

Annotations from WSAS _master document_-2.pdf

Page 5

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 7:54:42 PM

Page 5, Scope, P1, L1 - increasingly 'seen' as

Annotation 2; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 7:57:16 PM

Page 5 P3 - Given that an activity may in and of itself be a participant is this metadata propagated?

What metadata may/should be propagated? What may not or shouldn't and why not?

Annotation 3; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:00:39 PM

Page 5 P4 - The term tree used in activity's masquerading as participants implies that propagation is hierarchical.

What checks and measures guarantee against cycles in a Direct Acyclic Graph?

If there are no such measures is the effect of constructing a DAG with cycles resolved.

I guess there is a certain worry implicit here that some evil engineer (like me) will deliberately try this out and create a distributed infinite immortal cycle...

Annotation 4; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:02:16 PM

Page 5 P6 - Implicit propagation demands a dynamic standardized facility for resolving or retrieving context information in an implementation independent way?

Annotation 5; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:03:54 PM

Page 5 P6: Context Augmentation for application specific semantic extension implies an arbitrary nature to context being propagated.

Can a system filter or query context in a standardized way?

Page 7

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:08:11 PM

Page 7 Bullets - Is SOAP the only or default protocol envisaged?

Page 9

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:08:00 PM

Page 9 P1 - What are the static, dynamic, semantic and behavioural differences between 'activities' and 'tasks' as emphasized here.

Precise definitions should be supplied.

Annotation 2; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:09:32 PM

Page 9 P3 - Add bullet?

Identify active roles (coordinator, participant, coordinating activity, participating activity, coordinating task, participating task etc...)

Annotation 3; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:13:40 PM

Page 9 - main components item 1 - Surely the service inherently provides an extensibility mechanism through allowing trust or sharing contexts to be propagated etc.. using the service itself?

Adding an extensibility mechanism would be a good addition (unless it is a part of this specification already...).

Page 13

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:20:40 PM

Page 13 - P2 What is the difference between a participant and a parties? This needs clarification as it must be explicitly documented where active and passive behaviour is mandated and to what extent it is binding.

For example, a hierarchical relationship is assumed... How is cycle recursion in the case of a DAG occurring limited?

Eg: (Activity|Task) 'Participant' Masquerading limits to be enforced?

Annotation 2; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:22:04 PM

Page 13 - General comment. It strikes me that RDF would allow simple context retrieval and can support both hierarchical and DAG like 'structures' and extensibility (eg: trust sharing extension etc...)

Page 15

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:48:26 PM

Page 15 - Example Activity structure. Link A5's end to subactivity 2 of A1's context and you've got a DAG because you specifically don't mandate against, and facilitate 'out-of-band' interactions.

How does this specification prevent against either deliberate or innocent abuses of the specification?

Maybe i'm crazy but I sniff security risks...

Page 16

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:34:30 PM

Page 16 end - Add bullet - Scope for restricting certain contexts.

Page 21

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:38:46 PM

Page 21 - General comment. Gak! I hate Word Error! comments...

Page 33

Annotation 1; Label: Darach J Ennis; Date: 1/15/2003 8:44:20 PM

Page 33 - Add bullet? NoInfiniteLoop

Prevent DAGs / cycles