| 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 201 | all | all | te | The document is written with an emphasis on "layers" as an essential organizing principle; however, the document provides no explanation of the criteria for identifying a layer or how layers interact.  Diagrams such as Figures 9 and 10 are useful to show which ABBs interact but the layer in which the ABBs reside does not provide greater context or clarity.  Moreover, one could take the interacting ABBs and completely reassign the layers (or remove the layers altogether) and the information conveyed by the figures would remain essentially the same.  For example, the Integration Layer includes mediation, messaging, and logging/auditing.  These are all essential pieces but why are these in this layer rather than in their own layers or part of another one?  Why aren't all the event-related ABBs in an Event Layer?  The text often uses the construct of "the abc ABB in the xyz Layer" but the layer phrase does not provide any distinguishing value. | If layers remain the organizing construct (Comment OA 204 suggests an alternative), provide explanation of what constitutes a layer, how are ABBs assigned to layers, and rules/guidance for how layers interact.  Clarify whether layers are supposed to be logical or physical. Be clear why these layers, e.g. why the Integration Layer includes mediation, messaging, and logging/auditing, rather than other combinations. If the choice is one of numerous possible combinations, make it clear that this is one way of collecting capabilities and others may also be useful.  See also comment OA 219, OA 220, OA 221, others.  Note, many comments that follow merely propose “Revise and clarify” or “Revise and elaborate” because it is not clear what more specific can be proposed short of significant alternative text that requires coordination with the editors. |  |
| OA 202 | all | all | te | Capabilities get captured as an undifferentiated list inside layers and have insufficient context.  For example, in section 14 (Quality of Service Layer), authentication, authorization, encryption, and auditing (capabilities 9-12) are separated from access control aspects (capabilities 21 and 22).  The presentation has the capabilities at the same level without any indication that some are at a lower level of granularity and contribute to others at a higher level.  In the Integration Layer, the "ability to authenticate/authorize for service invocation and message routing" is listed as a capability, but it is not clear until later that this is not a major contribution of this layer but is related to access control and other ABBs that will be introduced even later. | Revise the lists of capabilities currently appearing in each layer. When introducing a list of capabilities, note when these are major contributions of the current layer being discussed vs. capabilities which primarily originate in other layers.  Minimize redundancy when giving lists of capabilities and the corresponding ABBs. |  |
| OA 203 | all | all | te | ABB “details” vary widely in level of detail provided. In general, there are too many named pieces and not enough beyond names. Some ABB definitions contain a great deal of detail, often providing context for themselves and numerous other ABBs. Other ABBs have minimal information that leaves many questions.  For example, the Legacy System ABB detail only states "this ABB describes the legacy systems running in the Operational Systems Layer".  Is this ABB only for description?  Does this ABB generate a description?  What constitutes this description?  Where does one find this description? | State what constitutes a consistent level of detail that is sufficient to describe an ABB. Discussion about the interaction among ABBs should be removed from individual ABB detail and given more prominence than being embedded in the ABB detail.  There is too much emphasis on pieces and not enough on needed outcomes to which those pieces may contribute. Interaction detail often falls in the x.3 and/or x.4 sections; use this material as a basis for providing context across layers before getting into the sections with each layer's details. This would focus more on business activities rather than a bill of materials. |  |
| OA 204 | all | all | te | The level of detail throughout the document is not applicable to all likely readers and it is not easy for a particular audience to find material most relevant to their needs.  For example, my experience has often been with projects interested in basic search and basic retrieval, especially enabling this in a consistent manner across distributed sources that they can access but do not own.  Where is basic search? Where is basic retrieve?  What service or combination of services enables someone to do this?  A more effective organization of this material would be to partition by role (e.g., a consumer of information services) and the activities of interest to those roles. | Reorganize the presentation to focus on views aligned with particular roles and the activities in which the role is likely engaged. For example, what activities are of interest to a developer and where do developers need to immerse themselves in detail for their contributions?  (Infrastructure developers may have different interests than composition developers.) What activities are of interest to consumers and their needs?  Where do we make use of opacity so the consumer role sees outcomes with little, if any, knowledge of the developer details?   Then, given an area of interest, what ABBs come into play?  When there are common ABBs across roles, like security, the text should make the commonalities obvious rather than appear redundant. |  |
| OA 205 | all | all | te | There are numerous places where the document talks about "in an organization" and it is unclear how the point applies in a SOA ecosystem that spans organizations. Some examples are:    -- The Information Aspect is responsible for manifesting a unified representation of the information aspect of an organization …    -- SOA Governance ensures that the services and SOA solutions within an organization are adhering to …    -- This ABB enables organizations to organize, govern, and manage their valuable assets scattered throughout the enterprise and to encourage re-use of existing assets within the organization.    -- … provide their own sub-architecture for managing the flow of data across the organization. | Explicitly address how references to "an organization" relate to multiple interacting organizations.  Terms such as organization, enterprise, and the SOA ecosystem need to be defined with respect to each other. Given these terms, when do items discussed "in an organization" naturally extend across organizations and where are additional challenges (and possibly ABBs to address these) likely needed?  Addressing this may be possible through a set of definitions and then consistent use of terms or may be best explained in a dedicated, overarching section.  Uses of the term organization should be considered throughout the document for whether any limitations are implied. |  |
| OA 206 | all | all | te | The document often does not differentiate between vision and what commonly done in practice. For example, section 10.2.1.4 mentions numerous routing possibilities, some in common use and some being actively researched. The text does not differentiate. | Clearly state up front the intent of this RA as far as the degree to which it reflects common use and where it introduces what we believe to be future capability that a SOA approach will make readily accessible. Be clear in discussions when you are talking about which. |  |
| OA 207 | all | all | te | Too many desired outcomes are stated as facts. For example, any use of the term “ensures” is likely conjecture because while we believe there are benefits to the SOA paradigm (and we hope to realize these), use of the SOA paradigm “ensures” nothing. | Review document and “ensure” it is written as a technical specification and not as SOA advertising. |  |
| OA 208 | all | all | te | This document is not clear when it is providing a general discussion on areas such as management and software development that have a non-SOA existence and use and where SOA introduces something unique. This is critical for both context and for specifically where we expect the SOA paradigm to have impact. | Clearly state where the text is providing general discussion for context and where SOA principles are expected to add to, extend, or change the traditional context. |  |
| OA 209 | all | all | te | The use of the terms “virtualization” and “cloud computing” feel like last minute buzzword add-in. | Review document and consider whether something significant is being said. If not, delete. |  |
| OA 210 | Introduction | lines 289-291 | te | “The report is intended ... as well as promote effective large-scale adoption of SOA.”  (1) This is no longer a report.  (2) Promoting adoption of a technology/technical approach is not the purpose of an international standard. | (1) Replace report with standard.  (2) Delete beginning with “as well as”. Also on line 384. |  |
| OA 211 | 4.1 | line 355 | te | Is SOA as an architectural style “based on” design or should it be “the basis for” design. | Change to “the basis for”. |  |
| OA 212 | 4.1 | lines 357-359 | ed | Not clear, especially “implementations of services are provided use processes and service composition” | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 213 | 4.1 | lines 360-361 | te | Open standards go beyond infrastructure. If use of open standards is a distinguishing characteristic, that should be generally stated. | Revise to clarify. |  |
| OA 214 | 4.1 | line 364 | te | “Strong” governance is a matter of interpretation and there are numerous examples where getting wrapped up early in “strong” governance was a diversion from getting something done. | Replace “strong” with “appropriate”. |  |
| OA 215 | 4.1 | lines 367-370 | te | Original text: “Service orientation is utilized for enabling efficient co-operation between autonomous (business) entities (e.g. clients, service providers, and third parties) that wish to collaborate to achieve common goals.”  Cooperation does not require “common goals” but rather an expectation of individual benefit. | Suggested text:  (1) “Service orientation is utilized for enabling efficient co-operation between autonomous (business) entities (e.g. clients, service providers, and third parties) that see that cooperation as being an enabler in realizing their individual goals.”  -or-  (2) “Service orientation is utilized for enabling efficient co-operation between autonomous (business) entities (e.g. clients, service providers, and third parties) that wish to collaborate to achieve common (technical) outcomes.” |  |
| OA 216 | 4.1 | line 372 | te | Original text: “Business-oriented SOA takes ‘service’ as its basic element...”  Unclear whether service is meant here in the context of IT artifact or more general definition. Is service really the basic element or is it needs, requirements, capabilities? Is service the basic element of design? of implementation? | The term “service” is overloaded and this is one example where there is need for clarification of which meaning.  This is a general issue across this document. |  |
| OA 217 | 4.1 | line 389 | te | “service oriented computing” is introduced in text as significant term but it is never defined and not otherwise used. | Delete. |  |
| OA 218 | 4.3 | Figure 1 | te | Which layers are primarily logical and which primarily realization of the logical? Are the following two lines consistent?  Line 450: “...multiple separations of aspect...”  Line 451: “Figure 1 depicts a SOA as a set of logical layers.” | Revise and clarify both figure and surrounding text. |  |
| OA 219 | 4.3 | lines 451-459 | te | “... one layer does not solely depend upon the layer below it ... partially-layered architecture ...”  However, there appears to be some implied layering, especially in early horizontal layers.  This again implies there is no consistent rationale for what is a layer and how it is used. | Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 220 | 4.3 | line 463 | te | This is the first use of “Aspect”. The term is never defined and never explained as compared with Layer. | Critical term must be clearly defined and explained. Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 221 | 4.3 | lines 463, 465 | te | Integration Aspect included both in horizontal (line 463) and cross-cutting (line 465). It is not clear how or why. | Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 222 | 4.3 | lines 471-475 | ed | (1) Need to qualify what mean by decoupling or use more colloquial term.  (2) Text says (1) something is valuable, (2) there is a qualification, then (3) text valid even if not qualification. | Suggested:  Provider/consumer separation along the lines of the business relationship is a valuable separation of concerns. The use of SOA principles can facilitate customizing how this separation is implemented. |  |
| OA 223 | 4.3 | line 481 | ed | “vertical layers” are not strictly vertical in Figure 1, especially given 3D shading and seeming reference below to 3D nature. | Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 224 | 4.3 | lines 488-490 | te | The text seems to be saying that management applies to governance as much as governance does to management and, thus, there is no principled layering but something more arbitrary. | Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 225 | 4.3.1 | line 491ff | te | Text that follows indicates this is 1) all underlying infrastructure and 2) all legacy IT that is not designed per SOA paradigm. This conflates two very different things. As critical infrastructure, this underlies everything. As legacy pieces, this is a box of odds and ends off to the side. | Revise and clarify. Is this part of comment OA 201? |  |
| OA 226 | 4.3.1 | lines 498-500 | te | (1) Rather than “including custom or packaged application assets, ...” should this be “where the functionality may depend on custom ...”  (2) Not clear whether a composed service is part of the systems layers. | (1) Consider proposed alternate  (2) Revise and clarify what this layer is, what it includes, how what it includes relates to things in other layers. |  |
| OA 227 | 4.3.1 | line 519 | te | How do “existing services” relate to things in the Services Layer? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 228 | 4.3.2 | line 531 | te | Is “service contract” as used here in more inclusive sense of Part 1 or as just the WSDL? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 229 | 4.3.2 | line 534 | te | Original text: “The service component layer manifests the IT conformance with each service contract defined in the services layer; it guarantees the alignment of IT implementation with service description.”  What other than the interface described in the service description is guaranteed by the service component layer? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 230 | 4.3.2 | lines 547-549 | te | Original text: “Subsequently, the Provider organization may decide to replace one component with another with the result that there is no impact on any consumers of the *Service*.“  (1) What is meant by capitalized, italicized Service?  (2) This is only true if the outcomes (real world effects) and conditions of use (e.g. policies), and other things enumerated in the service description are identical. | (1) Revise and clarify.  (2) Suggested:  “Subsequently, the Provider organization ~~may decide~~ is able to replace one component with another having the same interface, producing the same outcomes (real world effects), and having identical conditions of use with the result that there is no impact on any consumers of the Service. ” |  |
| OA 231 | 4.3.3 | line 554 | te | Unclear whether the Services Layer “provides” business functionality or “describes” it. Is this layer a logical representation? To what extent does it include implementation aspects?  Part of the confusion is that there is an underlying assumption of a container-based development methodology and deployment that is never explicitly described. This becomes more clear after one pieces together a lot more text but that requires at least another 30 pages of text. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 232 | 4.3.3 | lines 559-565 | te | (1) More complete discussion of what goes into service description can be found in OASIS SOA RAF.  (2) More is needed in the way of defining what constitutes service dependencies. Specifically, if compositions of compositions exist, what level of dependencies are captured? | (1) Revise making use of OASIS SOA RAF.  (2) Develop and include consistent, scalable guidance. |  |
| OA 233 | 4.3.3 | line 568 | te | “contracts (service descriptions)” is conflating terms defined elsewhere. Need to stick with consistent definitions and relationships. | Check use of “contracts” and “descriptions” throughout document and make sure consistent use. |  |
| OA 234 | 4.3.3 | line 574 | te | “Functional capabilities aka services” is overloading the term services. | Delete “aka services”. |  |
| OA 235 | 4.3.4 | 581ff | te | (1) Application is never defined, nor is the relationship with service. If a composition is made available as a service, where does the Process Layer fit in? When does a service become an application?  (2) Seems like Process Layer includes 1) infrastructure to execute processes and 2) data describing process flow to be executed. Composing or decomposing processes seems like technology and practice outside of SOA, though pieces of specific process functionality may be accessed using services. | (1) Define “service”, “application”, “process” and provide clear relationship between terms.  (2) Clearly separate what is existing technology outside of SOA and where SOA provides a difference. Analyzing process flows is useful but not specifically SOA. |  |
| OA 236 | 4.3.5 | 606ff | te | Much of the text relates to human consumer. Is this intended to be the focus? Are there situations where machine access, e.g. interaction initiated by other service, would use Consumer Layer rather than interacting directly through published interface? | Clearly indicate scope of this layer. If it is human directed, make this clear. If it can be machine interaction, explicitly show where this is expected to occur.  See also OA 258. |  |
| OA 237 | 4.3.5 | lines 627-629 | te | These ideas about security are too important to bury here. | Move to end of first paragraph. |  |
| OA 238 | 4.3.6 | lines 633ff | te | The later detail in Section 10 discusses more functionality but this subclause almost completely focuses on mediation. A lot of good material that would argue for a “Mediation Layer” but it does not adequately introduce Integration Aspect. | Revise to give a more inclusive discussion of what later attributed to this layer/aspect. |  |
| OA 239 | 4.3.6 | lines 634-638 | ed | Text can be more concise and focused. | Suggested text:  “The Integration Aspect enables and provides the capability to mediate~~, which includes transformation, routing and protocol conversion to transport service requests from~~ between the service requester ~~to~~ and the ~~correct~~ service provider. It ~~supports~~ provides the capabilities to transform, route, and convert protocols, ~~required for~~ enabling ~~SOA such as routing, protocol support and conversion, messaging/interaction style,~~ support for heterogeneous environment, adapters, service interaction, service enablement, service virtualization, service messaging, message processing and transformation.” |  |
| OA 240 | 4.3.6 | lines 639-640 | te | The referenced clause more likely should be here rather than the reference. | Move indicated text. |  |
| OA 241 | 4.3.6 | lines 646-648 | te | Text unclear. It seems the point is adapters are a class of resources that provide mediation. Should probably also say adapters are often used to mediate with legacy assets. Adapters may be useful to any consumers, human or machine. | If my assumptions are accurate, the text should be revised to explicitly incorporate these ideas. |  |
| OA 242 | 4.3.6 | lines 656-661 | te | This relates to comment OA 238.  Given the prior text in this subclause, it is unclear why/how binding occurs here. If this paragraph introduces something fundamental (and I believe it does), those points should appear earlier. | Resolve consistent with OA 238. |  |
| OA 243 | 4.3.7 | lines 662ff | te | This subclause has a lot of unnecessary and distracting words that need to be minimized to key takeaway points. For example, need a clear statement that security is being handled as a specific “type” of policies. In general, level of detail inconsistent with previous subclauses. | Delete most of detail and condense to a few focused paragraphs. |  |
| OA 244 | 4.3.8 | lines 745ff | te | Information Aspect seems to emphasize enterprise data management where a single representation (semantics and structure) can be enforced. How does this interact with mediation? How does this apply to a heterogeneous ecosystem where multiple representations exist? How does this accommodate agile evolution of representations for unanticipated users and unanticipated needs? | This relates to OA 205. Include sufficient discussion on how Information Aspect supports heterogeneous environment. |  |
| OA 245 | 4.3.9 | lines 789-793 | te | This relates to OA 202. My first read was that these are capabilities provided by governance rather than those used by governance. This is confusing because other subclauses do not include this discussion. | Delete or make clear what is provided by governance vs. what is used by governance. |  |
| OA 246 | 4.3.9 | lines 802-803 | te | Does this layer support “ability to monitor” or does it “indicate what needs to be collected and specify actions and procedures in response to collected metrics”? | Consider and revise. |  |
| OA 247 | 4.3.10 | lines 806ff | te | Is this a Development Layer or Development Aspect? It is unclear because we have no clear understanding of what is a layer or what is an aspect? | Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 248 | 4.3.10 | lines 812-813 | te | Management provide control over what development work is done but technical changes during O&M are not management responsibility. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 249 | 4.3.10 | line 823 | te | Testing as related to participating in the SOA ecosystem should be an emphasis of Development Layer | Add appropriate material. |  |
| OA 250 | 4.4.1 | lines 839ff | te | A statement is needed for all service categories and possibly as part of principles that a preferred service solution is a common service providing well-defined functionality but can be customized for consumer needs rather than a new service for every variation. For example, an Interaction Service can access data in XML and apply custom stylesheets to give the desired presentation; it does not require a different service for each presentation. | Add this key point as a guide for all service categories but also add as general principle. |  |
| OA 251 | 4.4.1 | lines 840-842 | te | (1) This is different from the Mediation Services discussed in Integration Aspect. No mention of transformation.  (2) Mediation Services are not responsible for smart routing but smart routing may be enabled by mediation available.  (3) “binding” has been used extensively as specific concept with respect to interfaces. Use in line 840 can be confusing. | Revise as suggested and to be consistent with discussion of mediation elsewhere. |  |
| OA 252 | 4.4.1 | lines 850-852 | te | Are access services really services, just adapters, or services to create and apply adapters? | Clarify this service category. |  |
| OA 253 | 4.4.1 | lines 856-857, 871-876 | te | These appear to be misc. services to satisfy stakeholder special needs but these do not require their own categories. For example, why aren’t Partner Services just mediation? Simplifying taxonomy will make it easier to apply. | Delete special categories. |  |
| OA 254 | 4.4.1 | lines 858-860 | te | Lifecycle Services should just be a subset of Management Services. They do not seem unique enough to be own category. | Delete special categories. |  |
| OA 255 | 4.4.1 | lines 861-862 | te | Asset and registry services should be to manage and make accessible information describing assets, where this \*may\* include how asset is accessed. | Revise category description. |  |
| OA 256 | 4.4.1 | lines 865-867 | te | Management Services use metrics but are not “services that represent ... metrics”. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 257 | Question 1 | lines 891-903 | te | The answer presented here is we’ve created layers and the distinction between logical and physical is the layer assigned. This does not answer the basic question. Lines 891-897 are a repeat of the previous summary with no additional information. | Resolve in the context of comment OA 201. |  |
| OA 258 | Question 2 | lines 907-909 | te | This relates to OA 236. There comment was that discussion seemed to be very human/GUI centric. Aren’t things in Consumer Layer, as discussed above, primarily GUI-based, where the logic behind the GUI may invoke interactions with services? A consumer in this context would be unlikely to make an API-like connection. | Resolve consistently with OA 236. Make clear who this layer supports and how. |  |
| OA 259 | Question 6 | lines 935-937 | te | The text “and projects will be chosen to conform to a fixed set of patterns and configurations of the ABBs along with product selections and implementations” opens the question of making needs conform to available solutions rather than solutions addressing needs. | Delete text. |  |
| OA 260 | Question 7 | lines 941-943 | te | If an implementation is using the registry/repository for visibility but not governance, does this mean Governance Aspect is required? What are the implications of not including or being required to include? | Clarify important points for when/how deal with layers when only interested in a minor part of its scope. |  |
| OA 261 | Question 8 | lines 944-952 | te | This has been the focus of much of this document to this point and the text here adds nothing new. | Delete |  |
| OA 262 | Questions 9 and 10, Questions 16 and 17 | lines 953-985, 1025-1112 | te | ABBs have not been discussed up to this point, so there is little motivation or context for asking these questions. ABBs are fundamental and should be fully discussed earlier. In particular, how do ABBs relate to services? Question 17 then tries to pack everything into one place, attempting to combine all the logical and detailed implementation aspects. This remains confusing because line 1049 says “an ABB is a logical entity” and then Figure 3 and the related discussion indicate physical entities (to the extent a runtime file can be considered physical). | Delete these questions but add a significant introduction and explanation about what are ABBs and how are they used. This certainly relates to OA 201 and possibly also to OA 202 and 203. Explain purely in logical terms to provide basic understanding and then relate to implementation entities. Also, be clear where making assumptions about the implementation environment. |  |
| OA 263 | Question 11 | lines 986-994 | te | Some aspects of this seem confused. What should clearly be stated is  - Policies are defined by humans with corresponding responsibility and authority. It is not done by any Layer/Aspect.  - Policies are managed at a Policy Administration Point (PAP); may be part of Governance Layer  - Monitoring is done at the Management Layer  - Policies are evaluated at the Management Layer, possibly using the PAP in the Governance Layer. This is equivalent to having a Policy Decision Point (PDP). Evaluating policy compliance may require information beyond that collected through monitoring.  - Any layer/ABB/??? may make a request to the PDP for a policy evaluation. Requestor likely has a Policy Enforcement Point (PEP) to act on the response from the PDP. | Revise to unambiguously include these points. |  |
| OA 264 | Questions 14 and 15 | lines 1006-1024 | te | (1) What does “agreed to treat” mean as an answer to this question?  (2) Most of the answer to Question 15 is a tutorial on what is an event in a business activity. It does answer the where question but not the why. | Clearly state what and why. In particular, why are the different event activities spread across the architecture? Even if not in its own layer, why not in a single layer? |  |
| OA 265 | Question 17 | lines 1083-1101 | te | Solution Components seem to have private copies of services. Doesn’t this run counter to the SOA paradigm? It appears closer to code reuse than service reuse. Can multiple solutions use different elements of different existing Solution Components? | Clearly state how this example supports service reuse? |  |
| OA 266 | 5.1.1 | lines 1133-1135, 1142-1145 | te | List of assets in this layer seems to include everything. In line 1142, talk about instantiating ABBs, so it appears some ABBs are logically in one layer but their runtime elements are here and the Service Component Layer. It should not be the job of the reader to piece this together. | This whole discussion needs to be constructed in a manner to be much easier to follow. |  |
| OA 267 | 5.2 | lines 1211ff | te | To what extent is this layer intended to have all necessary running code vs. service calls to external functional components? | Make scope of this layer clear. Resolve consistent with OA 266. |  |
| OA 268 | 5.2.1.5 | line 1237 | te | Given diversity of legacy systems, what does this ABB do? The single line “detail” is clearly insufficient. | Revise and elaborate. |  |
| OA 269 | 5.2.1.6 | line 1239 | te | Does this “represent” all possible databases? What is meant by represent? | Revise and elaborate. |  |
| OA 270 | 5.2.1.7, 5.2.1.8 | lines 1241, 1243 | te | Are these implementations of ABBs that are logically in the Management Layer or are we just using the ABBs available from the Management Layer? | Revise and elaborate. |  |
| OA 271 | 5.2.1.12 | lines 1256-1257 | te | What if making use of elements for which you don’t have a copy to put in Deployment Unit? For example, how does this work if in a heterogeneous environment with providers in different ownership domains? | Revise and elaborate. |  |
| OA 272 | 5.2.2 | Figure 5 | ed | Labels should no longer include QoS. | Revise figure. |  |
| OA 273 | 5.3 | line 1284 | te | Given other definitions, what is a subsystem? | Define and relate to other defined architectural terms. |  |
| OA 274 | 5.3 | Figure 6 | te | (1) Labels should no longer include QoS.  (2) Label interactions and/or explain in text. | Revise figure to correct labels and provide additional information. |  |
| OA 275 | 5.4.1 | lines 1312-1319 | te | This is example of information indicated in OA 203 that needs to be part of general development of context and is not the domain of one layer. | Revise and clarify |  |
| OA 276 | 5.4.2 | line 1346 | te | Policy Manager appears in this line and in Figure 7 and then sporadically through the document but it is never “detailed” or included in an ABB list. | Define and reference appropriately or correct instances if the name has been changed.  Also, connect with concept of Policy Administration Point (PAP). |  |
| OA 277 | 5.4.2 | lines 1346-1363 | te | The first detailed discussion of security should not be embedded in a layer where a reader would not have reason to look for it. | Extract this text and include in a discussion of security and security activities. |  |
| OA 278 | 5.4.3 | lines 1377-1379 | te | This distinction between functional and infrastructure ABBs belongs in an overall discussion of the architecture and not embedded in a layer. | Extract this text and include in a discussion of an overall discussion of ABBS and related activities. |  |
| OA 279 | 5.5.1 | lines 1384-1391 | te | “From an SOA perspective, ... integrate in a perimeter-less, cross-organizational manner ... cloud ... reuse of existing application assets ... running within an organization.”  (1) Not clear how the cross-organization is really supported, especially when deployment units seem to have private copies.  (2) Example of “cloud” interjected with no substantive value added.  (3) The assets “within an organization” does not obviously mesh with the cross-organization noted earlier in the paragraph. | Resolve in the context of comment OA 205 and OA 209. |  |
| OA 280 | 6.1 | lines 1464-1470 | te | (1) Figure 3 shows Service Component composed of Functional and Technical Components. “facilitate” used here seems the wrong relationship; Functional provides service functionality, Technical enables access through service mechanisms.  (2) How does contract/specification relation to service description and previous definitions? Specification has not been previously defined. Line 1472 conflates as contract/description/specification. | (1) Revise text using relationships noted.  (2) Revise consistently with definitions.  If not noted elsewhere, there needs to be a clear discussion of and defined relationships among contract, description, and specification. |  |
| OA 281 | 6.1 | lines 1477-1486 | te | Multiple duplications  - line 1480 duplicates 1477  - lines 1484-1485 said at end of previous page  - line 1486 said for the third time in 10 lines | Revise to state clear points once and only once. |  |
| OA 282 | 6.1.1 | lines 1470, 1500 | te | Introduce idea of service container but never define what this is. Needed as part of overall description of architecture and relationships among parts. | Define term. Incorporate per previous requests. |  |
| OA 283 | 6.1.2 | line 1529 | te | “broker pattern” never defined. | Define and state relationship with other relevant defined terms. |  |
| OA 284 | 6.2.1.1, others | lines 1549ff | te | (1) Service Component is an essential ABB and this “detail” says nothing about what it is or connects it with any central discussion of critical points.  (2) Other ABBs in 6.2.1 are especially weak. | Resolve consistent with OA 203. |  |
| OA 285 | 6.3 | Figure 11, lines 1622-1634 | te | This is a reasonable process but certainly not the only one. For example, what about a process that calls for early description before coding begins? | Important elements captured in the text can be discussed but a particular process should not be included because there are too many reasonable variants. |  |
| OA 286 | 6.3 | Figure 12 | te | Following text does not discuss steps 6 and 7. | Add these steps to following bullet list. |  |
| OA 287 | 6.4 | Figure 23 | te | Does Service Layer really invoke Service Component Layer or is it more accurately ABBs currently assigned to the respective layers that interact? Nowhere has this document defined what it means for layers to interact. | Resolve consistent with OA 201. |  |
| OA 288 | 6.4.2 | lines 1709-1710 | te | “The Service Component Layer realizes the services from the Services Layer and then uses the Operational Systems Layer to execute the services in a runtime environment.”  First time this clear a statement of relationship has been made, Again, should be highlighted in section describing fundamental relationships. | Resolve consistent with OA 201, others. |  |
| OA 289 | 6.4.2.1 | footnote 2 | te | Is this saying that a copy of code can still be out there even if logical entity not supposed to be active? This sounds like poor practice and a lapse of reasonable governance. | Revise and clarify or reconsider what being said. |  |
| OA 290 | 6.4.2.1 | lines 1725-1727 | te | “Finally, it is the responsibility of Service Components to faithfully reflect the definition of one or more services. To ensure that this relationship is maintained, a Service Component must not exhibit behaviors not defined in a service description.”  (1) The software cannot have responsibility.  (2) If the service exhibits behaviors not defined in the service description, it is a shortfall of the service description or the process by which the service was designed and implemented. | Revise so the software is not given human responsibility. |  |
| OA 291 | 6.4.2.1 | lines 1731-1732 | te | “The service then invokes the corresponding Service Component...” What is the meaning of service in this use? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 292 | 6.4.2.2 | lines 1740-1741 | te | “For this reason, traceability between the Service Component Layer and the Operational Systems Layer is an important element of an SOA.”  This traceability is important for running code, regardless of SOA. | Delete. Attribute things to SOA that are reflections of SOA paradigm and not general practice. |  |
| OA 293 | 6.5.1 | lines 1774-1775 | te | Missing the fundamental question of whether looking at things through a service paradigm or traditional software integration and use. | Revise to get to critical point. Nothing wrong with a traditional software approach if that’s what situation calls for. Need to emphasize in terms of paradigm. |  |
| OA 294 | 6.5.1 | lines 1776-1777 | te | This is only a question because insist on thinking in terms of layers rather than using Mediation capabilities that are orthogonal to layers. | Resolve consistent with OA 201, others. |  |
| OA 295 | 6.5.1 | lines 1782-1787 | te | This is general discussion material that needs to be in a more general section. | Resolve consistent with OA 208. |  |
| OA 296 | 6.5.2.1 | lines 1789-1804 | te | This is a general SOA discussion. From the perspective of Application B, all it sees is the Service A description, including but not limited to interface information. Package X and Package Y provide the substance of Service Component A’s Functional Component. Isn’t Service A the Technical Component? Also, substituting Package X with Package M requires the equivalence of a number of things other than the opacity provided by Service A. Unless predictable outcomes are maintained, the consumer will not see the substitution as equivalent. | Numerous difference in interpretation in text vs. in comment. Consider and revise appropriately. |  |
| OA 297 | 6.5.2.2 | Figure 79, lines 1817-1830 | te | Figure 21 shows a common adapter used by two different service components.  This seems to imply a shared entity at the coding level rather than common access through a service.  Would a more cross-organization approach be to use Adapter 2 as part of a service that enables access to Application 2 and then any consumer, including service compositions, could leverage the single service?  This would also avoid propagating changes to different instances of Adapter 2.  How does the process shown in Figure 21 or the suggestion above differently support interaction outside a single (or multiple tightly bound) organization(s)? | Justify, revise, or show comment as alternative to what shown in Figure 21. Include discussion of cross-organizational aspects per OA 205. |  |
| OA 298 | 7.1.1 | lines 1846-1848 | te | “The notion of ‘programming to interfaces rather than implementation’ only existed in the programming models such as Java and C++, but was never part of the architectural style until the advent of SOA and services.”  This is simply not true! System engineering has long emphasized defining interfaces and acting through these interfaces. Large programs had Interface Control Documents (ICDs). SOAP was initially just what was thought to be a simpler representation using XML. It wasn’t until the document style that we moved away from remote procedure calls (RPCs) and “coarse-grained” interfaces started to have meaning. | Remove the inaccurate statement and revise unless completely delete. |  |
| OA 299 | 7.1.1 | line 1864 | te | What constitutes dependencies vs. opacity? What happens to component dependencies when we have compositions of compositions? Does consumer care if Service A depends on Service B or is agreement and trust between consumer and Service A, i.e. Consumer trusts Service A to manage its dependencies. | Document needs discussion of practical limitations of listing dependencies and how this impacts use of services. |  |
| OA 300 | 7.1.1 | line 1867 | te | Not clear what is meant by “actual home”. Other than service endpoint, which doesn’t seem pertinent at this layer, there is no location. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 301 | 7.1.1 | lines 1879-1880 | te | Service Layer “providing” registry and repository seems to conflict with registry and repository being in Governance. | Clarify what seems like an inconsistency. |  |
| OA 302 | 7.1.2 | lines 1881-1930 | te | This is an example of OA 202. There is a long list of capabilities that seem to have counterparts elsewhere and the text is unclear as to what is used from other layers vs. what this layer contributes. There are numerous detailed questions for specific capabilities that will not be entered here in hopes that resolving this comment will deal with many of those. | Resolve consistent with OA 202. |  |
| OA 303 | 7.1.2 | line 1884 | te | Service Definition is capability to create service descriptions? This seems like generating unnecessary distinction. | Simplify and just talk to service description. |  |
| QA 304 | 7.2.1.1 | lines 1938-1945 | te | The details of the Service ABB have nothing to do with the definition of service. | Clearly state in early portion of this document what are the various uses of the term service and the relationship among these uses. |  |
| OA 305 | 7.2.1.3 | lines 1949-1969 | te | Most of what is in this text describes basic detailed architectural relationships at the implementation level. It should not be confined in the details of one ABB but should be part of a more general architecture discussion that the individual ABBs can reference for consistent context. | Resolve consistent with OA 201-204 and other comment requesting a consistent architectural discussion. |  |
| OA 306 | 7.3 | lines 2021-2047 | te | (1) See comment OA 305.  (2) In addition, this detail illustrates a situation where a single organization owns and deploys all the code. How does this relate to a heterogeneous environment of both distributed providers and distributed consumers? | (1) Resolve consistent with OA 305.  (2) Resolve consistent with OA 205. |  |
| OA 307 | 7.4.2 | lines 2089-2091 | te | Text along with Figure 113 is very useful but “converting data between different formats” is not shown in Figure 113. | Add into Figure 113 and include additional steps to show where/how it fits in. |  |
| OA 308 | 7.5 | lines 2111-2112 | te | “Services are functions that are accessible across a network via well-defined interfaces of the Services Layer.”  This is yet another aspect of the term “service” and not well connected with other uses. | Resolve consistent with OA 304. |  |
| OA 309 | 7.5 | lines 2139-2141 | te | “While there may be a compelling IT-related reason behind the use of such services, they are not generally tied back to a business process and as such do not warrant the rigorous analysis required for business services.”  Underlying IT is as much a business and justifies the same amount of rigor. | Delete or revise so do not understate need for business understanding and careful development and use. |  |
| OA 310 | 7.5 | lines 2142-2151 | te | The indicated text is a general statement having nothing in particular to do with the Service Layer. | Move and consolidate elsewhere with similar material in this document or simply delete as redundant. |  |
| OA 311 | 8.1.1 | lines 2155-2165 | te | The indicated text is general SOA advertising and adds nothing to the definition of the Business Process Layer. | Delete. |  |
| OA 312 | 8.1.1 | lines 2181-2183, 2191-2192 | te | The idea of “atomic service” makes sense in the abstract but in practice, opacity would indicate a consumer of a service does not know if it is atomic or a composite. Also, if some service makes use of infrastructure services, does that make it a composite? | Composition is using services with well-defined functionality to create additional (higher level?) functionality. Remove (at least minimize) the discussion in terms of atomics services. |  |
| OA 313 | 8.1.1 | lines 2198-2204 | te | Text is not a fundamental part of SOA paradigm but a business need that may be facilitated by domain tools that may be available as services. | Delete or move to more general, consolidated discussion elsewhere. |  |
| OA 314 | 8.1.1 | lines 2205-2208 | te | Text assumes only a top-down process. What about a bottom-up or horizontal approach? | Delete or move elsewhere as not enough value to elaborate here. |  |
| OA 315 | 8.1.1 | lines 2209-2264 | te | (1) Much of this is domain specific to business analysis and not a contribution of SOA.  (2) For lines 2215-2224, bottoms-up is not really symmetric with top-down. Rather, these can be done in parallel with top-down to see where already have existing pieces that can be brought to bear.  (3) “All the services should be represented and described by the Services Layer; and Service Components are represented by the Service Component Layer.” Text has nothing to do with the rest of the paragraph and the ones that follow.  (4) For lines 2256-2258, is it service components or services that need to coexist? | Prefer to delete entire section. If not, revise per specific comments. |  |
| OA 316 | 8.2.1.1 | lines 2346-2348 | te | This is an especially troubling example of OA 203. Not clear what this ABB does, what artifacts it creates or consumes. Seems this should be an engine that executes a data file that prescribes a specific process instance. Telling me this is core and fundamental does not tell me what it does. | Provide a meaningful set of details that makes it clear what this ABB does. |  |
| OA 317 | 8.2.1.7 | lines 2361-2374 | te | This is flip side of OA 316. This contains interesting detail and would be easier to understand if explain the process concepts that services can enable, then introduce the ABBs and how they work together. | Resolve consistent with OA 203. |  |
| OA 318 | 8.2.1.14 | lines 2406-2408 | te | Why is a Process Service Adapter different from other adapters used to expose things as services? | Revise to make clear why this is different or emphasize that it is a special type of a more general class already discussed. |  |
| OA 319 | 8.2.2 | lines 2436-2439 | te | The text conveys a general point that should be made elsewhere and a lot earlier. | Delete here and incorporate in general discussion/context/activities if this provided. |  |
| OA 320 | 8.5 | lines 2499-2501 | te | The text is not a useful summary; it just restates a premise. | Delete. |  |
| OA 321 | 9.1.1 | lines 2505-2522 | te | Real content of this section begins on line 2523. | Condense text to a few clear points or just delete and incorporate relevant points elsewhere. For example, could begin at line 2523 and move 2507-2511 after 2525. |  |
| OA 322 | 9.1.1 | lines 2536-2538 | te | Text not clear. How does this relate to “entry for externals” emphasized in previous text? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 323 | 9.1.2 | lines 2576-2582 | te | Why is Backend Integration different from any other consumer using any service? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 324 | 9.3 | lines 2678-2680 | te | “It is important to note that practically there is no real difference between human and non-human actors – they all represent interactions with the SOA.”  This is an essential point that is too important to be buried here. | Move this to where highlighting essential principles and properly emphasize. |  |
| OA 325 | 9.3 | Figures 182 and 193 | ed | Essentially the same figures with one change. | Condense into one figure. |  |
| OA 326 | 9.4.1 | lines 2700-2709 | te | This is the same as has been said for other layers. It is confusing in that it is not always clear where new material is being introduced and where there is just repetition.  This comment also applies to following layers. | Structure document to get points across once, cross reference as necessary, and reduce redundant material. |  |
| OA 327 | 10.1 | lines 2744ff | te | The text represents different aspects of the Integration Aspect but is an inconsistent whole with little context.  (1) The general introduction contains significant advertising that has minimum content. The section is an incomplete, varied collection of things associated with the layer but often without a strong connecting thread.  (2) It is unclear what capabilities this layer provides vs. what are SOA-related things with which may have connection.  (3) The “detail” on capabilities is often not clear or in context and the capabilities as presented tend to be disconnected lists and not clear where activities of other layers and this layer makes major contribution. | Significant content that needs to be carefully rewritten to be complete, consistent, and with strong connecting thread throughout. |  |
| OA 328 | 10.2 | lines 2836ff | te | This comment is a counterpart to OA 327. The ABBs focus changes drastically with no context. 10.2.1.1-10.2.1.8 focus on transformation, then 10.2.1.9 is basic messaging, 10.2.1.10 is transactions (which hasn’t been previously introduced), 10.2.1.11 ... | As with OA 327, significant content but almost random presentation that needs to be carefully rewritten to be complete, consistent, and with strong connecting thread throughout. |  |
| OA 329 | 10.2.1.3 | lines 2854-2860 | te | The text emphasizes a messaging focus for mediation while the previous discussion (section 4.3.6) emphasized the transformation aspects. Both are important and the two sections should cover the same aspects in a consistent manner. | Revise and clarify. Resolve consistent with OA 238. |  |
| OA 330 | 10.2.1.5 | line 2876 | te | What is “data enrichment” supposed to convey here? | Delete last sentence or expand to explain. |  |
| OA 331 | 10.2.1.6 | lines 2878-2884 | te | It is unclear whether intend for transformation to be based on semantic inference or only hardwired equivalences. | Clarify intended scope of this ABB. |  |
| OA 332 | 10.3 | Figures 39 and 40 | ed | Are Figures 39 and 40 needed separately? | Condense into one figure. |  |
| OA 333 | 11 | lines 3042ff | te | Much of the writing still reflects when this was named QoS Layer. | Revise taking care to do more than change names if emphasis of content should change. |  |
| OA 334 | 11.1.2 | lines 3082-3086 | te | What does this and, in particular, “command center for security management” mean in a heterogeneous, distributed environment of independent participants? | Resolve consistent with OA 205. |  |
| OA 335 | 11.1.2 | lines 3101-3105 | te | If business process is exposed as a service, how do business process monitoring and service monitoring interact? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 336 | 11.1.2 | lines 3108-3113 | te | How does Policy Monitoring and Enforcement relate to previously introduced Command and Control Management? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 337 | 11.1.2 | lines 3119-3131 | te | Good material but areas of concern that exist outside of SOA. | Resolve consistent with OA 208. |  |
| OA 338 | 11.1.2 | lines 3143-3146 | te | This indicates a significant level of control unlikely across organizations. Especially problematic will be incorporating things not built under this regiment. | Resolve consistent with OA 205. |  |
| OA 339 | 11.2.1.4 | lines 3264-3265 | te | “A solution is considered to have high security if it ensures authentication and authorization based upon proper roles.” What about Attribute-Based Access Control (ABAC)? | Expand to incorporate more than RBAC. |  |
| OA 340 | 11.2.1.7 | lines 3282-3299 | te | Similar to OA 338. This indicates a significant level of control unlikely across organizations. Especially problematic will be incorporating things not built under this regiment. | Resolve consistent with OA 205. |  |
| OA 341 | 11.2.1.11 | lines 3316-3326 | te | “This ABB acts as a kind of policy enforcer providing access control and enforcing policies related to access control and rights. ... This ABB depends on the Governance Aspect, that defines security policies, to retrieve security policies and act as a local policy decision point and local Policy Enforcement Point (PEP).”  Is enforcement done by Access Controller here or in Governance? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 342 | 11.2.1.12 | lines 3327-3332 | te | Why/how does this differ from Access Control ABB? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 343 | 11.2.1.17 | lines 3344-3361 | te | This ABB seems to be doing some significant things that are neither obvious on how its done or what is otherwise required to do these.  (1) “This ABB is responsible for monitoring and managing the overall health of the applications...” What does this ABB have within itself to manage vs. what management is needed to be done by the application?  (2) “Integrity and reliability are typically handled inside the application which uses several redundant storage and commit mechanisms to achieve integrity and reliability.” What is assumed, required, or recommended?  (3) “This ABB is responsible for understanding these relationships and presents the root cause of the application problem.” The software does not “understand”.  (4) “This includes decomposing the application and understanding the individual component resource needs to be able to pinpoint resource problems on an application context.” This seems more of an impact on applications to provide certain information in certain form. | Revise and clarify. This is somewhat of an understatement considering the scope of capability implied. |  |
| OA 344 | 11.2.1.22 | lines 3378-3381 | te | “Since a solution here refers to an SOA-oriented business solution, it implies a network-based service accessible remotely. Due to unpredictable network features, a solution is considered with high availability if its delay is always below some predefined threshold.”  This is an essential point that is too important to be buried here. | Move this to where highlighting essential principles and properly emphasize. |  |
| OA 345 | 11.2.1.33 | lines 3424-3453 | te | How does the Policy Enforcer interact with the Access Control ABB? Is access control more than a specific type of policy? | Make clear why these are different and how they interact. This should be reflected in the write-up for both ABBs and, more importantly, a general write-up on security. |  |
| OA 346 | 11.2.1.33 | lines 3436-3438, 3446-3451 | te | Indicated text is specifically on implementation experience. Text is not appropriate where currently placed but could be an interesting section about implementation experience to date. | Delete from current location and possibly incorporate in new section on implementation experience. |  |
| OA 347 | 11.2.1.33 | lines 3441-3442 | te | “Policies are generally enforced by the underlying message transport system that connects service providers with consumers during runtime.”  It is unclear how/why messaging does enforcement. Moreover, wouldn’t messaging convey the relevant messages as directed by a PDP and/or PEP? | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 348 | 11.3 | Figure 295 (29? 5?) | te | This figure says little as standalone. Text needs to be added to provide context of interactions to accomplish specified activities. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 349 | 12.1.1 | lines 3606-3608, 3691-3693, 3698 | te | (1) Single “common format” may not be feasible. There may be numerous useful defined formats and the need to mediate among them.  (2) This also applies to “common Information model”. While this may have relevance within a domain, it is not generally possible and there are numerous examples where this has failed.  (3) Also, “common data models”. | (1) Replace “common” with “usable”.  (2) State in terms of having well-defined semantics and the ability to mediate among these.  (3) Resolve consistently.  This is also related to and should be resolved consistent with OA 205. |  |
| OA 350 | 12.1.1 | lines 3612-3621 | te | (1) MDM acronym not defined  (2) Can’t IaaS be used as the basis for MDM? | (1) Define MDM.  (2) Clarify use of general IaaS for more limited approaches. |  |
| OA 351 | 12.2.1.12 | lines 3766-3767 | te | The detail gives no hint of the composition shown in Figure 50. This is significant omission, especially given level of detail provided in components. | Expand detail to include mention of composition and what the composite adds rather than using the components as separate entities. |  |
| OA 352 | 12.2.1.21 | lines 3823-3826 | te | Is there a difference in carrying this out for services vs. solutions vs. other resources requiring auditing? If no significant differences, please state such; otherwise, explain. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 353 | 12.2.1.32 | lines 3882-3883 | ed | “Information is one of the fundamental constructs of an SOA solution and analysis and design based on the service- oriented paradigm.”  Extraneous material. | Delete |  |
| OA 354 | 12.2.1.33 | lines 3885-3886 | ed | “Event is one of the fundamental constructs of an SOA solution and analysis and design based on the service-oriented paradigm.”  Extraneous material | Delete |  |
| OA 355 | 12.2.1.34 | lines 3887ff | te | What if access other provider content collections without creating central data repository? | Resolve consistent with OA 205. |  |
| OA 356 | 12.2.2 | line 3916 | te | Must also be able to use data persisted elsewhere. | Add discussion of data access to collections the requester does not own, control, or otherwise have preferred relationship. |  |
| OA 357 | 12.3 | Figures 50, 321 (32?), 332 (33?) | te | These are not sufficient without text walking through use scenario(s). For example, why is Information Service Gateway needed if it always goes directly to Data Aggregator? | Provide detail of steps in context of activities using these capabilities |  |
| OA 358 | 13 | lines 3982ff | te | Governance is a particularly challenging area when we are trying to coordinate among independent entities with their own rules and processes.  Much of the discussion in the RA implies (even if it is not explicitly stated) that there is a "top" (e.g., CIO) to the organization and everything is coordinated (mandated?) from the top rather than among independent contributors. | Resolve consistent with OA 205. Resolution must pay particular attention to how governance is impacted by a SOA ecosystem of independent participants. |  |
| OA 359 | 13 | lines 3982ff | te | Much of this section is “best practice” from someone’s experience base rather than absolutes. Also, there needs to be a general discussion of governance that incorporates specific SOA needs and behaviors. For example, governance should strongly interact with service description as the collection point of service characteristics and constraints; this is missing. | (1) Remove best practice material. It is not architecture.  (2) Add material that specifically addresses SOA needs and behaviors. |  |
| OA 360 | 13.1 | lines 4001-4002 | te | “the extensible and flexible SOA governance framework will ensure that all aspects of SOA are managed and governed”  This is advertisement, not architecture. | Resolve consistent with OA 207. |  |
| OA 361 | 13.1 | line 4003 | te | SLAs need to be based on desired, realizable outcomes with metrics that measure outcomes. | Revise and clarify. Simply having KPIs may miss business value focus. |  |
| OA 362 | 13.1.1 | line 4022 | te | “Compliance process are the conformance processes ...”  Are we talking compliance or conformance? | Define terms and use consistently. |  |
| OA 363 | 13.1.1 | lines 4032-4046 | te | These points assume top-down control of everything. Even within an organization, what about incorporating services within the lifecycle that began outside the lifecycle and have demonstrated value? | In addition to resolving consistent with OA 207, need to address lack of perfect control within an organization. |  |
| OA 364 | 13.2.1.1 | lines 4173-4177 | te | Repository detail must state that it is not used directly but through Asset and Service Repository specializations. | Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 365 | 13.2.1.2, 13.2.1.3, 13.2.1.4 | lines 4178-4213 | te | In practice, distinction between registry and repository for things like discovery has been muddied, (This is illustrated by lines 4204-4206.) Registries are more often used for endpoint resolution while the bulk of metadata is in the repository, and it is searches against the metadata that typically lead to service (or other resource) discovery. | Revise text to avoid attempts at distinction between registry and repository and concentrate on activities the reg/rep combination supports. |  |
| OA 366 | 13.2.1.4 | lines 4209-4210 | te | “This in particular supports agility through service versioning so that the impact of services being released can be addressed through versions of services.”  This makes no sense. | Delete. |  |
| OA 367 | 13.2.1.6 | lines 4220-4222 | te | Business Rules Manager may not be sufficient because will eventually need to manage and execute more complex decision models. | Consider expanding scope here. |  |
| OA 368 | 13.2.1.8 | lines 4228-4229 | te | “Policy is one of the fundamental constructs of an SOA solution and analysis and design based on the service-oriented paradigm.”  Policies predate SOA. How does what is specified as policy and how policy is used differ from an approach without services? | Resolve consistent with OA 208. |  |
| OA 369 | 13.2.1.9 | lines 4237-4239 | te | Policies should be distributed (or accessible by) PDP, not PEP. PEP gets result of PDP. | Resolve consistent with pattern laid out in OA 263. |  |
| OA 370 | 13.2.1.9 | lines 4242-4243 | te | “A key tenant of an effective security program is management of security based on well-defined policies.”  This is advertisement, not architecture. | Delete |  |
| OA 371 | 13.2.2 | lines 4305-4308 | te | This paragraph mentions three different repositories. Does this imply separate repository implementations or can these logical repositories make use of the same implementation? When are we managing an asset and when are we managing the asset description, i.e. consistent discovery of assets? | Expand repository discussions to answer these questions and include these points. |  |
| OA 372 | 13.3 | lines 4334-4341 | te | Reader can get lost in a long list of ABBs without a context, e.g. sample activities/scenarios, against which to see interactions. | Expand discussion in terms of activities using these ABBs to give context to the boxes and arrows in Figure 376. |  |
| OA 373 | 13.3 | lines 4352-4357 | te | Excellent to have explanation with interaction diagram. A little more detail is needed in a few places:  - What happens with steps 0, 0a, and 0b? Is this for defining policy?  - There seems to be a lot of pieces and it is not always clear why all parts or interactions are needed, e.g. doesn’t Policy Monitor know policies being monitored without asking Service Registry? Could see Service Registry (Repository?) notifying Policy Monitor when service description (which would include list of relevant policies) updated.  This would also be easier to read as an enumerated list corresponding to process steps. | Revise text per comment. |  |
| OA 374 | 15,16 |  | te | These clauses concentrate more on activities and functions that make up work that services are supposed to enable. These do not get bogged down in detailed pieces but begin to provide a context for how the pieces work together. | Consistent with OA 204, these clauses should inform a more activity-based organization of this document. |  |
| OA 375 | 16 | lines 4986-4987 | te | “When we apply SOA, as defined in the SOA RA, to a given level of granularity of an SOA ecosystem, we will typically find the need to create the same layers for each level of granularity.”  The goal should be to have ABBs applicable to new problems without the overhead of building duplicate layers. | Justify duplication or revise to demonstrate reuse. |  |
| OA 376 | 16 | lines 4990-4994 | te | “To participate in an SOA or services ecosystem, a company, a company would need to have a standard reference architecture such as that depicted by the SOA RA, in order to facilitate the integration and collaboration of architectures across companies.”  (1) How does “a company” relate cross organization?  (2) The message sounds like “build redundantly and hope it fits together”. This is probably not intended. | (1) Resolve consistent with OA 205.  (2) Revise and clarify. |  |
| OA 377 | Annex A | lines 5047-5048 | ed | Reference 17 should be updated to OASIS Reference Architecture Foundation for Service Oriented Architecture Version 1.0, 4 December 2012: <http://docs.oasis-open.org/soa-rm/soa-ra/v1.0/cs01/soa-ra-v1.0-cs01.pdf>. | Update |  |