Additional Note on Requirements and Scope Addendum to Choreology Ltd submission to OASIS BT TC of 12 March 2001

3 April 2001 Alastair Green (alastair.green@choreology.com) Copyright © Choreology Ltd, 2001. Subject to OASIS IPR Policy.

1. Extent of the Specification

The diagram below illustrates potential areas of standardization. It's not a perfect diagram but I hope it will give us an initial reference point for discussing the scope of the proposed standard. Please note: inclusion of an item on this diagram *does not* necessarily mean that I think we should include it in the standard.



Key:

- 1. Initiator/Coordinator (IC): the Demarcation API
- 2. Coordinator/Participant (CP): the Coordination Protocol
- 3. Participant/Service (PS): Participant API
- 4. Initiator/Service (IS): Operation Invocation Protocol
- 5. Identifier extraction: read context from Coordinator
- 6. CP communications: how the Coordination Protocol is carried
- 7. Identifier insertion: write context into Service/Participant
- 8. IS communications: how the Operation Invocations are carried
- 9. Communications/Carrier (CC): carrier bindings.

I believe that the irreducible core of the specification is the Coordination Protocol, recognising that an Identifier format will need to be defined.

Application ease of use will perhaps be most assisted by the addition of elements No. 1 (the Demarcation API), No. 3 (the Participant API), and Nos. 5 & 7 (Identifier extraction/insertion).

Ease of implementation may be assisted by a standardized approach to communications (elements No. 6 and No. 9).

Potential standardization elements can be made mandatory, optional, illustrative or absent.

Considerations in deciding whether to include these elements, and what kind of presence or "force" that they will have, are interoperability; time to standardization; comprehensibility of standard; ease of use of standard implementations.

2. Different organizational units and the use of XML

Existing transaction protocols support tightly-coupled (shared data) application systems. Ideally without losing this capability, the new standard must add support for loosely-coupled operations which are owned by different organizational units (which may be departments of a single firm, or different companies). This makes interoperability very important. The use of standard XML messages maximizes the chances of achieving interoperability.

3. Non-repudiation/audit trail

In our original submission we listed some security requirements. In a conversation with Svend Frølund from HP Labs, he pointed out that we had missed the important need for non-repudiation of messages involved in the coordination protocol. This was raised in our subsequent presentation, in tandem with the desirability of an audit trail (a matter also raised by HP Arjuna Labs' submission).