Precise Semantics of UML Composite Structures, Minutes of the 2012/09/25 telco

The following topics have been discussed (or were supposed to be):

* Test suite:
  + Discussion about what the test suite should be
    - Need for defining test coverage criteria
    - Build the test suite so that it matches the coverage
    - Would be useful to address optional requirement related to Alf extension (would be more efficient to model examples)
  + Presentation of a first, simple example model:
    - Comment: If we remove the only connector in the model, this a fUML model
    - Nevertheless, all the “initialization” part of the RunMethod is typically what we want the semantics of composite structures to address, so that this does not have to be explicitly modeled.
    - TODO: refactor the model to introduce constructor operations => semantics of composite structures should result in configuration of instances equivalent to those obtained by calling these constructors
* Semantics:
  + Discussion on how to determine the defining connector for a CS\_Link
  + Note: This information is currently used to determine where requests can be propagated
    - Overriding CreateLinkActionActivation may be a possibility.
    - But, it seems that making /definingConnector and /ownedConnectorInstances derived and introducing constraints could be sufficient (i.e. no need to override semantics of create link actions) => cf. discussion thread “Proposal on connector instances” on the mailing list.
    - TODO: investigate these alternatives
* Connector redefinitions:
  + Cf. discussion initiated by Nicolas on the mailing list
  + Conclusion regarding our submission => out of scope at this time
* [NOT DISCUSSED] Improvement of the document generation template
  + TODO: Have a look at the IFML example to see what is required for the front matter

Additional details can be found in the slides of the meeting, available on the wiki.