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1. Introduction
   1. Role of the deliverable

This document is the first version of the project progress report covering 2015 semester 1.

* 1. The List of Technical Work Packages

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UC Code | Requirements derived from |
| WP2 | Semantic Parsing and Generation of Documents and Documents Components |
| WP3 | Model to/from Knowledge Base (synchronization mechanism) |
| WP4 | Knowledge Base Design and Implementation |
| WP6 | Architecture, Integration and Evaluation |

* 1. Structure of the document

This document is organized as follows:

Chapter 1 introduces the document.

Chapter 2 provides the PPR

* 1. Terms, abbreviations and definitions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Abbreviation | Definition |
| RDF | Resource Description Framework |
| WP | Work Package |
| UC | Use Case |

1. The Project Progress Report (2015 Semester 1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project key data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | |
| Project name | | | | | 13028 ModelWriter | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Full length title | | | | | Text & Model-Synchronized Document Engineering Platform | | | | | | | | | | |
| Call & project ID | | | | | ITEA 2 Call 8 - 13028 | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| Time frame | | | | | start: | | 01-10-2014 | | | end: | | 30-09-2017 | | |  |
| Size | | | | | PY: | | 60.07 | | | M€: | | 4.2 | | |  |
| Project leader | | | | | Ferhat Erata (UNIT Information Technologies R&D Ltd.) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Involved countries | | | | | Belgium, France, Turkey | | | | | | | | | | |
| PCA status | | | | | PCA has not been signed yet | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project acronyms | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KB (Knowledge-base), UC (Use Case), MW (ModelWriter), ALM (Application Lifecycle Management), EMF, RDF, QDMS (Quality Document Management System), MBSE (Model Base Software Engineering) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 overall targeted innovations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Top 4 overall targeted business impacts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Capability to create a readable textual document (using an editor) and relate its content to existing models' elements | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 1 | MBSE development | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | Obeo, UNIT, Loria | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | All | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State- of-the-Art | | | - There are some Document annotation systems - A new capability is to annotate a text using an ontology  - A new Recommendation system is addressed (synchronization links automatically proposed) | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | | Challenge in MBSE development is how to maintain the coherence between multiple distributed models or between models and documentation. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Capability to model some content graphically using a domain-specific notation and then generate some readable but structured text/ document | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 2 | Reducing time to spend for Quality Control activities, by this way it provides manufacturers faster production | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | Obeo, UNIT | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | HISBIM | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State- of-the-Art | | | Preliminary template based document generation approaches are available | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | | QA QDMS, Microsoft Pinpoint QDMS | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Capability to ensure / manage the synchronization between the artifacts (documents and models) bi-directionally | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 3 | Expertise on document extraction | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | Obeo, UNIT | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | OBEO | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State- of-the-Art | | | A synchronization link management is addressed as a synchronization engine. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Semantic Annotation of Text with Model Elements | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 4 | New Open Source projects with professional service | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | CNRS/LORIA, Obeo, Airbus | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | OBEO | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State- of-the-Art | | | Semantic Annotation is mostly restricted to the annotation of text with Knowledge or Database elements. ModelWriter will investigate how to make these approaches more generic and extend them to arbitrary models. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Reversible Semantic Processing | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | 5 | More sell of Obeo Designer and Obeo SmartEA (OBEO) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | CNRS/LORIA | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | OBEO | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State-of-the-Art | | | Semantic parsing maps text to semanticrepresentations. Natural language generation maps semantic representations to text. As these two processes are standardly treated independently, we aim to produce a system that both parse and generate a simple interaction between text-to-model and model-to-text conversion. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Natural Language Generation from KB Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 6 | Supporting Traceability in ALM, e.g. by addressing impact analysis in the procedure of application development | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | CNRS/LORIA | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | UNIT, Havelsan | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | SotA | | | Existing approaches of generating from KBs generally use templates thereby yielding stilted text. There are also no approaches that can generate fluent text from arbitrary KBs. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | | - No similar offer in TFS / none announce | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Model / Text Synchronization Engine with iterative and interactive matching synchronization | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 7 | Synchronization between use case documents and business process models | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | Obeo, UNIT, KocSistem | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | | KocSistem, UNIT | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State- of-the-Art | | | - Handmade synchronization available - Only doc generation or reverse engineering exist without interaction. - There is no platform which extensively supports synchronization between technical texts, models and knowledge base. Also, there is no Eclipse based platform capable of synchronizing text or model with a KB. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | | The current tools in the market do not fully support automatic update on the process models when a change occurs in the use cases and vice versa. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Design and implement of a heterogeneous knowledge representation approach, which allows combination and migration between different representations in MW | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 8 |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Main contributors | | | MANTIS | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Main contributors | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | State- of-the-Art | | | Representation of knowledge can vary in different abstraction levels. When a text like system description or requirement definition is modeled as a single model that defines different aspects, there need to be a coherence between definitions. ModelWriter will provide this coherence by providing an ontology used at different abstraction levels. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Market / competitors | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 overall KPIs | | | | | | | | | | | Current | | Target | | |  | Top 4 overall risks | | | | | | | | | | | | | S | P |
| 1 | Time to implement a new case | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | 1 | Technical difficulty to deploy and integrate within existing framework/platforms | | | | | | | | | | | | H | L |
|  | Metric description | | | Average time to implement a new case, including development of required NLP of Knowledge resources (such as ontology, NLP resources, and so on). | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | To consider most used technologies for both DSM and doc edition | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | | Ability to offer support | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Usability & automation degree | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | 2 | High complication and/or poor performance | | | | | | | | | | | | H | M |
|  | Metric description | | | Number of synchronization links accepted by a user over number of synchronization links automatically proposed.  Nielsen, Jakob (1990). Ten Usability Heuristics. (voir la liste plus bas) http://www.useit.com/papers/heuristic/heuristic\_list.html Bastien, J.M.C., Scapin, D. (1993) Ergonomic Criteria for the Evaluation of Human-Computer interfaces. Institute National de recherché en informatique et en automatique, France (http://www.inria.fr) | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | Well identified capabilities level of automation | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Number of supported Domain Specific notations; Supporting various user-visible modeling languages | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | >=2 | |  | 3 | ModelWriter Generated QDMS Reports may be inappropriate to vendor customer requirements | | | | | | | | | | | | L | H |
|  | Metric description | | | At least two of the following languages need to be supported: ADL, UML, ORB and BPMN | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | System development should be interactive with vendor customer quality department | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | | If it is not possible, outsourcing quality experts who worked in a big vendor company at the past. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Faster QDMS reporting/generating | | | | | | | | | | 2 per  day | | 10 per  day | |  | 4 | Lack of data inside the consortium prevents the training of high quality Natural Language Processing Tools | | | | | | | | | | | | M | M |
|  | Metric description | | | In HISBIM pilot factory, Quality control department personnel is able to report 1 or 2 QDMS documents in a day. With the ModelWriter system 10 QDMS documents generation is expected. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | Use external data | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | | Demonstrate usefulness of the NLP tools on data that is external to the project (e.g., RDF data from DBPedia dn text data from WikiPedia). | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Number of different Open Source users detected on newsgroups | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 20 | |  |  | 5 | Semantic annotation is highly ambiguous and yields many possible annotations for a single text/model fragment (LORIA) | | | | | | | | | | | | H | M |
|  | Metric description | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | Apply disambiguisation techniques (e.g., Lesk algorithm for word sense disambiguisation) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | | Allow for interactive annotation where the user manually provides the required disambiguisation | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Number of operational projects which is used in MW | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 6 | |  | 6 | The definition of KB is still in early stage and the API for the semantic services is not defined | | | | | | | | | | | | M | M |
|  | Metric description | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | Mantis should work on this architecture and API for the next year. | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | | The model / text synchronization can work without this semantic services connection. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Unique visitor on MW webpage per month | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 800 | |  | 7 | Annotations and markers should be resistant to modification of input documents | | | | | | | | | | | | M | M |
|  | Metric description | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | It has been identified as a top challenge | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Covering different textual representatives in the project | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | >=2 | |  | 8 | Gendoc project has some features which overmap MW | | | | | | | | | | | | M | H |
|  | Metric description | | | Structured texts and semi structured texts need to be supported, e.g. Java code, Mark down, and so on. | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Avoidance action | | | Discuss with Gendoc committer to align MW and Gendoc to avoid this overlapping. | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Back-up / mitigation plan | | | Fork Gendoc or do everything in MW. | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Changes in the technological and business relevance during the reporting period | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| One option during writing the FPP was to reuse all the existing code of the Open Source project called Intent. This option is no more adapted to the expectation outcomes of MW. We re-restructured the architecture and the new one is more reliable. The first prototype seems to validate our first choices and is positive. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project statement on progress during the reporting period | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A good architecture design has been setuped. A VERY good operational collaboration has occurred between Obeo and UNIT developers, which produces already several interesting Proof of Concept and a real sharing of knowledges. Thanks to knowledge acquired with ModelWriter, Obeo has sold 2 commercial contracts for professional services to extract any information from a document. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Updates to partners' exploitation prospects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIT Information Technologies R&D Ltd. | | | | | | | | | sme | | TUR | | 11 PY | |  |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Mantis | | | | | | | | | sme | | TUR | | 8 PY | |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Sogeti Belgium | | | | | | | | | ind | | BEL | | 7 PY | |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Katholieke Universiteit Leuven | | | | | | | | | uni | | BEL | | 6 PY | |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| OBEO | | | | | | | | | sme | | FRA | | 4 PY | |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Airbus Group SAS | | | | | | | | | ifc | | FRA | | 2 PY | |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Havelsan | | | | | | | | | ind | | TUR | | 0 PY | |  |  | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 8 overall partners' Exploitation Related Achievements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Standardization | | | | Open Source Software | | | Specification & Verification of ALM Platform | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T4B T4I | | | Planned | | |
| 2 | Standardization | | | | Open Source Software | | | Change Impact Analysis & Visualization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T4B T4I | | | Realized | | |
| 3 | Exploitation | | | | Collaboration | | | Collaboration between UNIT and HAVELSAN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T4B | | | Realized | | |
| 4 | Dissemination | | | | Workshop | | | The 2nd International ModelWriter Workshop | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | Realized | | |
| 5 | Standardization | | | | De facto standard | | | System Installation Component Ontology | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T4I | | | Realized | | |
| 6 | Dissemination | | | | Publication | | | Parsing Text into RDF | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | Realized | | |
| 7 | Standardization | | | | Open Source Software | | | Semantic Annotator | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T4B T4I | | | Realized | | |
| 8 | Standardization | | | | Open Source Software | | | Synchronization Engine Prototype | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T4B T4I | | | Planned | | |
| Realized Exploitation Related Achievements statistics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Dissemination | | | |  | Exploitation | | | |  | Standardization | | | | |  | New company | | | |  | Patent | | | |  | Human capital | | | |  |
|  | Total: 7 | | | |  | Total: 3 | | | |  | Total: 3 | | | | |  | Total: 0 | | | |  | Total: 0 | | | |  | Total: 0 | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work progress during the reporting period | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 technical achievements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Top 4 next technical targets | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Semantic Annotation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 1 | Conception and Implementation of a Semantic Parser | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | | A semantic annotator is generated which annotates text with model elements. In Airbus case, texts are System Installation Design Principles and the model is an OWL KB. In Obeo case, code documentation is annotated with Ecore concepts and Java procedure names. | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | | The mapping between text fragments and model elements produced by the semantic annotator aims to develop a semantic parser which can map text to model fragments. As the first step, we will test the parser on "simple texts" such as the semi-structured SIDP rules provided by Airbus. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | QDMS system integration via plug-in | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 2 | Conception and Implementation of a Text Generator | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | | ModelWriter system communicates with QDMS by XML files | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | | Using the mapping between text fragments and model elements produced by the semantic annotator, the aim is to develop a text parser which can maps model to text fragments. In a first step, we will test the generator on "simple input such as sets of RDFS triples. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Technical Architecture Design | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 3 | ModelWriter will be able to generate standard QDMS reports | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | | ModelWriter system might be automatically fill QDMS documents according to user basis inputs as short terms/keywords | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | First prototype of Model / Text synchronization | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 4 | A synchronization prototype with UI and engine together | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Prototypes to select a reliable library for document parsing | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | 5 | First alpha release of ModelWriter integration | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | | All of the model editor, writer part and knowledge base will be integrated. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Connectors for external writer part | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 6 | Knowledge-based complete design | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Markers and their classification | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 7 | Test plan and acceptance test | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Mapping of the markers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 8 |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | | The first version of Mapping is realized with regarding type of the relation for that mapping. | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Top 4 next technical targets from latest PPR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Not application; this is the first review of ModelWriter and there is no last PPR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 issues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Impact | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Confidential Data delayed at the start of work on WP2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | Work on the Conception and Implementation of the semantic annotator was delayed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | | The Airbus data provides an interesting testbed for semantic parsing and text generation. However using it required the signature by the French partners of a Non-Disclosure Agreement which could only be finalized in June 2015. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | | LORIA started work on a restricted dataset and implemented a first question/answering prototype using this dataset whose components were described in a conference paper. This allowed AIRBUS to develop a full blown version of the approach on their data. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Uncertainty about Belgium Participation means that work on Semantic Parsing was delayed | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Work on Semantic Parsing was restricted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | | The Belgium partners were responsible for work on Semantic parsing. This work was delayed to the second year. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | | CNRS/LORIA investigated a first rule-based approach to semantic parsing which allowed for a first analysis of the linguistic issues raised by the data. Further work will build on automatic, statistical approaches. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Two ModelWriter technical leaders left Obeo | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Knowledge transfer has been successfully operated | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Scope of Intent was mainly authoring which isn't the scope of MW | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | The architecture specification of MW helped to remove the part of Intent and to reorganize the project | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Space application drop | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  | Losing the leadership at the beginning of the project | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | | UNIT has accepted the leadership | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Belgian consortium have not been funded yet | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Some of the tasks are left without owner. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | | Re-allocation of tasks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Need for more large industries in Turkey for exploitation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Exploitation would be limited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Details | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mitigation action | | | - Havelsan participated as a large-scale use case provider  - Ford-Otosan is under negotiation for participation in ModelWriter. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deliverables (overall status) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | Actual-vs-planned (overall status) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number of deliverables | | | | | | | | | | | 134 | |  | | | Time consumption (months) | | | | | | | | | 9 | | 36 | | 25% | |
| Already submitted | | | | | | | | | | | 60 | | 45% | | | Planned effort consumption (PY) | | | | | | | | | 13.4 | | 60.1 | | 22% | |
| Delayed (< 3 months) | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 2% | | | Actual effort consumption (PY) | | | | | | | | | 12.5 | | 60.1 | | 21% | |
| Details | | | The project has a large number of deliverables which are inherited from the previous leader of the project (Space Application) and their management is difficult due to their exhaustive number (some of the small tasks are defined as a separated deliverable). We may merge some of them and propose to ITEA in the next change request. Anyway, the only deliverables which are delayed are:  - D6.5.1-1 Acceptance Test Plan (release 1)  - D6.5.2-1Automated Acceptance Tests(release 1) - D6.4.3-1 IDE-integrated User Interface to handle Sync issues (major release 1) All of the abovementioned three deliverables are due at Month 12 of the project (Sep. 2015) and are delayed 1 month. The reason is that as their title indicates, they are planned for the 1st release of the project and the 1st release is postponed to month 16 of the project.  Please note that all of the accomplished deliverables including software and document ones are considered in the submitted item. Also, please note that some of the deliverables are their first version and will be updated later. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Discrepancies explanation (partners) | | | | > Centre National de la Recherché Scientifique (-55%): The first candidate identified for recruitment cancelled unexpectedly which lead to some delays in recruiting a PhD candidate to work on the project.  > OBEO (-70%): The planned 2015 effort is not linear: we plan to work more on the end of the year than in the 1st semester. We also prefer to move some effort from 2015 to 2016: as the initial scenario of reusing Intent engine has been modified by recreating from scratch a new engine, we prefer to parallelize development after creating a strong core and having a clear idea of architecture and specification. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delayed (> 3 months) | | | | | | | | | | |  | | 0% | | | Project technical progress (%) | | | | | | | | |  | |  | | 20-30% | |
| Details | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments | | | Some of the components are developed such as Semantics parsing of the text; writer enhancement including markers and mapping/link (with their configurations); model-to-text linking and vice versa;  However, some of the planned tasks for the first year of the project were not completed such as KB design and acceptance test due to the delay in the start of the project and the first major release is postponed to month 16 of the project. | | | | | | | | | | | |