|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VC | schema definition |  | Technical /minor | There are two issues with the Modality value:  1. Within the schema definition, the enumerated values for Scent and DNA are repeated, this needs to be corrected.  2. The specification says "If an implementation is exposing an unlisted modality, it /may/ use another value." In practice, because the xsd declares enumerations, the implementing language may not be able to process any value not in the list. For example, in Java, an Enum is declared with all of the corresponding allowed values. When XML is unmarshalled into an Enum type, there is NO way to store a value that has not been enumerated. The resulting object will be null (if it doesn't fail entirely)  [[bioserv-comment] Public review comments for WSBD-v1.0-csprd...](http://markmail.org/message/hnyjnjx66v2bg7ep?q=list:org%2Eoasis-open%2Elists%2Ebioserv-comment) | 1)Fix enumerated values of Scent and DNA. | Accept. |
| VC | Section 3.12 |  | Editorial /minor | The enumerated value noSuchParamter is mis-spelled shouldn't this be corrected to noSuchParam\*e\*ter in the schema definition?  [[bioserv-comment] Public review comments for WSBD-v1.0-csprd...](http://markmail.org/message/3ympjlvydgnmuhqd?q=list:org%2Eoasis-open%2Elists%2Ebioserv-comment) | Correct the spelling of noSuchParamter in the schema definition. | Accept. |
| VC | Section 5.1 | ¶1 & First Example figure | Technical /minor | The meaning and use of the relationship element is unclear. Section 5.1 defines that it must start with "livePreview", but no reasoning is provided. Presumably, if there are multiple values, the client application should/could provide these as options in a select box?  Live preview that is easy to implement and support is going to be critical to widespread acceptance of this standard.  This specification seems to indicate that "multipart/x-mixed-replace" is the way to accomplish this. This is easy to implement on browsers that support it, but you have to rely on browser detection scripts to determine if it is not supported.  Section 6.15.2.2 recommends using a live stream to provide textual feedback, but offers no suggestions on how to implement this, or describe the implementation to the client.  Server Sent events may provide a richer preview mechanism for some sensor types. This is also not supported by all browsers, but detection of support in javascript is much simpler - 'if (typeof(EventSource) !== "undefined")' The event stream can also be returned from a restful web service call. We used this in our working prototype implementation of wsbd sending events containing text sensorStatus, fingerQuality, and even base64 encoded preview images. We would like to see Content-Type:text/event-stream included in appendix B as an allowed mime type.  [[bioserv-comment] Public review comments for WSBD-v1.0-csprd...](http://markmail.org/message/v4l55klhwvw6wztj?q=list:org%2Eoasis-open%2Elists%2Ebioserv-comment) | We would like to see Content-Type:text/event-stream included in appendix B as an allowed mime type. | Accept. |
| VC | Section 6.19 |  | Technical /major | 1)For the Get Sensor Data operation (section 6.19), the URL Template only includes the {captureId} parameter, but the URL Parameters definition includes {captureId} and {maxSize}.  2)Additionally, section 6.19.3 indicates that this operation provides metadata, but this operation only returns the raw sensor data, not a Result structure with metadata.  What is really missing here is ability to request sensor data in an alternate format. For example: We need to be able to configure the service for Content-Type of image/x-wsq so that the download operation will return wsq encoded fingerprint data, but our browser based client also needs to be able to display the image. Since most (if not all) browsers do not support wsq, we need the ability to download the same sensor data in a browser friendly format like image/png. It would be possible to have the client include an accepts header specifying the desired format, unfortunately, html does not allow you to add headers to img src attributes. Adding a URL parameter for the content type would be an ideal solution for this.  [[bioserv-comment] Public review comments for WSBD-v1.0-csprd...](http://markmail.org/message/d3xo47p4dcch4b3w?q=list:org%2Eoasis-open%2Elists%2Ebioserv-comment) | 1)Make Get Sensor Data operation URL template consistent with the Parameters definition.  2)Adding a URL parameter for the content type would be an ideal solution for this. | 1. Accept. Remove the “{maxSize}” parameter 2. Accept. |
| VC | Section 6.1.1 |  | Editorial /minor | Since there is a clearly defined Precedence of Status Enumerations (Section 6.1.1), it would seem logical for all of the Result Summary sections to list the expected results in order of precedence. This might simplify implementation and creation of test plans.  [[bioserv-comment] Public review comments for WSBD-v1.0-csprd...](http://markmail.org/message/tfgvsoir3zp4wv4n?q=list:org%2Eoasis-open%2Elists%2Ebioserv-comment) | For all of the Result Summary sections, list the expected results in order of precedence. | Accept. |
| VC | Section 5 | chart | Technical /minor | There seem to be several operations missing from the summary table including:  /capture/{sessionId}/async - start/stop aysnc capture  /download/{captureId}/raw - get sensor data  [[bioserv-comment] Public review comments for WSBD-v1.0-csprd...](http://markmail.org/message/azwoocudyo2iyvuq?q=list:org%2Eoasis-open%2Elists%2Ebioserv-comment) | Add operations to the summary table | Accept. |
| TAB | Section 4.1 |  | Bug /major | From 4.1:  \*\*\*\*\*Read-only parameters must specify its current value by populating the default value field with the value. Additionally, read-only parameters must not provide any allowed values. Allowed values are reserved to specify acceptable information which may be passed to the service for configuration.  \*\*\*\*\*  I have a sense of the distinction you are trying to make between read-only parameters and allowed values but even so, the first sentence seems to me to be incoherent. "...with the value?" From where?  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1433> | Time consuming but someone needs to read this out loud to one or more listeners. It would help catch things like the first sentence here. | Accept. |
| TAB | Section 4.1 |  | Bug /minor | 4.1 Service Information reads in part:   ."...Service information must include the required parameters listed in Appendix A; including the optional parameters is highly recommended...."   Suggest:   Service information consists of the required parameters listed in Appendix A. Optional parameters SHOULD be included.  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1431> | Note the dropping of the must, you define "service information" in terms of Appendix A. Then say Optional parameters "SHOULD" be included. | Accept. |
| TAB | Section 2 |  | Bug /minor | While the TC is reviewing the text with an eye on what is normative or not, you might want to take the time to kill as many of the adverbs and adjectives in the draft as possible.   For example:   2.1 "...A HTML page may be fully conformant to the HTML 4.0 specification, but it is not interoperable between web browsers..."   As far as I remember, web pages conform to HTML 4.0 or they do not. The term "fully" is a noise word.   2.2.2 ".... Most sensor components are hosted within a dedicated hardware component, but this is not necessarily globally true."   What? How about:    ".... Most sensor components are hosted within a dedicated hardware component, but this is not always true."   2.3 "...Regardless, it is a useful distinction in that it illustrates the flexibility afforded by leveraging highly interoperable communications protocols...."   Even if the sentence is useful in context (which it doesn't appear to be), communications protocols are interoperable, or not. "highly" doesn't add anything here.  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1426> | I can't estimate out of the 375 instances how many will result in re-writing but I suspect it will be a much cleaner draft after that task is done.   In part because you will have to ask yourself, as I have on numerous occasions, what was I really trying to say? and then say it clearly. | Accept. |
| TAB | Entire draft |  | Bug /minor | If you search for "in this" you will find a number of references to "in this example" that's fine, but you will also find "in this document," or "in this specification," which are not fine.   For example:   \*\*\*\*\*   Overriding HTTP status codes is just one example of the rich set of features afforded by HTTP; content negotiation, entity tags (e-tags), and preconditions are other features that could be leveraged instead of “recreated” (to some degree) within this specification. However, the authors   avoided the use of these advanced HTTP features in this version of the specification for several reasons:  \*\*\*\*\*   Could be written:   "WS-Biometric Devices omits advanced HTTP features because:"   You don't have to apologize for your choices, just announce them clearly and distinctly.  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1425> | Sweep the draft for "in this" and similar references. May have the advantage of shortening some of the prose as well. | Partial accept. |
| TAB | Section 2 |  | Bug /major | I mentioned the use of must/MUST in another issue but the use of keywords in general should be reviewed.   Here are two examples using "should:"   2.1 Interoperability:    Each browser has its own interpretation of how the content should be displayed.   2.4.3 Client Identity    Likewise, many-to-many relationships (i.e., multiple session ids being shared among multiple clients) are also possible, but should be avoided.   Two difference types of should? One? What do they mean for conformance?  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1424> | Review and properly capitalize keywords, when they are keywords, considering what the normative text means when invoked by a conformance clause. MUST, MUST NOT, SHOULD, SHOULD NOT (from memory, see RFC 2119, which you cite.) | Accept. |
| TAB | Entire document |  | Bug /minor | I counted 16 instances of: "Enclosing tags (which may vary) are omitted."  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1423> | Not necessary for anyone with enough XML chops to be implementing this standard.   Delete. | Accept. |
| TAB | Section 3.5 |  | Bug /major | 3.5 Range reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  A Range is a container used to describe a range of data, and whether the upper and lower bounds are exclusive. The upper and lower bounds must be inclusive by default.  \*\*\*\*\*   No.   By definition in your schema, the upper and lower bounds are inclusive by default. Users can choose to make either bound exclusive. Thus:   "The Range element is a container for elements that define a range and whether its upper or lower bounds are exclusive. Bounds by default are inclusive."   Yes?  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1422> | Recast to:   "The Range element is a container for elements that define a range and whether its upper or lower bounds are exclusive. Bounds by default are inclusive." | Accept. |
| TAB | Section 3.4.1.3 |  | Bug /major | The concluding sentence of this section reads:   \*\*\*\*\*  Configurable parameters with no restrictions on its value must not include this element.  \*\*\*\*\*   And that element would be?   I was checking usage of MUST (which occurs only 3 times) versus "must," which occurs 196 times.  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1421> | Suggest checking every occurrence of must, convert to MUST and verify its meaning in context. | Reject. That element is “allowedValues” |
| TAB | Section 4.3.1.2 |  | Bug /critical | Defining 4.3.1.2 Modality as xs:string leaves modality (which I followed from the conformance clauses) extremely vague.   Is that necessary in light of existing work that defines a wide range of modalities for bio-metric identification? Such as: <http://www.biometrics.gov/Standards/Registry_v5_2014_08_01.pdf>   To keep this family friendly, I could conform by saying:   < item>  882 <key>modality</key>  883 <value>Toe</value>  884 </item>  885 <item>  886 <key>submodality</key>  887 <value>leftToe</value>  888 </item>   And so indicate in my conformance title.   I don't think looseness here serves any useful purpose.  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1420> | Define modality with a standard set of modalities and their sub-types. | Reject. Values for modalities and submodalities change too frequently to realistically keep this specification up to date. This may be revisited during future revisions. |
| TAB | Appendix B |  | Bug /critical | I appreciate the clear separation of all the examples but so far I haven't discovered if they are normative or not?   For that matter, I can't determine on the face of the text which portions of it are normative or not.   Raising serious issues for conformance when text may or may not be normative.   For example, Appendix B Content Type Data, cites numerous formats and their formal definitions. I would like to assume that means an implementer saying they support image/jpeg must really support the JPEG standard.   That is far from clear in this draft.  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1417> | Clearly separate and label normative versus non-normative text. Can say, for example, that all labeled examples are non-normative, so you don't have to say non-normative for each one. Notes are usually non-normative. Entire sections can be if necessary, say introductory materials. | Accept. |
| TAB | Section 1.2 |  | Bug /minor | 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  [XSDPart2]  P. Biron, A. Malhotra, XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes Second Edition, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-2-20041028/,> W3C Recommendation. 28 October 2004.  \*\*\*\*\*   The correct citation reads:   \*\*\*\*\*  XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes Second Edition , P. V. Biron, A. Malhotra, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 28 October 2004, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-2-20041028/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-2/> .  \*\*\*\*\*  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1415> | Correct citation to:   XML Schema Part 2: Datatypes Second Edition, P. V. Biron, A. Malhotra, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 28 October 2004, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-2-20041028/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-2/> . | Accept. (Leave in the information in the square brackets.) |
| TAB | Section 1.2 |  | Bug /minor | 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  [XSDPart1]  Henry Thompson et al., XML Schema Part 1: Structures Second Edition, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-1-20041028/,> W3C Recommendation. 28 October 2004.  \*\*\*\*\*   The correct citation reads:   \*\*\*\*\*  XML Schema Part 1: Structures Second Edition , H. S. Thompson, D. Beech, M. Maloney, N. Mendelsohn, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 28 October 2004, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-1-20041028/> .  Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-1/> .  \*\*\*\*\*  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1414> | 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  [XSDPart1]  Henry Thompson et al., XML Schema Part 1: Structures Second Edition, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-1-20041028/,> W3C Recommendation. 28 October 2004.  \*\*\*\*\*   The correct citation reads:   \*\*\*\*\*  XML Schema Part 1: Structures Second Edition , H. S. Thompson, D. Beech, M. Maloney, N. Mendelsohn, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 28 October 2004, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/REC-xmlschema-1-20041028/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema-1/> .  \*\*\*\*\* | Accept. (Leave in the information in the square brackets.) |
| TAB | Section 1.2 |  | Bug /minor | 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  [XMLNS]  Tim Bray et al., Namespace in XML 1.0 (Third Edition), <http://www.w3.org/TR/2009/REC-xml-names-20091208/>. W3C Recommendation. 8 December2009.  \*\*\*\*\*   The correct citation reads:   \*\*\*\*\*  Namespaces in XML 1.0 (Third Edition) , T. Bray, D. Hollander, A. Layman, R. Tobin, H. S. Thompson, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 8 December 2009, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2009/REC-xml-names-20091208/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml-names> .  \*\*\*\*\*  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1413> | Correct citation to:   Namespaces in XML 1.0 (Third Edition), T. Bray, D. Hollander, A. Layman, R. Tobin, H. S. Thompson, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 8 December 2009, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2009/REC-xml-names-20091208/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml-names> . | Accept. (Leave in the information in the square brackets.) |
| TAB | Section 1.2 |  | Bug /minor | 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  Tim Bray et al., Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fifth Edition), <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml/>. W3C Recommendation. 26 November 2008.  \*\*\*\*\*   The correct citation reads:   \*\*\*\*\*  Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fifth Edition) , T. Bray, J. Paoli, M. , E. Maler, F. Yergeau, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 26 November 2008, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2008/REC-xml-20081126/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml> .  \*\*\*\*\*  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1412> | Correct citation to:   Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fifth Edition) , T. Bray, J. Paoli, M. , E. Maler, F. Yergeau, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 26 November 2008, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2008/REC-xml-20081126/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml> . | Accept. (Leave in the information in the square brackets.) |
| TAB | Section 1.2 |  | Bug /minor | 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  [WSGloss]  H. Haas, A. Brown, Web Services Glossary, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/NOTE-ws-gloss-20040211/,> February 11, 2004.  \*\*\*\*\*   The correct citation is:   Web Services Glossary , H. Haas, A. Brown, Editors, W3C Working Group Note Interest Group Note Coordination Group Note, 11 February 2004, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/NOTE-ws-gloss-20040211/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-gloss/> .  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1411> | Correct citation to:   Web Services Glossary, H. Haas, A. Brown, Editors, W3C Working Group Note Interest Group Note Coordination Group Note, 11 February 2004, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2004/NOTE-ws-gloss-20040211/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-gloss/> . | Accept. (Leave in the information in the square brackets.) |
| TAB | Section 1.2 |  | Bug /minor | Section 1.2 Normative References reads in part:   \*\*\*\*\*  [HTML5] HTML5. A vocabulary and associated APIs for HTML and XHTML. W3C Candidate Recommendation, <http://www.w3.org/TR/html5/,> 31 July 2014.  \*\*\*\*\*   [HTML5] key is fine but the citation is incorrect.   Should read:   \*\*\*\*\*  HTML5 , I. Hickson, R. Berjon, S. Faulkner, T. Leithead, E. Doyle Navara, T. , S. Pfeiffer, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 28 October 2014, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-html5-20141028/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/html5/> .  \*\*\*\*\*  <https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/TAB-1410> | Correct citation to:   HTML5, I. Hickson, R. Berjon, S. Faulkner, T. Leithead, E. Doyle Navara, T., S. Pfeiffer, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 28 October 2014, <http://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-html5-20141028/> . Latest version available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/html5/> . | Accept. (Leave in the information in the square brackets.) |
| TAB | Section 1.3.3 | Figure 1 | Bug /minor | The legend label 1 points to actors and not swim lanes in figure 1. | Locate label 1 to the right side (moving label 2 down) and have arrows point directly to the swimlanes.   And consider another label to point to the "actors" for completeness. | Reject. |

VC – Vernon Craddock

TAB – OASIS Technical Advisory Board