical regions was changed to reflect the one that is actually used (see section 11.1):

uddi-org:iso-ch:3166:1999

### Attribute added to relatedBusinessList response document to indicate direction.

The schema does not specify the side of the relationship both businesses sit on. Therefore, an attribute with the name direction was added to the sharedRelationships element.

The example and the text in section 12.9.1 were updated to reflect the new attribute and its usage.

### Typos and formatting glitches.

A number of typographical errors and formatting problems have been reported and fixed during the open specification review. None change the meaning of the text.

## Errata 2

### instanceParms content must not be an XML string.

The text that describes the instanceParms element within the bindingTemplate indicates that "a namespace qualified XML string, using a namespace outside of the UDDI schema" is a valid content. This is not true. Embedded XML of a different namespace is not allowed throughout the whole UDDI schema. The text in section 7.2.3.2 is changed accordingly.

### New UNSPSC tModel.

The Universal Standard Products and Services Classification (UNSPSC), published by ECCMA (see <http://www.eccma.org>) was changed significantly with Version 7. There are now two more digits and also points between the different hierarchy levels. For example, the code for software suites was changed from 43161704 in Version 6 to 43.16.17.04.00 in Version 7. As a consequence, the specification is now updated with a new tModel for UNSPSC (unspsc-org:unspsc) that is the successor of the existing tModel for Version 3.1 (unspsc-org:unspsc:3-1).

The list of tModels in section 11.1 is updated with the new tModel for UNSPSC.

### Empty <categoryBag/> and <identifierBag/> elements not allowed

The UDDI V2 Schema allows empty <categoryBag/> and <identifierBag/> elements, each of which is optional in every place it is used. This leads to questions about whether an empty bag is equivalent to an omitted one and if not, what the difference is. Since there is no intended difference, having two ways of expressing the same thing is unnecessarily confusing. To eliminate the confusion, the UDDI V2 schema has been modified to require <categoryBag/> and <identifierBag/> elements to have at least one child. As a consequence, the corresponding part in section 10.2.2 was changed to:

```
<element name = "identifierBag">
  <complexType>
    <sequence>
      <element ref = "keyedReference" maxOccurs = "unbounded"/>
    </sequence>
  </complexType>
</element>
```

and the corresponding part in section 11.1 was changed to:

```
<element name = "categoryBag">
  <complexType>
    <sequence>
      <element ref = "keyedReference" maxOccurs = "unbounded"/>
    </sequence>
  </complexType>
</element>
```

that is, the expression `minOccurs = "0"` was removed in both cases.

### Effect on existing service projections when projected service is deleted.

After deleting a service that is referred to in service projections, the service projections still exist, but do not refer to any existing service. That is, the remaining service projections only contain the businessKey and the serviceKey from the originally projected service. As a consequence, the UDDI V2 Schema was changed to allow businessService structures without name and bindingTemplates elements.

The sections 6.1 and 6.2 were updated accordingly.

**Typos and formatting glitches.**

A number of additional typographical errors and formatting problems have been reported and fixed since Errata 1 was published. None change the meaning of the text.

## Errata 3

### Behaviour of tModel references in address structures.

#### Checking keyedReferences

The text of the specification is not clear whether the keyValues in addressLine elements are checked if the address structure references a checked tModel. This is not the case since only actual keyedReferences are checked, but not the “virtual” keyedReference in an address structure. The following sentence in section 5.2.3.3:

“Together with the address’ tModelKey, keyName and keyValue virtually build a keyedReference that represents an address line qualifier, given by the referenced tModel.”

is changed as follows:

“Together with the address’ tModelKey, the keyName and keyValue qualify the addressLine according to the address structure specified in the overview document of the referenced tModel.”

#### Occurrence of keyName keyValue pairs.

The text of the specification is not clear whether addressLine elements, adorned with keyName keyValue pairs, must be present if the address carries a tModelKey. This is not the case. The addressLine elements are always optional, regardless of the presence of a tModelKey in the address structure. The text in section 5.2.3.2 is changed as follows:

“The tModelKey is a tModel reference that specifies that keyName keyValue pairs given by subsequent addressLine elements, if addressLine elements are present at all, are to be interpreted by the address structure associated with the tModel that is referenced.”

### useType attribute in phone and email elements now optional.

The text that describes the phone and email elements within the contact structure indicates that “if more than one [...] element is saved, useType attributes are required on each.” This is an unnecessary burden for the publisher, especially when publishing one element without a useType attribute in a first step and trying to add a second element in a second step. In this case, a useType attribute would be required even for the first, previously unqualified, element.

The sentences:

“If more than one [...] element is saved, useType attributes are required on each.”

are removed from the descriptions for both the phone and email elements in section 5.2.3.1, thus making the attribute completely optional.

### publisherAssertion optional in publisherAssertions response messages.

The text that describes the publisherAssertions response message wrongly states that one or more publisherAssertion structures are returned. In fact, zero or more publisherAssertion structures are returned, for example, when a publisher uses the get\_publisherAssertions API before publishing any publisherAssertion.

The text in section 12.7 is changed accordingly.

### Clarifying the requirement and the valid codes for the xml:lang attribute.

The text that describes the name element is not clear about the valid codes for the xml:lang attributes. Also, it specifies that xml:lang attributes are mandatory and, if omitted during publication, are inserted

by the operator. Since requiring xml:lang attributes does not make sense in every circumstance, the requirement was withdrawn, thus making the xml:lang attribute now optional.

The text in section 5.2.2 was updated as follows:

“A businessEntity MAY contain more than one name. Multiple names are useful, for example, in order to specify both the legal name and a known abbreviation of a businessEntity, or in order to support romanization.

When a name is expressed in a specific language (such as the language into which a name has been romanized), it SHOULD carry the xml:lang attribute to signify this. When a name does not have an associated language (such as a neologism not associated with a particular language), the xml:lang attribute SHOULD be omitted.

As is defined in the XML specification, an occurrence of the xml:lang attribute indicates that the content to which it applies (namely the element on which it is found and to all its children, unless subsequently overridden) is to be interpreted as being in a certain natural language. Legal values for such attributes are specified in the IETF standard RFC 1766 and its successors (including, as of the time of the present writing, RFC 3066). As is indicated therein, language values begin with a primary language tag, and are optionally followed by a series of hyphen-delimited sub-tags for country or dialect identification; the tags are not case-sensitive. Examples include: "EN-us", "FR-ca".

The same mechanism applies to the name element within the businessService structure.”

### **Formatting of name elements in tModel structure.**

The description of the name element within the tModel structure is not clear on what format is expected and whether the xml:lang attribute should be used.

The convention that was used to define the names of the canonical tModels, for example, the UDDI Types taxonomy, was based on URIs, for example, “uddi-org:types”. The following sentence is added to the description of the name element in section 8.3:

“The name should be formatted as a URI and, as a consequence, the xml:lang attribute of the name element should not be used.”

### **name element made optional in the serviceInfo structure.**

The result of deleting a service (which is being projected to) or deleting a business which is the parent of such service will result in a "broken" service projection. Such “broken” service projections appear in their businessEntity as businessService elements containing the businessKey and serviceKey attributes as their only content. As a result of this behavior, it is necessary for the name element of the serviceInfo structure to be made optional. A change to the schema is required as follows:

```
<xsd:complexType name="serviceInfo">
  <xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:element ref="uddi:name" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
  </xsd:sequence>
  <xsd:attribute name="serviceKey" type="uddi:serviceKey" use="required"/>
  <xsd:attribute name="businessKey" type="uddi:businessKey" use="required"/>
</xsd:complexType>
```

The following text has been added to sections 12.6.1 and 12.11.1:

"Since a serviceInfo structure can represent a projection to a deleted businessService, the name element within the serviceInfo structure is optional (see section 4.4.13.3 of the V2 API Specification on deleting projected services)."

## References

- 1) UDDI Version 2.0 Data Structure Reference (<http://www.uddi.org/pubs/DataStructure-V2.00-Open-20010608.doc>)