

**Review Comments
For
80.1.4a Enterprise Application Integration (EAI)
Core Release 3.0
Application Enablement Guide (Preliminary)
Version 1.0**

Introduction

Presented below are review comments for the document 80.1.4a EAI Core Release 3.0 Application Enablement Guide (Preliminary), dated June 28, 2002.

General

Much of EAI Release 3.0 Application Enablement Guide contains the same material as EAI Release 1.0 Application Enablement Guide (i.e., deliverable 54.1.4). Some of this material has been altered and some has not. One global change was to change all occurrences of “SFA” to “FSA”. Section numbers have also been adjusted. Errors in deliverable 54.1.4 are carried over (i.e., repeated) in 80.1.4d. Carry-over errors imply that material was copied, but not adequately reviewed to ensure that old material is still valid. Thus, it is unclear if all old material has been fully and correctly updated in the Application Enablement Guide for Release 3.

During the document review process, specific concerns were identified including those that are significant and those that are minor.

Individual concerns are tabulated in tables with the following column headings:

- **Reference/Document Location** – pinpoints where the concern was found within the reviewed document.
- **Concern** – identifies the nature of a concern and if appropriate why there is a concern.
- **Suggested Correction** – suggests possible way(s) of resolving a concern. The actual way a concern is addressed is the responsibility of the document author(s).

Significant Concerns

The concerns tabulated below are viewed as significant because they reflect missing, incomplete, or inaccurate information that the document indicates is provided.

Significant Concerns (in order of occurrence in reviewed document)

Reference/Document Location	Concern	Suggested Correction
Page 8, section 1.3	This document contains a great deal of information,	Suggest providing a road map between document

	<p>but it is very difficult to quickly find the specific information indicated in the separate Executive Summary document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines the procedures to enable SFA business applications to connect to the EAI Core Architecture. • Documents the steps to design and build interfaces between SFA business applications and legacy systems. • Identifies the procedures to identify the business rules for the interface between SFA business applications and legacy systems. <p>In particular, it is not obvious which sections provide the types of information identified in the 3 bullets above.</p>	<p>contents and the 3 bulleted objectives. This would aid users in quickly finding needed information without having to read the whole document.</p>
<p>Page 9, section 1.3, 11th bullet</p>	<p>Bullet “Section 11 – Appendix B: Glossary This section provides a glossary of MQSeries related terms and abbreviations”.</p> <p>There are many terms and abbreviations in this document that are not contained in the Appendix B Glossary. Some abbreviations are defined in the text, but others are not (e.g., DMZ, ACS, mqm, MRM, BLOB, UTCL, RRS, TSYS).</p>	<p>Suggest expanding Glossary to also include terms and abbreviations found in this document.</p>
<p>Page 11, section 2, 1st sentence</p>	<p>Statement “FSA has not previously utilized</p>	<p>Clarify statement as well as the relationship between</p>

	<p>MQSeries as part of its existing middleware infrastructure therefore no standards currently exist. This section will provide guidance on naming conventions for using MQSeries in the FSA EAI architecture”.</p> <p>The above statement is confusing because the document 54.1.4 EAI Application Enablement Guide, Release 1, dated July 13, 2001 contains extensive discussion about naming guidelines.</p>	<p>different versions of the EAI Application Enablement Guide.</p> <p>The nature of changes in naming conventions from previous guidance should be explained, so users do not mistakenly follow out-of-date guidance. In particular, many, but not all, naming conventions contained in the document 54.1.4 have been changed in 80.1.4.a.</p>
<p>Page 26, section 2.5.3, 2nd paragraph</p>	<p>Statement “When defining a cluster, the following objects are included in the set of default objects defined when creating a queue manager on V5.X of Sun Solaris and Windows NT, and in the customization samples for MQSeries for OS/390”.</p> <p>No objects immediately follow this statement.</p> <p>Note: this same statement occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.</p>	<p>Clarify where “following objects” are located.</p>
<p>Page 29 & 30, section 2.7.1, diagram</p>	<p>Statement ” The FSA EAI cluster consists of 2 Sun Solaris Servers named SU35E16 and SU35E17. The Sun Servers are the repository queue managers for the cluster”.</p> <p>The diagram of the EAI BUS Architecture Overview (Development/Test) shows</p>	<p>Indicate SU35E16 and SU35E17 on diagram</p>

	<p>only one MQSeries Server for the EAI Bus Server Cluster. (Compare with the diagram for EAI BUS Architecture Overview (Production) on page 39 that shows 2 servers for EAI BUS Servers Clusters).</p> <p>If there are 2 servers, the diagram should show both servers.</p>	
Page 35, section 2.9.1 & table	<p>Text defines NL as Network Level. There is no NL listed in the Table, NW is listed.</p> <p>Should NW be NL? This Table is the only place where NW is found in document.</p>	Clarify the use of application approach “NW” in Table.
Page 36, section 2.10, last sentence	<p>Statement “Several methods exist to enable communication between a WebSphere hosted application and the EAI bus”.</p> <p>The above statement may leave a reader wondering what the several methods are and where they are discussed in detail.</p> <p>Note: The above statement also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.</p>	Elaborate on statement that there are several communication methods by identifying them and/or indicating where they are described.
Page 80, section 5.9.4	Section heading is presented but no text is provided for section.	Add material for section 5.9.4 Assigning and Deploying Resources to Brokers.
Page 86, section 7.1	Much of the document uses the term “Data Integrator”; however, section 7 uses the term “DataIntegrator”	Clarify differences, if any, between the term “Data Integrator” and “DataIntegrator”. If they are the same, use the same

		terminology throughout the document.
--	--	--------------------------------------

Minor Concerns

The concerns tabulated below are minor in nature because they do not have a significant adverse effect upon the understanding or technical merits of the document. In particular, many, but not all, of the following document concerns are cosmetic errors that may cause reader confusion. Minor errors should be corrected when other more significant document changes are made.

Minor Concerns (in order of occurrence in reviewed document)

Reference/Document Location	Concern	Suggested Correction
Page 8, section 1.1, 1 st paragraph, last sentence	Statement “This deliverable defines the guidelines for enabling FSA application developers to design and implement applications utilizing the features of the EAI Core architecture, as defined for the initial release”. The meaning of “as defined for the initial release” is confusing since this document is for Release 3.	Clarify statement with respect to release (i.e., release 3) features.
Page 9, section 1.3, 7 th bullet	Bullet “Section 7 – Application Integration This section will provide guidance on integrating FSA Applications to utilize the EAI Core Architecture”. Section 7 is actually entitled “Examples”. “This section contains representation examples of interfaces using each of the EAI middleware products”.	The initially identified contents of Section 7 and its actual contents are different. There is a need for a section that provides “guidance on integrating FSA Applications to utilize the EAI Core Architecture”.
Page 15, section 2.1.4, 1 st and 2 nd bullets	Bullet “Remote queue names can be up to 48 characters long. They should be short, but long enough to be meaningful”.	Delete second occurrence of the same bullet.

	Same bullet appears twice.	
Page 22, section 2.3.2, 6 th paragraph, 2 nd sentence	<p>Wording “There should be only one dead letter queue defined on each queue manger”.</p> <p>Note: The same spelling error also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.</p>	Change “manger” to “manager”.
Page 23, section 2.5.1, 2 nd paragraph, 1 st sentence	<p>Statement “The hardware architecture implemented at FSA can be seen in the diagram below”.</p> <p>There is no diagram showing hardware.</p> <p>Note: This same statement also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.</p>	Correct statement to match actual material presented.
Page 24, section 2.5.2, 1 st paragraph, 3 rd sentence	<p>Wording “... sends messages to any two ore more repositories”.</p> <p>Note: The same spelling error also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.</p>	Change “ore” to “or”.
Page 45, section 4.1.7.1, 3 rd node	<p>Wording “The third node is the short description of as to the functions of the node”.</p> <p>It appears that “of as to” should be “for”.</p>	Change “of as to”.
Page 54	There is an extra blank page prior to section 5.	Check document paging.
Page 63, section 5.4, 1 st sentence	<p>Wording “... including new interfaces for message content as well message delivery”.</p> <p>Missing “as”.</p> <p>Note: The same statement also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.</p>	Change “as well message delivery” to “as well as message delivery”.
Page 64, Figure 1	The figure on this page is labeled as Figure 1, but there are several figures presented before this figure.	Clarify unique numbering for figures.

	Note: The same statement also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.	
Page 67, section 5.5.4, 2 nd paragraph	Wording “Note: Refer to Section 6.1...” Correct section is 8.1 for this document.	Change “6.1” to “8.1”.
Page 74, section 5.9.1.3, under 1 st bullet	Wording “... of legacy datastructures created in the C ...”	Change “datastructures” to “data structures”.
Page 87, section 7.2, table and elsewhere as appropriate	Inappropriate initial capitals appear to be used for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statements in SQL Statements • Database in FMS Database • Interface in COD-FMS Interface 	Ensure that capitalization is used for names and not for emphasis. Ensure that capitalization is correctly used throughout document.
Page 100, section 9.4	Wording ”CICS Use commands ...” “IMS Use the IMS ...” “RRS Use MQCMIT ...” The word “use” should not be capitalized in the 3 sentences above. Note: The same errors also occur in the Release 1 version of this document.	Change “Use” to “use”. Ensure that capitalization is correctly used throughout document.
Page 104, section 11, adapter definition	Wording “... an adapter is used isolate ...” The word “to” is missing between “used” and “isolate”. Note: The same error also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.	Change “used isolate” to “used to isolate”.
Page 107, section 11, IAFeB definition	Wording “Used by insurance companies to build eBusiness/integration systems upon”. Wording “upon” is unnecessary.	Change to “Used by insurance companies to build Business/integration systems”.

	Note: The same error also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.	
Page 108, section 11, installable services definition	Extra period is at end of last sentence. Note: The same error also occurs in the Release 1 version of this document.	Remove extra period from end of sentence.
Various location in document	In addition to the errors listed above there are other minor errors.	Correct grammar errors.