

ebXML Quality Review Group

Summary of Review of

Business Process Methodology submissions:

- **Business Process and Business Information Analysis Overview v0.6**
- **Business Process Specification Schema v0.99**
- **Business Process Analysis Worksheets and Guidelines v0.8e**
- **E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns v0.3**
- **Catalog of Common Business Processes v0.91**

Release Date: 19th March 2001

Report prepared: 30th March 2001

Reviewers: Tim McGrath, Nagwa Abdelghfour, Jon Bosak, Stuart Campbell, Murray Maloney, Bob Glushko, Jim Werner, Ben Van De Walle.

Traceability Matrix prepared by Mike Rawlins.

The Quality Review team have completed their review of various submissions from the Business Process Methodology teams as submitted on March 19th to 21st 2001.

Whilst these documents are the deliverables from two separate sub-teams within the Business Process Methodology team, the QR team felt it was beneficial to review all these submissions at the same time.

We recommend that the ebXML Business Process Specification Schema v0.99 document go immediately for its second round of public review.

Our general comments on this document are in Appendix A of this report. These should be addressed as part of the public review process.

We further recommend that the remaining ebXML discussion papers:

- **Business Process and Business Information Analysis Overview v0.6,**
- **Business Process Analysis Worksheets and Guidelines v0.8e,**

- **Catalog of Common Business Processes v0.91,**
 - **E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns v0.3,**
- also go forward for their first round of public review.**

However, the Quality Review team are concerned about the weak alignment of some of these documents with the ebXML Specification Schema. In many cases they either fail to differentiate or clearly specify the relationship between the UMM Metamodel and the Business Process Specification Schema.

We are concerned that the confusion these current documents may spawn within the wider community will be damaging to the overall ebXML initiative. For example, it is perceivable that these documents could result in development of UMM Metamodel compliant business process models, but not ebXML compliant models.

Examples of instances where this confusion may arise are:

Business Process and Business Information Analysis Overview...

- Line 172-173 (The Specification Schema is more than a DTD form)
- Line 260-261 (Why UMM Metamodel and not Specification Schema?)
- Line 298-299 (How does a Metamodel define a methodology?)
- Line 313-316 (If Specification Schema meets requirement then why use Metamodel? If not, why use the Specification Schema?)
- Line 327-329 (Does the ebXML CPP and CPA reference the Metamodel or Specification Schema?)
- Figure 7.2-2 (Overlaps with Specification Schema Figure 11. cf. Business Process Analysis Worksheets and Guidelines Lines 305-306)
- Lines 356-362 (Why Metamodel *and* Specification Schema?)
- Lines 589-594 (Confuses metamodel with model and does not mention Specification Schema)
- Line 631-632 (Is the description using the Metamodel, Specification Schema or something else?)

Business Process Analysis Worksheets and Guidelines...

- Lines 120-121 (Will these worksheets produce Specification Schema compliant definitions)
- Line 180 (Should this be via the Specification Schema?)
- Line 186 (Will this be ebXML compliant because it uses the Specification Schema?)
- Table between lines 201-202 (Could have an analogy for the Specification Schema – is it also the Entire tax code?)
- Figure 6-1 Lines 219-221 (If the right hand boxes are the UMM methodology, what do the Metamodel and Specification Schema address)
- Line 249 (Specification Schema does not recommend REA ontology)

Line 291-296 (Introduces Specification Schema for first time)
Figure between lines 305-306 (Overlaps with Specification Schema Figure 11.
cf. Business Process and Business Information
Analysis Overview Figure 7.2-2)

Catalog of Common Business Processes...

Line 148 (Should this be “maps to Specification Schema” not
“maps to Metamodel”?)

In addition, there are inconsistencies common across these white paper and discussion documents that emphasise the general confusion about where and how this material aligns with other ebXML specifications.

- The incomplete specification of the requirements on the ebXML Registry regarding cataloguing, classification and registration of business processes.
- These documents address some ebXML Requirements (e.g. the Registry requirements mentioned in the previous bullet point) and arguably constitute part of a technical specification. If this is the intention then their approval process needs to reflect this.
- Frequent unclear descriptions of the interfaces with the Trading Partner CPP and CPA.

Specific details of individual documents are given in Appendices B, C, D and E. These issues must also be addressed as part of the public review process.

Appendix A

Business Process Specification Schema v0.99

As with the previous version of this specification, our overall concern is the structure and readability of the document. Whilst we acknowledge the many improvements since the previous version, there still appears to be some duplication and redundancy of material.

For example, Section 8.2 is highly redundant with much of section 6. For example:

- "Binary collaboration" in lines 2202-2227 summarizes what appears in lines 694-733.
- The definition of "Business Partner Role" at lines 2248-2251 repeats verbatim lines 1334-1337.
- "Business Transaction" is defined at both 2273-2280 and 1511-1518.

In part this may be a feature of the structure the team have taken with this document. Currently, the approach is:

- Section 6. Concept
- Section 7. UML
- Section 8. XML (DTD) – including cross-references.

This places the same object in three sections and hence to need to duplicate explanations and definitions. Perhaps, these could be combined as:

- Section 6.1 Concept
 - Section 6.1.1 UML
 - Section 6.1.2 XML (DTD)
 - Section 6.2 Concept
 - Section 6.2.1 UML
 - Section 6.2.2 XML (DTD)
- etc...

This may also avoid the "cut and paste" errors, for example the "an" instead of "and" mistake occurs in both 2279 and 1518.

In addition, we note from the change log ("Issues list"), that there are some issues that appear to be unresolved. For example, there is some confusion about the use and value of REA models. The change log notes these as not adopted, yet does not explain why it would only be partial and why this would not be appropriate. More concerning is the fact that the Business Process Analysis team's documents still rely heavily on REA models, despite this resolution.

Specific Comments....

Headers

Should the date be January 2001?

Line 13

Please use International date formats.

Line 67, 77-81

No section numbers in table of contents.

Line 264-270

If Specification Schema meets requirement then why use the Metamodel? If not, why use the Specification Schema?

Line 289 Figure 2

"busines" is misspelled.

Some text is illegible in black and white print.

“Business Signal Definitions” should be “Common Modeling Objects” for consistency with text.

Line 316

Has a difficult sentence construction with some missing and extraneous words. It possibly needs an example or analogy to clarify the meaning. The relationship of the Specification Schema to the UMM and its Metamodel should be unambiguously stated. Are the models produced from using the Specification schema different from those developed using UMM?

Line 328

If we have to say "where possible" then we may have a problem here – what kinds of constraints couldn't be represented in XML Schema?

Line 333

Should say Chapter 11, not Chapter [11]

Line 345-347

Is the intention to say these signals are “universal”.

Line 369 and 536

“two” should be “more”. NB not confined to two flows.

Line 390-391

Maybe “single” is a better term than “atomic”.

Examples of these types of activities would assist the reader.

Line 446

The comma after Schema should be a period.

Line 450

“to” should be “for”

Line 459

Expand acronyms when first used.

Line 461

BSI has not been explained yet.

Line 479, 1298, 1865

“Specifically The” should be ““Specifically, the”

Line 484

Figure 4 is useful but doesn't match its caption. The discussion in

Line 488-504

Describes things that don't appear in the figure, like "specification rules" and "production rules"

Line 502

There isn't any logical reason for requiring that what gets stored in the repository is XML. UML could just as easily be stored and a transformation into XML could be done only when it is needed.

Line 529, 630, 691, 874

The word “semantics” is somewhat overloaded in ebXML, can we suggest you just say “UML diagram of ...”.

Line 585

Footnote is empty.

Line 595

State which standards P2D comes from (may be ISO 8601).

Line 621

Sounds odd to say that all business documents have unique structures when we know that they will be composed from reusable components, which means they will have substantial structural similarity. Suggest use the term “varying”.

Line 694 - 773

Section 6.4.2.1 is a little hard to wade through. It might help to take the example (including a diagram) starting at line 718 and give it a separate section like "Example".

Line 734-736

A CPA need not use an ebXML business process. ebXML can be incrementally adopted.

Line 737

“must” should be “could” (see point above).

Line 740

It would also help to put a separate section heading here for the issue about legally binding.

Line 749-755

Should be a non-normative note. It may also pay to reference the document “E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns”.

Line 761

Is the intention to mean “legally” binding or the more practical “commercially” binding.

Line 773

Extraneous quotes at end of paragraph

Line 841

Can these only be ebXML CPAs?

Line 918

It may be useful to bring sections 6.4.4.2 and 6.4.2.2 closer as they cover the same example but are currently separated by intervening sections

Line 986-1027

Section 6.5 repeats a lot from 6.4.1.1 and elsewhere. It may be better to put this earlier and then the other somewhat disjointed sections might be made tighter

Line 1033

Specified shouldn't be capitalized

Line 1057

Do these UMM patterns form part of the ebXML specification? If so, they need to be described here. How do these relate to the “Catalog of Common Business Processes” and the “E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns”?

Line 1075, 1077, 1081

Why have full-colon at the end of the section heading?

Line 1078-1079, 1083

Paragraphs should start on the left margin.

Line 1109

Is the "need proper definition" a note to the editor?

Line 1151

What is meant by ebXML messages? Are these ebXML Message Service messages, messages containing ebXML content? Does it matter what the messages are?

Line 1158-1159

Is this really what non-repudiation means? What about "no denying the sending of a document".

Line 1174-1177

Repeats lines 987-990 (section 6.5)

Line 1192

"is" should be "are"

Line 1250

Avoid putting content in the title. If this is also known as a "ProcessException", say so in the text.

Line 1518

"an in" should be "as in"

Line 1604

"the receipt must be non-reputable" should be "the receipt must be non-repudiatable". We understand "reputable" to mean "to have a good reputation, to be respected". Is that what is meant? ☺

Line 1630 and 1646

Does the business activity have to be "requesting commerce"? Could it be "requesting information" or other things... maybe it just wants to engage some entity in the complementary role, whatever that is.

Line 2407, Table between 2679-2680 and 2697 and 2699 and 2749

Is it ebXmlProcessSpecification or ebXMLProcessSpecification?

Line 3011

If these signal structures are to be ebXML standards then there needs to be a discussion about intent, both now and in the future. What happens if ebXML adopts XML Schema before RosettaNet does and these signals are re-implemented by ebXML, only to have RosettaNet do them differently?

Line 3184

Extraneous space before the word “UN/CEFACT”.

Line 3230-3239

This is the wrong copyright statement. Should use the “ebXML” version.

Appendix B

Business Process and Business Information Analysis Overview v0.6

Some of the material in this document represents the finest description and presentation of not only the Business Process models, but of the entire ebXML framework. The Editors are to be congratulated. We would also like to restate our opinion that this document could be combined with the “Core Component and Business Process Document Overview” to form an overview of all ebXML content definitions.

It is possible that section 8.4 spends too much time covering fundamental analysis techniques and this material could be removed or summarised.

Another concern is that two key methodologies referenced by this document (UMM and REA) provide no valid references to supporting material or documents available for the reader to access. How can they be expected to know what these things are?

Finally, this layout does not use the ebXML template, e.g. page number in footers, additional section for Glossary, etc.

Specific Comments....

NB. Some of these comments may repeat in the document that the original content was sourced from.

Line 83

The section for “Copyright statement” is not in the table of contents.

Line 116

“semantics” should be “semantic”.

Line 105-130

Should mention incremental compliance and adoption of the various ebXML components.

Line 140-165

Should also mention Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement and also the Security Risk Assessment documents.

Line 213

Is there a better term than “plug-in”? (See the Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement specification for a description of this interface)

Line 229-231

Lines are hidden on the diagram.

Lines 233-234

Some items in this table should be identified as “optional”.

Should there be references to TRP Message Services in the “Electronic Plug-in”, “Process Execution” and “Process Management” rows (for situations where ebXML Message Services are used).

Should there be references to Trading Partner team’s Collaboration-Protocol Profile and Agreement specification in the “Process Management” rows (for situations where ebXML CPAs are used).

The UN/CEFACT Modelling Methodology (UMM) needs a reference where it can be found.

Line 239

Why are only these collaborations defined?

Line 250

Why use the GAAP acronym – is it used elsewhere?

Line 256

Figure 8.3-2 is actually 8.3-1.

REA reference (in footnote) should also be in Section 12 – References.

The REA web site (www.reamodel.org) is “under construction”.

Line 262

The terms “Design time” and Runtime” need explanation

Line 264-267 Figure 6.3-1

How does this diagram relate to Figure 6.1-1.?

Text needs reformatting on left hand side.

Line 278-279

This implies all business processes are in CPPs and CPA, it should say “may be”.

Line 282

Use document name not just acronym.

Line 291

How do process models “specify interoperability”?

Line 298-299

How does a metamodel specify a methodology?

Line 320 Figure 7.2-1

Some images overlap text on this diagram.

Line 327-329

What is the “full” specification?

Line 334

Inconsistent use of the convention for capitalising SHOULD, etc...

Line 336

Can we say “it is possible to compare models” – shouldn’t we say “it may be possible”.
Using a consistent methodology does not ensure interoperability.

Line 361

“processes re-engineering” should be “process re-engineering”.

Line 369 and 375

Shouldn’t there be a connection or relationship between Figure 8.2-1 and 8-2.2 (e.g. A Document inside a Transaction)

Line 390-397

Repeats line 236-251 (section 6.2)

Line 403, 406, 414

If we are supposed to relate these to REA terms, then understanding of REA should be noted in the Caveats and Assumptions (section 5.3)

Line 451

“is” should be “are”.

Line 471-473

X12 and EDIFACT standards do not define business processes (except by loose implication). It is the various implementation guidelines and those with the knowledge to construct these guidelines that define the business processes. Is that what is meant by “associated business processes”?

Line 480

“involved” should be “involves”.

Line 486

Can we say “e.g. an ebXML Registry” to improve clarity?

Line 491

“and” should be “or” – they are not jointly owned.

Line 493-494

Sentence does not scan.

Line 498

Is “controlled” the same as a “moderated”? Would that be a more recognisable term?

Line 511-512

What is meant by saying specifications will be “recognized over time”?

Line 522

What is a “general UML domain”?

Line 531 Figure 8.4-5

Shouldn't there be a link between “Business Process and Business Information Model” and “Registration”? Can we register models? (see line 539 as well)

Line 539-540

Does this imply these must be ebXML CPAs and not other trading agreements?.

Line 586-587

This sentence uses the word “standard” too freely. Maybe use a word like “initiatives”.

Line 633-641

Should be section 10.1.1 “Analysis Worksheets and Editor”

Line 635-636

Has an extraneous paragraph break.

Line 639-640

Diagram needs moving to avoid splitting this sentence.

Line 642

Should be re-numbered 10.1.2 (see comment above).

Line 652-659

Repeats lines 643-650.

Line 660

Should reference the ebXML Glossary.

Appendix C

Business Process Analysis Worksheets and Guidelines v0.8e

There is some evidence that this document specifies features that address the ebXML requirements. For example, on line 472 it specifies how semantic descriptions are formed. On lines 487-517 the Business Process Identifiers are addressing an ebXML Requirement (section 3.3 “library of documents based on identified services and interactions”).

This material must be moved to the only Business Process team technical specification document, the “Specification Schema”, or face the possibility of needing an additional round of public review.

We also have some concerns about the Registry Information Model mapping. This appears to rely on the ExtrinsicObject feature and therefore may not address the Registry classification schemas and subsequent contextual discovery of business processes.

Finally, this layout does not use the ebXML template, e.g. document title and page number in footers, table of contents, “work-in-progress” in headers, etc.

Specific Comments....

Line 98, 247

The word “public” means “open to everyone”. This may not be the case. A better (but clumsier) term may be “intra-organisational”.

Line 108

Lingua franca should be italicised (for consistency with line 105).

Line 110-112

Where is the end of this quotation? – it has two end quote marks.

Line 120-121

Are these also BP Specification Schema compliant?

Line 183

The term business process editor has not yet been defined.

Line 204

“of” should be “or” (in footnote)

Line 207-210

Needs some discussion on whether these worksheets intend to stay aligned indefinitely with UMM and all future versions.

Line 218-219

Where in the Core Components tools will we find the document definition worksheet?

Line 227, 242, 360

There seems little point in a footnote to explain an acronym. It may be better in the body text.

Line 249-250

This appears to contradict the Specification Schema document Issues log.

Line 286

“Overtime” should be “Over time”.

Line 288

Avoid suggesting things may be “simple”.

Line 412

Should come after 417

Line 413-417

Needs quotation marks around this paragraph.

Line 425-426

Under “Economic consequences” in the table, the footnote does not scan.

Line 465

Page layout goes to landscape – is this deliberate for the remainder of the document?

Line 472

Is this document attempting to specify how semantic descriptions are formed?

How can anyone enforce lack of ambiguity?

Line 486

This is either a new section or an Appendix but not both.

Line 487-517

This is clearly addressing an ebXML Requirement (section 3.3 “library of documents based on identified services and interactions”)

Line 519

Extraneous page break

Appendix D

Catalog of Common Business Processes v0.91

Once again, there is some evidence that this document specifies features that address the ebXML requirements. For example, Line 91 implies this document is a specification for the cataloguing of business processes. Lines 231-245 then define these services required from the Registry. Furthermore, lines 258-259 identify and recommend classification schemes. These references also illustrate confusion as to where and when the classification of Registry items needs to be defined.

We suggest this material be moved to the only Business Process team technical specification document, the “Specification Schema”, or face the possibility of needing an additional round of public review.

Whilst it is extremely valuable, it is not clear how this catalogue will be used and maintained. We are left wondering what happens next?

Finally, this layout does not use the ebXML template, e.g. page number in footers, table of contents, etc.

Specific Comments....

Line 59, 61
Bookmark errors.

Line 91
Implies this document is a specification.

Line 106
Surely it provides more than a list of names?

Line 137-138
Does this refer to the classification in the ebXML registry?

Line 147
Does this also comply with the Specification Schema?

Line 162
Extraneous quote mark.

Line 167

Figure 0-1 is illegible. Also, what is the numbering convention being used? Shouldn't this be Figure 6.nn?

Line 194

Figure 7-2.1 is illegible.

Is this complete? Do financing and technology procurement not use labor? Is transport free (no finance)? Are these relationships important to the catalog?

Line 216

Is the ebXML Business Library the Registry?

Line 215-222

Contains rhetoric without justification. Why do business domain experts from UN/CEFACT need to define each specification? Why does the owner need to be an accredited global standards body?

Line 218

"its" should be "It is".

Line 237-239

Sentence needs re-working.

Line 249

Should "atomistic" be "atomic" (is "atomistic" a real word?)

Line 264-265

This sentence uses to word "standard" too freely. Maybe use a word like "initiatives".

Line 265-266, 268-269

X12 and EDIFACT standard messages do not define business processes (except by loose implication). It is the various implementation guidelines and those with the knowledge to construct these guidelines that define the business processes. Therefore, this table may not be comparing equivalent objects.

Line 288

Shouldn't this table refer to the Specification Schema rather than the Metamodel?

Appendix E

E-Commerce and Simple Negotiation Patterns v0.3

This is an enlightening and informative example of the definition of a specific business pattern.

Whilst it is extremely valuable, it is not clear how this document will be used. We are left wondering what happens next?

One again, the layout does not use the ebXML template, e.g. page number in footers, table of contents (and font), etc.

Specific Comments....

Line 86

What is meant by “relied upon”?

Line 90

Suggest “implementers” rather than “users”. Business process users would hopefully be oblivious to much of this.

Line 124, 181

Should “atomistic” be “atomic” (is “atomistic” a real word?)

Line 127

Given that many current business documents are not legally binding, would it not be more practical to suggest “commercially” binding as a better term.

Line 142-149

Are instructions to the editor of the ebXML Glossary.

Line 178

The word “logic” is redundant.

Line 185

Should be Appendix E not Exhibit. Also, this does not appear in the current version of the document referred to.

Line 245-246, 258-259, 269-270

There is some confusion about the document and message ID. Shouldn’t all references for a business pattern be at the document level and not the message level?

Line 292-293

If this negotiating pattern is being used to form a CPA how can it refer to the CPA?
Should it allow for using the CPP of the recipient?

Line 296, 303

Most other specifications refer to this as the “Business System Interface” not the
“business logic interface”.

Line 331-332

Figure 7-1 should use a UML diagram (e.g. a sequence diagram) for consistency with
other ebXML documents.

Line 344-347

We think this document now forms an Appendix to the CPP/CPA specification.