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.