Citation (line number/page/section etc):	Comments:	Reviewer	Priority/Rank:*	Type:
Provide, line number, section number, or citation. *It is recommended to activate sequential line numbering in the document as page numbers can vary based on printer drivers.*	*List the topic/issue/comment with each residing on a separate line.*	*Name*	*Major/High Impact* *Major/Low Impact* *Minor/High Impact* *Minor/Low Impact*	*Comment* *Question* *Typo*
1 Introduction	A more concise & direct writing style would improve this section, especially for readers with English as a second language. For example, the first sentence could simply say: "The Behavioral Framework (BF) incorporates and extends the content and intent of the HL7 Dynamic Model (DM)."	Ann Wrightson	Major/Low	Comment
General	Abbreviations used for convenience of typing should be expanded, eg using find/replace. I found it easy to forget what new-to-me abbreviations meant between one use and the next, & combing back to find the expansion is an annoying distraction from following the main thread. Abbreviating a lot of things also conveys an impression of "in-group-speak" which is not helpful IMO.	Ann Wrightson	Major/low	Typo
1 Introduction	Include concise identification of principal sources of your basic SOA & EA concepts, to orient the reader – similar to para 3 of section 2, which is good (but also needs proper citations, eg in a references section at the end of the document).	Ann Wrightson	Major/Low	Comment
1, para 2	"type types of parties (roles → capability, capacity, competency) between which the data is flowing" is opaque and needs a rewrite, though I think I know what it is trying to say	Ann Wrightson	Major/low	Typo
1.1	I appreciate that ArB agreed these criteria, however for a wider readership they are IMO too opaquely expressed as they stand, hence my suggestions below.	Ann Wrightson	Major/low	Comment

1.1, first bullet	Phrase "loose coupling" is potentially confusing as it has various connotations. Suggest "Must enable rigorous expression of the behavior of an interaction independently of other aspects of systems that realize the interaction."	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
1.2, second bullet	How can there be shared behaviour that is not in some respect a behaviour of a participating system? Suggest: "Must not specify system behavior beyond that necessary to participate in shared interactions."	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
1.2, sixth bullet	"Should provide a loose coupling…" I can't make sense of this formulation. I guess it's about keeping information content independent of the way(s) it is represented on the wire?	Ann Wrightson	Major/low	Typo
1.2, seventh bullet	Too cryptic. I think you mean: "Must provide HL7 with a common way to specify "dynamic" (behavioral) aspects of healthcare interoperability in ballotable artifacts such as domain models, service and messaging standards."	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
1.2	Substantive comment: the BF should also provide those involved with local specification of healthcare systems the means of expressing dynamics in ways that are well understood by developers with commonly available skills such as UML. The diagrams in the rest of the document do reflect this, so hopefully this is already implicit & just needs saying.		Major/low	Comment
2.0, paras 1 & 2	"cloud" is used in para 1 before it is explained in para 2. Suggest move the last two sentences of para 1 to the end of para 2.	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
2.0, last para	These 3 are not "distinctions" between things as far as I can see. Rephrase.	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
2.1	The content of this section needs to be stated much more simply. Avoid tangled syntax, latin tags, passive constructions and periphrasis (talking round the point rather than stating it directly). ☺		Major/low	Comment
2.1 first para (ref 3.1.1 and 3.2.4)	I guess 2.1 should refer to 3.1.1; omit 3.2.4 or refer to 3.1.1.	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
2.1 second para, first & second bullet	"Measurable"? How would you measure it? –making it operational IMO would be eg by requiring evidence of the existence (and hence possibility) of conformant implementation between disparate platforms before going from DSTU to full standard.	Ann Wrightson	Major/??	Comment

	Also, I don't think "quantitative" is right, as it's unlikely the answer will be eg "42". What's needed is a conformance model and assessment process that allows objective, evidence based judgements. In some cases this could be computable, in others I'd expect the equivalent of a "safety case" – a collection of evidence supporting a reasoned, independently checkable human judgement.			
2.1 3rd para, before bullets	…is a tangle of squidgy syntax. Suggest: "In brief, an ISRS qualifies as an Implementable Standard/Specification for three reasons" (**or** "from three perspectives")	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
2.1 3rd para, bullets	…would be better expressed with more emphasis on the ISRS rather than the technical solution. How about: • The ISRS has been implemented in a demonstrable technical solution that realizes the ISRS specification models • The technical solution also addresses aspects of its implementation context ("cloud") that are not specified in the ISRS • If there are any ISRS conformance criteria beyond realization of the specification models, then the technical solution has been assessed as conformant to these criteria according to an applicable conformance/ compliance model	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Typo
2.2	Writing style tends to the pompous & turgid. Scrap the "ultimately may be utilized" tendency in favour of "used", & stop preaching.		Major/low	Comment
Figure 1	I'd like to see the "HL7Specification" background model too, for context (or is there no more than in Figure 3?)	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Comment
Figure 2	Appears to say that the existence of the two parties is dependent on that of the CollaborationContract (If I stop subscribing to XYZ newsfeed, I cease to exist…) Suggest use "ResponsiblePartyRole" & "CommissioningPartyRole", or some other alternative if there is sensitivity over "role" in this context.	Ann Wrightson	Minor/low	Comment
Figure 2	Do you mean to imply that a payload message type can only be used in one interaction type? That would be wrong, the obvious exception being an "application error" message type used as a common component of many interactions.	Ann Wrightson	Major/low	Comment

Figure 3	Core vs process services: I'm very uncomfortable with this as a way of classifying services, because it's all relative to where you "are" in a layered architecture, i.e. core/ process is a role for a service from a particular perspective, rather than an inherent trait of a service spec. In fact, I would say that for a well specified ISRS it must not matter whether in a particular implementation context it functions as a core service or as a process service, & conformance of individual services to ISRSs needs to be independent of conformance of collections of services to HL7-specified service architectures (eg in a future domain model). Analogy: metadata is a kind of role for a data item, not an absolute classification of types of data.	Ann Wrightson	Major/??	Comment
Introduction	Acronyms should be spelled out when first used. dE.g., SAEAF on page 1. CSI a bit later (section 2)	Mead Walker	Minor/High Impact	Comment
Introduction	Try hard not to over use the term "unambiguous", and do not throw it in unless it adds. For example, what makes our specification of when the data flows particularly unambiguous	Mead Walker	Minor/low	Comment
HL7 Solutions	Why capitalize Solution Context? Do we consider this a proper noun?	Mead Walker	Minor/Low	Question
Page 6	Contract is defined as" "The term "contract" within the SAEAF explicitly means the contract for the overall interaction that refers to a type of collaboration and binds together the various participants." I think the definition is circular, and we need a better. To me, a contract represents an agreement between two parties, and that is more or less what I think we need.	Mead Walker	Minor/High	Comment
Page 6	From paragraph 4, the text launches into a discussion of service contracts. While both service specifications and a behavioral specifications are critical for HL7, I think they need to be pulled apart more.	Mead Walker	Major/High	Comment

Page 6	The document says: "Determining behavior then is equal parts establishing the appropriate behaviors that the service may take on, and separately establishing what the characteristics are of the collaborations in which it may participate, recognizing that these collaborations are established independently of these services, even though they may inform each other." Do we take this seriously? If so, than the granularity of the behavioral model is not simply service/message/document type specific.	Mead Walker	Major/High	Question
Page 7	ISRS shows up by itself	Mead Walker	Minor/Low	Comment
Page 7	What does this mean? "The technical solution addresses cloud-specific aspects of the implementation context into which it is embedded."	Mead Walker	Minor/Low	Question
Page 8	"an application may realize a service role". I suggest generalizing to support documents and messages	Mead Walker	Minor/Low	Comment
Page 8	"Contracts talk about all of the different Collaboration Participations (see below) that must happen for the business process to be fulfilled." What is trying to be said here?	Mead Walker	Minor/Low	Question
Figure 2, page 9	We need to assign attributes to the classes, and to provide descriptions of both classes and attributes.. (note, it does seem like some attributes are missing, and having some but not all is quite disconcerting) By the way, is responsible party/commissioning party analogous to client/server? Sender/receiver? Requester/responder?	Mead Walker	Major/High	Comment
Figure 3, Page 11	We need to assign attributes to the classes, and to provide descriptions of both classes and attributes.. (note, it does seem like some attributes are missing, and having some but not all is quite disconcerting)	Mead Walker	Major/High	Comment
Page 12, Section 3	This section badly needs a discussion of how service specifications are related to messaging and document managing specifications	Mead Walker	Major/High	Comment
Page 13	The document states: "These collaborations rely at their most granular level on exchanges to pass information back and forth to exposed services in groups of interactions that are scoped by a given set of collaborators playing either the role of Commissioning Party or Responsible Party." This seems unnecessarily loose, given that Figure 2 shows each interaction having exactly one commissioner and one responsible party.	Mead Walker	Minor/Middling	Comment

Page 13	Can we replace "talk about" with something more specific? Do it wherever it appears.	Mead Walker	Minor/Low	Comment
Figure 5, Page 15	We need to assign attributes to the classes, and to provide descriptions of both classes and attributes.	Mead Walker	Major/High	Comment
Page 15	The document states: "The *Domain Analysis Model* is the static information model that describes the sorts of information that may be exchanged behaviorally by the service." I disagree with this. A domain analysis model is created, but then transformed into a RIM based model – for messaging it is an RMIM. That is the model that describes the information to be exchanged.	Mead Walker	Major/??	Comment
Page 16	This is an example expanding on a point above. The document states: '*Role Relationships* express the sorts of expected relationships between roles that leverage each role's responsibilities in the context of a particular collaboration. " But the only attribute provided is an id, how can the role relationship full the stated role in this situation?	Mead Walker	High/Major	Comment

Review Status/Dispensation:

Final dispensation after review by requestor and discussion by team.

Concur. Will try to improve language.

Concur. We will not use abbrviations in this document, and will establish a glossary

Will include references and citations.

Concur

These were approved by INM / OO / SOA / ArB. There are amendments out there that change the language of 1 or 2 of them

Concur … we are really trying to talk about shared state, and this needs to be made clear

Will try to make more clear what is being coupled loosely and why it is of benefit

Concur

This should be brought out. This should be part of our "Implementable Standards" piece in the SAEAF and in the BF

Concur

Concur

Concur

Concur

This is an issue for the SAEAF, and its implementation. What does "quantifiable" mean?

Concur

Concur

ok

This is included in the SAEAF

Concur

Will clarify

This is an informative guide, first and foremost. However, it is clear that there are different types of services - one size won't fit all. Perhaps we need a better way to approach this topic. One advance that we have made is profiling services to demonstrate the different clarifications.

Concur

Concur

Will change

Your phrasing is better. Will modify and simplify.

recent versions pull these things well apart.

You are correct. HL7 must specify components that are contextualized appropriately (a word that provides clarity but with vagueness intended)

ISRS has been removed

Each cloud has its own concerns. Other clouds don't care about them.

Service Roles may be realized through documents or messages.

Will clarify

Later versions of the models are more complete.

Comm / Resp party is a logical distinction that contextualizes service providers / consumers, regardless of interoperability paradigm

model dumpouts harmonized with model and attributes have been filled in

concur

Interactions contain multiple exchanges to fulfill the behavior that is being commissioned.

concur

An analysis model discusses the concepts and classifications of information to be exchanged, no?

will modify the model to reflect more specificity. The role is visible to the relationship as a set of behaviors.