

P1450.4 meeting minutes - 11/16/05

Attendees: Chris Nelson, Bruce Parnas, SB Thum, Jim O'Reilly, Oscar Rodrigues, Ernie Wahl, Dave Dowding, Bob Roberts, Doug Sprague, Jose Santiago

Not present: Tony Taylor, Tom Micek, Yuhai Ma, Eric Nguyen, Steve Lill, Daniel Fan, Greg Maston, Jim Mosley

Agenda/Summary:

- Recap procedural decisions reached at face-to-face meeting.
 - Guidelines for introducing a new issue.
 - If a new item needs to be addressed, we're now requiring that it be introduced as a formal proposal (from conceptual model subgroup discussion on 11/15/05, and ITC face-to-face meeting on 1/07/05).
 - Guidelines for (re)introducing a resolved issue.
 - If a previously-settled issue needs to be reintroduced or revisited, the person who wishes to reopen it must show why the current proposal is unworkable (not just suboptimal).
 - P1450.4 website
 - Issues/resolutions document. Will update/restart previous document (from Archives link in Quick Links section of P1450.4 website, dated March 9, 2004). Dave and Jim will co-own the document.
 - Chris: Adding a date column to issues (when first introduced) and resolutions (as progress occurs) would be helpful. Remove (or don't update to current date when opened) footer date in document.
 - Chris: It would be helpful if the issues/resolutions document editor and minutes editor were the same person.
 - Planning to add proposal document on web.
 - Purpose of Wednesday call. Clearinghouse for issue discussion (voting on proposals or resolutions). The Wednesday call is NOT intended to be a design meeting.
 - WGs and TWGs should have (and will have) rules/procedures document on website.
 - WG membership
 - Conceptual: SB, Ernie, Dave.
 - Bruce and Bob expressed interest in participating.
 - Syntax: Greg, Tony, Doug, Jim, Dave
 - Chris: Construct design should be done in conceptual model subgroup; syntax group efforts should be slaved to conceptual model work.
 - Discussion about SBs concerns re: complexity of syntax
 - There has been some concern about the complexity of TestModules, FlowNodes, and TestFlows (in particular, the exit ports and exit port actions), and in part, their impact on the how such constructs might impact a GUI editor. Suggest reviewing our current proposals against OpenStar (i.e., FlowItems) and see what leverage.
 - Bruce: From ITC face-to-face meeting, there was a suggestion to determine whether FlowNodes and TestModules could be collapsed into a single entity.
 - Drive design work from conceptual model group; syntax group will then make adjustments to syntax as necessary.
 - Discussion about latest updates on syntax document.
 - Chris: Please articulate binning design in conceptual model. Hard to see what the syntax is intended to describe or implement.
 - Ernie: Binning document (design) from 1998 is available in archive section of website (in password-protected section).
 - Chris: Are we putting constructs into the language that are more sophisticated than the application (defining a flow language) requires? Are we providing

features that don't add value? Let's try to guard against this. Example (from dot1) variable scoping. Another example: What value

- Complexity of TestModule, FlowNode – procedure for resolving? Conceptual model TWG will resolve, bring back to syntax group.
- Doug: Differences between conceptual model and syntax (for example, terminology) – where do these differences get resolved? This call (the full WG call) would seem a likely candidate . . .
 - Dave: If issues arise, use email (either direct, or more preferably, the reflector).
- Ernie: Discussions between the syntax subgroup and conceptual model group are not just unidirectional. In detailed one-on-one discussions, some things that I thought were out of sync were actually in sync, and other things that seemed to be in sync were actually out of sync. Email can be a slow mechanism to resolve these issues – one-on-one phone calls (or discussions on full WG calls) can be a quicker way to resolve some of these issues.
- Ernie: What's the view on how syntax review takes place?
 - Need to focus on feature sets – Type specification (test flows, flow nodes), binning.
 - Review should focus on features – rather than specific syntax document revision numbers.
- **Summary: Conceptual model TWG should define capabilities needed; syntax subgroup should develop syntax to implement those capabilities.**
 - No further changes to syntax document until conceptual model and syntax document is in sync. Target date for completion is TBD.

For reference STIL .4 information can be found at the IEEE STIL website:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/> (select the [P1450.4](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/dot4/index.html) link from the table) or use the direct link <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/dot4/index.html>