**From:** Sarabura, Martin  
**Sent:** 01 March 2018 20:41

Specification:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Comment** | **Status** | **Actions left** | **Note for CM** |
| 1. Additional artifacts references vocabulary 2.0 whereas the document itself says the version is 2.1 (<https://htmlpreview.github.io/?https://raw.githubusercontent.com/oasis-tcs/oslc-domains/master/rm/requirements-management-vocab.html> ) | Jad: Fixed | - |  |
| 1. Abstract: <missing!> | Jad: Fixed  Copied content from the CM specs. | - |  |
| 1. Status: RF on Limited Terms hyperlink should be <https://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/ipr#s10.2.3> | Jad: Won’t Fix!  this text is not controlled by the RM document. | - | Note also that the CM specs has the same link as the RM. |
| 1. Copyright notice should be 2018 | Jad: It is already “Copyright © OASIS Open 2018. All Rights Reserved.” Under the “Notices” section. | **Martin:**  Can you identify if this is still a problem? |  |
| 1. Sec 1 2nd sentence: supports key RESTful web services interface[s] for … (add [s]) | Jad: Fixed.  I think “The specification supports key RESTful web service interfaces for” is even more appropriate. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 1 3rd sentence: OSLC [RM] takes an open…. (remove [RM]) | Fixed. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 1 4th sentence: … were created by the OSLC Domains TC. | Jad: I did the suggested change, but not closed yet. | **Martin:**  A sanity check: the scenarios and specs were created under open-services (not exactly this domains TC). Is it still OK to take the suggested text? |  |
| 1. Recommend we move 1.4 (conventions and keywords) up to 1.2 so it applies to the rest of the document | Jad: won’t fixed.  According to Jim, the CM is the reference to use. | - |  |
| 1. I don’t think we need to include the IPR Policy section since the same text already appears in the Status section. | Jad: won’t fixed.  According to Jim, the CM is the reference to use. | - |  |
| 1. Should we have a Motivation section? See <https://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/oslc-core/trunk/specs/config/oslc-config-mgt.html#motivation> for an example | Jad: won’t fix.  During 15th March meeting, we agreed that it is not necessary for the RM specs. | - |  |
| 1. Terminology section should be marked Non-normative and maybe use same formatting as in <https://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/oslc-core/trunk/specs/config/oslc-config-mgt.html#terminology> ? | Jad: A change is done, but not closed yet | **Martin:**  Sanity check: The whole of Introduction section is marked non-normative. If we only mark Terminology as non-normamtive, what does this mean for the other subsections? ConfigMangement also only mark some subsections as non-normative. | CM needs to be changed as well. |
| 1. Sec 2.4 resource formats: Just a thought: Should we maybe have a reference to the exact document in which the normative requirements for core are listed? Specifically <https://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/svn/oslc-core/trunk/specs/oslc-core.html#resourceOperations> where in 4.4.1 we say the service MUST accept text/turtle and application/ld+json. That’s pretty important! | Jad: Reduced 2.4 to simply refer to OSLC Core 3.0 | **Martin + Jim:**  Can you confirm that the formulation and reduction is acceptable?  I have also removed the last 4 rows in “2.1 Compliance” since they also referred to resource formats. | CM needs to be changed as well. |
| 1. Sec 2.5 authentication: In addition to … , OSLC [RM] servers SHOULD support… (not [CM]) | Jad: Fixed. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 2.6 – Same RM not CM | Jad: Fixed. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 2.8.3 – Same RM not CM | Jad: Fixed. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 3 – should be 2.1 not 2.0 | Jad: Fixed. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 4.1 – “outwith”? With all due respect to Ian, I’d recommend “beyond” as more standard English (2 instances) | Jad: fixed. I thought it was “outside”. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 4.3 – results misspelled “resutls” | Jad: Fixed. | - |  |

Vocabulary:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Comment** | **Status** | **Actions left** | **Note for CM** |
| 1. Use a more current date under the title? |  | **Martin:**  Can you please clarify? I think the date is automated. |  |
| 1. Additional artifacts should list Vocabulary as (this document) | Jad: Fixed | - |  |
| 1. Same notes re status, copyright notice | Jad:  \* Status text is not controlled by the RM document.  \* It is already “Copyright © OASIS Open 2018. All Rights Reserved.” Under the “Notices” section. Any other place you are referring to? | **Martin:**  Can you identify if this is still a problem? |  |
| 1. Move 1.3 up to 1.1? | Jad: won’t fixed.  According to Jim, the CM is the reference to use. | - |  |
| 1. Sec 1.3 references oslc\_qm which I believe is not used in the rm spec? (Couldn’t find it in the vocab or shapes docs) | Jad: Fixed.  RM does not refer to any other domain specs. The other entry was referring to RM – itself! | - |  |
| 1. Sec 3.1 and 3.2: *It is strongly recommended that any additional properties be defined in XML namespaces distinct from those defined by OSLC in these specifications.* I believe the core spec says you MUST use non-OSLC namespaces. |  | **Martin:**  I suggest we simply delete this text. It seems to be the wrong place to state it. Note that under section 2, it is stated already that “Servers may define additional \*\*root\*\* subclasses and provide additional properties as needed.”.  And; what does “Requirement creation through a Creation Factory resource in the Service Description is REQUIRED by this specification.” Mean? Delete?  The only reference I could find is “5.3.2 Domain TCs and other extensions MUST contribute their vocabulary terms in a namespace which is assigned to them as an authority.” (<http://docs.oasis-open.org/oslc-core/oslc-core/v3.0/cs01/part7-core-vocabulary/oslc-core-v3.0-cs01-part7-core-vocabulary.html#comPropImplConform>)  Note that this text is also duplicated under the Requirement Collection resource. |  |
| 1. Missing the actual vocabulary! 3 respec errors: 2. Error including URI=./requirements-management-vocab.ttl: error (NetworkError: Failed to execute 'send' on 'XMLHttpRequest': Failed to load 'https://raw.githubusercontent.com/oasis-tcs/oslc-domains/master/rm/requirements-management-vocab.ttl'.) 3. Error including URI=./requirements-management-shapes.ttl#Requirement: error (NetworkError: Failed to execute 'send' on 'XMLHttpRequest': Failed to load 'https://raw.githubusercontent.com/oasis-tcs/oslc-domains/master/rm/requirements-management-shapes.ttl'.) 4. Error including URI=./requirements-management-shapes.ttl#RequirementCollection: error (NetworkError: Failed to execute 'send' on 'XMLHttpRequest': Failed to load 'https://raw.githubusercontent.com/oasis-tcs/oslc-domains/master/rm/requirements-management-shapes.ttl'.) | Jad: I assume this is solved now | - |  |

**From:** Sarabura, Martin  
**Sent:** 02 March 2018 21:51

Vocabulary:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Comment** | **Status** | **Actions left** |
| 1. Sec 2: What does \*\*root\*\* mean here? *This specification defines the \*\*root\*\* superclass, and a number of specific, commonly occurring subclasses, properties and values. Servers may define additional \*\*root\*\* subclasses and provide additional properties as needed.* |  | **Martin:**  The CM specs refers to ChangeRequest instead of “root”.  I suggest we replace “root” with “the Requirement and Requirement Collection superclasses, together with ….” |
| 1. Shouldn’t we have a non-normative recommendation for how to represent a tree structure in these collections? The only real option available here is the oslc\_rm:uses property. Presumably it can include another requirements collection; thus creating a hierarchy. Since it is the only option then presumably everybody will figure that out but it’s such a common scenario (ReqIF, Integrity LM) that it seems worth mentioning – or some other approach if oslc\_rm:uses is not desirable for some reason. |  | **Martin:**  We have discussed this during a telco but don’t recall a decision.  I suggest we don’t add such text at this stage. |
| 1. Another philosophical question, what is the granularity of Requirements Collections in relation to Service Provider (or LDPC)? I can see them being identical, or, it could be that there are many requirements collections within a given service provider. What would be our (presumably non-normative) recommendation for how to design this? |  | **Martin:**  We have discussed this during a telco but don’t recall a decision.  I suggest we don’t add such text at this stage. |
| 1. I believe we need to state that you must not use OSLC namespaces for non-OSLC properties, right? Thus change the sentence: *It is strongly recommended that any additional properties be defined in XML namespaces distinct from those defined by OSLC in these specifications.* I need to find that reference in the Core docs |  | **Jad:**  same as point 6 in previous email. So depends on what we decide there |
| 1. ~~dcterms:modified – Timestamp last latest resource modification~~ | ~~Jad: Fixed.~~ |  |

**From:** Sarabura, Martin  
**Sent:** 19 March 2018

**Vocabulary:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Comment** | **Status** | **Actions left** |
| The previous version of the RM spec <http://open-services.net/bin/view/Main/RmSpecificationV2#RM_Relationship_Properties> says this:  *RM providers MUST accept relationship properties, as described in OSLC Core Link Guidance. The following relationship properties are defined by this specification: …*  Then the spec lists 5 properties, all with minimum cardinality 0 and therefore optional.  An equivalent statement does not appear in the new spec though the concept is discussed in this section <https://rawgit.com/oasis-tcs/oslc-domains/master/rm/requirements-management-spec.html#labels> | Jad: Fixed as per T**C 20180322:**  \* RM spec will retain the section on relationship properties. But will change MUST to MAY, refer to the OSLC Core link guidance and indicate servers may provide relationship properties for compatibility with 2.0 implementations that use them  \* also indicate that this is no longer recommended practice.  \* Keep the relationship table from the RM 2.0 spec, and don't create any shape, its ok that this table has different format because it is not part of the RM vocabulary. | **Jim, Martin & Nick:**  Can you please review the new text? |

**From:** Schulte, Mark D  
**Sent:** 08 March 2018 22:47

**Specification:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Comment** | **Status** | **Actions left** |
| 1. General    1. I thought we were going to client and supplier instead of consumer and service provider but there are still instances of the former references scattered throughout the document. | Jad: I see we are adopting client and server in the CM specs. I see there are a couple of consumer/provider (besides Service Provider) that might be fixed. But let’s be sure what the correct terminology is first. | - |
| 1. Specification URIs    1. There are a couple of references in this section to “OASIS OSLC Lifecycle Integration Domains TC”.  The official name of the TC appears to be “OASIS OSLC Lifecycle Integration for Domains TC”. | Jad:  \* I have no control over the text in the “Status” section.  \* Fixed the text in the intro. | - |
| 1. Related Work    1. It might be good to add a couple of lines on how this is related to the 2.0 Specification and what has/has not been touched.  If more appropriate, that perhaps could also be part of the currently blank Abstract section. | Jad: Won’t fix.  This section is a listing only I believe. We do however have “Appendix A. Version Compatibility” that covers this need | - |
| 1. Citation Format    1. When does “OASIS Working Draft 01“ get dropped?  Surely we don’t release this with ‘working draft’ in the document? | Jad: no idea! I hope these are to be fixed upon publication. | - |
| 1. Notices    1. In paragraph 5, there are two uses of “infringed”.  I think it would read better if instead we used “infringed upon”.    2. In paragraph 7, it says “OASIS’ procedures”.   I’m not sure the possession marker is needed here. | Jad: Won’t fix.  I believe this is standard text. But of course, we need to confirm if we can change it first. | - |
| 1. Base Requirements    1. Paragraph 1, Syntax…..addition  “recommendations in both of these specifications” | Jad: fixed. | - |
| 1. 2.5 Authentication    1. Reference to OSLC CM servers…..instead of OSLC RM servers | Jad: Fixed | - |
| 1. 2.6 Error Responses    1. See previous comment | Jad: Fixed. | - |
| 1. 2.9 Labels for Relationships    1. Change “…it may be helpful to display an informative and useful textual label instead of or in addition to the URI of the predicate and or object.” To “…it may be helpful to display an informative and useful textual label instead of, or in addition to, the URI of the predicate and/or object.” | Jad: Fixed. | - |
| 1. 2.9 Labels for Relationships    1. For Link definition…..”…resource, only then OSLC servers may support” doesn’t sound right. | Jad: Fixed. | **-** |
| 1. 4.1 Server Resources – “outwith” can’t be right.  Should that have been “within”. | Jad: Martin suggested “beyond” | - |
| 1. 4.3 Query Capabilities – misspelling, “oslc:resutls” | Jad: fixed | - |
| 1. Acknowledgements – Nicholas Kruk should not have a “?” after his name.  First and last names should be separated by a space.  Might consider listing people alphabetically but up to you since the list is short. | Jad: he did in the 2.0 version ☺ Fixed. | - |

**Vocabulary:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Comment** | **Status** | **Actions left** |
| 1. 1.2 Terminology    1. First paragraph might be improved as a bulleted list. | Jad: Won’t fix.  Following the same format as the (reference) CM specs. Note that this is not the reference list, so the bullet list might be quite an overkill with few words per line. | - |
| 1. 2.1.4 RequirementCollection    1. “A collection uses **includes** zero or more requirements”……better, more accurate? |  | **Jim, Martin & Nick:**  “includes” makes more sense than “uses” But was there a reason one used “uses”. Are we changing the meaning of this term if we make this change? |
| 1. All of the relationship type descriptions seem like they should be consistently described and using the same example as the title.    1. For instance, instead of “a defect may be said to affect a requirement” as an example of “affectedby” say instead “a requirement may be affected by a defect.”       1. From a consistency standpoint, 2.1.8 for “satisfiedBy” does in fact follow the format but the others do not.  At a minimum, this is inconsistent.    2. 2.1.12 says “For example, a test plan may be said to validated a requirement collection.”    Correct the grammar here. | Jad: Fixed. | **-** |
| 1. 3.1 Resource:Requirement    1. Suggest a period instead of a comma in the following sentence:       1. Requirement resource properties are not limited to the ones defined in this specification, service providers may provide additional properties | Jad: Fixed. | - |
| 1. 3.1 Resource:Requirement    1. Description section, need to fix grammar here – “or possed by a solution component,”    2. Add ‘or to’ here  “……achieve an objective, or to satisfy a contract, standard, specification, or other formally imposed documents.” |  | **Jim, Martin & Nick:**  Is this meant to be “possessed” or “posed”? Where did this text come from, so we can check?  **More importantly, why is there such a desciption, when the Requirement vocabulary term is much more consise with a simple “statement of need” text. (See 2.1.3)** |
| 1. 3.1 Resource:Requirement    1. In the description column, **foaf:person** is referenced.  Shouldn’t resource names there follow the same font convention as other references such as **oslc:AnyResource** | Jad: Fixed | - |