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# 07/21/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Sandy Friedenthal
2. Rick Steiner
3. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meeting
2. Discuss solution from previous session. Do we all agree?
	1. Original RFP definitions will be renamed by appending to the concept name “-RFP”?
3. Discuss going forward issues

## Meeting Notes

1. Review Action Items from previous meeting
	1. Done - Chas to rename the terms in the RFP by appending the name of the block corresponding to each term with '-RFP'
	2. Done - Chas to post the updated file to GitHub
	3. Done - John to post these notes as part of the minutes from this meeting
2. Discuss solution from previous session. Do we all agree?
3. Chas suggested using a stereotype to identify the original V1 RFP concept definitions vs. adding an –RFP suffix to their name. This would allow us to easily identify them also by their color on diagrams. Everyone agreed. The stereotype will be moved to a unique package.
4. Approach was changed to:
	1. The V1 RFP requirements will first be modeled with only the V1 concept definitions and then the V2 RFP requirements will be modeled with the new concept definitions.
	2. This way the V1 RFP model will be captured first producing a clear starting point (base line) for new V2 RFP requirements and terms
	3. Therefore the V1 Requirement diagrams will only contain the concept terms with the “RFP Definition” stereotype applied.
	4. If a term was used in the requirement text that was not included in the original list, then a concept term will be added with the “RFP Definition” stereotype applied but without a textual definition. The definition will be resolved when the V2 RFP requirements are modeled and new concept definitions are added.
	5. If issues surface as the V1 RFP requirements are modeled, issues will be captured that will be resolved when the V2 RFP requirements are modeled.
	6. The relationships for refine, satisfy and allocated will still be used as defined earlier.
5. In the previous session’s “approach” notes Sandy mentioned something that should be added. That is, we will be reconciling the new V2 RFP concept term definitions against other industry establish sources including sources such as:
	1. INCOSE Handbook
	2. Industry Standard SE Definitions (draft 6) - Compiled by Julian Johnson
	3. SEBoK: Glossary of Terms
	4. Rick’s model representing Dave Oliver’s capture of the original RFP work
6. Comments after reviewing existing diagrams for requirement 6.5.1.1
	1. Add the remaining requirements that contain the bulleted items from requirement 6.5.1.1 and appropriate concept items
	2. Included relationships to these requirements including the refine relationship
	3. Change the multiplicity of Components to a System from “\*” to “1..\*”
7. Actions for next meeting
	1. John will forward the latest models to Sandy
	2. Sandy will take a first pass at modeling the first few V1 requirements and make other suggested changes in these notes (items 2a and 2d).
	3. John will attempt to bring in a list of use cases and their textual definitions from the SE Workflow Use Case model to this model.

# 07/28/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Chas Galey
2. Rick Steiner
3. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meeting
2. Next meeting will be Monday Aug 3rd at 11 AM, not Tuesday. Normal scheduled meeting will remain on Tuesdays
3. Review model changes
	1. Organize Requirements in a containment tree that replicates the paragraphs in the original RFP
		1. Requirement import issues, refer to original RFP markup document
	2. Apply stereotype to uniquely identify all V1 RFP Requirements and concept terms
		1. Change name?
		2. Use it change color also?
	3. One issue per comment
	4. How do we manage issues?
	5. Element of Interest – This was a new V1 RFP term but the original was modified.
	6. Some of the original RFP requirement names have an added suffix, i.e. “\_imported”. This will be removed so they agree with the original RFP.
	7. Change model name to SECM-Domain
		1. Parts or all of this model can be referenced in the SECM-Kernel model

## Meeting Notes

Reviewed Changes

1. Model Name change – The name of the MD file and the model package are called “SECM-Domain
2. Requirements from the UML 4SE RFP
	1. All have the UML 4SE RFP Stereotype applied
	2. They have been arranged in a containment tree to agree with the paragraph organization within the original RFP
	3. A few of the requirements had a suffix “\_imported” added to their name. This suffix has been removed.
	4. A few differences from the original RFP were found and fixed. They are summarized below.
	5. The requirements in this area of the model now reflect the content from the original RFP and **should not be changed**. This is intended to be a baseline of the original RFP.
3. Concept Terms from the UML 4SE RFP
	1. All have the UML 4SE RFP Stereotype applied
	2. The names and definitions of these terms should not be changed. This is intended to be a baseline of the original RFP.
	3. The Element term was returned to its original name and a new “Element of Interest” term was added and replaced the Element on diagrams where it was used.
4. New Concept Terms derived while modeling the UML 4SE RFP Requirements
	1. They do not have any additional stereotypes applied.
		1. This should be enough to uniquely distinguish them from the RFP terms. If not, we can do something more at a later point.
	2. They are all located in a common package called “Undefined Concept Terms in UML4SE RFP”. This package is located within the “1-UML4SE RFP::3-Requirements Model” package.
	3. When a new term is created it should ultimately be moved to this package.
		1. When they are created it is assumed they will originally be located in a sub-package of the “3-Requirements Model” package.
	4. The new terms can be given a definition.
	5. A Table is available in this same package called “Concept Terms not in UML4SE RFP“.
		1. This table lists the new concept terms, their parent, definition and stereotypes. These columns are intended to help us manage the new terms.
5. Issue Capture
	1. One SysML “Problem” element will be created to capture each issue
	2. All issues should be ultimately moved to the package “1-UML4SE RFP::3-Requirements Model::Issues”
		1. When they are created it is assumed they will originally be located in a sub-package of the “3-Requirements Model” package.
	3. There is a new table defined, “Table of Issues”, to capture and help manage the list of issues.
6. Corrections made to the Imported Requirements from the Original RFP
	1. Notes were sometimes in the wrong context, in that they were included within the text if a lower level requirement.
		1. If a note was associated with one requirement it was included with that requirement after the requirement text.
		2. If the note was intended for more that one of the requirements then a separate requirement was created with a unique ID that associated it to the set of requirements, e.g. ID = 6.5.6.1.Note1, Name = Note 1.
	2. One bulleted item requirement was missing and was added
	3. One requirement had the wrong ID
	4. The requirement text often appeared in the name field and the text field was empty.
		1. The text was moved to the text field
		2. The name now provides an abstracted name

# 08/03/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Chas Galey
2. Rick Steiner
3. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meeting
2. Rick, can you publish the html Review Model? Yes, will re-generate
3. Review Structure Requirement Models
4. Model Questions
	1. Should Concept terms be blocks or classes? Looks like they are all classes. Did this happen when we applied the UML 4SE RFP stereotype that was applied to class and not block?
	2. Identifying new concept terms on a diagram
	3. Establish a Modeling Guidelines section?

## Meeting Notes

1. Review Action Items from previous meeting - Done
2. Our next meeting will be Aug 10th 2 PM. The major topic will be to review the Structure Requirement Models
3. Model Questions
	1. Should Concept terms be blocks or classes? Yes and they were all changed to blocks during the meeting.
	2. All new concept terms will be stereotyped «UML 4SE Implied». The stereotype will be configured to cause these new terms to appear light blue when placed on a diagram.
	3. Establish a Modeling Guidelines section? Yes, create a package 0-Guidelines and use comments to capture each guideline topic
4. Actions
	1. John will add guideline section to the model
	2. Chas will setup MD to cause a unique color to appear for items placed on a diagram when the «UML 4SE Implied» stereotype is applied
	3. Rick – When John and Chas are done Rick will re-generate and publish a model review html to his blog
	4. John will schedule our next meeting for 2 PM August 10th.

# 08/10/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Sandy Friedenthal
2. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
2. Review Sandy’s updates for the SECM-Domain Model in the UML 4SE RFP Requirements Model
	1. Structure Requirements
		1. System Hierarchy
		2. Environment
		3. System Interconnection
		4. Deployment of Nodes to components
	2. Behavior Requirements/Functional Transformation of Inputs to Outputs
		1. Input/Output
		2. System Store
		3. Function

## Meeting Notes

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
	1. All actions were complete from last week’s meeting. The only unconfirmed item open was applying a unique color to blocks when the <UML 4SE Implied» stereotype is applied and that was confirmed closed today.
2. Discussion Items
	1. Managing Model Change – We need to learn how to use GitHub so that multiple folks can simultaneously make model changes and merge results when done. We need to understand how to use GitHub to achieve this or investigate other alternatives such as using Teamwork as a solution. Until that occurs we will try an email based manual Token scheme.
		1. **Action** – John to ask Chas if using the Teamwork approach solves this issue and if it is doable.
		2. **Action** – John – Establish a procedure for the email based token.
	2. Model Review - The review was not a formal review. We simply quickly examined the diagrams Sandy completed and fixed a few small things. Good progress was made but the modeling is taking more time than anticipated, as always. However, it is still believed that the effort will be extremely valuable for deriving future SysML V2 requirements.
	3. We need to establish a metric for what level of requirement modeling is “good enough”. We discussed two criteria but we need to hear from others.
		1. Does the model provide sufficient understanding of the UML 4SE RFP requirements?
		2. Can we use this model to measure if the requirements are correct. and if not raise the appropriate issues to be used for the SysML V2 Requirements
	4. An observation – There are probably many modeling techniques that could be used to model these requirements. Some of these modeling techniques are being established. To ensure consistency across the model we need to identify these technique patterns and use them consistently as the remaining requirements are modeled.
	5. Model Tool Issues
		1. When requirements are placed on a diagram the color is no longer pink (RGB 254,235,232). They are a brown color (RGB 255, 204, 158). This was caused by applying the «UML 4SE RFP» stereotype. When this stereotype is applied we would like the color not to change.
		2. When a block is created for a new concept term, the «UML 4SE Implied» stereotype cannot be applied. We would like this to be applied to Blocks and maybe other elements such as Value Types.
		3. **Action** – Ask Chas if he can help resolve these issues
3. Next session – Monday Aug 17th at 11 AM.
	1. At the very least Sandy and John will discuss his additions. If everyone can make it we will decide then if we should cancel our normal Tuesday session. If most cannot make it, we will use our normal Tuesday time to sync up.
	2. **Action** – John Send out meeting notice

# 08/17/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Sandy Friedenthal
2. Rick Steiner
3. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
2. What level of requirement modeling is “good enough”? See Criteria in 8/10 meeting notes.

## Meeting Notes

1. Sandy added Requirements modeling for section 6.5.2.1.3
2. The first pass of diagrams are complete and will soon be ready for a detailed review after a brief overview with the team.
	1. All of Structure, 6.5.1
	2. Parts of Behavior, 6.5.2 including Input-Output, 6.5.2.1, System Store, 6.5.2.2 and Function, 6.5.2.3
	3. All of Verification 6.5.5
3. Next Sections scheduled
	1. Sandy will continue with the Behavior section
	2. John will start work on the requirement section, 6.5.4.
4. Next Meeting tomorrow 8/18 11 AM ET
	1. We plan to use Yves’s virtual meeting and audio as provided on the meeting notice

# 08/18/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Yves Bernard
2. Rick Steiner
3. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
2. Next Meeting time – 10 AM ET next Tuesday, 8/25? Vs. 11 AM
3. Chas to provide update on using Teamwork and stereotypes issues in MD
4. What level of requirement modeling is “good enough”? See Criteria in 8/10 meeting notes.
5. Brief overview of the requirement model
6. Discuss a process for reviewing the model. The proposed process is:
	1. Brief introduction to the team of new diagrams
	2. Review in detail during non-meeting time and capture comments
	3. Meet as a team to adjudicate comments and issues

## Meeting Notes

1. Review Action Items – All closed
2. Agreed next Meeting time will be 10 AM ET next Tuesday, 8/25, Vs. 11 AM
	1. **Action** – Yves will update the virtual Meeting
	2. **Action** – John will send an update to the meeting notice
3. Chas to provide update on using Teamwork and stereotypes issues in MD
	1. The issue is permitting multiple people to work on the model and avoid model merges. The Check-out facility does this by ensuring only one person as the model (or a section of the model checked out.
	2. Chas has procured a teamwork License for us to use and he is in the process of getting it stood up.
	3. Yves suggested using the SVN available via the OMG site.
4. What level of requirement modeling is “good enough”? See Criteria in 8/10 meeting notes.
5. Brief overview of the requirement model
	1. Provided overview
	2. The Structure section of the requirement model is ready for review.
	3. Yves (Airbus) cannot access Rick’s Blog. Yves has been trying to get this restriction removed. He will continue this. Airbus also blocks email with zip files.
	4. **Action** - Rick will select another location to post the model. Suggestions were the OMG SVN site and our wiki.
6. Discuss a process for reviewing the model. The proposed process is:
	1. Brief introduction to the team of new diagrams
	2. Review in detail during non-meeting time and capture comments
	3. Meet as a team to adjudicate comments and issues

# 08/25/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Sandy Friedenthal
2. Chas Galey
3. Rick Steiner
4. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
2. Transition to Teamwork
3. Walk-thru of new Requirement Model sections
4. Review Requirements Models
	1. Start now
	2. Complete 1 week?
	3. Sections?

## Meeting Notes

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
	1. Meeting set up – Yves provided connection and John sent out email
	2. HTML Model copy for review - Rick provides two html versions of the model. One at his Blog [WP2.0 version](http://blog.ricksteiner.net/sysmlweb/SECM-Domain_WP2.0/), and the second at [svn.omg.org](http://svn.omg.org).
2. Transition to Teamwork
	1. Chas Demoed teamwork
	2. **Action** - Chas will move the latest version of the model in the next two days and provide us a user ID and passwords
3. Last session Sandy walked-thru diagrams for 6.5.1.1 and 6.5.1.2. Sandy continued a walk-thru (Introduction) of new Requirement Model diagrams. This session included:
	1. 6.5.1.3-System Interconnection
	2. 6.5.1.4-Deployment to Component to Nodes
	3. 6.5.2.2.1 Control input
	4. 6.5.2.2.2 Control operator
	5. 6.5.2.2.3 Events and conditions
	6. **Action** – John will complete updates to the walked-thru diagrams and notify Chas when it is committed to Git-hub.
4. Review Requirements Models
	1. **Action** – All review diagrams in 6.5.1 Structure from 6.5.1.1 to 6.5.1.4
	2. **Purpose of the review**:: Does the Requirements model capture the text requirements sufficiently to help us
		1. Establish a common interpretation of the text requirements
		2. Identify relevance of requirements/concepts for SysML v2
		3. Identify issues with the requirements to be addressed in the requirements/concepts for SysML v2
	3. Compete your review before 9/1/2015
	4. **Reminder**: Our next session is scheduled for 8/31 at 11 AM ET where Dan Dvorak from JPL will provide a brief overview of the JPL Foundation Ontologies.
	5. **Action**: John will ask the group when our session to discuss your collected questions and issues will be. 9/1 or 9/8/2015, 11 AM ET

# 09/08/2015 Meeting Notes

## Attendees

1. Yves Bernard
2. Sandy Friedenthal
3. Rick Steiner
4. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings
2. Review Structure requirement model for the UML 4SE RFP Requirements
	1. Step through two comment responses from Yves and John

## Meeting Notes

1. Action Items – All actions from previous meetings were completed. The most significant of these accomplishments was that Chas has moved SECM-Domain model to No Magic Teamwork application. The server and the license for Teamwork is being provided by No Magic. Thanks Chas!
2. Review and comment adjudication for the as-is Requirement Model section 6.5.1, Structure. –
	1. Comments were received by Yves and John.
	2. We spent most of the time reviewing a few of Yves comments.
	3. Because of time limitations not all of the comments were addressed. John agreed to go through all the comments and either resolve comments that can be quickly addresses or create Issues for comments not resolved. The issues will be addressed in the SysML V2 model, which will be referred to as the “to-be model”. Also John and Sandy discussed some of the items in Sandy’s diagrams that were not discussed and further updates were made.
	4. All the changes made to the model are captured in the review results document.
3. Improved modeling approach
	1. More than expected time has been spent on the requirement “as-is” model. Our ambition is to invest most of our available time on the to-be model.
	2. Suggested new approach:
		1. Select a requirement section of the model, e.g. Structure
		2. For this section, examine the Oliver model that Rick has created, the as-is requirement model in this model, the issues in this model and other suggested ontology references. Based on this input immediately construct a to-be model for this section.
		3. Some of the other references that are presently available on our wiki included the JPL Ontology work and the Lifecycle Modeling Language (LML). As they are made available on our wiki others could include the INCOSE Ontology work, and work done by Harold Eisenman and John Holt.
	3. The hope is that this will help focus our attention more on the to-be model and keep us from spending too much energy on the as-is. If there are issues with the as-is requirement model we should discuss them and either quickly make some adjustments or capture an issue.
	4. Sandy has taken a first pass at the Structure/System Hierarchy to-be model. Please take a look. It is just an idea for an approach to this diagram and an example of the new approach. We will discuss this diagram at our next session.

# XX/XX/2015 Meeting Notes Template

## Attendees

1. Yves Bernard
2. Sandy Friedenthal
3. Chas Galey
4. Rick Steiner
5. John Watson

## Meeting Agenda Topics

1. Review Action Items from previous meetings

## Meeting Notes

# Meeting Info

## Member Email List

yves.bernard@airbus.com, cgaley@nomagic.com, rick@ricksteiner.net, safriedenthal@gmail.com, jcwatson@ieee.org

Sanford Friedenthal <safriedenthal@gmail.com>,

'Rick Steiner' <rick@ricksteiner.net>,

BERNARD Yves <yves.bernard@airbus.com>,

Charles E Galey < cgaley@nomagic.com>,

## Dial-in number

* 323-920-0091

### Presenter PIN: 709 2444#

### Attendee PIN: 386 1901#

# Email Token Checkout Procedure

1. There is one token. Whoever has the token can make changes to the model, everyone else should not.
2. To request a token send an email to John. You will receive an email response that the token has been passed to you or that the token is not available.
3. If you receive the token begin and complete your work as soon as possible
4. When you receive the token;
	1. Pull the latest version from GitHub
	2. Make your changes
	3. When finished Push and Commit to GitHub or ask someone to do it for you
	4. Send an email after a successful commit to John to release the token

1. Review of:
	1. Functional Transformation of Inputs to Outputs
		1. Input/Output
		2. System Store
		3. Function
			1. A Value type is specified called Time Step. Should this be stereotyped with «UML 4SE Implied> and included in that package?