Minutes of the Architecture Committee

Place: WebEx
Date/Time: 2015-12-11 – 11:00-12:20 CET
Minutes: Andreas Benzing, ICS AG

Participants: Andreas Benzing  ICS (Daimler) (chair)
Stefan Ebeling  BMW
Gerwin Mathwig  PL MDM@WEB
Reinhard Pirtauer  PL MDM|BL (substitute)
Gert Sablon  Siemens
Stefan Wartini  MBBM
Jan Wiegelmann  NorCom

Guests: Ulrich Bleicher, Sebastian Dirsch, Alexander Nehmer, Sibylle Peter, Dietmar Rapf, Hans-Dirk Walter

Participants are referred to by their initials, i.e. GM refers to Gerwin Mathwig.

1 BMW Architecture Proposal

The proposal presented in the slides [1] is presented by SE. The primary intention of the proposal is to follow the computation-to-data-paradigm. Queries should therefore be evaluated locally as much as possible and only be forwarded when necessary. The coordination between different openMDM instances is handled using the distributed connector service. A dedicated event bus is therefore not included in the proposal. Due to the focus on the basic principle, not all individual openMDM components are listed in the graphic. The client is planned to be implemented as a thin client, currently planned in JavaScript. Therefore, the proposal provides the basis for a web client.

The execution view is also presented and discussed. To provide an architecture description which is as generic as possible, the description will be updated to refer to corresponding standards instead of concrete products/implementations where possible. This way, the underlying requirements also become clearer.

To make sure that the proposal matches the requirements posed by the user stories currently gathered by the SC, the AC will request a unified set of these user stories. Based on this input the AC can then check if the user stories can be implemented using the proposal and release the proposal if no collision is found.

1.1 Javascript Framework

The JavaScript survey is briefly discussed by the attendees. The participants agree on AngularJS with Bootstrap widgets as the favored candidate. The parties involved in development are hereby asked to check if this solution works for them. In case of objections,
the objecting party must provide a clear explanation why this approach cannot work along with an alternative that does work.

2 Discussion of Proposal Process
Unfortunately, the feedback to the proposals has been very low to nonexistent. One reason for this seems to be the lack of experience with the proposed technology and/or the missing responsibility. AB will therefore gather a list of parties involved in development as proposed by GM. These parties will be asked explicitly for a response to the proposals to get a better understanding of the situation. Based on these initial responses, the AC can then decide on further action. As mentioned previously, any objections to a proposal must thereby be accompanied by an alternative solution.

Proposal feedback will be requested from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bertrandt AG</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoo Engineering AG</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigatronic GmbH</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itemis AG</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Solutions GmbH</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piterion GmbH</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science + computing AG</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Next meeting
The next AC conference call will be held on January 15, 2016, 11:00 CET.
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