

# TT/minutes/20170111

## Attendees

- [Gunnar Andersson \(old account, disabled\)](#)
- [Jeremiah Foster](#)
- [Klaus Birken](#)
- [Unknown User \(toscalix\)](#)
- [Torsten Mosis \(Elektrobit\)](#)
- [Nicholas Contino](#)
- [Gianpaolo Macario](#)
- [Manfred Bathelt](#)
- [Philippe Robin](#)

## Minutes

- Meeting cadence reminder -- we meet every other week
- Component description language / Component modelling
  - Gunnar presentation -- showing presentation from Klaus Uhl showing a slide that might describe a useable model. This model might describe components which would describe IPC for example and would have boilerplate binding code available. One use would be to ensure that each component has only the communication channels and other mechanisms that are necessary supporting the concept of "least privilege".
  - Why don't we create a shared language for components in GENIVI?
  - Manfred: I'm lacking a context -- is this just the start of the discussion?
  - Gunnar: we've discussed this in the SAT a couple times but it is not many months old. There has been a brainstorming session that listed some proposed parameters or parts of the component model
  - It might overlap UML but this format might be useful for developers since its text based
  - Klaus: You can use content assist as well to get all the interfaces
  - Manfred: The approach to use a DSL like Franca is good, but for defining a standard we ought to agree on a goal. What is the ultimate target we want to fulfill? We are currently thinking of similar things to extend Franca to make it more powerful, something we want to discuss in the coming months. For our work it is essential to describe the overall architecture -- the static part as well as the deployment.
  - Gunnar: Agreed, you cannot set up the access control without having a complete and static model.
  - Manfred: From that point you can go in many directions, how to build, doing IPC deployment, identify definitions for frameworks, though that becomes more specific as you go up the stack risking namespace clashes with proprietary framework names and APIs.
  - Manfred: If we had a flexible description that could be extended without creating new dialects, extensibility without new language powers as it were. Perhaps we ought to think about is more static components using the same patterns to parameterize and refine those definitions in the deployment using Franca
  - Generating access control rules is my main goal. Perhaps we need to have a voting on priority, we currently have just a rough dump
  - Manfred: We have some ideas and we would also like to do more with Franca in the future, like using Franca as an exchange format for tools and architecture. I'd be happy to show our work in one of the next TT sessions.
  - Klaus: Is it implemented?
  - Manfred: No, it is in the design stage
  - Klaus: My point of view is that it would be necessary to have in the GENIVI context and we see this in various company's component languages. Extending Franca with another DSL is something I'm reluctant to do since Franca is already used in places where there already is a component language, this would mean that existing users would have to chose from two of languages that do the same thing. If there would be an open source component language tool many companies would be using it, but there really isn't so people build proprietary ones.
  - Gunnar: Sent another email to Klaus Uhl to bring him into this discussion.
  - Manfred: I'm not thinking about another DSL, rather extending Franca. The advantage here is validation. Using one DSL in Franca allows you \*one\* validation versus validating multiple DSLs which is much more difficult.
  - Gunnar: What if we create a new language called Franca CDL? There will still be Franca IDL?
  - Manfred: new keywords would be added
  - Gunnar: How would we make it understandable that this new CDL is part of Franca?
  - Manfred: I'm happy to upload to the internal wiki as this is a new project still in the early design phase.
  - Torsten: We're working on something similar, we had a Master's Degree student working on this. It is still far away from being used and I think we're interested in having something similar to what we're discussing today.
  - Gunnar: Let's collate as much information as possible
  - TODO: Torsten, Klaus, Manfred to bring information from internal discussions on extended Franca with a new Component Description Language for discussion in the next meeting
- FOSDEM talks chosen, please see addendum
- Check scope of Tools Team for missing tools
  - In the past, Gerrit has been mentioned. I feel that GitHub is more powerful and is more widely used by GENIVI members. Would it be useful to have a talk on some of GitHub's code comparison tooling and other advanced GitHub features at the upcoming GENIVI AMM? Perhaps a discussion in this forum on the merits of Gerrit vs. GitHub and what we can do with each?
- Identify the tools we want to discuss at the AMM
- QFace and Franca integration -- do we want to bring in Juergen Blockage-Ryanelle, author of QFace into this forum to discuss integration with Franca?
  - The feeling was that a meeting with Juergen might be beneficial, plan is to bring him in if he's available in February on the 8th
- Klocwork status
  - TODO: Gunnar to follow up
- Bug tracker -- time to make the move to JIRA since bugzilla will be deprecated fully by the upcoming AMM
  - TODO: Juergen Gehring is in charge of the CommonAPI work now, Jeremiah to contact him about bug migration

