OMG Component implementors and FTF common meeting minutes

Paris, April 25th, 2001

Chairs: Michel Ruffin, Alcatel (CCM implementors working group) & Ignacio Silva-Lepe, IBM (Component FTF)

Background

A lot of success for this ad hoc meeting gathering more than 40 persons from 1pm to 5pm.

The major goal of the meeting was to set up a plan for finalising the CCM specification by September. The FTF should finalise the specification by this date and exhibit implementation because specifications which are not finalised two years after their adoption are rejected by the OMG.

Andrew Watson outlined the options available to the Components FTF in getting its work done until the finalisation deadline runs out. This happens somewhere between September and November – nobody seemed to remember exactly. Andrew emphasised that the CCM is already testing the limits allowed by the OMG Policies and Procedures, and that the FTF should be very careful not to strain them any further. One obvious option is to let the CCM die because of the timeline. This is somewhat interesting for having more time to get the specification into shape, but unattractive because it would be several years until a new Components specification could be adopted. And, as Andrew added, "it would be much more difficult to get Components through the AB a second time around." The cutting down of a specification into parts is possible. The implemented parts could then pass the deadline, while the non-implemented and non-implementable parts are dropped.

An OMG repository "ccm" (this name has to be confirmed) has been created to store ccm implementor working group documents on the OMG server.

In order to get a common understanding of the specification, Humboldt University has produced a document (ccm/01-04-01) providing a component implementation of the dinning philosopher example. The example has been implemented by Humboldt/GMD Fokus, LIFL, FPX/Alcatel and GMD Fokus/Eurescom. They have all been demonstrated GMD Fokus demonstration presenting their deployment solution.

The principle which has been adopted is to cut the specification in pieces and for each piece to identify the possible solutions for fixing the problems. Parts which cannot be fixed by September (and which are not mandatory for the CCM implementation) are rejected from the specification (such as CIDL) and will be replaced latter on by new RFPs. Parts which are necessary might have a transient solution for fixing the specification (such as the deployment model); new RFPs will latter on replace these parts.

The discussion has been driven by the presentation of Franck Pilhofer "Making sense of component" (slides ccm/01-05-01) and Philippe Merle (slides ccm/01-05-02). LIFL implementation of the dinning philosopher example is described in ccm/01-05-03.

Fixing the specification

The major features of the specification have been listed and the way to fix the problems in each part has been evaluated. Name of implementors have been associated to the different features. Their implementation will be the reference for solving the problems for these features of the specifications.

Abstract Model (Philippe Merle, LIFL)

- OMG IDL3
- OMG IDL3 to OMG IDL2
- Abstract Model API
- IR3 API (Frank Pilhofer, FPX/Alcatel, with the help of Jishnu, HP)

This part is already implemented by LIFL and FPX/Alcatel. Frank has done a proposal for the Interface Repository and is providing an implementation. Other will align on this proposal. Remaining issues in this part can easily be solved by implementers (Philippe is responsible for this part except the IR3).

Component Programming Model

- CIF concepts (OK, Olaf Kath, University of Humboldt/GMD Fokus)
- CIDL syntax (DEAD and future RFP)
- **API** between business code and glue code **must** be defined for portability issues
  - MOF CIF metamodel (OK, Olaf Kath) should define source portability rules
  - Mapping might be provided by a revised submission of the specification.

Olaf Kath should provide a metamodel covering CIF concepts and source portability rules. The language mapping which is of tremendous importance for the independence of component source from vendors but is not necessary for finalising the specification might be provided by a revised version of the submission.
The CIDL will not be implemented by implementors and need a lot of work to be fixed. This part will then be removed from the specifications and replaced latter on by additional RFPs. These RFP(s) should also cover other services than the persistence service such as security, ...

Container/Server Execution Model This part needs more studies specially on the notification service issues.

EJB compatibility/interoperability. No demonstration is planned of intereoperability by the group. IF problem arise these might be fix latter on in a RTF.

Packaging Model

- Open Software Description (XML) Implementations exist of this and solving the issues should work fine.

Deployment Model (Philippe Merle + A. Hoffman GMD Fokus, Jim Kulp, Mercury + Software radio SIG). The deployment model (need for a complete set of API) will be totally replaced by a new specification issued with a new RFP. In the meantime a quick fix of the actual specification will be provided by Philippe in order to allow the finalisation of the specification.

Agenda items for the Boston meeting July 11th, 2001, 13:00-17:00

- "The Dinning philosophers CCM implementation example", Olaf/Frank/Philippe. The idea is to take an example and to see how we implement and deploy it with the specifications in order to be sure of a common understanding.
- Assessment of the specification state (progress report)
- Discussion on new RFPs
- Component configuration and deployment RFP
- CIDL+ RFP
- ...
- Update on current implementations
- Plan for co-ordinating efforts, roadmap.

- Go over the outstanding issues and see how we can best move forward towards their resolution

Mailing lists

CCM implementors Working Group: ccm@eurescom.de
Component FTF: component-ftf@omg.org