List of issues that need to be submitted and addressed

1. I’m concerned that ecore is used for the Modelica metamodel in Part III rather than EMOF (EMOF is also supported by the EMF technology). This is an easy conversion.  Oddly though I can see no depiction of the metamodel in either ecore or EMOF: I would for example expect to see some UML class diagrams.  Instead there is what appears to be Modelica syntax.

[cp]: converting the ecore model to EMOF --> Nicolas will do this -- use a transformation to generate CMOF

adding diagrams:

     - Wladimir: would it add value to add the diagrams?

     - ecore tools could generate diagrams in an automated fashion.  [AI for Wladimir]

1. Likewise the UML Profile is represented in proprietary Eclipse format. Again this would be a simple conversion.

[cp]  my understanding is that we did this to support the qvt implementation, it is not really part of the specification.  Nicolas:  what is ultimately the best way to represent the SysML4Modelica profile and the Modelica abstract syntax meta model in a way to meets OMG expectations?

--> Nicolas will apply the same process as for the SysML profile

--> we need to resolve the issue of difference between the normative SysML profile organization and MagicDraw's  --- will be done in FTF

1. Each Annex should state whether Normative or Informative

[cp] easily added to the document.  However, ideally, we would complete and thoroughly test the qvt rules so that we can make that normative.

1. Section 3 Conformance requires more detail for the practical definition of ‘full realization’ and ‘abstract syntax compliance’

[cp]  I need advice here.  I don't know how to formulate this in a way that meets OMG expectations.  To be honest, this was missing completely, and I added it at the last minute when finalizing the document...

The tool to support this must support Modelica 3.2

compliance OMG QVT 1.1

compliance OMG SysML v 1.2
compliance with a Modelica compiler and QVT operational implementation such that

Optional compliance:  round-trip equivalence.

This supporting a custom profile, namely, SysML4Modelica

Must support the concepts

in a matter that is functionally equivalent to what is specified

The practical evidence for testing Level 1 compliance is that there is round-trip.

1. 4.1 should reference version 1.1 of QVT.
2. 4.2: It’s not clear how the MDA Foundation Model ‘constitute provisions of this specification’.

[cp]  easy fix for 4.1.  Should we just remove the reference to MDA since it isn't really required for the spec

Leave just a bullet.  The use of QVT fits within the MDA initiative.

1. 7.1: this SysML issue does not belong here as such: if a change is needed it should be specified as a detailed edit to the SysML spec. Otherwise just raise the issue in the normal way.

[cp] well, it has been raised in the normal way.  We were just referencing it here.  Not sure what Pete wants us to do -- remove it?  To be honest, this is issue is important from SysML's perspective, but we only used it in the example, and as such it is really not directly relevant to the spec.

Take out.

1. Section 8 claims that a “formal, systematic approach is used” for the transformation: however as acknowledged later, QVT is not used for all the transformations – p6 states that  “initially” only a textual definition will be used. And it’s not clear whether Annex C is normative. However it’s not clear when this ‘initially’ will be addressed.
2. Overall it’s not clear which of the textual transformations in part 4 have a QVT representation – it would be useful to have an annotation in Part 4..

[cp] Yes, this is ambiguous, and there is not really a good answer for it at this point.  Ideally, we would have the complete transformation implemented in qvt, and we would then make the qvt normative.  But we don't have that ready right now.  I personally feel that we should complete the qvt implementation during the summer and make it normative in the final version.  This will require further discussion...

1. P6 uses ‘meta-case’ for transformation technology.

[cp] relic from when were use meta-CASE tools such as MOFLON to do the transformation.  I will update.

1. Figure 2 uses stereotypes such as <<transformation>> that are not defined.

[cp] this was more conceptual this figure.  not sure how to address this.  Are these stereotypes clearly defined in the MDA document?

add reference to MDA document.

1. Section 9: presumably these are production rules for Modelica syntax. Does this need to be duplicated in this spec?

[cp]  agreed that we should probably remove these.

1. There is a formatting problem in the heading for chapter 20.

[cp] not sure what Pete is referring to except that the section is labeled "20. Annex A -- Robot Example" .  I tried to figure this out in OpenOffice but could not get it to be labeled as just Annex A but still show up in the table of contents properly -- I just gave up on it and decided to fix it in the final version.

1. The QVT does not use the standard URI for the UML metamodel.

[cp]  not sure what this means -- Nicolas can you clarify?

1. Likewise I’m not sure of the use of openmodelica.org.

[cp] again not sure... Nicolas?

new section 7.2:  addressed in the new section that deals with limitations of current tools.