Finnish ballot comments for ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7/WG17 W17N0217 ODP Enterprise language Final Committee Draft

Finland votes NO for the progression of the current draft document, with the following comments.

FIN1 G Summary of concerns Inconcistent use of terminology

Rationale

- Roles and processes do not match
- Cobehaviour missing
- Implementation objects vs. modeling world at different levels of abstraction in process descriptions and in role descriptions
-

Proposal

<Proposal> - body text in Style "NB Comment", which might propose changed text:

FIN2 G Summary of concerns Relationship of communities

Rationale

- Federation is not dealt with. Federation means creation of a new community with a new set of governing rules and the federating communities need to be able to provide this specification.
- Cluttered otherwise, same conceptual things reappear several times in different terms.
- C-object and S-community have a special position, however, it does not clarify the situation as at the same time, it is acknowledged that several c-objects could be simultaneously be interacting within the same community.
- Relationships between c-object, role, s-community, refinement via population process are not clear enough.
- Relationships between enterprise specifications and organizations are undefined; likewise ownership and domain communities and other community types have relationships that could be clarified.

Proposal

<Proposal> - body text in Style "NB Comment", which might propose changed text:

FIN3 G Summary of concerns Reationship of roles and processes

Rationale

- Relationship between processes and policy are unclear.

-

Proposal

<Proposal> - body text in Style "NB Comment", which might propose changed text:

FIN4 G Summary of concerns Community life-cycle

Rationale

- The specified community could exist (be established and have responsibilities) without fixed identified objects populating it – late binding can be used for populating it
- Rules for changing the community structure are unclear and unnecessarily strict (no federaition allowed)
- How to decide whether an enterprise object can join a community?
    - Rules for community to accept a new member as being capable of performing its duties (assignment rules)
    - Rules for an object to inherit the policies of the community it joins (inconsistent)
    - Rules for an object to check the acceptability of the community policies when joining (missing) or as a preforming member (missing or inconsistent)

Proposal

<Proposal> - body text in Style "NB Comment", which might propose changed text:

FIN5 G Summary of concerns Behaviour and policies

Rationale

- Situations may arise in which an object is allowed to ask for a service which is prohibited from use. No failure or violation management concepts are offered.
- Relationship between policy and behaviour is unclear.

Proposal

<Proposal> - body text in Style "NB Comment", which might propose changed text:

> Proposed new normative text in style "proposed text"
>
> Proposed new Note in style "Proposed Note"

FIN6 G Summary of concerns Force concepts

Rationale

- Not a full set, other similar groups have not been spelled out this way – language is extensible.

-

Proposal

<Proposal> - body text in Style "NB Comment", which might propose changed text:

FIN7 G 1,5, 8 Audience of the document

Rationale

In clause 5, lines 26-33 of page 5, Canada expects to hear about the intended audience of this document. The Enterprise language should address both audiences, and this statement is already present in Clause 1. In addition, clause 5 should contain clearer statements on how these audiences should use the language in various situations. The list of situations should be expanded. The use as a basis for tool and language construction is also reflected to clause 8, where requirements should be set for tool providers to nail down some of the correspondence statements now left free for the specifiers.

Proposal

Proposed changed text for clause 5, lines 38-39: Replace the sentence "It also provides a rigorous framework for the development of supporting methods and tools" with a new paragraph:

> This standard also provides a framework for development of software engineering methodologies and tools exploiting ODP viewpoint languages, and a set of concepts for development of denotational languages for ODP enterprise language itself. For these purposes this standard provides rules for the information contents of the specification and the grouping of that information. Further requirements on the relationships between enterprise language concepts and

> their mappings to concepts in other viewpoints are specific to the methodologies, tools or denotational languages to be developed.

Proposed text for clause 8, add between lines 10 and 11 at page 24:

> When this standard is taken as a basis for a standard methodology or a tool supporting a detailed software engineering methodology, the tool or methodology designer can specify a list of correspondences between viewpoint concepts or between enterprise language and the modeled system concepts.

FIN7 G 1,5, 8 Usage examples

Rationale

Needs more concrete understanding on the situations in which enterprise language can be applied.

Proposal

Proposed changed text at line 5, page 6, first sentence after note:

> When preparing a specification, there are many approaces used for understanding, …

Proposed new paragraph between lines 34 and 35, page 6:

> Current trend is to integrate existing systems into global networks, where the functionality of interest spans multiple organizations. The enterprise language provides means to specify the joing agreement of common behaviour of the ODP systems within and between these organizations.

FIN8 E 0, line 6, page ? Spelling

Rationale

Missing word.

Proposal

Replace “Open Distributed” with “Open Distributed Processing”.

FIN9 E 2, page 3, line25 Spelling

Rationale

Proposal

Replace “con tain” with “contain”.

FIN10 E 5, page 6, lines 35-39 Clarity

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Replace the last paragraph with:

> The enterprise specifications can also be used at other phases of the system life-cycle. The specification can for example be used at system run-time to control agreements between system and its users, and to establish new agreements according to the same contract structure. Enterprise viewpoint specifications may contain rules for inter-organizational behaviour.

FIN11 E 5, page 6, line 30, lines 33-34

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Replace “Thus, two” with “Several”. Remove last sentence of the paragraph.

FIN TL 6.1.2

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Replace the definition by

> “Preferences about possible future states, which influence the choises within some behaviour”.

Add note:

> 3 – Statements of objective may be an explicit part of the specification depending on the denotation and methodology selected. The objective of the system may also be indirectly present for example in policies governing the system and its behaviour.

Remove note 2.

FIN A 6.1.3 xxxx

Rationale

We feel no need for additional concepts here. When there is a need to express the actual capabilities of a system, the terms capability and system behaviour are available.

FIN E 6.1.4 xxxx

Rationale

Policies as means of controlling alternative behaviours is equally powerful, already existing mechanism.

Proposal

Remove 6.1.4.

FIN TH 6.1.5 Process

Rationale

- Continuous processes are denied.
- We don't understand the need of multiple starting points. How is starting point defined?
- What is a result?
- Is there really difference between activity and process
- Partially ordered sequence of parallel activitites of enterprise objects.

Proposal

Use the term workflow instead. – kts omgn workflowstandardi

FIN E 0 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

xxx

FIN TH 6.1.6, 6.1.7 Step

Rationale

Misreading of part 2…. 8.3 does not require an identified object to be associated.

Proposal

> **Step:** An action associated with one or more roles.
>
> 1 – An action is a modeling concept that is not reserved to a single occurrence of an action. However, the term action is for short also used for action occurrences.
>
> 2 – As the granularity of actions is a design choise, the actions can be further refined as more detailed behaviour.

Process: Composite behaviour of the community leading to a preferred state in the community. Process can be expressed as a partially ordered sequence of steps.

1 - Process is an activity with objective.

2 - Activities can be refined and thus repetitive behaviour patterns can be modelled.

Role: Identifier for a part of a composite behaviour.

Role can be expressed as a collection of steps it participates and its internal behaviour.

FIN E G, 5 Relationship between Part 2 and EL

Rationale

Part 2 concepts are general and thus difficult to generally apply to enterprise language. The application of the concepts need to be refined for each specific context, thus the readers should be given some guidance for interpretation.

Proposal

Add role, behaviour, action, activity, contract, policy, etc introductions and interpretations to clause 5, which currently works only as a motivation section.

FIN E 6.1.7 S-community

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

remove

FIN E 6.1.8 xxxx

Rationale

Poista jälkimmäinen virke.

Proposal

xxx

FIN E 6.1.10 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

delete

FIN e 6.2 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Add Assignment rule: denotes the criteria on which an enterprise object is selected to perform a role. The criteria defines

- capable
- willing
- relationship between objects

FIN E 6.2 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Title: Role and enterprise object related concepts

FIN E 6.3.1 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Remove note 1 (redundant with 6.3.2).

FIN E 6.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

Add "Policy framework": A structuring rule in a community specification that specifies for which purposes policies are set in these communities.

Note - 1. When communities are nested, the enterprise objects must conform to all policies in all communities it participates. As the participated communities may have different policy frameworks, the effective set of policies becomes larger.

2. When a community plays a role in another community, the policies may not be contradictory, but the policy frameworks may differ.

3. Establishing a federation means creation of a new community, thus, a new policy framework is created that is consistent with the policy frameworks of the establishing parties. For example, the members of the federated community must conform to both the communities within their organizations and the federated community spanning across the organizatonal boundary. The federated community policy framework may leave some aspects of common behaviour without policies. Therefore, enterprise objets may run into situations where their policies contradict.

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

There are violations against explicitly stated policies, i.e., failures (violations against a contract). These should be considered as errorousness behaviour implementation or specification. There are also violations caused by inconsistent assumptions between communicating parties about the permissions, obligations and prohibitions. These may arise for example in federation situations where there is no full control to the interacting objects environment or in other situations where an action is not considered to be essential enough to be specified with policies in detail for all possible participants of an interaction. Only some of these situations can be considered as design or implementation errors. Mechanisms are needed for catching violations and for using appropriate recovery or sanction mechanisms.

FIN E 7.9.4 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal

FIN E 6.3.3 xxxx

Rationale

xxx

Proposal