

Category: 1- Editorial, 2-Minor Technical, 3-Major Technical						
Item		Reference				
No.	Submitter	Line	Email	Category	Comment	Status
79	Henry Lowe	305	22-Aug	2	in the example, is "ebxmlpayload" required? If not, how do you know that this part contains a payload? There is no attribute saying this is a payload.	Chris to provide wording
104	Marty Sachs	478-479	22-Aug	3	Please provide 'To' and 'From' subelements for TPAId. Each trading partner should be able to select its own value of TPAId in order to use it as a local rapid locator.	Defer
120	David Burdett	412+	22-Aug	3	Add section on guidelines for use ... >>>Document Reference elements MUST created for each principal header element that is not a Manifest or a Header element. It is RECOMMENDED that Document Reference elements are created for each top-level MIME part contained within the ebXML Payload Container. It is an implementation decision of the application or process that is using the ebXML Messaging Service to specify which parts of the ebXML Payload Container are referenced by the Message Manifest".<<< The rationale for this is that knowledge of the existence of, for example, digital signatures, routing headers, etc in the ebXML Header Document is something that the ebXML Messaging Service could usefully discover from the Manifest. Specifying guidelines on what should be referenced in the ebXML Payload Containers should help provide some consistency of use.	Defer
122	David Burdett	437	22-Aug	3	TPAInfo - just a place holder that I think changes are required here, that will arise out of work in the TP group that we haven't yet done.	Defer
123	David Burdett	454+	22-Aug	3	Need to update definition of PartyId to reflect conclusion (?) of the discussion on the list on PartyId - suggest we add a comment that this is under review.	To be discussed, need: Kiss, international, standards compatible, extensible. Chris, dave, henry, Marty. Dick to resolve offline
126	Ian Jones	473	22-Aug	2	Is TPAInfo mandatory?	Defer - mark as under review
137	David Burdett	520	22-Aug	3	See recent email suggesting new value of "Delivery Semantics" of "CommunicationProtocol"	Discuss on the list, but defer for this release

Category: 1- Editorial, 2-Minor Technical, 3-Major Technical						
Item		Reference				
No.	Submitter	Line	Email	Category	Comment	Status
140	Gordon van Huizer	522	22-Aug	3	<p><AsbestosSuitOn> A number of references in other ebXML documents indicate that the purpose of reliable messaging is for guaranteed delivery ("OnceAndOnlyOnce" semantics, which is even called out specifically in some cases). It's fair to say that this is how ebXML reliable messaging is being marketed, and a reasonable expectation to many. Why, then, do we pull back here to "AtMostOnce"? Since we fully anticipate that ebXML implementations can ride atop reliable messaging infrastructures such as MQSeries and JMS implementations, why are we reluctant to provide a value of OnceAndOnlyOnce within the enumeration for the DeliverySemantics attribute? Presumably the ability to support guaranteed delivery is negotiated at the TPA level. If a given provider doesn't support guaranteed delivery, fine. But let's at least provide a value in the message header for it. If we are dead serious about NOT supporting OnceAndOnlyOnce in ebXML, we need to ensure that other ebXML documents make it clear that it is not supported so that expectations are appropriately calibrated. My opinion, though, is that we should support Onc</p>	Defer, but state that this section is under development
151	Henry Lowe	Routing	22-Aug	3	<p>This is not unrelated to the issue of routing. This document says nothing about how routing is handled or reflected in the message header. If we are using source routing (i.e., the message originator or perhaps the TPA defines the route the message will take to the destination). Presumably a full set of source routing information will need to be contained in the header or perhaps in subheaders containing the route when the route comprises more than a single hop. This set of routing information would have to contain the necessary "context" for each transport in the case of different transports being used for different hops, e.g., hop-1 uses HTTP, hop-2 uses CORBA, hop-3 uses MQSeries, and hop-4 uses SMTP (OK, perhaps this is a bit complicated, but the header information structure should be able to support this heaven knows what the real world may turn up).</p>	Defer as reliable messaging and multi-hop

Category: 1- Editorial, 2-Minor Technical, 3-Major Technical						
Item	Reference					
No.	Submitter	Line	Email	Category	Comment	Status
152	Marty Sachs	General	22-Aug	3	Some of the discussions about interrelations between Reliable Messaging and transport protocols point up the need to state the assumptions about the transport function in some manner. One possibility is some kind of definition of a conceptual interface between the Messaging Service and the transport function. It's fine to say that the messaging service is agnostic to the transport protocol but in real life, the Messaging Service run-time must interact with the transport run-time. Design of the messaging service protocol must be with the understanding of what goes on in the most likely transports. Since it is highly likely that an implementation will include both the messaging service and the transport function, it may be sufficient to express the interactions as a series of informative notes (or an informative appendix) rather than as a formal interface definition. The important point is that the assumptions have to be stated to ensure that the messaging service and transport function will work together correctly.	Defer
158	Dick Brooks	General	22-Aug	3	we need to provide a complete list of possible values for the 'content' attribute within the PartyId element.	Defer
159	Dick Brooks	General	22-Aug	3	The MessageData element should also include a 'DeliveryDeadline' element which indicates the last instance in time a message can be delivered to an intended recipient and a 'ResponseDeadline' element to tell the receiver how long they have to send an acknowledgment. I believe it would also be valuable to indicate how an acknowledgment should be sent on the same session that was used to send the ebXML message. If the AcknowledgeTo element is not present then whatever was specified in the TPA determines how acknowledgments are delivered.	Defer
163	Marty Sachs	462-464	29-Aug	2	If the specification lists a set of identifiers which can be values of the context attribute, this list should be described as suggestions. A pair of partners in a business relationship should be free to define a private pair of identifiers.	Defer