| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MB** | **Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1) | **Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1) | **Type of com ment** | **Comment (justification for change) by the MB** | **Proposed change by the MB** | **Secretariat observations** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OA 001 | all |  | te | Numerous references appear to be incorrect. OASIS 002 specifically notes problem with [21], references that should be to [13] are to [19], others. Also, some of the references to definitions are wrong. | Check entries in bibliography and references, definition and other references throughout document. |  |
| OA 002 | 2.1.3 |  | te | (1) Comparison of definitions of choreography and collaboration: how much of a global behavior needs to be known for a collaboration to turn into a choreography. Is it enough if any global information? Does it remain a collaboration if any global information is missing? Choreography (global knowledge) vs. collaboration (no global knowledge is a false dichotomy. WS-CDL has little uptake to prove worth of this distinction and it breaks down with any degree of complexity in what is composed.  (2) Ref [21] is to WSDL 1.1. It appears reference is intended to be WS-CDL.  (3) Should collaboration have its own subclause number? (Note, 2.1.20 and 2.1.21 are separate.) | (1) Remove choreography as current defined.  (2) Correct reference if not deleted.  (3) Add subclause number for collaboration. |  |
| OA 003 | 2.1.11 |  | te | (1) Human actor already defined in 2.1.10 to include person or organization. Not need to be repeated here.  (2) define in the singular | human task  Task which is done by Human Actor. |  |
| OA 004 | 2.1.13 |  | te | NOTE is unclear: Is this meant to say the element that directs the orchestration is outside the set of elements being orchestrated? | Clarify. Suggested:  Note: The element that directs the orchestration is external to any elements making up the composition or the composition itself. |  |
| OA 005 | 2.1.16 |  | te | (1) Service has repeatable outcomes but opacity would say that the consumer has no knowledge whether the executed activities are the same or different. For example, a service could improve its executed activities to improve delivery of its advertised outcomes. This is the essence of “black box”.  (2) The phrase “is self-contained” is not clear. What does it mean for a “logical representation” to be “self-contained”? | Suggest:  Logical representation of a set of activities that gives rise to repeatable outcomes, may be composed of other services, and is a “black box” to consumers of the service. |  |
| OA 006 | 2.1.17 |  | te | If, as indicated in Note, service broker can be used for used for things other than registration and publishing, then the main definition should reflect this and not just have it in Note. | Suggested:  Element that can direct use of other services in response to needs of consumer service request, including use for discovery (service or content), routing, unified registration and publishing. |  |
| OA 007 | 2.1.18 |  | te | Note connects general term to ESB, but it should be clear that it can be something other than ESB. | Suggested to be added before ESB sentence:  A service bus can range from a logical collection of such functions to the functions collected into a single commercial product. |  |
| OA 008 | 2.1.19 |  | te | Do we really want to equate service catalogue, registry, and repository? More recently, have seen repository holding metadata and registry resolving endpoints, but even this is far from a certainty. | Suggested:  Any of one or a number of components that support the functions needed for creation, storage, management, search, and retrieval of metadata for services.  Note: in actual use, the terms may be used interchangeably or specific functions may be associated with one term rather than another. |  |
| OA 009 | 2.1.20 |  | te | (1) Is there a reason to have a general term in 2.1.3 and a specific term here? If both, shouldn’t the specific one be in terms of the general one rather than repeating the text?  (2) It is debatable how much a given element needs to know about things being done by other elements with which they do not interact. Burden of global knowledge is one reason WS-CDL did not get beyond W3C Candidate Recommendation. | per OA 002, recommend dropping use of term choreography. It provides little, if anything to these documents.  If keep, 2.1.20 should be in terms of 2.1.3. |  |
| OA 010 | 2.1.21 |  | te | Is there a reason to have a general term in 2.1.3 and a specific term here? If both, shouldn’t the specific one be in terms of the general one rather than repeating the text? | Collaboration where collaborating elements are services. |  |
| OA 011 | 2.1.23 |  | te | Definition here says very little while lines 727-729 is concise and provides more substance. | Incorporate lines 727-729 as part of definition and modify (or delete) lines 727-729 to reflect more substantive definition. |  |
| OA 012 | 2.1.24 |  | te | Note is not clear and awkwardly worded – “with services operationally or with contractually”. What is intended distinction between operational and contractually? | Revise to clarify intended idea. |  |
| OA 013 | 2.1.25 |  | te | (1) What does service contract look like that does not include SLA (2.1.34)?  (2) Service contract may define interaction rules for resolving disputes but more typically it is in terms of measurable outcomes, not details (in black box) of the how. | (1) Revise to have clear relationship between service contract and SLA.  (2) Suggested, conditional on resolution to (1):  Terms, conditions, and measurable outcomes (real world effects?) that are formally or informally recognized as the contractual basis of service interaction. |  |
| OA 014 | 2.1.28 |  | te | Development and implementation are two separate things that may overlap but should not be defined as the same thing. | If must have both terms, then have separate definitions. For example, I would expect a design aspect in development and a build aspect in implementation. |  |
| OA 015 | 2.1.29 |  | te | While discovery enables one to identify useful services, there is nothing obvious to retrieve in terms of the service proper. After a search for services, one may want to retrieve the full service descriptions. Also, discovery is an activity that may make use of a process but it is not itself a process. | Suggested:  Activities by which a service consumer can find services which meet their specific functional and/or non-functional requirements. |  |
| OA 016 | 2.1.30 |  | te | Governance is more than lifecycle and “chains of responsibility” is usually why it fails. | Suggest something more along lines of OASIS SOA-RAF:  The prescription of conditions and constraints consistent with satisfying common goals and the structures and processes needed to define and respond to actions taken towards realizing those goals. |  |
| OA 017 | 2.1.31 |  | te | The term “real world effect” is not otherwise defined and not clearly related to definition of effect in 2.1.5. | Suggested:  Explicitly relate effect and real world effect, providing more substance to 2.1.5.  OASIS SOA-RAF definition: A measurable change to the **shared state** of pertinent entities, relevant to and experienced by specific **stakeholders** of an **ecosystem**. |  |
| OA 018 | 2.1.33 |  | te | List is too specific but non-inclusive. | Suggested:  Ability of providers and consumers to use information exchange defined at both the syntactic and semantic levels as the basis for predictable interactions leading to predictable outcomes. |  |
| OA 019 | 2.1.34 |  | te | (1) This implies SLA is a subtype of service contract. Is this intended?  (2) Does SLA “define the interaction”? This seems more fundamental to the service and the SLA reflects the defined interaction.  (3) While “a complete, specific definition of each service” may be theoretically desirable, it is practically unachievable; OASIS SOA-RM [13] notes that description is always incomplete. Also, the note jumps from talking about a specific service to a collection of services. | (1) Distinguish between service contract and SLA. If substitute service contract in SLA definition, is it redundant?  (2) at a minimum, delete “the interaction and”  (3) Simplify Note. Current text is trying to say too much that will be covered later. |  |
| OA 020 | 2.1.35 |  | te | Definition is a bit circular (lifecycle throughout life) and limited. | Suggested:  Phases of service instantiation from conception of service functionality through development, implementation, deployment, operational use, and retirement.  Note: In actual use, enumerated phases may explicitly include those noted in this definition or may expand or contract these phases, as appropriate. |  |
| OA 021 | 2.1.36 |  | te | Need to address services ecosystem and seem less directed at individual services. For example, management does not optimize what implemented as a service but may optimize allocation of resources that support/enable service functionality. Optimizing for individual services may not optimize for ecosystem of many consumers and many services. Also, management does not maintain or operate services; service provider does that. | Needs significant rewording.  As suggestion, OASIS SOA-RAF states: Management is a process of controlling resources in accordance with the policies and principles defined by Governance.  Definition may want to explicitly include dependency on monitoring, but that may be packing too much into definition. |  |
| OA 022 | 2.1.38 |  | te | Control is a separate aspect from monitoring. | Suggested:  Tracking state and operational conditions related to service execution and associated effects on the service ecosystem. |  |
| OA 023 | 2.1.39 |  | te | Is there a reason to have a general term in 2.1.13 and a specific term here? If both, shouldn’t the specific one be in terms of the general one rather than repeating the text? | Orchestration where orchestrated elements are services. |  |
| OA 024 | 2.1.42 |  | te | (1) The phrase “using IT” should either be part of previous definitions that feed this or dropped. Seems out of place here.  (2) Services do not necessarily “utilize activities that comprise business processes”, e.g. a compression service does something technical that may provide business value when used.  (3) “require strong governance” is qualitative and debatable in the context of how much is enough. Other elements on list are technical; this is open to nontechnical interpretation. | (1) Suggest deleting phrase.  (2) Delete note completely. It is trying to say too much that is included elsewhere in document. Otherwise, delete phrase.  (3) Delete note completely. It is trying to say too much that is included elsewhere in document. Otherwise, delete phrase. |  |
| OA 025 | 2.1.43 |  | te | (1) Line 1274 says this extension of IT and EA governance  (2) SOA Governance is more than IT Governance. Debatable whether most useful definition is as extension of other governance or something working hand-in-hand with governance having other focus.  (3) Note 1 is neither definition nor clarification of definition. They are debating points already included elsewhere.  (4) This is part of discussion of governance as compared to management. It is not part of governance definition. | (1) Be consistent  (2) Consider OASIS SOA-RAF definition:  The prescription of conditions and constraints consistent with satisfying common goals and the structures and processes needed to define and respond to actions taken towards realizing those goals.  (3) Delete Note 1.  (3) Delete Note 2. |  |
| OA 026 | 2.1.45 |  | te | Is this needed? If SOA is an architectural style, what does it mean for a style to have a lifecycle? | Delete. If keep, need to align with service lifecycle. |  |
| OA 027 | 2.1.46 |  | te | Why management, service management, and SOA management? If this is SOA solution management, be specific. In addition, this has to be more than lifecycle.  Also be clear what is the difference between managing a service that delivers a solution vs. a solution that is made up of services vs. an infinite combination of the two. | Minimize the proliferation of terms and make separate terms obviously distinct. I cannot suggest something specific because I can’t clearly tell the difference. |  |
| OA 028 | 2.1.47 |  | te | SOA application is not defined nor is it obvious related to all the other defined variations. | Insert new definition clearly distinct from other definitions or remove occurrences of term. |  |
| OA 029 | 2.1.48 |  | te | Seems redundant with definition of SOA maturity. | Delete or clarify distinction. |  |
| OA 030 | 2.1.49 |  | te | Policy is a term that needs to be defined, then service policy is obvious extension. | Introduce definition of policy.  [in general as overriding comment] Reduce definitions of obvious extensions because these tend to be redundant or inconsistent. |  |
| OA 031 | 2.1.50 |  | te | There is a lot that can be said as notes to service provider definition, but this one is not particularly useful beyond others. | Delete Note. |  |
| OA 032 | 2.1.51 |  | te | (1) Should be in terms of service description  (2) Not publishing registered service because service becomes registered by publishing  (3) Publishing provides information on how to make use of service but doesn’t “make” available. | Suggested:  Creating and maintaining service description in accessible location that supports search across and retrieval of descriptions. |  |
| OA 033 | 2.1.53 |  | te | This definition is stating the obvious. In the text that follows, does a hybrid solution making use of SOA principles and non-SOA principles count as a SOA solution? If so, does SOA governance, management, ... take responsibility for all non-SOA aspects? | Revise to provide meaningful, informative definition or delete. |  |
| OA 034 | 2.1.54 |  | te | While this passage is extracted from the SOAP 1.2 Primer, it is not meant as a definition and comes across as a jumble when used as a definition. | Delete entry, unnecessary.  If keeping, suggest paraphrasing text in SOAP 1.2, Part 1:  a protocol intended for exchanging structured information in a decentralized, distributed environment. It uses XML technologies and an extensible messaging framework containing a message construct that can be exchanged over a variety of underlying protocols. |  |
| OA 035 | 2.1.56 |  | te | Do you really want to use a Web Services definition that excludes REST? There is no clear need for the REST, SOAP, and Web Services definitions as far as use in Parts 1 or 2. | Delete this entry and the REST entry 2.1.15. |  |
| OA 036 | 3 | all | te | The text in this section often loses sight that this section is supposed to be Principles and Concepts. It often gets into implementation details or SOA advocacy. Concepts and principles should be concisely presented and clear how these are different than and/or augment standard software and systems development. | Some specific examples of this are explicitly cited in the following comments but, for lack of fortitude, many are not. The editors should split up the text and reread with the questions  - is this a concept unique to SOA? (Keep)  - is this a principle that needs to be kept in mind when applying the SOA paradigm (and not just usual software development practice)? (Keep)  - Is this what some currently think is best practice? (Discard or move to a section on Best Practices)  - is this what we (or our marketing people) hope we get from saying SOA? (Discard or move to a section on Wishful Thinking)  Also, search for and generally replace the word “ensure” with something like “intend”. Typically, we ensure nothing. We design and build things to perform functions and produce things we need. Sometimes we are more successful than others, but we ensure nothing. For example, line 619: SLAs do not ensure adherence; line 620, governance does not ensure business requirement are met. |  |
| OA 037 | 3.1 | lines 523-527 | te | (1) Too many words, stick to the point  (2) Repeated service definition needs to be consistent with | (1) Suggested: “Service Oriented Architecture (~~abbreviated~~ SOA) is an architectural style ~~that supports service orientation and is a paradigm for business and IT (Note: see 3.1.40). This architectural style is~~ for designing systems in terms of services available at an interface and the outcomes of services.”  Note: if the text is not deleted, the reference should be to 3.1.42.  (2) Revise as necessary. Note should be to 3.1.16. |  |
| OA 038 | 3.1 | lines 528-540 | te | Conflating “distinguishing characteristics” and what may be considered best practice  - “it is recommended that implementations use open standards”  - “requires strong governance”  - “requires a criteria to determine what [is] a good service” | Delete items that are not specifically Principles and Concepts |  |
| OA 039 | 3.1 | lines 533-534 | te | Unclear what is meant by “implementations of services are provided use processes and service composition.” | Revise and clarify |  |
| OA 040 | 3.1 | lines 542-555 | te | This is advertisement, not Principles and Concepts, and not suitable for an ISO/IEC standard. | Delete |  |
| OA 041 | 3.1 | lines 564-569 | te | (1) Seems duplicative of lines 52-527 where defining SOA  (2) “service oriented computing” is used as a key term but never defined or used elsewhere | (1) Delete or work into other text  (2) Delete |  |
| OA 042 | 3.2.1 | lines 578-594 | te | (1) Couldn’t those creating and those providing services be different entities and not just appear as the same entity?  (2) How does providing and hosting differ? As written, it seems like hosting is just the details of providing. In Part 2, this is differentiated as steps in code manipulation, but here the distinction is neither clear nor necessary.  (3) Publish Service is the same in lines 580 and 591. There has to be a less redundant way to present.  (4) Governance is the same in lines 583 and 594. There has to be a less redundant way to present. | Revise so distinctions are clear and apparent redundancy removed. |  |
| OA 043 | 3.2.1 | lines 601-602 | te | Unclear: “A contractual obligation does not necessarily translate to an interaction dependency, since it may have been sourced to a third party. ” | Revise and clarify |  |
| OA 044 | 3.2.1 | section beginning line 605 | te | Consumer can be a very broad term and it is unclear under what situations some entity can be considered a consumer.  (1) Is someone creating a service composition with a number of services considered a consumer of those services?  (2) Is the consumer only who interacts with the composition?  (3) Is the immediate entity interacting with a service, e.g. one service in a chain calling another, considered a consumer when the composition is used? | Clarify who is considered a consumer in the case when we are talking about more than just a single, isolated service. |  |
| OA 045 | 3.2.1 | lines 609-612 | te | A consumer can become aware of a service through other means than Service Discovery and Service Registry Search as defined. In any case, these do not seem to merit being called responsibilities. | Suggested for lines 607-608 and corresponding text for Providers:  “the consumer may engage in activities related to the discovery and initiation of exchanges of messages with the service, including:” |  |
| OA 046 | 3.2.2 | lines 628-630 | te | This is the third time in under 20 pages that we have the complete definition of service. It was defined once to be reused and should just reference the definition, as needed, thereafter. | Replace repeated text with reference, as needed beyond just having defined term. |  |
| OA 047 | 3.2.2 | lines 631-632 | te | A service produces specific outcomes and has no idea of value. Value is presumed but relative and not required per the architectural style. | (1) Change “produces outcomes” to “produces specified outcomes”.  (2) Delete “that are of value to its consumers” |  |
| OA 048 | 3.2.2 | lines 635-636 | te | This is not as clear-cut as the statements express this.  (1) re “they are equivalent to the consumer and should be able to be used interchangeably”, a consumer may have other distinguishing criteria. At best, they are “mechanically” equivalent.  (2) What is an example of equivalency in the context of a provider? | Delete if this is not an area you want to significantly expand on here. Is it necessary? If keep,  (1) Clarify that equivalency is subjective and you can’t tell someone that two things are equivalent when they believe they’re not.  (2) Provide an example as this is not at all obvious. |  |
| OA 049 | 3.2.2 | lines 646-649 | te | This seems to have a particular implementation procedure in mind, which would be beyond Principles and Concepts.  (1) If a service description enables an entity to choose a service and that description provides an endpoint and message information, is picking an element really a separate step from picking the service? Note, the endpoint in the description may be a proxy that supports redirection.  (2) Should ESB (an implementation) be cited in Principles and Concepts. | (1) Clarify if this is meant to be generally applicable and reconsider if it based on a particular implementation approach.  (2) Remove ESB reference. |  |
| OA 050 | 3.2.2 | Figure 2 | te | Figure semantics unclear as to what is composition vs. subclassing vs. named relationship. | Revise figure to clearly show intended relationships. |  |
| OA 051 | 3.2.3 | lines 666-672 | te | This section wanders and misses the necessary points. For example, description needs unambiguous semantics or search more difficult. Meaningful use of services require unambiguous semantics in what provider says it is offering and what consumer believes it is requesting. | Revise to concisely make relevant points about semantics and not things like “business user ... needs to ... satisfy its goals ... via services ...” |  |
| OA 052 | 3.2.4 | lines 674-677 | te | “Atomic” may be used here with an implied context but there are many questions without context:  - Is a multi-step process considered atomic?  - Can one Human Actor start a task and another one complete it? | Clarify what reader needs to understand re atomic. |  |
| OA 053 | 3.2.4 | lines 679-686 | te | “Activity” is used in general language sense but it is not clear if BPMN discussion of “task” is part of its definition or “task” is also used in general language sense and BPMN is introduced to provide contrast. | Revise and clarify |  |
| OA 054 | 3.2.5 | line 690 | te | Sentence as written is confusing | Suggested:  In this case, composition refers to a collection of parts assembled for a purpose and not the act of composing. |  |
| OA 055 | 3.2.5 | lines 696-697 | te | This is unclear because the way to use processes, actors, and tasks is very different and often outside of service orientation. This may be generally true of composition outside the SOA context but is not obvious ”For SOA”. | Clarify what of this applies to SOA and how it applies. |  |
| OA 056 | 3.2.5 | lines 698-700 | te | This implementation detail is not in the scope of SOA. | Delete. |  |
| OA 057 | 3.2.5 | lines 710-712 | te | See comments to 2.1.20. “every member knowing” is not feasible. | Still suggest deleting all references to choreography. |  |
| OA 058 | 3.2.5 | Figure 3 | te | (1) Is Actor here a general actor or the Human Actor per Figure 2?  (2) The Performs arrow is the reverse of Figure 2.  (3) Is Composition here what is meant in preceding text?  (4) Is service composition what defined in section 2 or what is in lines 727-729 to follow? | Revise figure to clearly show intended relationships and unambiguously relate to text. |  |
| OA 059 | 3.2.5 | lines 718-719 | te | Given text “Elements of SOA systems are Services, Actors, Tasks, and Systems. Any of these elements can perform a service.”  Where do we distinguish between the two uses of the term service? Is the distinction clearly maintained throughout the document? | Need to explicitly address as part of definition of terms in Section 2. Need to check subsequent use throughout documents. |  |
| OA 060 | 3.2.5 | lines 730-753 | te | How does this detail relate to SOA? Seems more general tutorial. | Make relevance clear or delete. |  |
| OA 061 | 3.2.5 | lines 748-750 | te | Advertisement, not description | Delete |  |
| OA 062 | 3.2.5 | lines 752-753 | te | Text is not clear | Delete or revise. |  |
| OA 063 | 3.2.6 | lines 756-758 | te | (1) Should “search ... desired services” be “search a collection of service descriptions”?  (2) What does it mean to “retrieve desired services”?  (3) Is discovery “query for the service metadata” or “query against the service metadata”?  (4) Service description is defined, so should be preferred term rather than metadata. | (1) Use replacement text  (2) Delete retrieve  (3) Use latter replacement  (4) Use defined term |  |
| OA 064 | 3.2.6 | lines 760-761, 764-766 | te | Numerous small issues with text that best addressed by supplying alternative. | Suggested:  Registration is the process by which a service description is made visible to prospective consumers. This is often accomplished through adding the service description to a collection of descriptions, e.g. a registry or repository, that supports search of the descriptions against criteria provided by the consumer. |  |
| OA 065 | 3.2.6 | lines 768-772 | te | This is not service discovery but rather endpoint resolution based on a container-based software development and deployment approach. | Delete. |  |
| OA 066 | 3.2.6 | lines 774-780 | te | This detail is neither principle nor concepts. It also is not universally used. | Delete. |  |
| OA 067 | 3.2.6 | lines 783-785 | te | Sentence unnecessary:  “They often introduce governance mechanisms to ensure that services are developed with re-use in mind, and that the possibility of re-using existing services is explored before new ones are written.”  Governance is a separate issue under a separate discussion. | Delete. |  |
| OA 068 | 3.2.6 | lines 788-798 | te | (1) This is opinion with very little appropriate for a standard.  (2) “common vocabulary” should be covered more completely in discussion of semantics (section 3.2.3). | (1) Delete  (2) If not delete, cover more completely in section 3.2.3 and reference here, as necessary. |  |
| OA 069 | 3.2.6 | lines 801-805 | te | Not clear how this differs from service repository. Continuing problem that began with definitions where seem to be equate all the terms. | Revise consistent with previous comments of need to explicitly differentiate or treat as the same. |  |
| OA 070 | 3.2.6 | lines 807-816 | te | Most commonly see combined registry/repository implementations with UDDI playing a relatively small part. In an case, this is implementation and neither principles nor concepts. | Delete. |  |
| OA 071 | 3.2.7 | lines 821-826 | te | Contains extraneous or unclear text.  (1) “as the outcome of a request in the definition of a service” is unneeded and confusing.  (2) “It is important that services have simple, well-defined interfaces. This makes it easy to interact with them, and enables other elements to use them in a structured manner.” Mostly unnecessary.  (3) Unclear. “The concept of an interface includes the notion that interfaces that define the parameters for information passing in and out of them when invoked.”  (4) “domains” in line 827 is never defined. | (1) Delete.  (2) Delete but change sentence beginning on line 821 to “Service interfaces provide a well-defined means for other elements to interact and exchange information with a service.”  (3) Delete.  (4) Revise without undefined term. |  |
| OA 072 | 3.2.7 | line 832 | te | (1) Unclear what would constitute an informal constraint for the interface.  (2) Parenthetical does not clarify informal constraint | (1) Provide example as did for formal constraint.  (2) Delete and replace with example asked for above. |  |
| OA 073 | 3.2.7 | lines 834-836 | te | The points here are well-taken but it is necessary to emphasize that semantics must be interpreted consistently. | Add to end of paragraph:  This also requires that the semantics of the defined interface be honored by all services implementing the interface. |  |
| OA 074 | 3.2.7 | line 868-871 | te | Up to this point, the subsection is discussing contractual aspects but here get into wider range of things in service description. The hierarchy of information is unclear. I would say service description as defined in 2.1.26 contains a variety of information that includes applicable policies. Service descriptions are specific to the service, irrespective of the parties involved in an interaction. Service contract may be specific to the participants. Some elements of what can be applied as a contract may be included in the description, e.g. a valid license is needed to use this service. Other explicit elements of a contract are not included in the description, e.g. the discounted cost of the license. The contract may include required or prohibited effects; the description covers both wanted and unwanted real world effects, e.g. a drug’s (unwanted) side effects. | These points need to be included in additional text. |  |
| OA 075 | 3.2.7 | line 885 | te | The phrase “they do not describe an intended course of action” seems an important distinction but it is not clear what it means. | Revise and clarify |  |
| OA 076 | 3.2.7 | lines 888-889 | te | A policy cannot apply to zero things. It may be an abstract assertion but it is not policy until someone applies the assertion to something. | Delete “zero” and the parenthetical. |  |
| OA 077 | 3.2.7 | line 902 | te | Explicit service contracts tailored to sets of participants are not included in a service description because the description only describes the service, not tailored uses of the service. Policies referenced in service descriptions may be the basis of implicit contracts. | Delete phrase “service contracts”. |  |
| OA 078 | 3.2.7 | lines 904-906 | te | Not clear and introduces conflicts with reference implementations. | Suggest instead:  Explicit service descriptions provide information necessary to know what a service does, the conditions of use, the user experience during interaction, the details of information exchange, and the location at which information exchange occurs. |  |
| OA 079 | 3.2.8 | lines 916-917 | te | “Service Management and Monitoring, Service Support” are not lifecycle stages but rather activities beginning with Service Operations and Retirement. | Delete phrase and replace with Service Operations. |  |
| OA 080 | 3.2.9 | lines 929-968 | te | None of this has anything explicit to do with SOA or, more explicitly, SOA Principles and Concepts. It is standard software system development. It is missing important context of where SOA has influence and impact. | Highlight SOA-specific aspects or simply delete. |  |
| OA 081 | 3.2.9 | Figure 8 | te | Line 955 is Manage, Figure 8 is Manage and Govern. | Make consistent |  |
| OA 082 | 3.3.1 | lines 982-995 | te | Text is unclear as to major points it is trying to make related to SOA Integration Principles and Concepts. | Revise so important points are clear to reader. |  |
| OA 083 | 3.3.1 | line 1000 | te | Begin sentence with “Figure 9 shows a number...” | Correct wording |  |
| OA 084 | 3.3.1 | lines 1022-1023 | te | The need is not for “stronger management” but flexible management that can be tailored to different situations, especially where governance and management cannot be top down and application of governance and management must be cooperative. | Replace current phrase with some variation of text in comment |  |
| OA 085 | 3.3.1 | lines 1025-1039 | te | (1) Start subsections with important points instead of writing around them.  (2) Not clear how mediation is different from transformation | (1) Suggested text:  Transport  A message originating with a sender must be able to reach its intended receiver. This is accomplished through use of a transport infrastructure that provides the protocols necessary to convey messages between the two. The sender and receiver may both be connected to a common transport infrastructure or bridging will be necessary between their respective infrastructures. This bridging may require protocol translations, as well as...  Transformation  The sender and receiver must have a common understanding of the message content. This may require a transformation between formats fir presentation of content or between vocabularies in order to align local semantics. An example here is where...  (2) Revise text to unambiguous differentiate. |  |
| OA 086 | 3.3.2 | lines 1041-1048 | te | No mention of security. | Either revise heading so only Management or add content about security. |  |
| OA 087 | 3.3.2 | lines 1107-1118 | te | These definitions are not clear. There needs to be a reference that can be cited to provide a standard definition for each of these conditions. | Research and use standard definitions. |  |
| OA 088 | 3.3.2 | lines 1119-1123 | te | This is an important piece and should be given more prominence. | Move up so it is not buried at the end of a subsection. |  |
| OA 089 | 3.3.2 | lines 1125-1140 | te | The following items are not adequately addressed:  (1) Need to distinguish between attack to harm asset, attack to disrupt communication with asset and attack to unauthorized access to asset.  (2) Not clear that Destruction and Removal are distinct. In both, the attack results in an operational resource no longer be available. Whether or how much of a residue of the resource remains does not seem to be a major distinction.  (3) How much Corruption is needed for Destruction?  (4) Interruption would seem like the resource still exists as opposed to destruction/removal but communications is impeded. | Revise and likely reduce list to items in (1). More fully explain these items |  |
| OA 090 | 3.3.2 | lines 1141-1174 | te | (1) Authentication should be first because it is often a prerequisite to Access Control  (2) “the proof of identity should be carried between initial consumer and ultimate provider” raises issues of how this is done in a scalable and untamperable manner. This does not need to be laid out here but it should be noted as an issue, especially as related to complex service compositions and service chaining.  (3) “There aspect that SOA ... a trustee protocol between components.” is unclear as to what points are being made.  (4) Data Confidentiality section is unclear as to what points being made.  (5) Data Integrity section is more clear on purpose but has extraneous text, last sentence with inconsistent level of detail. | (1) Revise order and not a prerequisite.  (2) Add caveat about scalability for complex service combinations.  (3) revise and clarify.  (4) revise and clarify.  (5) Suggested:  Data Integrity: Ensure that data is received as sent or retrieved as stored in all of the interactions between service components.~~, whether they are~~ This includes data exchange for SOA management or lifecycle purposes ~~or~~ and for interactions between service consumers and providers. Examples: digital signature with XML-Signature, anti-virus software. ~~The XML signature should only be processed at both end to avoid opening a breach in the various nodes that constitute an SOA architecture between the service consumer and provider.~~ |  |
| OA 091 | 3.3.2 | lines 1176-1190 | te | Not clear why have not included relevant pieces in general security and general governance.  (1) Is there anything fundamentally different between general governance and governance applied to security concerns?  (2) Where must security concerns be included in general governance? | Include in context in relevant security and governance sections. |  |
| OA 092 | 3.3.2 | lines 1198-1200 | te | Does this mean that SOA solutions are using dedicated infrastructure or SOA domain of responsibility includes non-SOA uses of any infrastructure SOA solutions touch? We certainly don’t want cost of former and I don’t think SOA wants responsibility of latter. The conclusion would be a collaboration is needed among management functions. | Clarify the scope of SOA management, explicitly noting what is and is not included in a heterogeneous environment. |  |
| OA 093 | 3.3.2 | lines 1210-1211 | te | re “address how software, systems and services are developed and maintained throughout the software lifecycle”, while this should be addressed in the context of security concerns, is lifecycle really part of security management? | Clarify and maintain a manageable scope. |  |
| OA 094 | 3.3.2 | lines 1214-1215 | te | How is Event Management different from what explicitly included in Business Activity Monitoring and Management? | Clarify and maintain a manageable scope. |  |
| OA 095 | 3.3.2 | lines 1230-1242 | te | There is an assumption of a governing entity with a uniform set of goals that cover all users. It assumes away a heterogeneous community and providers and consumers. It talks about service-level goals and business design but does not clarify whose goals and design, and the likelihood of inconsistencies among contributors. | Consider this in terms of a heterogeneous ecosystem where there is no one in charge at the top. Expand discussion to include this. |  |
| OA 096 | 3.3.2 | lines 1244-1252 | te | (1) What is distinction between service metadata and service description?  (2) A service description is not necessarily a physical document. Neither are policies, although that is one representation.  (3) Seem to be saying we need service discovery in addition to registries and repositories to manage service descriptions. Can more effectively manage a reasonable number of services without a registry/repository and this is often preferable for a limited number of services. However, service discovery through visibility enabled by service description is critical, whether or not in context of reg/rep.  (4) What are Logical Deviations? What are Service Related Entities? | (1) A service description is a collection of service metadata.  (2) Delete reference to physical documents  (3) Revise to includes points in comments.  (4) Use previously defined terms, define these, or remove text. |  |
| OA 097 | 3.3.3 | lines 1261-1373 | te | (1) Detail goes way beyond Principles and Concepts and is pushing a specific methodology.  (2) re “Corporate governance of IT”, this is an example of assuming a single top of a hierarchy. What about governance across corporations/organizations with different governance in place?  (3) re Guidelines, guiding principles are not governance although how to apply may be. | (1) Delete most of the material and stick to Principles and Concepts, likely already covered.  (2) If not delete, revise to be less single organization centric.  (3) Simply delete. |  |
| OA 098 | 4.1.1 | lines 1390-1392 | te | WS-I is not really interoperability across different protocols unless you call constituents of WS-\* stack as protocols. | Delete beginning with “otherwise” on line 1391. |  |
| OA 099 | 4.1.2 | lines 1405-1406 | te | re “participating sides must defer to a common information exchange reference model”, this is not always possible or sufficient, even in in theory desirable. Even when basic agreement, often see disconnects in extensibility elements. | Revise to include realism that differences exist and evolving vocabularies introduce new terms faster than they can be governed. Include what needs to be done to accommodate this. |  |
| OA 100 | 4.1.2 – 4.1.9 |  | te | Bullet lists need to be turned into informative prose. How do items relate? Note, section 4.1.5 is currently inconsistent in that it does provide text instead of bullet. | Revise to provide context and flow. |  |
| OA 101 | 4.1.5 | lines 1503-1504 | te | re “The capability to locate or discover services based on specific criteria is enabled by registries and repositories.” Discovery is enabled by accurate, up-to-date service description. This may be managed using registries and repositories, but there are numerous examples where deferring a formal reg/rep has reduced distractions while still enabling availability. A reg/rep is a place to put accurate service description but its existence doesn’t “ensure” it. | Revise to emphasize description and position reg/rep as possible facilitator. |  |
| OA 102 | 4.1.5 | lines 1507-1514 | te | Is there a reason to describe in detail a tightly coupled approach that represents traditional coding but little in the use of the SOA paradigm. | Revise for SOA context or delete. |  |
| OA 103 | 4.1.5 | lines 1515-1520 | te | This has little to do with the topic of this subsection, Discoverability. | Delete. |  |
| QA 104 | 4.1.5 | line 1522 | te | There are too many reg/reps out there that are not facilitating discoverability. | Replace bullet with:  Service descriptions that are available from predictable locations. |  |
| OA 105 | 4.1.5 | lines 1527-1530 | te | These bullets are more likely touted benefits of reg/rep, not of discoverability. | Delete. |  |
| OA 106 | 4.1.6 |  | te | This subsection is very sparse. | If there is not more to say commensurate with other subsections, then delete. |  |
| OA 107 | 4.1.7 | lines 1550-1551 | te | re “Self-Contained services are encapsulated and do not depend on other services for their state”, this seems to ignore that a service can be a composition of other services or make use of non-SOA-enabled capabilities. Self-contained seems like a very slippery concept. | Delete as peripheral item that is harder to explain than to ignore. |  |
| OA 108 | 4.1.8 |  | te | Loose coupling for a message exchange environment is different from expansion joints in plumbing. What is missing is that message exchange must be well-defined but still provide principled mechanisms for variations in inputs and extensibility. Bullet on lines 1573-1575 is no different from traditional Interface Control Document and these are typically not held up as examples of loose coupling. Something like document style rather than RPC is more of an example that should be discussed. | Revise to really consider how elements of the SOA paradigm facilitate (but do not ensure) loose coupling. |  |
| OA 109 | 4.1.8 | lines 1585-1586 | te | re “Minimizing changes to consumers of services over time, even when versions change or changes are needed for qualities of service or protocol support.” This is misleading because the benefit is really minimizing the plumbing changes but other changes may make service unacceptable. Loosely coupled interface may make it easier to substitute an alternate service but loose coupling must also extend to things like policies. | Revise in context of comment OA 107 to include wider understanding of loose coupling. |  |
| OA 110 | 4.2 | Figure 11 | te | Numerous questions on relationships (or lack of), cardinality, and composition that are difficult to list in this table. | Discuss real time. |  |
| OA 111 | 4.2 | lines 1656-1658 | te | Layers are an abstraction but there is no context for why this abstraction and how it provides what benefits. | More detailed questions about layers will be included in review of Part 2. Resolve here in context of resolution to comments there. |  |
| OA 112 | 4.2 | lines 1659-1662 | te | (1) A capability does not “represent” a requirement but rather satisfies a requirement.  (2) re “This cohesive set of needs or functionality is summarized by name given to the capability.” There is a limit in what can be stuffed into a name and, while useful, is not sufficient. | (1) Replace “represents” with “satisfies”.  (2) Delete as not really adding anything. |  |
| OA 113 | 4.2 | lines 1663-1673 | te | Text states what ABB can be used for but not clearly what it is. | Suggested:  ABB: A logical element that realizes one or more capabilities. Its implementations provide the basic building blocks for composing SOA solutions. |  |
| OA 114 | 4.2 | lines 1674-1677 | te | Numerous questions on Method activity definition.  BTW, I do not remember seeing this in Part 2. Should it just be deleted? | Suggested:  Method activity: A set of steps that conveys a dynamic view of how ABBs interact. It should impact how ABBs are defined and how implementations are designed to facilitate effective composition. |  |
| OA 115 | 4.2 | lines 1678-1682 | te | More than Options go into Architectural Decisions and no reason to specially call this out. | Delete. If kept, enhance to provide some critical substance. |  |
| OA 116 | 4.2 | lines 1689-1690 | te |  | Suggested:  “This ~~includes~~ may be represented through the use of diagrams, patterns, pattern languages and interaction protocols.” |  |
| OA 117 | 4.2 | lines 1691-1692 | te | This tells me how a KPI may be used but not what it is. | Define KPI. |  |
| OA 118 | 4.2 | lines 1693-1695 | te | This tells me how a NFR may be used but not what it is. | Define NFR. |  |
| OA 119 | 4.2 | line 1696 | te | Definition needs definition. | Suggested:  “Technology used to implement an ABB.” |  |
| OA 120 | 4.3 | lines 1704-1705 | te | Don’t we have more relevant examples than telemarketing? | Replace with more relevant examples. |  |
| OA 121 | 4.3 | Figure 12 | te | Numerous questions on relationships, cardinality, and composition that are difficult to list in this table. | Discuss real time. |  |
| OA 122 | 4.4 | Entire section | te | We jump from discussion in terms of capabilities to “service” and this makes assumptions hard to relate to previous text. In particular, are things in terms of “service requirements” as stated or “capability requirements” related to business needs? | Have assumptions in terms of capabilities as just discussed or connect better to services. |  |
| OA 123 | 4.4 | line 1742 | te | This is really talking to a SOA solution and not SOA the paradigm and nowhere is SOA as a thing defined. | Replace SOA with SOA solution in this line and consider for elsewhere in this section. |  |
| OA 124 | 4.4 | lines 1757-1762 | te | (1) Service contract here refers to something like a WSDL and not the general set of agreed to conditions discussed and defined previously.  (2) Service contract is not service interface and does NOT define what the service does for consumers.  (3) The functional elements are not “obligated” to anything. | (1) Revise to maintain consistent terminology and meaning.  (2) Service contract and service interface together define how to communicate and conditions under which communications and subsequent actions can occur.  (3) The functional elements implements the capabilities provided to generate the described outcomes. | OA 124 |
| OA 125 | 4.4 | line 1783 | te | Figure 13 shows a one-way flow with no indication of interaction. | Suggested:  Figure 13 shows a message flow from the Consumer Layer through intermediate layers and, finally, to the Operational Systems Layer. |  |
| OA 126 | 4.4 | line 1795 | te | Figure 13 does not show a response or make clear whether the return path is a reverse of the forward path or can be different. | Revise to give more information on response. |  |
| OA 127 | Annex A | lines 1844-1845 | te | Need to update SOA-RAF reference to reflect Committee Specification | Update |  |