



# Issues List for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Version 3.0

## Working Draft 17, 24 April 2007

### Document Identifier:

ebms\_issues-3.0-wd-17

### Location:

[http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg\\_abbrev=ebxml-msg](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg_abbrev=ebxml-msg)

### Technical Committee:

OASIS ebXML Messaging Services TC

### Chair:

Ian Jones, British Telecom <[ian.c.jones@bt.com](mailto:ian.c.jones@bt.com)>

### Editor:

Pete Wenzel, Sun Microsystems <[pete.wenzel@sun.com](mailto:pete.wenzel@sun.com)>

### Abstract:

This document catalogs issues for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Specification V3.0, 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.

### Status:

This document was last revised or approved by the TC on the above date. The level of approval is also listed above. Check the current location noted above for possible later revisions of this document. This document is updated periodically on no particular schedule.

Technical Committee members should send comments on this specification to the [ebxml-msg@lists.oasis-open.org](mailto:ebxml-msg@lists.oasis-open.org) list. Others should use the comment form at [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/form.php?wg\\_abbrev=ebxml-msg](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/form.php?wg_abbrev=ebxml-msg).

For information on whether any patents have been disclosed that may be essential to implementing this specification, and any offers of patent licensing terms, please refer to the Intellectual Property Rights section of the OASIS ebXML Messaging Services TC web page (<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ebxml-msg/ipr.php>).

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85

---

# Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	5
2 Technical Deliverable Issues.....	6
2.1 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, PR01.....	6
CORE-1 Issue (Closed).....	6
CORE-2 Issue (Closed).....	6
CORE-3 Issue (Closed).....	6
CORE-4 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-5 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-6 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-7 Issue (Closed).....	7
CORE-8 Issue (Closed).....	8
CORE-9 Issue (Closed).....	8
CORE-10 Issue (Closed).....	8
CORE-11 Issue (Closed).....	9
CORE-12 Issue (Closed).....	9
CORE-13 Issue (Closed).....	9
CORE-14 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-15 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-16 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-17 Issue (Closed).....	10
CORE-18 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-19 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-20 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-21 Issue (Closed).....	11
CORE-22 Issue (Closed).....	12
CORE-23 Issue (Closed).....	12
CORE-24 Issue (Closed).....	12
CORE-25 Issue (Closed).....	13
CORE-26 Issue (Closed).....	13
CORE-27 Issue (Closed).....	13
CORE-28 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-29 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-30 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-31 Issue (Closed).....	14
CORE-32 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-33 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-34 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-35 Issue (Closed).....	15
CORE-36 Issue (Deferred).....	15
CORE-37 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-38 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-39 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-40 Issue (Closed).....	16
CORE-41 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-42 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-43 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-44 Issue (Closed).....	17
CORE-45 Issue (Closed).....	18
CORE-46 Issue (Closed).....	18
CORE-47 Issue (Closed).....	19
CORE-48 Issue (Closed).....	19
CORE-49 Issue (Closed).....	20
CORE-50 Issue (Closed).....	20

86	CORE-51 Issue (Closed).....	20
87	CORE-52 Issue (Closed).....	20
88	CORE-53 Issue (Closed).....	21
89	CORE-54 Issue (Closed).....	21
90	CORE-55 Issue (Closed).....	22
91	CORE-56 Issue (Closed).....	22
92	CORE-57 Issue (Closed).....	23
93	CORE-58 Issue (Closed).....	23
94	CORE-59 Issue (Closed).....	23
95	CORE-60 Issue (Deferred).....	24
96	CORE-61 Issue (Deferred).....	24
97	CORE-62 Issue (Deferred).....	24
98	CORE-63 Issue (Deferred).....	24
99	CORE-64 Issue (Closed).....	25
100	CORE-65 Issue (Closed).....	25
101	CORE-66 Issue (Closed).....	25
102	CORE-67 Issue (Closed).....	26
103	CORE-68 Issue (Closed).....	26
104	CORE-69 Issue (Closed).....	26
105	CORE-70 Issue (Closed).....	27
106	CORE-71 Issue (Closed).....	27
107	CORE-72 Issue (Closed).....	28
108	CORE-73 Issue (Closed).....	28
109	CORE-74 Issue (Closed).....	28
110	CORE-75 Issue (Deferred).....	29
111	CORE-76 Issue (Closed).....	29
112	CORE-77 Issue (Closed).....	29
113	CORE-78 Issue (Closed).....	30
114	CORE-79 Issue (Closed).....	31
115	CORE-80 Issue (Closed).....	31
116	CORE-81 Issue (Closed).....	31
117	CORE-82 Issue (Closed).....	31
118	2.2 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR01.....	31
119	CORE-83 Issue (Partially Deferred).....	31
120	CORE-84 Issue (Closed).....	32
121	CORE-85 Issue (Closed).....	32
122	CORE-86 Issue (Closed).....	32
123	CORE-87 Issue (Closed).....	33
124	CORE-88 Issue (Closed).....	33
125	CORE-89 Issue (Closed).....	33
126	CORE-90 Issue (Closed).....	34
127	CORE-91 Issue (Closed).....	34
128	CORE-92 Issue (Closed).....	34
129	CORE-93 Issue (Closed).....	34
130	CORE-94 Issue (Closed).....	35
131	CORE-95 Issue (Closed).....	35
132	CORE-96 Issue (Closed).....	35
133	CORE-97 Issue (Closed).....	36
134	CORE-98 Issue (Closed).....	36
135	CORE-99 Issue (Assigned-Conformance Profile).....	36
136	CORE-100 Issue (Open).....	37
137	CORE-101 Issue (Open).....	37
138	CORE-102 Issue (Closed).....	37
139	CORE-103 Issue (Closed).....	37
140	CORE-104 Issue (Deferred).....	38
141	CORE-105 Issue (Pending Edit).....	38

142	CORE-106 Issue (Closed).....	39
143	CORE-107 Issue (Closed).....	39
144	CORE-108 Issue (Open).....	39
145	CORE-109 Issue (Open).....	39
146	CORE-110 Issue (Closed).....	40
147	CORE-111 Issue (Closed).....	40
148	CORE-112 Issue (Closed).....	40
149	CORE-113 Issue (Closed).....	41
150	CORE-114 Issue (Open).....	41
151	CORE-115 Issue (Open).....	41
152	CORE-116 Issue (Open).....	41
153	CORE-117 Issue (Partially Deferred).....	42
154	CORE-118 Issue (Open).....	42
155	CORE-119 Issue (Closed).....	42
156	CORE-120 Issue (Closed).....	42
157	CORE-121 Issue (Pending Review).....	43
158	CORE-122 Issue (Open).....	44
159	APPENDIX A. Revision History.....	45
160	APPENDIX B. Contributors.....	47
161	APPENDIX C. Notices.....	48
162		

---

# 1 Introduction

163

164 This document catalogues issues for OASIS ebXML Messaging Services (ebMS) Version 3.0, which is  
165 developed by the OASIS ebXML Messaging Services Technical Committee. It is intended to record  
166 specific issues that potentially need to be implemented as changes or additions to a specification.

165 Each issue includes the following information:

- 166 • A unique *issue ID*, such as CORE-42. This appears in the section heading. The possible categories  
167 are **CORE** for the Part 1 Core Features specification, ....
- 168 • A *short name* for the issue. This appears in the section heading. (Not used.)
- 169 • The issue's *status*. This appears in the section heading. The possible statuses are **Open** for issues  
170 that still need a resolution, **Assigned** for open issues awaiting specific proposals, **Deferred** for  
171 issues that we have put off dealing with until a future specification or revision, **Pending (Edit,**  
172 **Review)** for issues that we have resolved but that remain to be implemented, and **Closed** for  
173 issues that have a resolution and require no further action (for example, because the resolution has  
174 been implemented or because no action at all is necessary).
- 175 • The *source* of the issue, indicating where it was first raised or reported.
- 176 • The assigned *owner* of the issue. This person is responsible for proposing options and a preferred  
177 resolution.
- 178 • An arbitrarily long *description* of the issue, including any discussion history.
- 179 • The *resolution* of the issue, once this information is available. It should include the date and  
180 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>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

**Owner:**

Unassigned

**Description:**

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

**Resolution:**

07/12/2006, agree example incorrect. Fixed in WD 14.

#### CORE-2 Issue (Closed)

**Source:**

Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

**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>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

**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.

222 **CORE-4 Issue (Closed)**

223 **Source:**

224 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
225 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00000.html>

226 **Description:**

227 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  
228 attribute is not in the docs (PartyId is not an xmltype)

229 **Owner:**

230 Hamid

231 **Resolution:**

232 07/12/2006, XSD and text need updating.  
233 New schema in WD 17.

234 **CORE-5 Issue (Closed)**

235 **Source:**

236 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
237 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00001.html>

238 **Description:**

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

241 **Owner:**

242 Hamid

243 **Resolution:**

244 07/12/2006, XSD needs realignment.

245 **CORE-6 Issue (Closed)**

246 **Source:**

247 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
248 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00001.html>

249 **Description:**

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

252 **Owner:**

253 Hamid

254 **Resolution:**

255 07/12/2006, XSD needs realignment

256 **CORE-7 Issue (Closed)**

257 **Source:**

258 Ronald van Kuijk <ronald@vankuijk.net>  
259 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00001.html>

260 **Description:**

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

263 **Resolution:**

264 07/12/2006, Remove periods. Fixed in WD 14.

265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310

## CORE-8 Issue (Closed)

**Source:**

Yangsun Park, KorBIT <ysplays@postech.ac.kr>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00004.html>

**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>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00004.html>

**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  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>

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>  
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00004.html>

**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



311 pull message from same MPF queue.

312 **Owner:**

313 Jacques/Hamid (draft text already exists).

314 **Resolution:**

315 07/12/2006, Substantive issue: Solution is to secure MPFs, so that only authorized partners can  
316 pull from respective "queues". Think more about options.

317 11/29/2006, Addressed in P-Mode Model 0.81 & Message Authorization draft, to be included in  
318 WD 16.

319 **CORE-11 Issue (Closed)**

320 **Source:**

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

323 **Description:**

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

326 **Resolution:**

327 07/12/2006, included in WD 14.

328 **CORE-12 Issue (Closed)**

329 **Source:**

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

332 **Description:**

333 Line 290 Change:

334 `"/x:MyHeader/x:SomeProperty/@value1"`

335 To

336 `"/x:MyHeader/x:SomeProperty/@attribute1"`

337 **Resolution:**

338 07/12/2006, Fixed in WD 14.

339 **CORE-13 Issue (Closed)**

340 **Source:**

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

343 **Description:**

344 Line 294:

345 The prefix "wssswa" is defined in [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/16672/wss-v1.1-spec-os-SwAPProfile.pdf)  
346 [open.org/committees/download.php/16672/wss-v1.1-spec-os-SwAPProfile.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/16672/wss-v1.1-spec-os-SwAPProfile.pdf) with the value  
347 "http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/oasis-wss-SwAPProfile-1.1.xsd" rather than "http://docs.oasis-  
348 [open.org/wss/2004/XX/oasis-2004XX-wss-swa-profile-1.0.xsd](http://docs.oasis-open.org/wss/2004/XX/oasis-2004XX-wss-swa-profile-1.0.xsd)"

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

350 **Resolution:**

351 07/12/2006, Fixed in WD 14.

352 **CORE-14 Issue (Closed)**

353 **Source:**

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

356 **Description:**

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

359 **Resolution:**

360 07/12/2006, Correct. Clarify that submit/deliver operations occur only once per message  
361 lifetime. Any actions performed by an intermediary will be defined in different terms. Fixed in  
362 WD 14.

363 **CORE-15 Issue (Closed)**

364 **Source:**

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

367 **Description:**

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

371 **Resolution:**

372 07/12/2006, Having both types of message units in a single message is not precluded by the  
373 schema & Core. However, such cases are out of Core's scope. Possibly state this explicitly;  
374 look for and remove any other occurrences that imply only one or the other may be present.  
375 Conformance issue: Do implementations need to support this or not? Need to be more explicit?  
376 Solution: State in core that sensible combinations/bundling MAY be done; conformance profile  
377 (in advance of Part 2, Advanced Features) would specify explicitly.  
378 [Updates to Messaging Model in WD 14 may address this; are they complete?]  
379 Addressed by Bundling Options proposal from Jacques & Hamid. Included in WD 15.

380 **CORE-16 Issue (Closed)**

381 **Source:**

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

384 **Description:**

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

387 **Owner:**

388 Pete

389 **Resolution:**

390 07/19/2006, Signals are initiated by either MSH. Updates to Messaging Model in WD 14 make  
391 this even more unclear, and new definition is incorrect in the case of PullRequest signal.  
392 (State that signal generation is implementation-dependent?)  
393 Fixed in WD 15, Section 2.1.3.

394 **CORE-17 Issue (Closed)**

395 **Source:**

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

397 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

398 **Description:**

399 Line 342: "receive and process error messages associated"

400 should this be:

401 "receive and process Signal Messages associated"?

402 **Owner:**

403 Pete

404 **Resolution:**

405 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14, but also strike "associated with previously sent messages";  
406 not accurate for PullRequest signal? Further resolved in WD 15.

407 **CORE-18 Issue (Closed)**

408 **Source:**

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

411 **Description:**

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

414 **Resolution:**

415 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

416 **CORE-19 Issue (Closed)**

417 **Source:**

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

420 **Description:**

421 Line 382-383: Formatting (no new paragraph)

422 **Resolution:**

423 07/19/2006, Cited text rewritten in WD 14. No longer an issue.

424 **CORE-20 Issue (Closed)**

425 **Source:**

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

428 **Description:**

429 Line 364: Section 2.2

430 **Resolution:**

431 07/19/2006, No problem found at cited line.

432 **CORE-21 Issue (Closed)**

433 **Source:**

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

436 **Description:**

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

438 **Resolution:**  
439 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 440 **CORE-22 Issue (Closed)**

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

444 **Description:**  
445 Line 495, Message Pulling: It looks like this mechanism can be used to select a particular  
446 mailbox. Could this be generalized to a mechanism where the Initiator wants to retrieve a  
447 response to a particular message? The Responder could have a database of RefToMessageId  
448 values of messages waiting to be pulled. The requested message may not be the first in the  
449 queue.  
450 Could the Initiator provide additional filtering information, e.g. only retrieve message less than 1  
451 MB in size? This would increase the value for SMEs that have limited bandwidth connections.  
452 Or should the Initiator/Responder negotiate policies about which message to put in which  
453 Message Partition based on criteria like size?  
454 Is there only one message being pulled for each PullRequest / MPF?

455 **Owner:**  
456 Hamid (for schema changes)

457 **Resolution:**  
458 07/19/2006, Potentially substantive issue. Regarding last point, need to clarify that a single  
459 message is pulled each time. Don't disallow more complex selection mechanism; enable it by  
460 inserting a schema extension point in PullRequest element, but leave its use to profiles.  
461 11/29/2006, Addressed by changes to be included in WD 16. Implementations could also filter  
462 messages on Sender side, assigning different classes of messages to different MPFs.  
463 New schema in WD 17.

## 464 **CORE-23 Issue (Closed)**

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

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

470 **Resolution:**  
471 07/19/2006, Agree; insert forward reference to Processing Modes section. Fixed in WD 14.

## 472 **CORE-24 Issue (Closed)**

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

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

481 **Resolution:**  
482 07/19/2006, No action needed in specification; provide details in implementation notes. (Access

483 control to MPF is based on data other than PartyId.)

## 484 **CORE-25 Issue (Closed)**

### 485 **Source:**

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

### 488 **Description:**

489 Line 533 and 548: While it is a non-normative example, it may be clearer to change these to  
490 something like:

491 "<eb:MessageId>UUID-4@receiver.com</eb:MessageId>"

492 "<eb:MessageId>UUID-5@sender.com</eb:MessageId>"

493 <eb:RefToMessageId>UUID-4@receiver.com</eb:RefToMessageId>"

### 494 **Resolution:**

495 07/19/2006, Change to sender.example.com, receiver.example.com. Cite RFC 2606. Fixed in  
496 WD 14.

## 497 **CORE-26 Issue (Closed)**

### 498 **Source:**

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

### 501 **Description:**

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

### 505 **Owner:**

506 Pete

### 507 **Resolution:**

508 07/19/2006, Similar to other comments received. No change in spec. MPF could be used for  
509 push as well as pull. Note in spec that MPF may be useful for reasons other than identifying a  
510 pull queue.

511 Fixed in WD 15, Section 3.4.1.

## 512 **CORE-27 Issue (Closed)**

### 513 **Source:**

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

### 516 **Description:**

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

### 522 **Owner:**

523 Ian (to request clarification)

### 524 **Resolution:**

525 07/19/2006, Clarify – dynamic is a problem static binding via to and from. Seems orthogonal and  
526 possible, but requires more information; follow-up.

527 11/29/2006, Related to CORE-22. This functionality is left to implementation. Out of scope of

528 specification.

## 529 **CORE-28 Issue (Closed)**

### 530 **Source:**

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

533

534 Line 786:

535 "the the ebXML Application." -> "the ebXML Application."

### 536 **Resolution:**

537 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 538 **CORE-29 Issue (Closed)**

### 539 **Source:**

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

### 542 **Description:**

543 Line 887:

544 "Because either packaging option can be used, implementations MUST support non-multipart  
545 messages."

546 Should this be:

547 "Because either packaging option can be used, implementations MUST support both multipart  
548 and non-multipart messages." ?

### 549 **Resolution:**

550 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 551 **CORE-30 Issue (Closed)**

### 552 **Source:**

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

### 555 **Description:**

556 Line 901:

557 "parts. containing additional" -> "parts containing additional"

### 558 **Resolution:**

559 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

## 560 **CORE-31 Issue (Closed)**

### 561 **Source:**

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

### 564 **Description:**

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

### 566 **Resolution:**

567 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

568 **CORE-32 Issue (Closed)**

569 **Source:**

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

572 **Description:**

573 Line 918: "Package contain a type" -> "Package contains a type"

574 **Resolution:**

575 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

576 **CORE-33 Issue (Closed)**

577 **Source:**

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

580 **Description:**

581 Line 965: "Namespace declaration" -> "A namespace declaration"

582 **Resolution:**

583 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

584 **CORE-34 Issue (Closed)**

585 **Source:**

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

588 **Description:**

589 Line 1030: "the namespace for" -> "the namespace prefix for"

590 **Resolution:**

591 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

592 **CORE-35 Issue (Closed)**

593 **Source:**

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

596 **Description:**

597 Line 1079: "there MUST NOT be additional Payload Containers."

598 Does this mean the ebMS 3.0 specification precludes composition with other SOAP protocols  
599 that want to attach data? (Somewhat theoretical question, admittedly).

600 **Resolution:**

601 07/19/2006, Agree. State that there SHOULD NOT be additional attachments, but if there are  
602 any, they are outside the scope of MSH processing. MSH MUST NOT process data that is not  
603 referenced by PayloadInfo. Fixed in WD 14.

604 **CORE-36 Issue (Deferred)**

605 **Source:**

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

608 **Description:**

609 Line 1119 and 1148: "Both eb:UserMessage element and eb:SignalMessage element MAY"

610 Does this mean  
611 "Both a eb:UserMessage element and a eb:SignalMessage element MAY"  
612 or  
613 "Both eb:UserMessage elements and eb:SignalMessage elements MAY" ?  
614 If the spec allowed multiple eb:UserMessages, it could easily support batch/unbatch operations.

615 **Resolution:**  
616 07/19/2006, changes in WD 14 should now allow this; ambiguity removed. But further discussion  
617 of multiple UserMessages is deferred to Part 2.

## 618 **CORE-37 Issue (Closed)**

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

622 **Description:**  
623 Line 1159 and 1165: Not sure why "(no change beside renaming)" is there.

624 **Resolution:**  
625 07/19/2006, Agree to remove. Fixed in WD 14.

## 626 **CORE-38 Issue (Closed)**

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

630 **Description:**  
631 Line 1192: "cid:foo", note that "foo" has to be a MIME content ID, i.e. "foo@example.com".

632 **Resolution:**  
633 07/19/2006, Agree to replace with well-formed CID. Fixed in WD 14.

## 634 **CORE-39 Issue (Closed)**

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

638 **Description:**  
639 Line 1225: this allows for payloads not in the message, but line 1386 doesn't.

640 **Resolution:**  
641 07/19/2006, Agree Line 1385 needs updating – payload may be external. Fixed in WD 14.

## 642 **CORE-40 Issue (Closed)**

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

646 **Description:**  
647 Line 1230: Why is the element "timestamp" in lower case? eb:Timestamp would be more  
648 consistent?

649 **Resolution:**  
650 07/19/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.



651 **CORE-41 Issue (Closed)**

652 **Source:**

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

655 **Description:**

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

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

661 **Resolution:**

662 07/19/2006, Add back text from ebms V2 about multiple synonymous partyIds. Fixed in WD 14.

663 **CORE-42 Issue (Closed)**

664 **Source:**

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

667 **Description:**

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

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

672 **Resolution:**

673 07/26/2006, Add the error message raised is EBMS:0003 valueinconsistent. [EdNote: It already  
674 said that. Removed the conflicting text quoted above.] Fixed in WD 14.

675 **CORE-43 Issue (Closed)**

676 **Source:**

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

679 **Description:**

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

681 **Resolution:**

682 07/26/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

683 **CORE-44 Issue (Closed)**

684 **Source:**

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

687 **Description:**

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

689 **Owner:**

690 Ian

691 **Resolution:**

692 07/26/2006, Agree, add reference. [EdNote: What is the proper reference that defines the "id"  
693 attribute? XML Schema?]

694 12/21/2006 email from Pete at

695 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00026.html>  
696 Current best practice is to reference the xml: namespace  
697 (<http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace>), which now defines an xml:id attribute. Its  
698 specification is found in <http://www.w3.org/TR/xml-id/>, "xml:id Version 1.0", W3C  
699 Recommendation 9 September 2005.  
700 01/03/2007: Agreed to reference the above spec. Need exact text to include in Section 5.2.3.12,  
701 and inclusion in schema.  
702 Fixed in WD 17. Requires inclusion in schema?

## 703 **CORE-45 Issue (Closed)**

### 704 **Source:**

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

### 707 **Description:**

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

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

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

### 720 **Owner:**

721 Pete

### 722 **Resolution:**

723 07/26/2006, Agree, Duplicate of CORE-39. Partially fixed in WD 14. [EdNote: Still need to  
724 define and describe error condition in which external reference cannot be resolved, although  
725 much of the behavior around how (or even whether) to resolve a reference is implementation-  
726 dependent.]

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

728 11/29/2006, Disagreement as to whether anything needs to be done here; alternative is to leave  
729 complete handling of external references to implementations.

730 02/07/2007, Agree to include "unresolvable external reference" (type of ebms processing error).

## 731 **CORE-46 Issue (Closed)**

### 732 **Source:**

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

### 735 **Description:**

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

### 738 **Owner:**

739 Pete

### 740 **Resolution:**

741 07/26/2006, Simplify this paragraph to remove optional/should confusion. 2nd add sentence at

742 end of 1414 that this is metadata and its processing is not mandated.  
743 Done in WD 16.

## 744 **CORE-47 Issue (Closed)**

### 745 **Source:**

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

### 748 **Description:**

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

### 754 **Owner:**

755 Ric

### 756 **Resolution:**

757 07/26/2006, We are missing the description element in the schema in the appendix. (Discussion  
758 on extensibility points.) Need to add a note that other metadata may be added as an extension  
759 point, as key-value pairs.

760 09/27/2006, agreed to accept Ric's proposal posted at  
761 [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/email/archives/200609/msg00017.html)  
762 [msg/email/archives/200609/msg00017.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/email/archives/200609/msg00017.html)

763 Included in WD 15.

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

767 11/29/2006, Unsure of utility of providing pre-encryption MIME type. No need to define  
768 additional specific properties. (Left to profiling, or potential Part 2 work.) Propose to close with  
769 no further action.

770 12/06/2006, Ric agrees to close.

## 771 **CORE-48 Issue (Closed)**

### 772 **Source:**

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

### 775 **Description:**

776 Line 1425: eb:version="2.0" ?

### 777 **Owner:**

778 Ian

### 779 **Resolution:**

780 07/26/2006, Agree; correct. [EdNote: Don't see a problem here. This refers to a payload schema  
781 version, for which "2.0" may be valid. "3.0" is correctly used where eb:version refers to ebMS  
782 3.0.]

783 08/30/2006, Further issues: Line 1414, @version should be OPTIONAL. Examples do not  
784 contain required @namespace. Schema does not define the eb:Schema element at all; PartInfo  
785 is incomplete.

786 12/06/2006, Pending schema completion and alignment of examples with schema.

787 New schema in WD 17.

788 **CORE-49 Issue (Closed)**

789 **Source:**

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

792 **Description:**

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

794 **Resolution:**

795 07/26/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

796 **CORE-50 Issue (Closed)**

797 **Source:**

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

800 **Description:**

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

803 **Owner:**

804 Pete

805 **Resolution:**

806 07/26/2006, List is exemplar – this is correct for part 1, need to clarify the wording. – Part 2 we  
807 have left for later – suggestion any error raised outside MSH is an implementation decision.

808 08/30/2006: Note that it is not an exhaustive list. Also, addressing should not be included.

809 Included in WD 16.

810 **CORE-51 Issue (Closed)**

811 **Source:**

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

814 **Description:**

815 Line 1669: "reported in a log l" -> "reported in a log in"

816 **Resolution:**

817 07/26/2006, Agree. Fixed in WD 14.

818 **CORE-52 Issue (Closed)**

819 **Source:**

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

822 **Description:**

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

825 **Owner:**

826 Pete

827 **Resolution:**

828 07/26/2006, Need re-write and clarify what is going on 1st sentence OK, recommend partInfo  
829 unencrypt ok, routing is another issue!

830 08/30/2006, Can make recommendations here, but the actual runtime encryption policy needs to

831 be agreed between parties. Should specify elements to be encrypted in P-Mode.security.  
832 02/07/2007, Latest P-Mode drafts include list of encrypted parts.  
833 03/06/2007, See proposed text in WD 17, Section 7.4.

## 834 **CORE-53 Issue (Closed)**

### 835 **Source:**

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

### 838 **Description:**

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

### 841 **Owner:**

842 Pete

### 843 **Resolution:**

844 07/26/2006, Figure 7 addresses this – add note to this section referring back to fig 7.  
845 Included in WD 16.

## 846 **CORE-54 Issue (Closed)**

### 847 **Source:**

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

### 850 **Description:**

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

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

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

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

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

### 871 **Owner:**

872 Jacques

### 873 **Resolution:**

874 07/26/2006, Correct – semantic definition should be left to the P-Mode. Is ack and error a bad  
875 thing? Delivery that is restricted to the RM module is what is intended can we make this clear?

876 12/06/2006, Latest P-Mode draft fully addresses semantics of acknowledgment. To be included  
877 in WD 16. No further action required.

878

## CORE-55 Issue (Closed)

879 **Source:**

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

882 **Description:**

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

887 **Owner:**

888 Jacques

889 **Resolution:**

890 12/06/2006, Sequence assignment issue covered in Section 8.2.2 of WD 15. Also addressed by  
891 P-Mode appendix (reliability.inorder.scope parameter). Latest P-Mode draft improves on this, to  
892 be included in WD 16.

893

## CORE-56 Issue (Closed)

894 **Source:**

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

897 **Description:**

898 There is now no ebXML concept of Message Ordering. Can organizations still use the ordering  
899 features of the underlying RM specifications? E.g. certain service/action/cpaid/conversationid  
900 initiate new sequences, and others terminate them. Is there a way to specify this correlation.

901 Partners may want to specify that certain Service/Action combinations, with a new  
902 ConversationID and in the same Cpaid, are to be performed in-order. How do they specify this,  
903 and how does the ebMS processor know about this?

904 **Owner:**

905 Jacques

906 **Resolution:**

907 09/06/2006: Allow mapping between ebMS conversation and RM sequence.

908 1. Add in P-Mode:

909 \* PMode[1].Reliability.InOrder.Scope: this parameter is a string that defines the set of messages  
910 that must be ordered, if appropriate. For example, a value of "{eb:ConversationId}" means that  
911 all messages that share the same ConversationId in a conversation initiated by a message such  
912 as those subject to this P-Mode leg (typically, with Service/Action as specified in  
913 PMode[1].UserInfo), must be ordered.

914 2. Add in 8.2.2 (latest draft) after L1517, a third bullet item:

915 "\*\* Have sufficient control on which RM sequence is used when submitting a message (RM-  
916 Submit), so that an RM sequence may be mapped to an ebMS conversation  
917 (eb:ConversationId)."

918 (Above 2 edits complete in WD 15.)

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

922 12/06/2006, Contract is between RMP & RMP. MSH behavior is specified in 8.2.2, under "In-  
923 Order ebMS Delivery". Additional Inorder.Scope usages are listed in latest P-Mode draft, to be  
924 included in WD 16. Others are left to implementers to define.

925 **CORE-57 Issue (Closed)**

926 **Source:**

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

928 **Description:**

929 Line 2730: "This become a" -> "This becomes a"

930 **Resolution:**

931 Editorial. Fixed in WD 14.

932 **CORE-58 Issue (Closed)**

933 **Source:**

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

936 **Description:**

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

938 **Resolution:**

939 Editorial. Fixed along with CORE-38 in WD 14.

940 **CORE-59 Issue (Closed)**

941 **Source:**

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

944 **Description:**

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

947 **Owner:**

948 Jacques

949 **Resolution:**

950 09/06/2006: (belongs in compatibility section proposal); to appear in WD 15.

951 CM4) MEP mapping rules (between V2 and V3):

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

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

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

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

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

969 (e) In V3: Two-Way / Push-and-Push will map to two One-way in ebMS2, where the second

970 message refers to the first one using RefToMessageId. Each one of the two messages is  
971 handled as in (a) or (b).  
972 Latest draft of this entire section included in WD 15.

## 973 **CORE-60 Issue (Deferred)**

### 974 **Source:**

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

### 977 **Description:**

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

### 981 **Owner:**

982 Pete

### 983 **Resolution:**

984 09/06/2006: Not in scope of Core spec. Add to where Core lists additional features that may be  
985 described in a future specification.  
986 Note appears in Section 8.2.4 of WD 14.

## 987 **CORE-61 Issue (Deferred)**

### 988 **Source:**

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

### 991 **Description:**

992 ebMS2 has a Ping service. What happened to it?

### 993 **Resolution:**

994 09/06/2006: Test message is almost completely defined in Default P-Mode. "Discard" rule  
995 already exists in 5.2.1.8. We may define a more complete test service (whether/how it responds,  
996 correlates response test message, etc.) in future spec.

## 997 **CORE-62 Issue (Deferred)**

### 998 **Source:**

999 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
1000 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 1001 **Description:**

1002 ebMS2 had a section C Supported Profiling Services. It would be quite useful to have a similar  
1003 table that maps these profiles to ebMS3 with WS Security.

### 1004 **Resolution:**

1005 09/06/2006: Could specify these profiles in terms of P-Mode.Security. Not in Core spec; belongs  
1006 in Conformance Profile or similar document.

## 1007 **CORE-63 Issue (Deferred)**

### 1008 **Source:**

1009 Pim van der Eijk, Sonnenglanz Consulting BV <lists@sonnenglanz.net>  
1010 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00002.html>

### 1011 **Description:**

1012 ebMS2 had a section 6.6 with reliable messaging combinations. When Part II adds support for  
1013 multi-hop, it would be useful to review how this could be mapped to ebMS3 with WS-R or WS-



1014 RM.

1015 **Resolution:**

1016 09/06/2006: Defer until we define multi-hop functionality in a future specification.

1017 **CORE-64 Issue (Closed)**

1018 **Source:**

1019 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

1020 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1021 **Description:**

1022 Section 3 introduces a 'message pulling' feature on the SOAP level to overcome limitations  
1023 such as availability of static IP I find it strange that one would need such a feature, since ebMS  
1024 2 already provides SMTP/POP3 based transport which already covers such a need. The main  
1025 issue with this is shifting responsibilities. A sender is now required to keep the message available  
1026 for the recipient on his server, rather than dropping it in the realm of the recipient when ready.  
1027 This blurs the division of responsibility and leads to issues with message turnaround times.

1028 **Resolution:**

1029 09/06/2006: Message Pulling offers a richer feature set (decisions about what to pull and when).  
1030 SPAM and opaqueness of mail infrastructure are issues. However, SMTP binding is still  
1031 available. Message structure is transport-independent. Close with no action.

1032 **CORE-65 Issue (Closed)**

1033 **Source:**

1034 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

1035 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1036 **Description:**

1037 Section 2.2 introduces 'message exchange patterns', which attempt to tightly couple business  
1038 process with a particular message exchange. This shouldn't be part of ebMS as it introduces too  
1039 much dependency between process and messaging. The problems with sync and async  
1040 messaging modules wrt to MEP already indicate you're not on the right path here. Please stick to  
1041 the reftomessageid for linking messages and allow business process to design the message  
1042 patterns for the process. All we need to do here is making sure people 'can' relate messages if  
1043 they need to.

1044 **Owner:**

1045 Jacques

1046 **Resolution:**

1047 09/06/2006: Have dissociated ebMS MEP from SOAP binding. Addressed by Messaging Model  
1048 section changes of WD 14.

1049 **CORE-66 Issue (Closed)**

1050 **Source:**

1051 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>

1052 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1053 **Description:**

1054 Section 5,7,8 - changing the header formats to comply with WS\*. The main issue is backwards  
1055 compatibility. While I learned from Jacques that SwA is still the way to go, moving critical  
1056 information about in the SOAP Envelope will require recoding at the core. This will hamper  
1057 migration from ebMS 2 to ebMS 3 environments, if not block them completely, leaving the  
1058 communities on an island and requiring implementers to maintain two versions.

1059 **Owner:**  
1060 Jacques

1061 **Resolution:**  
1062 09/06/2006: Addressed by backward-compatibility section. Insert as Appendix to Core. Appears  
1063 in WD 15.

## 1064 **CORE-67 Issue (Closed)**

1065 **Source:**  
1066 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>  
1067 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1068 **Description:**  
1069 Processing Modes: Having a concise set of data for processing modes is a good idea. In the  
1070 past, we've seen people struggle with CPA's to configure their MSH's. Whether or not we need a  
1071 'formal' PM document is another issue, I believe the content is already inside the ebMS2 [3?]  
1072 spec, it just needs to be elevated into a concise document essentially detailing the various  
1073 parameters that one may set.

1074 **Owner:**  
1075 Jacques

1076 **Resolution:**  
1077 09/06/2006: Believed to be addressed by P-Mode model draft, included in WD 15.  
1078 <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/ebxml-msg/download.php/20048/PMode-model-3.doc>  
1079

## 1080 **CORE-68 Issue (Closed)**

1081 **Source:**  
1082 Gait Boxman <gait.boxman@tie.nl>  
1083 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00003.html>

1084 **Description:**  
1085 Conformance Profiles: Using a conformance profiles document separate from the main spec or  
1086 embedding it doesn't make a lot of difference. However, allowing choice on things like the  
1087 version of SOAP or WSS introduces options that may hamper interoperability on the larger  
1088 scale. IMO, It would be in the interest of the market (both developers and users) to fix versions  
1089 of underlying protocols as much as possible in order to avoid flexibilities that may divide the  
1090 market. Even when e.g. SOAP 1.2 is backwards compatible with SOAP 1.1, it is better to decide  
1091 on SOAP 1.1 or SOAP 1.2, rather than leaving it open. It simply reduces the number of  
1092 \*possible\* interoperability issues and the amount of test sets we need to add for interoperability.  
1093 If ebMS 3 doesn't decide on SOAP 1.1 or 1.2, it probably also doesn't decide pro or against  
1094 SOAP 1.3, which may be not so backwards compatible. This extends to all the underlying  
1095 protocols, and the combinatorial exponent of them.

1096 **Resolution:**  
1097 09/13/2006: Partially addressed through the use of Default P-Modes and predefined  
1098 Conformance Profiles. However, the TC has consciously decided \*not\* to eliminate some  
1099 options from the core specification, leaving them to end-user agreement. Note that receiving  
1100 software stacks may be able to process various choices automatically. See Section 1.3 for  
1101 reference to externally defined Conformance Profiles. Agreed to close with no further action.

## 1102 **CORE-69 Issue (Closed)**

1103 **Source:**  
1104 Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyclonecommerce.com>  
1105 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200605/msg00000.html>

1106 **Description:**  
1107 It would be useful to combine the MEP cases with the reliability, error, fault into a table that  
1108 provides an overview of the protocol message exchanges.

1109 **Owner:**  
1110 Jacques/Hamid; Dale to review

1111 **Resolution:**  
1112 09/13/2006: Considered to be an editorial issue, since all normative detail is already present in  
1113 the spec.  
1114 12/06/2006, Appears in a well-structured format under ebMS 2-3 mapping appendix (CM4: MEP  
1115 Mapping Rules). Propose to close with no further action, pending review and confirmation by  
1116 Dale.  
1117 12/11/2006, See updated proposal from Jacques at  
1118 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/21470/MEP-binding-cases-2.pdf>  
1119 Latest revision appears as new Appendix E of WD 17.

## 1120 **CORE-70 Issue (Closed)**

1121 **Source:**  
1122 Dale Moberg, Axway/Cyclone <dmoberg@cyclonecommerce.com>  
1123 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200605/msg00000.html>

1124 **Description:**  
1125 The MEP definitions do not map well to business transactions as defined in ebBP or in UMM. A  
1126 request-response pattern should not require fundamentally different ebMS MEPs depending on  
1127 how it binds to the underlying protocol.  
1128 It is unclear how the MEPs that were available in ebMS2, map to V3 MEPs.

1129 **Owner:**  
1130 Jacques

1131 **Resolution:**  
1132 09/13/2006: First part of issue (MEP binding) addressed in WD 14. Second part (v2-v3  
1133 mapping) addressed in draft Compatibility Appendix; see "CM4" section, to be included in WD  
1134 15.

## 1135 **CORE-71 Issue (Closed)**

1136 **Source:**  
1137 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1138 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1139 **Description:**  
1140 Section 2.2 MEPs: This section is useful but the problem is how far to go. The document  
1141 mentions the use of eb:RefToMessageId but not conversationId and does not talk about the  
1142 relation in time between the various messages. So I am not sure what role this section plays in a  
1143 document on the messaging standard. I suspect that ebBP or some such would be a better place  
1144 to talk of these things in terms of the structure of transaction patterns?

1145 **Owner:**  
1146 Jacques

1147 **Resolution:**  
1148 09/13/2006: Clarify transaction pattern binding and enforcement in MEP Modeling section?  
1149 Believe this has been addressed in Messaging Model Rationale (Section 2.2.1 of WD 14) and P-  
1150 Mode data model appendix. Agreed to close with no further action.

1151 **CORE-72 Issue (Closed)**

1152 **Source:**

1153 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1154 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1155 **Description:**

1156 Section 3 - Message Pulling: If the challenges can be met then I see this as a great step forward  
1157 for ebXML ms3.0.

1158 In our current communities we have been moving to ebXML ms2.0 from a mechanism based on  
1159 XML posted over http with responses being polled by the client.

1160 The moment we explain that we are moving to push push many of our partners respond with "it  
1161 wont work".

1162 Our intention would not be to move to an exclusive push pull model but rather when outbound  
1163 messages fail to be received we would take those messages and requeue them such that they  
1164 could be pulled by a partner as part of their recovery process.

1165 **Resolution:**

1166 09/13/2006: Closed; no action required.

1167 **CORE-73 Issue (Closed)**

1168 **Source:**

1169 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1170 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1171 **Description:**

1172 Section 4 - Processing Modes: I think this concept is a very good one. Not sure why the default  
1173 P-Mode has no reliability. My view of ebXML ms is that a key feature is reliable messaging.

1174 **Owner:**

1175 Pete

1176 **Resolution:**

1177 09/13/2006: Add note to indicate that default P-Mode is not designed for business use, but rather  
1178 for initial connectivity testing. Already exists at beginning of Section 4.3; add to that note that  
1179 reliable messaging protocol is also not included by default.

1180 Included in WD 15.

1181 **CORE-74 Issue (Closed)**

1182 **Source:**

1183 Derrick Evans, BT OneIT <derrick.evans@bt.com>  
1184 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg-comment/200607/msg00005.html>

1185 **Description:**

1186 Conformance Profiles: Having choices is good however we are in a very diverse community  
1187 (using ebMS solutions from three different vendors in the community plus an open source  
1188 implementation and three home grown ones).

1189 When it came to interop even our use of ebXML CPA/CPD threw some of them.

1190 It would be useful to try and come off the fence here even if it is to make a stand on the default  
1191 first port of choice for all the commercial vendors.

1192 **Resolution:**

1193 09/13/2006: Closed, as duplicate of CORE-68.

## 1194 **CORE-75 Issue (Deferred)**

### 1195 **Source:**

1196 Anonymous

### 1197 **Description:**

1198 ebMS3 introduces the message pulling feature with a notion of channel (MPF): Important issue  
1199 for some of our (very) small partners, to pull on our B2B-Hub. Features of the queue mgmt,  
1200 which seems important for us: Timeout, when queues will not be requested.

1201 What's about the sending of the ack? Is there any spec, e.g. new http-request or the same  
1202 request?

1203 If client sends a request, a sync acknowledge must specified! Or do you guess, that the  
1204 acknowledge should requested by the client on the same way like described above?

### 1205 **Resolution:**

1206 09/13/2006: Ack/sync issues already addressed in Pull Mode section. Regarding queue  
1207 management and timeout, could address via an MSH status signal, to be defined in Part 2.  
1208 These features may be implementation-dependent, therefore out of scope of the specification.

## 1209 **CORE-76 Issue (Closed)**

### 1210 **Source:**

1211 Anonymous

### 1212 **Description:**

1213 ebMS3 Message Exchange Patterns (MEP): We don't understand the advantage to put the MEP  
1214 in a CPA, because we see this feature inside the BPSS specs. Obviously most tools don't  
1215 support BPSS, but this can not be the reason for changing the specs. Can you clarify the need  
1216 for this?

### 1217 **Resolution:**

1218 09/13/2006: Closed as duplicate of CORE-71.

## 1219 **CORE-77 Issue (Closed)**

### 1220 **Source:**

1221 Anonymous

### 1222 **Description:**

1223 ebMS3 uses Web Services standards at wire level: Missing backward compatibility is not  
1224 acceptable from our point of view. Just the migration of existing partner from EDIFACT or other  
1225 protocols to ebMS is a hard work. When we have to migrate our new ebMS2-based community  
1226 to ebMS3 again, the partner won't accept.

1227 We see the advantages of using WebService Standards, but when somebody will use WS-  
1228 Reliability/WS-ReliableMessaging, he will use WebService at all and not ebMS. Question: Does  
1229 OASIS guess to harmonize both specifications, ebMS and WS?

1230 ebMS3 Introduces Processing Modes (P-Modes). Same question as above (no. 2): Is this part of  
1231 BPSS or ebMS? Firstly we suggest to differ between technical parameters like level of security,  
1232 reliability and process specs like MEP. Pre-build process specs containing technical parameters  
1233 make CPA generation easier. CPA structure becomes less complex.

### 1234 **Owner:**

1235 Jacques

### 1236 **Resolution:**

1237 09/13/2006: Backward compatibility issue addressed in Compatibility section (to be appendix of  
1238 WD 15).

1239 WS vs. ebMS is a FAQ; need to educate that ebMS is not an alternative to WS-\*; it \*is\* a WS

1240 extension module that adds business value (messaging middleware functionality). Clarify this in  
1241 Introduction section.

1242 09/27/2006: Agreed to text proposed by Jacques, with modification by Pete, for inclusion in WD  
1243 15:

1244 "1.3 Web Services and Their Role in an eBusiness Messaging Framework

1245 A major design choice in V3, is the specification of the MSH and its associated processing rules  
1246 as a Web Service. The intent is to make use of other relevant Web Services specifications that  
1247 fulfill certain messaging requirements, and build upon that base by adding what is necessary for  
1248 a complete eBusiness messaging service. For example, the message security and reliability  
1249 requirements are met through the use of other Web Services standards and their  
1250 implementations; and [something about what eb:Messaging adds in terms of business value].  
1251 ebMS 3 brings this all together into a single, coherent framework.

1252 The message SOAP body has been freed for business payload. The ebMS header is just a  
1253 SOAP extension among others. As a result, V3 is significantly more compliant than V2 with the  
1254 SOAP processing model, and apt at composing Web services standards that are defined as  
1255 SOAP extensions. Compliance of V3 with future WS-I profiles - in particular BP 1.2, BP 2.0 and  
1256 RSP profiles - will be an objective in subsequent releases, as it is expected that these profiles  
1257 will be natively supported by most SOAP platforms.

1258 Compliance with Web services standards does not remove the rationale behind an internet-  
1259 based messaging middleware. Often, document-centric eBusiness and eGovernment exchanges  
1260 need to clearly dissociate messaging functions from the way these messages are consumed on  
1261 the back-end. Such consumption may take place according to various models, as mentioned in  
1262 1.1. The use of [SOAP] message header elements that represent standard business metadata  
1263 (user or company ID, business conversation, business service and action, etc.), is a key feature  
1264 for supporting a decoupled binding with back-end business processes. At the same time,  
1265 experience has demonstrated that the messaging layer must be more supportive of business  
1266 transactions: messages are parts of basic choreographies that map to higher-level business  
1267 exchanges between partners. To this end, V3 supports a notion of message exchange pattern  
1268 (MEP) the properties of which (reliability, security, binding to underlying transport, error handling,  
1269 and other quality of service aspects such as timing, etc.) are controlled in a contract-based  
1270 manner by the message producer and consumer layers."

1271 P-Modes issue: Possibly already clarified by P-Mode section updates? [EdNote: Is this covered?  
1272 Confirm before fully closing issue.]

1273 12/06/2006, Agree that this has been addressed as completely as possible in ebMS core; refer  
1274 also to P-Mode/CPA mapping in a future version of CPP/A spec.

## 1275 **CORE-78 Issue (Closed)**

### 1276 **Source:**

1277 Anonymous

### 1278 **Description:**

1279 ebMS3 Conformance profiles are specified separately from the core specification:

1280 Question: Does OASIS guess, that CPA will become less complex, while removing specifications  
1281 like WS Security, SOAP and reliability in a "conformance profiles"? Why does the main  
1282 specification not guarantee interoperable implementations (also in ebMS2). It should! Do you  
1283 differ between ebMS and CPPA in this context? Sure ebMS by its own doesn't guarantee, but in  
1284 conjunction with CPPA it does!

### 1285 **Resolution:**

1286 09/20/2006: CPA will not be less complex; even though ebMS 3.0 refers to WS-\* specs for  
1287 security and reliability, the operational parameters of those underlying specs still need to be  
1288 specified. Believe the remainder of the comment has been addressed by P-Mode and  
1289 Conformance Profile definitions. Conformance Profiles have been defined in a document  
1290 separate from the core specification, so that they can be revised independently of the core.

1291 **CORE-79 Issue (Closed)**

1292 **Source:**

1293 Anonymous

1294 **Description:**

1295 No application interface has been specified (none was in ebMS2 either). We agree it should not  
1296 be part of the specification. We guess this should be the tasks of the tools supplier.

1297 **Resolution:**

1298 09/20/2006: Comment noted. No action required.

1299 **CORE-80 Issue (Closed)**

1300 **Source:**

1301 Anonymous

1302 **Description:**

1303 No Routing or multi-hop feature is specified (at least in Part 1): For us neither Multi-Hop nor WS-  
1304 Addressing is an important issue!

1305 **Resolution:**

1306 09/20/2006: Comment noted. Multihop support is scheduled for a Part 2 of the core  
1307 specification. No action required at this time.

1308 **CORE-81 Issue (Closed)**

1309 **Source:**

1310 Anonymous

1311 **Description:**

1312 No status request message has been specified (at least in Part 1), like it was in ebMS2: Not  
1313 necessary for us!

1314 **Resolution:**

1315 09/20/2006: Comment noted. Status request support is scheduled for a Part 2 of the core  
1316 specification. No action required at this time.

1317 **CORE-82 Issue (Closed)**

1318 **Source:**

1319 Anonymous

1320 **Description:**

1321 Error generation has been specified, but the way errors should be reported is not: We agree, it  
1322 should not be part of the ebMS how to report errors.

1323 **Resolution:**

1324 09/20/2006: Comment noted. Methods of error reporting are subject to partner agreement.  
1325 Options are now well documented in Error Handling section. No further action required.  
1326

1327 **2.2 CORE: Specification Part 1 Issues, Post-PR01**

1328 The following issues were received after the close of Public Review 01.

1329 **CORE-83 Issue (Partially Deferred)**

1330 **Source:**

1331 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,

1332 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1333 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1334 **Description:**

1335 CDC's PHIN Messaging System (PHINMS), which is based on ebMS 2.0. PHINMS uses XML  
1336 Encryption and XML DSIG standards for payload level encryption and signature. This software is  
1337 described at <http://www.cdc.gov/phn/software-solutions/phinms/index.html>.

1338 CDC's PHINMS extended ebMS 2.0 to handle:

1339 1) very large (in Gb range) payloads using chunking

1340 **Owner:**

1341 Jacques (for P-Mode addition)

1342 **Resolution:**

1343 12/06/2006: Chunking functionality to be addressed in future (Part 2) specification (Deferred).

1344 Agree to provide a "max message size" P-Mode. Liaise with CPP/A to request such a  
1345 parameter.

1346 12/19/2006: See proposal in email from Jacques at

1347 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>  
1348 included in WD 17.

1349 02/07/2007: Also addressed by latest P-Mode drafts, in WD 17.

1350 **CORE-84 Issue (Closed)**

1351 **Source:**

1352 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1353 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1354 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1355 **Description:**

1356 CDC's PHINMS extended ebMS 2.0 to handle:

1357 2) push/pull type interactions via a gateway (to handle sites that wanted to receive by polling the  
1358 gateway)

1359 **Owner:**

1360 Raja to review

1361 **Resolution:**

1362 12/06/2006, believe Pull functionality addresses this requirement. Close, pending review by  
1363 Raja.

1364 **CORE-85 Issue (Closed)**

1365 **Source:**

1366 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1367 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1368 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1369 **Description:**

1370 a) Is ebMS 3.0 designed to interoperate (over the wire) with ebMS 2.0?

1371 **Resolution:**

1372 12/06/2006, Agree that ebMS 2-3 mapping appendix answers this question.

1373 **CORE-86 Issue (Closed)**

1374 **Source:**

1375 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,



1376 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1377 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00008.html>

1378 **Description:**

1379 b) Is interoperability with WS-Reliable Messaging a future goal of ebMS?

1380 **Resolution:**

1381 12/06/2006, Note that this is not a matter of interoperability, but rather composability and usage  
1382 of this lower-level specification. Believe the WS-ReliableMessaging binding section answers this  
1383 question.

1384 **CORE-87 Issue (Closed)**

1385 **Source:**

1386 Dale Moberg <dmoberg@us.axway.com>  
1387 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200611/msg00022.html>

1388 **Description:**

1389 I notice that Role is still not a required element in the ebMS header.

1390 I would like the schema to require its use as unnecessary interoperability problems can be  
1391 avoided by requiring the element.

1392 Also, when ebMS is used with CPPA (and when CPPA is connected with BPSS), it promotes  
1393 integration by including the Role element.

1394 If the CPPA and BPSS are not used, it is easy to just default Role to something like Requester or  
1395 Responder.

1396 **Owner:**

1397 Hamid (for schema)

1398 **Resolution:**

1399 01/03/2007: Agreed to adopt Jacques' (in 12/7 email) suggestion to define a single "dummy"  
1400 Role value, for use when no CPA, BP, P-Mode, or other profile specification is in effect:

1401 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/ebxml-msg/defaultRole>

1402 Included in WD 17.

1403 **CORE-88 Issue (Closed)**

1404 **Source:**

1405 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1406 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>

1407 **Description:**

1408 12/06/2006 Meeting: Need to expand P-Mode.Security parameters to include more details, such  
1409 as algorithms, key sizes, etc.

1410 **Owner:**

1411 Ric

1412 **Resolution:**

1413 01/03/2007: Addressed by PMode-model-83 changes by Ric & Jacques.

1414 Included in WD 17.

1415 **CORE-89 Issue (Closed)**

1416 **Source:**

1417 Editor

1418 **Description:**

1419 Section 1.3: Complete EdNote.

1420 **Owner:**  
1421 Pete  
1422 **Resolution:**  
1423 Removed in WD 16.

## 1424 **CORE-90 Issue (Closed)**

1425 **Source:**  
1426 Editor

1427 **Description:**  
1428 Section 1.7: EdNote; "wsswa" namespace prefix does not appear in examples. Should it be  
1429 used, or removed?

1430 **Owner:**  
1431 Ric

1432 **Resolution:**  
1433 12/29/2006: Ric recommends removal in email at  
1434 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00027.html>  
1435 01/03/2007: Agree to remove from namespace prefix table. Done in WD 17.

## 1436 **CORE-91 Issue (Closed)**

1437 **Source:**  
1438 Editor

1439 **Description:**  
1440 Section 5.3.3: Confirm whether or not example is redundant and (if not), whether it is schema-  
1441 conformant.

1442 **Owner:**  
1443 Pete

1444 **Resolution:**  
1445 12/13/2006: Remove one example, and refer to it from the other location. Also give example of  
1446 "bundled" Error + User Message, and move Section 5.2.1 to end of Section 5.2.  
1447 Bundling section is now 5.2.4; new example in 5.3.4, in WD 17.

## 1448 **CORE-92 Issue (Closed)**

1449 **Source:**  
1450 Editor

1451 **Description:**  
1452 Appendix B: Resolve EdNote; is additional text needed?

1453 **Owner:**  
1454 Jacques

1455 **Resolution:**  
1456 12/19/2006: Proposal from Jacques at  
1457 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>  
1458 02/07/2007: Accept proposal (update to latest WSRM draft), included in WD 17.

## 1459 **CORE-93 Issue (Closed)**

1460 **Source:**  
1461 Editor

1462 **Description:**  
1463 Section E.2.5: Requires completion.

1464 **Resolution:**  
1465 12/13/2006: Resolved by latest Compatibility Appendix draft, to appear in WD 16.

### 1466 **CORE-94 Issue (Closed)**

1467 **Source:**  
1468 Editor

1469 **Description:**  
1470 Appendix H: Requires completion.

1471 **Owner:**  
1472 Pete

1473 **Resolution:**  
1474 Appears up-to-date, as of WD 17 and prior.

### 1475 **CORE-95 Issue (Closed)**

1476 **Source:**  
1477 Editor

1478 **Description:**  
1479 Replace Figure 15 (P-Mode Structure) with image of better resolution. Fix quotation marks.

1480 **Owner:**  
1481 Pete

1482 **Resolution:**  
1483 Need to obtain image source from Jacques.  
1484 Included in WD 18.

### 1485 **CORE-96 Issue (Closed)**

1486 **Source:**  
1487 Editor

1488 **Description:**  
1489 Replace Section 7.11.2 (which was carried over from ebMS2) with best current approach for  
1490 fulfilling nonrepudiation of receipt requirements. Include non-normative reference to BPSS  
1491 Receipt Ack signal.

1492 **Owner:**  
1493 Dale (Ack schema), Jacques (Packaging text)

1494 **Resolution:**  
1495 10/04/2006: Ian to discuss nonrepudiation requirements with ebXML Joint Committee.  
1496 02/21/2007: Much discussion about interaction between BP, CPA and Messaging layers to solve  
1497 nonrepudiation of receipt. What is now Section 7.12.2 solves this requirement, or very nearly so,  
1498 (possibly subject to reordering of signed elements), but we would need to define an  
1499 Acknowledgment Signal Message. [Monica advises to check nonrepudiation definition in  
1500 eBusiness Patterns document from original ebxml.org.]  
1501 Edits and example included in WD 17.

1502 **CORE-97 Issue (Closed)**

1503 **Source:**

1504 Editor

1505 **Description:**

1506 EdNote: Update Section B.2 as WS-ReliableMessaging spec progresses; also need intro text at  
1507 beginning of section.

1508 **Owner:**

1509 Jacques

1510 **Resolution:**

1511 12/13/2006: Also remove reference to MakeConnection feature, which is not needed within the  
1512 context of our usage.

1513 12/19/2006: See proposal from Jacques at  
1514 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00023.html>

1515 02/07/2007: Accept proposal. Included in WD 17.

1516 **CORE-98 Issue (Closed)**

1517 **Source:**

1518 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>  
1519 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200612/msg00028.html>

1520 **Description:**

1521 Issue with example ebMS Message Headers

1522 line 851 - Section 5.2.2 eb:Messaging Element Specification  
1523 line 1044 and 1096 - Section 5.3.1 UserMessage Example

1524 The eb:Service element has a value of QuoteToCollect. QuoteToCollect is not a URI type, so  
1525 the eb:Service element should have a type attribute. Or the element value should be changed to  
1526 a URI. To be consistent with 5.2.3.8 possibly the example should be changed to look like

1527 <eb:Service>urn:services:SupplierOrderProcessing</eb:Service>

1528 Or to be consistent with the Secured Message Examples

1529 <eb:Service type="someType">QuoteToCollect</eb:Service>

1530 **Owner:**

1531 Editor

1532 **Resolution:**

1533 01/03/2007: Agree to fix examples. Also add example of @type alternative usage in Section  
1534 5.2.3.8.

1535 Done, in WD 17.

1536 **CORE-99 Issue (Assigned-Conformance Profile)**

1537 **Source:**

1538 Sasha Schlegel <sacha\_oasis@schlegel.li>  
1539 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200702/msg00013.html>

1540 **Description:**

1541 In this discussion, signature and encryption were identified as two key functions, and the order in  
1542 which they occur. It was noted that ebMS 3.0 no longer specifies the default configuration as was  
1543 defined in ebMS 2.0.

1544 ebMS 2.0 has two defaults:

1545 a) encrypt first, then sign. As a Note in section 4.1.4.5

1546 b) the Reference for the actual ebMS 2.0 SOAP message XML digital signature was set in

1547 Section 4.1.3.

1548 **Owner:**  
1549 Pete

1550 **Resolution:**  
1551 02/14/2007:  
1552 a) Confirm existence of requirement to encrypt before signing. Prefer to keep order specified in  
1553 Section 7.6 (sign before encrypt).  
1554 b) Include reasonable defaults in Gateway conformance profile:  
1555 If signing, sign all payloads & headers that are available prior to signing.  
1556 If encrypting, include all Payloads & Messaging header at minimum.

## 1557 **CORE-100 Issue (Open)**

1558 **Source:**  
1559 Jacques, 02/14/2007 Conference Call

1560 **Description:**  
1561 Notes that in Hamid's draft schema, Role is required in FromParty, but optional in ToParty.

1562 **Owner:**  
1563

1564 **Resolution:**  
1565 Should be required in both. Schema fixed by Dale; included in WD 17.

## 1566 **CORE-101 Issue (Open)**

1567 **Source:**  
1568 Pete

1569 **Description:**  
1570 Validate all XML example text against schema.

1571 **Owner:**  
1572

1573 **Resolution:**  
1574

## 1575 **CORE-102 Issue (Closed)**

1576 **Source:**  
1577 Pete

1578 **Description:**  
1579 F.2.6, "...mappings between CPA & P-Mode are defined in a separate Appendix." Do we still  
1580 plan to include such an additional appendix?

1581 **Owner:**  
1582

1583 **Resolution:**  
1584 03/07/2007: Agreed that this should be done in a separate document, not needed in core spec.  
1585 Note to that effect in spec.  
1586 Done in WD 18.

## 1587 **CORE-103 Issue (Closed)**

1588 **Source:**  
1589 Pete, 12/20/2006 Conference Call

1590 **Description:**  
1591 Disagree with requirement in 7.7 to support Username token.  
1592 **Owner:**  
1593 Pete  
1594 **Resolution:**  
1595 12/20/2006, Agreed to remove REQUIRED keywords, as this is a user/conformance profile point.  
1596 Complete in WD 17.

## 1597 **CORE-104 Issue (Deferred)**

1598 **Source:**  
1599 Raja Kailar, Ph.D., Business Networks International, Inc.,  
1600 on behalf of US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <kailar@bnetal.com>  
1601 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200702/msg00031.html>

1602 **Description:**  
1603 Within the CDC PHINMS, we have a feature called "delayed retry". This is done by a "Message  
1604 Sender" when a "Message Receiver" is down for an extended period of time (i.e., after a certain  
1605 number of retries are unsuccessful). Basically, the message is kept in a cache and we attempt it  
1606 after a long delay (say a few hours or a day). This is useful to handle network failures.  
1607 I realize that regular retries using the same conversation ID etc are part of the spec. Is the above  
1608 kind of delayed retry part of the "guaranteed delivery" specification? If not, it may be a useful  
1609 addition.

1610 **Owner:**  
1611

1612 **Resolution:**  
1613 02/21/2007, Jacques is aware of similar requirements and expressed concern that the underlying  
1614 reliability specifications do not specify the retry rules and this may lead into very implementation  
1615 specific requirements. Any solution is not simple as the basic Reliability specs do not support  
1616 this multiple level re-tries and de-duplication. This is probably not solvable in the core but may  
1617 be addressed in Part 2.  
1618 02/28/2007, Raja confirmed that the interpretation that we had previously discussed was correct,  
1619 that this was a second level retry that may be sent as a second message after a delay but with  
1620 an additional reference. This item was discussed and several options discussed the main issues  
1621 is the limitation of the underlining reliable messaging specifications. The TC believes that this is  
1622 a useful value add feature and that we should investigate a method for inclusion if possible as an  
1623 additional feature supported by part 2 and additional conformance profiles as this could be a  
1624 processing control and not wire protocol problem and solution.

## 1625 **CORE-105 Issue (Pending Edit)**

1626 **Source:**  
1627 Jacques

1628 **Description:**  
1629 Track progress of WS-RX specs.

1630 **Owner:**  
1631 Pete

1632 **Resolution:**  
1633 03/07/2007: Update reference in B.2 to latest WS-RX specs.  
1634 Reference WSRM 1.1 CD 7, 03/01/2007 in WD 18.  
1635 Update reference again to CS or OS version if available prior to our release.

1636 **CORE-106 Issue (Closed)**

1637 **Source:**

1638 Jacques

1639 **Description:**

1640 Receipt Signal requires a good example.

1641 **Owner:**

1642 Pete

1643 **Resolution:**

1644 Added Section 7.9.3 example in WD 18.

1645 Note that a message/part referencing issue remains.

1646 **CORE-107 Issue (Closed)**

1647 **Source:**

1648 Pete

1649 **Description:**

1650 Permanent Namespace URI and Schema Location URL needed. Currently specified identifiers  
1651 will not be resolvable, as we have no ability to serve documents from the stated location.

1652 **Owner:**

1653 Pete

1654 **Resolution:**

1655 Replaced namespace URI with "http://docs.oasis-open.org/ebxml-msg/ebms-3.0" and  
1656 schemaLocation with "http://docs.oasis-open.org/ebxml-msg/ebms-3.0/schema/ebms-header-  
1657 3\_0.xsd", per recent convention. Done in WD 18.

1658 Revised with version-capable scheme in WD 19.

1659 Note that a RDDDL document (containing an index to specifications and schema files) should be  
1660 placed at the namespace location.

1661 **CORE-108 Issue (Open)**

1662 **Source:**

1663 Pete

1664 **Description:**

1665 Need reference to ASC X12 Registry for party identification schemes.

1666 **Owner:**

1667

1668 **Resolution:**

1669

1670 **CORE-109 Issue (Open)**

1671 **Source:**

1672 Pete

1673 **Description:**

1674 Need more explicit instructions for making Receipt References correspond to the original  
1675 message's Referenced parts. RFC 2392 MID/CID schemes are somewhat, but not precisely,  
1676 relevant. See specification Section 5.2.3.3 and Example Section 7.9.3.

1677 **Owner:**

1678

1679 **Resolution:**  
1680

## 1681 **CORE-110 Issue (Closed)**

1682 **Source:**  
1683 Ric Emery <remery@us.axway.com>  
1684 <http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200703/msg00031.html>

1684 **Description:**  
1685 1541 - @type: This REQUIRED attribute indicates how the parties send and receiving the  
1686 message will interpret the value of the reference.  
1687 Notice that the @type is a REQUIRED attribute of eb:AgreementRef. The example at line 1536  
1688 does not include the @type attribute. All the examples I have looked at that contain the  
1689 eb:AgreementRef element do not include the REQUIRED @type attribute.  
1687 Either the samples should be updated or @type should be changed to OPTIONAL. It would  
1688 probably make sense to add wording along the lines of what is in the spec for eb:Service/@type.  
1689 Line 1555 - There is no restriction on the value of the type attribute. If the type attribute is not  
1690 present, the content of the Service element MUST be a URI (see {RFC2396}). Etc.

1688 **Owner:**  
1689 Editor

1690 **Resolution:**  
1691 03/21/2007, Agreed to follow eb:Service method; optional @type, but if omitted, content must be  
1692 a URI. Updated in WD 19.

## 1692 **CORE-111 Issue (Closed)**

1693 **Source:**  
1694 Pete

1695 **Description:**  
1696 Messaging/@version identifier should be removed. It needlessly complicates implementation by  
1697 allowing changes in processing semantics, which must then be coded into an application to  
1698 trigger on this version string. Prefer the alternative of versioning built into the namespace URI.

1697 **Owner:**  
1698

1699 **Resolution:**  
1700 Proposed removal in WD 19.

## 1701 **CORE-112 Issue (Closed)**

1702 **Source:**  
1703 Pete

1704 **Description:**  
1705 According to 5.2.2.12, PayloadInfo contains @xml:id and @eb:version attributes. These appear  
1706 to be extraneous; neither schema nor examples contain these attributes.

1707 **Owner:**  
1708

1709 **Resolution:**  
1710 Attributes descriptions removed in WD 19.



1711 **CORE-113 Issue (Closed)**

1712 **Source:**

1713 Pete

1714 **Description:**

1715 5.2.2.13 states that eb:PartInfo/Schema/@namespace is REQUIRED, yet it does not appear in  
1716 the schema or examples. Propose making it OPTIONAL and add it to the schema. Also clarify  
1717 that eb:PartInfo/Schema/@version is also OPTIONAL (only @location is REQUIRED).

1718 **Owner:**

1719

1720 **Resolution:**

1721 Fixed in WD 19.

1722 **CORE-114 Issue (Open)**

1723 **Source:**

1724 Pete

1725 **Description:**

1726 Are current extension points ("any" elements/attributes) sufficient to support anticipated new  
1727 features? For example, to support payload packetization, need to specify "part x of y"  
1728 parameters. Extension to UserMessage, PayloadInfo, or PartInfo? Perhaps use  
1729 MessageProperties or PartProperties instead?

1730 **Owner:**

1731

1732 **Resolution:**

1733

1734 **CORE-115 Issue (Open)**

1735 **Source:**

1736 Pete

1737 **Description:**

1738 Need a RDDDL index of documents. See <http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrml/200702> for an  
1739 example.

1740 **Owner:**

1741

1742 **Resolution:**

1743 **CORE-116 Issue (Open)**

1744 **Source:**

1745 Dale Moberg <dmoberg@us.axway.com>  
1746 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200703/msg00049.html>

1747 **Description:**

1748 ebMS 2.0 conformance should be required in Gateway Conformance Profile.

1749 **Owner:**

1750

1751 **Resolution:**

## 1752 **CORE-117 Issue (Partially Deferred)**

1753 **Source:**

1754 Sacha Schlegel <sacha@schlegel.li>  
1755 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200703/msg00053.html>

1756 **Description:**

1757 Is SMTP supported as a first class transport protocol in ebMS 3.0?

1758 **Owner:**

1759

1760 **Resolution:**

1761 04/11/2007, Agreed to revise note at end of SMTP binding appendix to reflect current level of  
1762 support. Done in WD 20.

## 1763 **CORE-118 Issue (Open)**

1764 **Source:**

1765 David Webber <david@drw.info>  
1766 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00004.html>

1767 **Description:**

1768 Describe how MTOM relates to ebMS 3.

1769 **Owner:**

1770

1771 **Resolution:**

1772 04/11/2007, Agreed that use of SOAP1.2+MTOM is a profiling issue; to be specified in a  
1773 conformance profile.

## 1774 **CORE-119 Issue (Closed)**

1775 **Source:**

1776 Jacques Durand <JDurand@us.fujitsu.com>  
1777 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00016.html>

1778 **Description:**

1779 suggest the following renaming:  
1780 Message Partition Flow --> Message Partition Channel  
1781 MPF --> MPC  
1782 Schema: @mpf --> @mpc

1783

1784 In 2.2.3:

1785 MEP Channel Binding -> MEP Transport Channel binding (these channels are lower level)  
1786 MEP Transport Binding -> MEP Transport Protocol binding

1787 **Owner:**

1788

1789 **Resolution:**

1790 Tentative updates made in WD 20.

## 1791 **CORE-120 Issue (Closed)**

1792 **Source:**

1793 Kazunori Iwasa <kiwasa@jp.fujitsu.com>  
1794 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00018.html>

1795 **Description:**  
1796 The related work "related to" section in the first page may describe the following specs:  
1797 SOAP1.1, SOAP1.2, WS-Security specs, WS-Reliability1.1, WS-RM CS, and ebMS2.0  
1798 and remove "replaces or supercedes" section.

1799 **Owner:**  
1800

1801 **Resolution:**  
1802 Updated in WD 20.

## 1803 **CORE-121 Issue (Pending Review)**

1804 **Source:**  
1805 Hamid Ben Malek <HBenMalek@us.fujitsu.com>  
1806 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/ebxml-msg/200704/msg00021.html>

1807 **Description:**  
1808 Issue 1: On page 77 (lines 3172 to 3179), the documentation mentions only PullRequest and  
1809 Errors within a SignalMessage and does not mention the newly added Receipt signal.  
1810 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1811

1812 Issue 2: On page 78, line 3193, the schema defines the element "ErrorDetail" with a capital letter  
1813 E (which is correct). In the spec, line 2038, the ErrorDetail is written with a lower case e (as  
1814 errorDetail). This should be corrected.  
1815 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1816

1817 Issue 3: this is similar to issue 2. On line 3196, the schema defines an attribute called  
1818 "RefToMessageInError". This attribute should be written with a lower case r as  
1819 "refToMessageInError" (page 51, line 2035 is using the attribute with a lower case r).  
1820 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1821

1822 Issue 4: On page 41, line 1505, the spec declares the element "AgreementRef" as being  
1823 optional. However the schema (line 3165 does not say it is optional). Schema needs to be  
1824 corrected here.  
1825 **04/18/2007: Agreed; fixed in WD 21.**  
1826

1827 Issue 5: On page 39, line 1393, the example is showing the element service with a type attribute.  
1828 However, the schema (on line 3266) declares the element service as a simple element (does not  
1829 have any attributes). If the spec is correct in this case, then the schema needs to add such an  
1830 attribute to the service element, otherwise remove the "type" attribute from the example.  
1831 **04/18/2007: Service should have @type attribute; fixed in WD 21.**  
1832

1833 Issue 6: In the schema (page 77, line 3127), it is declared: attributeFormDefault="unqualified".  
1834 This means that an attribute within a local element should not be qualified (local element is any  
1835 element that resides as a child or grandchild of the element <eb:Messaging>). However, in the  
1836 spec (page 39, line 1407) displays an example where the "location" attribute is qualified. The  
1837 same thing goes for the attribute "version" which is being qualified in the example, while the  
1838 schema says that it should not be qualified.  
1839 **04/18/2007: Agreed that eb: namespace attributes must be unqualified; fixed in WD 21.**  
1840

1841 Issue 7: The spec on page 38, line 1350, says that the SOAP mustUnderstand attribute is  
1842 REQUIRED, but the schema on page 79 (lines 3332-3333) says the attribute is optional. One of  
1843 them should be changed (either the spec or the schema).

1844 **04/18/2007: Agreed that this is a choice; one or the other MUST be present, but**  
1845 **impossible to specify this in schema; fixed with schema notations in WD 21.**  
1846

1847 Issue 8: This is just a suggestion. Currently the schema says attributeFormDefault="unqualified"  
1848 (meaning that attributes within local elements should not be qualified). However, I suggest that  
1849 we add a sentence to the spec (at the beginning of the "Packaging" section that says that  
1850 attributes could be qualified or unqualified (that is we accept both forms), and in the schema  
1851 documentation we mention that too. This would ensure that if an implementation is qualifying  
1852 attributes, while another implementation does not, they would still be able to read each other.  
1853 **04/18/2007: Same resolution as #6 above.**

1854 **Owner:**  
1855

1856 **Resolution:**  
1857 Resolved as shown in-line above; changes appear in WD 21.

## 1858 **CORE-122 Issue (Open)**

1859 **Source:**  
1860 Pete

1861 **Description:**  
1862 Constant URIs for all MEPs and other identifiable features are needed (some are missing, or  
1863 appear as seemingly non-normative example text).

1864 **Owner:**  
1865

1866 **Resolution:**  
1867

## APPENDIX A. Revision History

<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>What</b>
WD 01	22 Aug 2006	Pete Wenzel	Initial draft. Recorded resolutions reached through 26 July 2006 meeting. Noted which appear in WD 14.
WD 02	23 Aug 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-45 from 23 Aug 2006 meeting.
WD 03	30 Aug 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-55 from 30 Aug 2006 meeting.
WD 04	06 Sep 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-67 from 06 Sep 2006 meeting.
WD 05	13 Sep 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-77 from 13 Sep 2006 meeting.
WD 06	20 Sep 2006	Pete Wenzel	Further resolution discussion and ownership assignments through issue CORE-82 from 20 Sep 2006 meeting.
WD 07	03 Oct 2006	Pete Wenzel	Resolutions from 27 Sep 2006 meeting, and closure of issues whose resolutions are included in Core Spec WD 15.
WD 08	05 Dec 2006	Pete Wenzel	Updated status and resolutions, as of 29 Nov 2006 meeting. Fixed hyperlinks in Table of Contents.
WD 09	13 Dec 2006	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 06 Dec 2006 meeting.
WD 10	14 Dec 2006	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 13 Dec 2006 meeting and Core Spec WD 16.
WD 11	03 Jan 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 03 Jan 2007 meeting, and proposals posted in last month.
WD 12	07 Feb 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 07 Feb 2007 meeting.
WD 13	07 Mar 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 28 Feb 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 17.
WD 14	19 Mar 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 14 Mar 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 18. Divided into PR01 and Post-PR01 sections, in anticipation of PR02.
WD 15	27 Mar 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 21 Mar 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 19.
WD 16	18 Apr 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 11 Apr 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 20.

<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>What</b>
WD 17	24 Apr 2007	Pete Wenzel	Updated status, resolutions and new issues, as of 18 Apr 2007 meeting and Core Spec WD 21.

1869

1870

---

## **APPENDIX B. Contributors**

1871

1872

## APPENDIX C. Notices

1873 OASIS takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that  
1874 might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or  
1875 the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it  
1876 represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on OASIS's procedures with  
1877 respect to rights in OASIS specifications can be found at the OASIS website. Copies of claims of rights  
1878 made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an  
1879 attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by  
1880 implementors or users of this specification, can be obtained from the OASIS Executive Director.

1881 OASIS invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications,  
1882 or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to implement this  
1883 specification. Please address the information to the OASIS Executive Director.

1884 **Copyright © OASIS Open 2006. All Rights Reserved.**

1885 This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that  
1886 comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published  
1887 and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright  
1888 notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document  
1889 itself does not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to OASIS,  
1890 except as needed for the purpose of developing OASIS specifications, in which case the procedures for  
1891 copyrights defined in the OASIS Intellectual Property Rights document must be followed, or as required  
1892 to translate it into languages other than English.

1893 The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by OASIS or its successors  
1894 or assigns.

1895 This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and OASIS  
1896 DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY  
1897 WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS  
1898 OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR  
1899 PURPOSE.

1900