FIBO v2 Specification Automation

Kickoff Call

*19 February 2019*

# Attendees

* Jason
* Juergen
* Mike
* Pete

## Apologies

* Mariano
* Larry

# Circulation

Pete Rivett <pete.rivett@adaptive.com>; Mariano Benitez <marianobntz.omg@gmail.com>; Jürgen Boldt <juergen@omg.org>; Larry Johnson <larry@omg.org>; Elisa Kendall <ekendall@thematix.com>; Jason McC. Smith <jason@elementalreasoning.com>; Manfred R. Koethe <koethe@88solutions.com>; cory-c@modeldriven.com; 'Jim Logan' <jlogan@nomagic.com>

# Agenda

1. Outline the overall process
   1. Document production in LaTeX
   2. redline requirements and production
   3. diagrams generation and maintenance
   4. Jira coordination EDMC/OMG
2. Activity streams and dependencies
3. Who will do what?
4. Actions and next steps

## Ambitions

* Be able to produce and maintain documents in LaTeX
* Produce what is needed by \*TF Reports using LaTeX
* Align and streamline Jira across OMG and EDMC

## Baseline requirement

* EDMC GitHub is the system of record and source for all OWL
* Reflect changes in the OWL reliably across the process
  + CCM model reflects OWL
  + Specification reflects OWL directly or via CCM model
  + Jiras reflect changes in the OWL
  + Redline Spec / TF Report reflects all changes in the OWL as documented in the Jira(s)
    - Just redline of the OWL, Or
    - Redline text and diagrams as well
* Meanwhile, TF Report reflects the Jiras and review history
  + This is autogenerated by Jira

# Meeting Set-up

## Requirements

* Account for changes in submitted version against previous version
  + Redline and Jira change notes cross reference
* Align EDM Council Jiras (that account for changes already made) with OMG Jira
* Support FTF/RTF activities
* Be able to generate automatically or semi-automatically:
  + Specification
  + Redline
  + Diagrams

### Short Term:

For the first (FTF) Report:

* Account for changes since 2018 Q2.5 spec release
  + Currently in EDMC Jira only

### Longer Term

* Starting with FTF Report, be able to generate subsequent RTF Reports with that as baseline

# Meeting Detailed Notes

Following the initial draft of the Slide Deck (see updated version with outcomes of 19 Feb call as well as initial MB proposals).

MB explains the EDM Council and OMG RDF/OWL files curation and their relationship.

## OWL Files Usage

Q: Who uses the OMG RDF files (OMG namespace?

* State Street
* Bloomberg

The EDMC ones include Development ones that others might use.

## Generating RDF Artifacts

Possible that OMG could follow a similar arrangement to EDMC for generating RDF artifacts.

See also things in SysML OpenMBE activity. They also try to synch with OMG from a separate community (JPL)

Al Fresco report could be posted as an OMG document if we wanted.

## Other RTFs

Use GitHub and represent model changes in the RTF report using GitHub diff repots

These are both for changes in models and code

‘This constitutes the body of the change in the OMG issue’

## Redline

Can also get to the redline in a written spec using LaTeX

By having a git version for each change, we can tag.

New version of the GitHub repo, associated with a tag.

Apply the LaTeX table generation to get new version of the doc associated with that tag.

Labels and change to that text – reflects the change bars, reflecting the ‘tag’ from GitHub.

## Right now:

* Redline docs produced from a comparison of any 2 LaTeX documents.

**The step we need:** regenerating new version of LaTeX version in GitHub from the OWL in GitHub

Working on infrastructure that provides landing place for the text produced by the Owl driven GitHub.

Given a model that is producing content, can be written to a file location within the template. Pulled in and consumed. Git drives you model generation.

LaTeX – format, structure.

### To do:

Generate text of the doc from the OWL

This is the text of the Annexes (table showing OWL content).

Separately, PR comments that there is a need for some further textual material in the written Specification content itself, the need for which was not picked up in earlier EDMC or AB reviews. MB understanding was that non-Annex material, while extensive and not ‘boiler plate’, does not reflect and is not updated as a result of changes or extensions to the OWL.

## Tags:

Need to define the tag in GitHub is used to identify the changes in the redline.

We can use the #2 Jira as the name of the tag?

## Notion of 2 Jira numbers (one a sub-issue of the other)

Question:

* Does the Redline need to reflect the ‘change’ Jira or can it reflect the Issue?
* Since they are 1:1 these are the same matter

### Conclusion:

It is Ok to submit a RTF/FTF Reports in which the redline uses the original Issue Jiras.

(no-one objects to that)

## Now?

* MB: We have been using the #2 Jira?
* JB: understands that the assigned Jira number is the one, regardless of what happens underneath
* EK: uses the main one for the issue

Why we even have the #2 subordinate issue?

* Not needed for tagging issues.

So this means that using EDMC for #1 and OMG for #2 (MB initial proposal) doesn’t fly.

Can we use the EDMC Jira references as the tags in the OMG TF Redline?

* There may be cases where people have done this – ask Manfred.
* Or it may be DMN (no, they use OMG #s) or SysML

If not, we would have to slave OMG Jiras off the EDMC one.

Once we know that’s possible we will know what the tags will be (OMG Jiras).

Then talk about tags in LaTeX once the above is resolved / confirmed.

**Philosophy:** have the OMG Jira Nos be the issue Nos used as references in the Redline.

That Jira tag can reference the external source, for example the EDMC Jira.

# Conclusions / Proposals

That will work if we auto generate OMG Jiras from EDMC Jira.

**Intent of the script:** the issue No. in the Redline is hyperlinked to the issue in the OMG Jira database, so the AB reviewer can click through and see it.

Can have the external source inside the issue.

**Easiest solution:** Generate (one) OMG Jira from the EDMC Jira

* But try not to have it generate the 2nd Jira from it.

Even simple typo fixes have impact, e.g. diagrams, semantic changes.

## Jira Discussions

Assuming we clone the JIRA as above.

* EDMC: Move the resolution discussions from Pull Request to Jira comments anyway
* Can we clone the discussions?
* Can the omg Jira accept something from elsewhere? – might need a program to do that.

Some discussion happens earlier, via the weekly FCT meetings.

* Maybe this needs to be reflected as Jira comments after such meetings.

**Resolution:** tweak EDMC process so that EDMC FCT leads post précis of weekly meeting conversations on a given Jira into the Jira (can also link to Wiki meeting notes for more detail and context).

# Summary and Other Concerns

We might have all the changes to the OWL in the EDMC GitHub. Changes to the text of the document more of a challenge. Comments in Github, discussion in the Wiki, meetings, sometimes (not much) in Jira.

## Issue Resolutions

Jira does contain reference to the merges. We have not been so disciplined about writing the solutions.

EDMC: We need some discipline.

* e.g. after a meeting, post notes to Jira.
* The person doing the merge then needs to make sure they pay attention to the Jira.

## Accounting for Changes

How can one ensure that all changes accounted for?

GitHub is linked (with a tag for that’s Jira issue number) to the Jira so all changes are traceable. So no problem of losing changes. But having note to help understand the proposal.

# Next Steps

Bi-weekly call – find a better time.

Separate stream for LaTeX

* Once we have the Jira alignment answer from Mariano.

Likely separate streams ultimately for each of

* CCM – Specification-quality diagrams generation and maintenance
* Jira – Cloning of Jiras and comments as noted today
* LaTeX – pulling it together; consuming tags for redline changes

## Also

How to get from the OWL to a form that can go into the LaTeX?

* See the ‘Other Means’ box on the slide
* Replacing CCM for generation of Specification tables

This is a project for generating tabular content from RDF/OWL.

This is comparable with a number of EDMC Deliverables that are currently generated by the ‘Publisher’ automated system and could be added to that.

It is possible that one of the existing spreadsheet formats is already suitable for the FIB v2 Specification Annex

**Actions:**

* Review suitability of existing EDMC ‘Deliverables’ generated by Publisher, for replacing the tabular (textual) parts of the Annexes;
* Assuming no such; get FIBO FPT to initiate design of a further tabular product to be automatically generated each time GitHub is checked in, and notify what the URLs for this will be.