Meeting Minutes

Eclipse Automotive Interest Group

Subject:	**Eclipse Automotive Interest Group**	**Participants:**	see attached list
Meeting date:	2009/02/18	**Location:**	Bosch, Nordtor Plaza
Creation date:	2009/02/19	**Mailing list:**	Participants
Created by:	Andreas Graf, itemis GmbH		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
1		Ralph Müller: – Welcome and Introduction		
2		Introduction of particpants: **Lars Geyer-Blaumeiser**,**Bosch** Tool Platform within Bosch. Eclipse based Platform within Bosch. Platform maintenance. Working group objective is similar. Is it possible to leverage synergies. **Stephan Baumgarten, IAV** Rising count of used tools. This results in quality problems and traceability. One plattform could address these problems. **Olaf Kath, ikv++** Automation of Development processes, tool integration. Many years of eclipse usage, eclipse contributor. "Everything is a model" philosopy. Solutions fitting the development process. Difference Analysis for Matlab SL based on Eclipse. Spending lot of time on infrastructure components. Giving back to the community. Expected outcome: Tool connectors. Tools don't move into Eclipse fast enough. Support them to be integrated **Yuzhong Shen, Kuglermaag** Consulting in Automotive. Interest in community based open tool platform for seamless integration of several tools in each dev cycle from development to testing / integration to help customers in efficient **Thomas Seidl, Elektrobit:** Switched to Eclipse 2005. Interested in bringing all the approaches together with Elektrobit approach. **B. Haberstumpf, Software Architect, Elekrtobit:** ECU Config is main focus. Starting point is Basic-SW. Approach from the config side, not SW-dev side. Enhancing the platform. Looking at other technology, integration of C-dev tools into the platform. Customers work with Basic-SW, they code in C. Integration of these tools would be nice (incl. Version control systems).		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		Hendrik Höfer, Microdoc: Munich based. Java VMs for the automotive domain. Interested in integrating their work into the interest group. Also involved into testing / QA. Want to make sure that this gets integrated into this tool. Points out Eclipse Embedded Day in June, 25th. **Mark Broerkens, opensynergy.** Head of processes and tools. Focuses on in-car OS. Bridge gap between AUTOSAR /infotainment. Need tooling for code gen, model transformation. Main interest ist modelling, model2text. Interested in on-target testing. Adapting to ARTOP **Hans-Juergen Kugler, Kuglermaag:** Help clients improve their performance. Industry as a whole needs to forward. Believe in ecosystems. Launched initiative for open source (too early). Time has come for open source in Automotive. Integrated toolchain is best way to move foward (since constructed by developers) **W. Neuhaus, itemis:** member of board. Strategic member of eclipse foundation. Driving eclipse modeling project. Need for auto industry to move away from fragmented tool systems and move toward common tools on the non-competetive layer. Help customers to move to integrated toolchains (based on Eclipse). Strong interest in driving this group forward. By participating in the group and transfering topics to research projects. **S. Eberle, Geensys:** Provider of embedded services, products. Also in Transport / Aero. Lead of contribution to ARTOP. Collab with BMW / PSA. Artop is main reason for participation. Artop has legal issues. Both projects need to be synchronized. Platform should be compatible with Artop. Also engaged in research projects Edona. Object is to provide a platform for auto engineering. Edona consumes Artop results and adds many other aspects (from requirements to validation). Main motivation is keeping things synchronized. **Michael Köcher, Valeo:** Main objective is to get an overview of the Eclipse possibility. Wants to introduce Eclipse more in the company. **Jochen Krause, EclipseSource:** Strategic Member of eclipse, contributor to code base. Offers complete stack of services around Eclipse. Provide guidance on collobara-		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		tion of industry verticals. **Sergeij Schwenk, Bosch**: Tool development department. Responsible for Eclipse based tool dev. Interested in contribution. **Gerd Steiniger, Geensys:** Founding Member of Artop initiative. Objective is to align activities. **Anita Messinger, Kuglermaag:** Motivation as above **Martin Bickel, Continental:** Automotive IT, trying to establish standard SW-dev platform within Conti, eclipse based. Objective is exchange of SW-components between business units. BUs should not invent tools of their own. Tooling is not core competency. Preventing "re-inventing the wheel" within the company **Jennifer Neumüller, Denso:** Wants to gain experience with Eclipse. Toolchains are not integrated. Want integrated toolchain for LC management **Dimitar Pelkov, Johnson Control:** Identified lack of automation within company. Initiative for LC management. See tools going on Eclipse platform. **Fred Plante, QNX:** Director for OS tools, drivers, HW-support. Was with IBM, founder of .. project (with Ed Merks). Interest in tooling Automotive company. Introduced CDT project. **Andreas Selig, Bosch Appstadt?:** Tool chain for documentation / information engineering. Using Eclipse as frontend. Wants to identify possible cooperation. **Patrice, Raynal:** Strategic Member in Eclipse around Modeling / Generation / Transformation. Involved in several projects (e.g. Edona). **Harald Mackamul, Bosch Research:** Topic is development environment: Support other research projects to improve tooling. Transfer of result is difficult if there is no support in dev division. Working on project PMT, building dev environment in		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		embedded car software. Currently they are consumers of eclipse. Discussing further role as contributor. **M. Rudorfer, BMW Car-IT :** Focus on SW dev for cars. Team "SW-infrastructure". Deal with AR related topics, one topic is Artop. Goal is to establish Eclipse-like platform for AR tools. **Eric Steiger, Freescale (Phone):** SW-Architect, tools driver: Freescale is in Auto domain. Eclipse is a good way to integrated different tool vendors on the silicon. Integration with 3rd party, modelling and simulation, AR, ITC7 research program <-> integration silicon design tools with SW development tools.		
3		R. Müller: – Summary of first Meeting in Munich		
4		Michael Rudofer – Introduction of Artop initiative – Discussion on Slide 7: Competetive layer could also sit on AUTOSAR independent layer for the purposes of the Eclipse automotive interest group.		
5		Michael Rudorfer – Introduction of Artop initiative – Most participants were aware of artop		
6		S. Eberle – introduces Artop: No interest in development the specifics. Off-the shelf tools are not sufficient. Do not address custom aspects (legacy, non-AR aspects, rest of V-cycle). – Clarification: The AUTOSAR model is a domain specific model, not a UML profile. – Clarification: Will Artop adress eclipse 3.5 (Galileo)? --> Would be a logical step. Edona definition of target problem is not as strict. – Clarification: No integration of generation into CDT/JDT yet.MDT components are not directly used - they are prerequistes for other components. – Clarification: Traceability framework is just not mentioned. It would be interesting integrating traceability frameworks (e.g. model to model comparison). – Artop has its own License: Basically EPL for AUTOSAR members. – Commitment to APIs? No tooling used for APIs. Intention is to		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		keep API stable from Artop 1.1 onwards. Basic idea is to do it the eclipse way (keep stable). – Are code metrics availabe? No detailed metrics available. – R. Mueller puts focus on "Workspace management" of slide 6. – Eclipse env is pretty much file based – File based view is not sufficient. Paradigm moves from files to "model views". SW-component may be distributed between files or reside in the same file. Working on the model cannot be file based.		
7		Q W. Neuhaus: – Who is working on similar topics as those such addressed? – A: About nine members of the group.		
8		Q O. Kath: – Is there any component on variants. Relation of feature models to Artop models? AR 4.0 will include logical concepts for variant modelling. Model extension. – W. Neuhaus: Addressing PL engineering is a necessary aspect, as a cross cutting concern. Reuse is a big issue. Guess is that multi-model storage is a major concern. – R. Mueller: Variant needs to be addressed across the entire V cycle.		
9		R. Mueller - Address what should be included in a Galileo parallel release. What needs to be added to the list (in addition to those in Artop) Bosch BlueWorX: Additions - "oAW" -> XPand, Xtend, Xtext (Eclipse Component Names) - CDT 4.0 (Ganymed Release from June) - WST, XML Editor (3.0) - Parts of JDT (Dependencies need JDT core) JDTCore. Comment S. Eberle: Artop Eclipse SDK includes JDT, intention to keep it. - BIRT (Ganymede) - DTP (maybe connected to BIRT) Roadmap: Plan to stay in sync with Eclipse, move to Galileo in Q4. BUs are more reluctant to change infrastructure components (concern no regulations). Bosch does not plan to deliver JDT for ECU development. ECU developers do not use Java, reduction of package is wanted. Bosch Docucenter		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		- JET Elektrobit: - Nebula Widgets (addition to SWT) - most parts on older releases (3.2), no migration to newer releases. No current plans for migration. - CDT - BIRT - JDT in some respects (but not for major part of ECU dev) - own plugins for development additions (can be installed into Eclipse 3.4), no big dependencies. Opensynergy: - Mylyn (connection to Bugzilla, Subversion) - M2M: QVT operational (already included in Ganymede) - (CLI, Log4J) - TCF (DSTP/TM) (TODO: Löschen, falls es nicht erwähnt) Plans to migrate to 3.5 in Q4 Microdoc: - P2 (Update / Installation Manager)		
10		Q D.Peikov: - Distributed Design Capabilities? Parallel Working, Collaboration Aspect. A W. Neuhaus: Integration to repositories has to be adressed. Modularization of models has to be adressed. Fred Plante: Performance / Collaboration needs to be addressed at EMF level (ongoing) OSCE project?		
11		Lars G: Packages should be lean. There should not be an "all-inclusive" distribution. Haberstumpf: It is interesting to have a base platform that can be contributed to. Reduce number of Eclipse version. Höfer: Are there commercial / in-house developed plugins?		
12		**LUNCH BREAK**		
13		R. Mueller: Quick Circle Around to find out aspects / topics / artefacts that partipicants would like to bring in. – M. Rudorfer: Might Need to tidy up code before going public. – S. Eberle: Q2/2009: Proposal for starting an eclipse project. Initial		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		contribution Q3/Q4. – Lars G: Not yet clarified internally if Bosch will act as contributor. Possible areas: CDT (e.g. preprocessor handling). MSR / ASM handling (but is there broad interest?) Q Rudorfer does that include Fibex? A: not much – W. Neuhaus: Solution within research project: Standalone state chart with simulation + code gen. Can be combined with other tools, open interfaces API. AUTOSAR wrapper in the planning. Can generate Java, C, SPS code. Would be contributed, if of interest. – Kath: Feature Meta-Model and Feature Model Editor. Could seriously consider contributing those. QVT relational engine (EPL license), could be easily contributed (can be found on http://www.ikv.de). No implementation of operational part. Clarification: Eclipse QVT is based on ATL. ikv had requirements that asked for another technical foundation other than ATL --> own implementation. – Martin Bickel: Mentions Topcased, which is already open source. R. Müller: Topcased has serious interest in the activities of the interest group. Topcased is in productive use in Airbus. – Eric Steiger: Mentions RTSC in the stages of project proposal. From the mobile phone domain. Consider conflicts / synergies.		
14	**O**	Action for R. Müller: Clarify overlap between our activities an Topcased		R. Müller
15		Andreas Graf: Address question why only nine participants raised their hands earlier. – Feedback from Dimitar. Works on efficiency / integration of the Toolchain. – R. Mueller: More interest in Lifecycle issues? A: Yes, basically. – Q: Is there interest to come together for life cycle management. There should be discussion outside of this circle. Dimitar: Important aspect is to have tools that work together, not one monolithic solution. Fred Plante: Was expecting more automotive specific aspects. AUTOSAR seems the only automotive aspect. Most of the components are picked from existing things. A W. Neuhaus: Was discussed in first meeting: A good starting point would be kick off with existing technologies in bundles and add on automotiv specifics further on. But it should be clear that the things in the bundle should be driven from the automotive domain.		
		Session Developer Package Clarification: What is meant by Developer Package: "Developer" is automotive developer. But it is not a full comprehensive package. – S. Eberle: Was is the distinction between modelling package and developer package. In which way does it make sense to make a		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		distinction between the packages? – A W. Neuhaus: In the 1st meeting it was mentioned that there are often 2 roles in the development. – Jochen Krause: The term package is not conforming to the general use of package in the Eclipse terminology. Should be rephrase, because expectations will be that it is a downloadable, ready-to-work with package. Expectation management is mandatory. – Clarification: At this point we are a working group. At this point were are identifying the components that make sense wrt to automotive development. – R. Müller: Step 1 is identifiying the commonly used components in the automotive domain. We should give out the message of the most commonly used components. Step 2: Stuff is coming in from participants (e.g. Artop). – S. Eberle: "Packages" are targetet for company tool developers. The output of those will be the final "ECU developer packages". – M. Rudorfer: Agrees on expectation management. Labelling "Developer Package" might raise wrong expectations with the ECU developers. Naming should be done carefully. – M. Broerkens: Expectation was 2 packages: One for the end-user (embedded developer), one for the automotive tool developer. Various -CDT OpenSynergy -DSDP / Target Management – S. Eberle: Useful would be: Components supporting MISRA. – Dimitar: Useful would be: Target device emulation / simulation. – F. Plante: Putting in things "We'd like to see" will attract contributors. – S. Eberle: Compiler vendor integration would be a step forward. Eric Steiger: This is already commercially available. – Q Haufer: Is the scope of the integration constrained to one workspace? Are we looking more into repository-based systems? Or are we looking into the standard single workspace. – Quick round on how end-users work with large models? Standard config systems are used based on files. Artop: Finer grained, but		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		working on a local workspace. – Future strategies: What kind of requirements do we have? Model repository? Or smaller models. Use clever model partitioning. Discussion of configuration management. – Currently, there is no development of a repository solution. – F. Plante: A wishlist is necessary to make sure the wishes are addressed by the working group. – - Support for component testing and code coverage analysis. – - OpenSynergy: Full Debugger Support – J. Krause: A Download Location would really be useful. – Toolchains will always be a combination of general purpose infrastructure and specific tools. – Wishlist: Bosch: Developers work on a product line view. Preprocessor handling for product line. There should be a meta model that includes the preprocessor operations. Break between Eclipse and the "make" environment. A more sophisticated build system. – R. Müller: Look at OSEE (osee.microdoc.com)		
	O	Action point everybody: Announce interest in OSEE to R. Müller		Everybody
	O	Organize OSEE presentation		R. Müller
	O	Action item R. Müller: See if we can set up a Wiki / Mailing List		R. Mülelr
		Feedback: **Lars Geyer-Blaumeiser**,**Bosch** Confusion still there. Objectives not yet clear, outcome not yet clear. **Stephan Baumgarten, IAV** Hope was to get more support for developers. Wishes. Five of the 10 wishes will make him happy. **Olaf Kath, ikv++** Happy to see wishlist. Painful points are longer than wishlist. A lot of work done. Need to get more concrete. Set up a discussion forum for the wishes. **Yuzhong Shen, Kuglermaag** Wish List should be prioritized, responsibilites should be assigned. **Thomas Seidl, Elektrobit:** Very interesting. Big advantage would be to have one baseline. Baseline is relevant. **B. Haberstumpf, Software Architect, Elekrtobit:**		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		See what all this about. Achievement: Standard set of plugins within a given baseline. **A. Graf,itemis** Keeping the momentum up is major concern. R. Müller: Would it make sense to meet in June after the Eclipse Embedded Day in June? W. Neuhaus: 4 month from now is very long time. Smaller meetings should be done. R. Müller: Should we follow up on Lifecycle / Collaboration? Dimitar: Needs to be together with OEMs, because very OEM specific. **Hendrik Höfer, Microdoc:** Its important for this specific group is getting the process going. The challenge is going open. Starting with a baseline for the existing Eclipse is perfect. Don't but the stakes to high. Baseline is achievable in a reasonable timeframe, proves that the group is able to do something reasonable that is of value.This is a bigger value than creating a huge wiki with huge wishlists. Get it going. **Mark Broerkens, opensynergy.** Very happy that all automotive relevant components where identified and that OpenSynergy is using that components. We should be able to vote for Features. As soon as priorties are identified we should define next steps. R. Müller: Thinks we have not reached that point yet. Because that requires a more formal working group structure. Questions of steering committee and budget show up then. M. Broerkens: Need not be a formal vote. Could just show the interesting aspects to research projects. W. Neuhaus: Agrees with Ralph that this is probably one step to far. Confusion needs to be clarified first. Common goals should be clear. First: What kind of structure do we want in the future? What kind of outcomes could we produce. Then vote. Clarify governance. Produce that in a smaller group and suggest it to the group. Have this as a starting point. Who wants to be in the group: OBEO, Geensys, Ralph, Macklar, Kugler Maag, Wolfgang Neuhaus. **S. Eberle, Geensys:** Happy with the discussion. Next steps part could be more elaborate. Baseline could be a short-term outcome. Would be a chance to come out with something concrete.		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		Michael Köcher, Valeo: Interesting to hear about modelling and design package. There are a lot of topics that need to be discussed. Expectation was that there are more topics solved, but there are a lot of open topics. **Sergeij Schwenk, Bosch**: Are there any plans idea on the roadmap of the result? **Gerd Steiniger, Geensys:** Expectation was to do a segmentation between Artop and Eclipse EE. Meeting was useful. **Anita Messinger, Kuglermaag:** Sees today as a brainstorming day. Clarification and moving on is necessary. **Martin Bickel, Continental:** Interesting to see activities in modelling world. Setting up wishlist doesn't solve any problems. Interesting to see common problems like MISRA checking, compiler integration. These are topics with potentials for doing sthg together. There are a lot of companies that are interested in solving these problems. R. Müller action item with M. Bickel: Tackle one item on the wishlist **Jennifer Neumüller, Denso:** Expected something more concrete, happy with the discussion. Real issue is getting the work done. Looking forward to how the project continues. **Dimitar Pelkov, Johnson Control:** No expectations from the metting. "Cold water". No initial information about the the goals of the meeting. Better perception on what is going on and how to collaborate. Now all the topics are on the table, which is a good thing. **Fred Plante, QNX:** Quite interesting. A bit deceived on developer side, on modeling side there was a good progress on decoupling the pieces. Wishlist for dev package is still small, more items are expected. A little concern of the approach of the minimun package. If we woant to be successfull, people need to be hooked on the project. That should be new concrete components that are added.		

	↓	**D** = decision, **A** = activity, **O** = open issue, **I** = information, **F** = finished		
#	**↓**	**Topic**	**Date**	**Responsible**
		Andreas Selig, Bosch Appstadt?: happy about Artop introduction and learn about automotive area. Would like to have the working group as a platform for tool development in automotive domain. Bosch has quite a few tools, working group could be a platform for bigger collaboration. Concrete outcome is not yet clear. **Patrice, Raynal:** Quite happy about the open discussion and collection of requirements and ideas. Would have more expectations on the contents of the platform. More clarification is necessary. **Harald Mackamul, Bosch Research:** Also still not clear on the outcome. Glad to see how many participants are interested in the topic. Next steps seem to be very clear. Items are very familiar. More people can be convinced by use of the results of the meeting. **M. Rudorfer, BMW Car-IT :** Quite happy. Small concerns about two-step approach. Bundling might not work for the development part. You need critical mass, which is not yet there for the dev package. Hope: lets do modelling distro first, let it be a success and then do the next distro. Artop should show up on Eclipse website. R. Müller: Activities are a good marketing strategy. **Eric Steiger, Freescale (Phone):** New challenges that he was not aware of. Good refresher on Artop. Little concern with next steps. Lets do next steps. Better a small step and learn from that than a big step. Several problems could be solved in general Eclipse groups. Find a way to influence them.		

Miscellaneous: