0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:0.240  
Speaker 2  
Sure.

0:0:-11.-10 --> 0:0:0.510  
Speaker 1  
And of course, uh, this means that, uh, whatever we say from now on is transcribed more or less automatically and.

0:0:2.680 --> 0:0:30.250  
Speaker 1  
So just to clarify, as we are planning to use the, let's say the the insight from this interview, as I said, uh, we will anonymise all the data and use it in the as a reference for our paper for supporting the yeah, the claims that we make in the in the paper, uh, we have not planning to store any information.

0:0:30.260 --> 0:0:30.820  
Speaker 1  
Data whatsoever.

0:0:32.340 --> 0:0:32.730  
Speaker 2  
Yeah, sure.

0:0:32.810 --> 0:0:34.360  
Speaker 1  
You great.

0:0:34.470 --> 0:0:35.390  
Speaker 1  
This is fine.

0:0:35.400 --> 0:0:37.460  
Speaker 1  
Then we can move directly into the.

0:0:38.620 --> 0:0:40.620  
Speaker 1  
Uh, yeah.

0:0:54.10 --> 0:0:54.320  
Speaker 2  
Umm.

0:0:40.660 --> 0:0:57.240  
Speaker 1  
Main part of the meeting, so as I anticipated by email very briefly, we are doing this a study on this assistive modeling tool and I hope you can see the right screen.

0:0:57.250 --> 0:0:57.710  
Speaker 1  
Yes.

0:0:58.50 --> 0:1:6.880  
Speaker 1  
And the the idea is that and we would like to have a opinion of practitioners.

0:1:11.120 --> 0:1:35.480  
Speaker 1  
As a way for us to deciding collecting some some requirements, or rather functionalities of this tool that may be relevant for them and work on implementing such functionalities and later on once we are done, also to maybe if you are available once again check with you whether or not you think we fulfilled these requirements or expectation.

0:1:35.490 --> 0:1:36.240  
Speaker 1  
Let's see. OK.

0:1:35.750 --> 0:1:36.420  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:1:37.410 --> 0:1:43.760  
Speaker 2  
I I just have a a comment here because in my research project we're doing something I think is quite similar.

0:1:44.220 --> 0:1:44.380  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:1:43.830 --> 0:1:50.700  
Speaker 2  
So maybe if if we do this, we have at the end, I just wanna double check because maybe you'll be because we did something like this.

0:1:50.710 --> 0:1:53.40  
Speaker 2  
Maybe you can reuse sparks of that.

0:1:53.610 --> 0:1:54.550  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, over the weekend.

0:1:53.670 --> 0:1:58.720  
Speaker 2  
So I interviewed people at Volvo about essentially modeling assistance for architecture.

0:1:59.290 --> 0:1:59.450  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:1:59.30 --> 0:2:0.720  
Speaker 2  
So maybe it's something you could use?

0:2:0.730 --> 0:2:1.60  
Speaker 2  
I don't know.

0:2:1.750 --> 0:2:2.80  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:2:2.130 --> 0:2:5.480  
Speaker 1  
Or we can also have some sort of synergy.

0:2:6.430 --> 0:2:6.650  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:2:5.490 --> 0:2:18.120  
Speaker 1  
Anyhow, regardless of this work just, uh, a remark that because we need to be anonymous, we don't point out names of people as much as possible.

0:2:19.120 --> 0:2:19.710  
Speaker 2  
Oh yeah.

0:2:19.760 --> 0:2:22.510  
Speaker 2  
True, that's that's true.

0:2:18.130 --> 0:2:23.250  
Speaker 1  
Of course we will clear the traffic, but just to just to be sure. Yeah.

0:2:22.520 --> 0:2:23.540  
Speaker 2  
Sorry. Yeah.

0:2:24.170 --> 0:2:24.800  
Speaker 1  
Uh, no.

0:2:24.810 --> 0:2:25.920  
Speaker 1  
I mean, the company is fine.

0:2:25.930 --> 0:2:26.840  
Speaker 1  
It's not a problem.

0:2:26.910 --> 0:2:28.600  
Speaker 1  
So anyhow, we will.

0:2:28.650 --> 0:2:35.120  
Speaker 1  
I I'm I'm sure that you are already familiar with most of the concept that just to have like a common background.

0:2:35.190 --> 0:2:53.340  
Speaker 1  
So we have targeting the problem of or not the problem, but the area of reference architecture, so that can be described as general, let's say guidelines or foundations for designing a class of system in a given domain, company or whatever it is.

0:2:53.720 --> 0:2:55.390  
Speaker 1  
In this slide, we basically.

0:2:56.560 --> 0:3:7.830  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, put a very simple example of a reference architecture for Web browser just to web the discussion and here we can see that yeah, as I said, this general guidance now.

0:3:7.840 --> 0:3:15.730  
Speaker 1  
So we are are these components that needs to be basically implemented by any web browser and the relation OK.

0:3:16.60 --> 0:3:32.190  
Speaker 1  
The idea is that this reference architecture use or can in a way drive the development of E software architecture and uh, when you have a software architecture.

0:3:32.200 --> 0:3:40.950  
Speaker 1  
So like a concrete architecture for a system, in this case web browser, then you have like what is what can be called architecture compliance now.

0:3:40.960 --> 0:3:48.470  
Speaker 1  
So how the architecture, the software architecture bhavas with respect to the reference architecture?

0:3:48.860 --> 0:4:15.730  
Speaker 1  
So in this image again we draw upon the previous example and in the sorry in the in the solid line you see the the actual component of Mozilla Firefox browser and now they let's say implement the components of the reference architecture.

0:4:15.820 --> 0:4:29.320  
Speaker 1  
And because this is a pretty simple example, you can see that yes, the basically the compone the software architecture is compliant to the reference architecture in general.

0:4:29.330 --> 0:4:39.530  
Speaker 1  
This task is clearly not very easy to do, especially when the architectural complex and recent studies.

0:4:40.80 --> 0:4:44.110  
Speaker 1  
Uh, I lied at a lack of tooling support.

0:4:44.240 --> 0:4:44.480  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:4:45.410 --> 0:4:54.510  
Speaker 1  
Uh, that on the one end can help or provide guidelines and on the other end can also in a way provide automation for the for such task.

0:4:54.730 --> 0:5:5.180  
Speaker 1  
So we start from this and we our goal was to or is to develop, we call it assistive modeling tool.

0:5:5.190 --> 0:5:9.90  
Speaker 1  
But essentially, is a tool where architects can start drawing.

0:5:10.150 --> 0:5:29.610  
Speaker 1  
There architecture of course, when they start drawing their architecture, they will refer to a reference architecture and the tool automatically, while the the architect is working will take care of checking continuously the conformance of the software architecture to the reference architecture.

0:5:31.690 --> 0:5:45.210  
Speaker 1  
Thus providing the engine the architecture with the live, let's say uh compliant measure of the compliance that is expressed using some graphs that we will see later on.

0:5:46.330 --> 0:6:1.420  
Speaker 1  
And I think most importantly, the tool also provides possible strategies for reestablishing the compliance if the compliance is not achieved.

0:6:1.550 --> 0:6:5.20  
Speaker 1  
OK, so this is our goal.

0:6:5.30 --> 0:6:12.840  
Speaker 1  
Let's say the background and our goal what we did until now is, as I said, we did a bunch of activities, which is literature review.

0:6:13.600 --> 0:6:17.880  
Speaker 1  
Uh, and analysis of uh basically.

0:6:17.940 --> 0:6:19.130  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:6:19.370 --> 0:6:28.970  
Speaker 1  
Industrial or commercial tools similar to this and these activities help us in defining a list of requirements.

0:6:29.240 --> 0:6:43.380  
Speaker 1  
OK, that are those uh this requirements or as I said, we can think about requirements or feature or or or properties that our tool we'll have.

0:6:43.790 --> 0:6:48.520  
Speaker 1  
So now we have the the, the the question for for you are essentially 3.

0:6:48.590 --> 0:7:20.560  
Speaker 1  
So first of all, we would like you to charities based on your uh, let's say experience these uh, this requirements that we had already decided, but then most importantly we would like you to uh also tell us if you see that there are some missing functionalities requirements that you yeah you think are important and missing of course.

0:7:23.140 --> 0:7:24.440  
Speaker 2  
Uh, yeah.

0:7:33.30 --> 0:7:33.210  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:7:24.450 --> 0:7:35.530  
Speaker 2  
So maybe my context you you speak of or software architecture but I am working a lot on the intersection of software and hardware architecture so I don't know if that is something worth mentioning.

0:7:40.410 --> 0:7:40.570  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:7:35.540 --> 0:7:46.920  
Speaker 2  
But I mean, I think in general it's the same thing and at least the the issues that when we were working on that, the biggest issue that we saw was interfacing.

0:7:47.50 --> 0:7:59.910  
Speaker 2  
So sort of to make sure that interfaces between components are also sort of correct, particularly if they for example there's a software to hardware component to make sure that the interfaces of an architecture also make sense.

0:8:0.990 --> 0:8:15.60  
Speaker 2  
Uh, and something that we had an issue with when we were doing or not the issue, but something we tried to solve in a good way is that sometimes when you deal with this architecture, you need to be able to say that you know here should there be some interface or something.

0:8:15.70 --> 0:8:28.660  
Speaker 2  
But we maybe don't know how it should be done at this stage, so a requirement I might want to add is something that it should be maybe possible to have something like this because you're talking about conformance which is good of course.

0:8:28.710 --> 0:8:35.290  
Speaker 2  
But I think it's also important to be able to have a be a way to say that this part right here we don't know yet.

0:8:35.300 --> 0:8:38.470  
Speaker 2  
So we're, you know, we want it later to be solved.

0:8:38.480 --> 0:8:38.760  
Speaker 2  
Nothing.

0:8:39.880 --> 0:8:48.240  
Speaker 2  
Uh, but other than that, I think this is mostly to me a good I good list.

0:8:48.860 --> 0:8:53.130  
Speaker 2  
Ohh, some of these in my case are not that important.

0:8:54.850 --> 0:8:58.490  
Speaker 2  
Ohh but I think in general they make sense.

0:8:58.990 --> 0:9:12.570  
Speaker 2  
So the the interface, whatever that would be in our requirement are not sure how it would be translated, but things that at least for me, important if I take, let's say the top three is at least the collaborative so different stakeholders, very important.

0:9:13.910 --> 0:9:15.300  
Speaker 2  
Ohh then also the.

0:9:18.310 --> 0:9:24.80  
Speaker 2  
The cold and they continuous because oftentimes, especially in our case, we need to do it in steps.

0:9:24.90 --> 0:9:25.460  
Speaker 2  
We can't just do it at once.

0:9:25.980 --> 0:9:26.190  
Speaker 1  
Yep.

0:9:25.470 --> 0:9:27.410  
Speaker 2  
That's important that you have a method to do this.

0:9:30.290 --> 0:9:30.630  
Speaker 2  
And then.

0:9:33.890 --> 0:9:38.700  
Speaker 2  
I think that this either the graphical or modifiable or also important.

0:9:39.510 --> 0:9:44.200  
Speaker 2  
The rest I think are good requirements, but maybe not as important in my specific case.

0:9:44.210 --> 0:9:48.240  
Speaker 2  
The real time is not something that we consider at this stage.

0:9:48.310 --> 0:9:52.130  
Speaker 2  
So in my case, that's not a essential requirement.

0:9:53.170 --> 0:9:59.240  
Speaker 2  
The same for the web based we we are working with tools which are quite you know integrated in tooling landscape.

0:9:59.250 --> 0:10:8.790  
Speaker 2  
So for us it would not be a necessary thing to have them web based and when we were working with academic, we were working with, let's say, papyrus and these sorts of things.

0:10:8.800 --> 0:10:10.910  
Speaker 2  
And then it's also fine that it's not web based.

0:10:12.990 --> 0:10:17.880  
Speaker 2  
But apart from that, I think they are mostly the same, let's say and then they conformance.

0:10:17.970 --> 0:10:33.400  
Speaker 2  
We were not thinking that much about those terms, but in in the same way we wanted to have some maybe super user or something that we can say that you know you're making an architecture now and you know something is not right or if you are at this stage of making it, you should probably do this thing next.

0:10:33.150 --> 0:10:37.200  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, yeah.

0:10:33.460 --> 0:10:38.50  
Speaker 2  
Something like this, which I think is similar but maybe not by the same metric.

0:10:37.210 --> 0:10:38.240  
Speaker 1  
I mean, of course CR.

0:10:38.250 --> 0:10:40.220  
Speaker 1  
It's, uh, it's terminology.

0:10:40.230 --> 0:10:41.240  
Speaker 1  
Might be different.

0:10:41.510 --> 0:10:41.670  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:10:41.250 --> 0:10:42.20  
Speaker 1  
Uh, different.

0:10:49.600 --> 0:10:49.860  
Speaker 2  
Umm.

0:10:52.520 --> 0:10:52.710  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:10:42.60 --> 0:11:11.570  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, but yeah, the idea with the first requirement is to provide some sort of, I mean assistance for seeing this is according or not according what you said about the let's say the the team that OK, some things are important but you don't know yet how do implement them in the maybe it may be in a way.

0:11:11.580 --> 0:11:13.160  
Speaker 1  
Oops, sorry it may be.

0:11:24.450 --> 0:11:26.650  
Speaker 2  
Umm yeah.

0:11:34.790 --> 0:11:35.130  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:11:17.540 --> 0:11:36.390  
Speaker 1  
Hmm, captured by requirement 5 in the sense that we see this check as non blocking, so meaning that we don't want something that doesn't allow you to progress even though the conformance is not achieved or is yeah.

0:11:36.560 --> 0:11:37.180  
Speaker 1  
So in a way.

0:11:39.350 --> 0:11:39.670  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:11:39.350 --> 0:11:42.660  
Speaker 2  
Yeah, I think that I think that it's nicely captured by that.

0:11:42.820 --> 0:11:47.460  
Speaker 2  
And I think that it's at least in our context, is sometimes necessary.

0:11:52.920 --> 0:11:53.80  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:11:47.530 --> 0:11:54.770  
Speaker 2  
So it's it's good that you can have it as an opt in instead of a mandatory thing, let's say, which I guess is this nonblocking terminology.

0:11:55.430 --> 0:11:57.920  
Speaker 1  
Yeah. OK.

0:11:58.320 --> 0:12:2.410  
Speaker 1  
Uh, so basically, bring it with for the prioritization.

0:12:2.420 --> 0:12:6.30  
Speaker 1  
I took note while you were speaking and about.

0:12:6.360 --> 0:12:29.0  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, the, the, the second question, if you would add any requirement, I also took note of this more like let's say a requirement related to uncertainty of some uh, uh aspects that can be in a way related to the requirement 5, but maybe can be even more explicit and and.

0:12:28.790 --> 0:12:29.30  
Speaker 2  
You know.

0:12:31.420 --> 0:12:31.890  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:12:31.900 --> 0:12:37.460  
Speaker 1  
Regarding whether or not you will remove absolutely remove like any of this requirement.

0:12:38.710 --> 0:12:39.40  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:12:38.300 --> 0:12:39.70  
Speaker 1  
Uh, do you have?

0:12:44.750 --> 0:12:44.930  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:12:39.50 --> 0:13:2.140  
Speaker 2  
Maybe if we stay on the on the second one of adding requirement because something I'm not sure how how to formulate the dry play, it might be in this knowledge base but since we were working with sort of architectures coming or or principles of architectures coming from different concepts, we also needed a way for this assistant to be able to find common grounds in this.

0:13:2.190 --> 0:13:11.480  
Speaker 2  
So I shared ontology or something like this that recommendations should be based on and this is the very difficult, of course, but that would be a nice thing to to reach upon.

0:13:12.260 --> 0:13:18.510  
Speaker 2  
So so being able to try to move towards that, but I don't think that can really be a requirement, but OK, it just has a note on that.

0:13:18.150 --> 0:13:18.900  
Speaker 1  
Uh, yes.

0:13:18.950 --> 0:13:24.200  
Speaker 1  
Now I I can explain what we meant with the requirement #6.

0:13:24.790 --> 0:13:25.20  
Speaker 2  
Umm.

0:13:24.550 --> 0:13:38.860  
Speaker 1  
Essentially what we meant is that of course, when you approach, as you said, the architecture in general, you rely on a lot of already known styles or solution, or it can be added.

0:13:39.10 --> 0:13:46.300  
Speaker 1  
So what we wanted to have is a tool that in our way allows you to dig from already existing.

0:13:46.390 --> 0:13:47.880  
Speaker 1  
It can be anything really.

0:13:47.890 --> 0:13:48.390  
Speaker 1  
Styles.

0:13:48.550 --> 0:13:56.0  
Speaker 1  
Looked at your solution recommendation and you could in a way customize the experience of using this tool.

0:13:57.50 --> 0:13:57.520  
Speaker 1  
Hmm.

0:13:57.530 --> 0:14:3.280  
Speaker 1  
By saying OK, we won't do refer to this specific architecture to this specific style.

0:14:3.730 --> 0:14:7.790  
Speaker 1  
Uh, so that's what we meant.

0:14:18.540 --> 0:14:18.810  
Speaker 2  
Hmm.

0:14:8.0 --> 0:14:27.980  
Speaker 1  
So to have like a a base of artifacts already available from which the user can choose basically, and the probably this can be even I can be explained a bit better in the next slide.

0:14:27.990 --> 0:14:31.880  
Speaker 1  
So now this was the discussion.

0:14:31.890 --> 0:14:33.340  
Speaker 1  
Let's say on the general requirements.

0:14:33.350 --> 0:14:39.960  
Speaker 1  
Now we will show you some mock up for the tool and we can see.

0:14:40.230 --> 0:14:46.810  
Speaker 1  
I mean, we can discuss a bit more practically the this requirements or the implication of this requirements.

0:14:50.870 --> 0:14:51.730  
Speaker 3  
Umm yeah.

0:14:48.20 --> 0:14:52.550  
Speaker 1  
Of course, some later, whenever you want to step in the discussion.

0:14:52.740 --> 0:14:54.710  
Speaker 1  
So this is a as a mock up.

0:14:54.870 --> 0:14:55.630  
Speaker 1  
Simple mock up.

0:14:55.870 --> 0:15:0.710  
Speaker 1  
Uh preliminary mock up of our tool, uh.

0:15:0.800 --> 0:15:2.460  
Speaker 1  
So this part here.

0:15:2.470 --> 0:15:11.520  
Speaker 1  
So the bottom left is, uh, the editor that shows you the reference architecture that you are using at the moment.

0:15:11.530 --> 0:15:14.990  
Speaker 1  
OK, now of course it's very simple.

0:15:15.0 --> 0:15:18.450  
Speaker 1  
We did it on barbos just to simplify the.

0:15:19.80 --> 0:15:22.330  
Speaker 1  
Now the idea is sorry.

0:15:23.460 --> 0:15:23.710  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:15:20.120 --> 0:15:24.130  
Speaker 3  
From the top of left, top left, top left no bottom.

0:15:23.720 --> 0:15:24.170  
Speaker 1  
Talk left.

0:15:25.160 --> 0:15:25.690  
Speaker 1  
Uh, sorry.

0:15:25.700 --> 0:15:26.220  
Speaker 1  
Top left.

0:15:26.230 --> 0:15:27.10  
Speaker 1  
Yes, top left.

0:15:27.20 --> 0:15:27.430  
Speaker 1  
Sorry.

0:15:28.100 --> 0:15:40.310  
Speaker 1  
Uh, now the idea is that again here, for instance, within, let's say whatever organization can be, you may want to select different reference architecture.

0:15:40.320 --> 0:15:46.390  
Speaker 1  
No, you're gonna have a reference architecture for a train, for heavy vehicle, whatever.

0:15:46.780 --> 0:15:59.190  
Speaker 1  
And what we meant with knowledge base is that ideally you will have like a repository where you can simply load the the reference architecture of your choice and it will appear here.

0:15:59.200 --> 0:15:59.460  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:16:1.800 --> 0:16:9.680  
Speaker 1  
Uh, this is a a view of the of the reference architecture, mostly like components and connectors.

0:16:10.600 --> 0:16:26.710  
Speaker 1  
We also by let's say the literature of the study, so that some other important aspects are related to let's say constrains or styles that you can have on the reference architecture.

0:16:26.720 --> 0:16:35.220  
Speaker 1  
For instance, you can say OK, the component A should communicate with component B, getting certain cases, blah blah blah.

0:16:35.230 --> 0:16:52.520  
Speaker 1  
So this kind of constraints, so and we are thinking whether or not to basically also have a view that that show this constraint in the same way we show this the E let's see box and lines or component and connects connectors.

0:16:53.440 --> 0:16:58.100  
Speaker 1  
I don't know if this is something that may be relevant in your opinion or not.

0:16:59.880 --> 0:17:0.850  
Speaker 2  
No, I think so.

0:17:1.340 --> 0:17:11.220  
Speaker 2  
I mean, at least in my in my case, let's say the boxes are less important than the lines, so making sure you know that that sort of where the focus is.

0:17:11.230 --> 0:17:14.540  
Speaker 2  
But in the end it's the same same principles that finitely.

0:17:15.420 --> 0:17:18.801  
Speaker 1  
Umm and E.

0:17:19.810 --> 0:17:27.330  
Speaker 3  
So you mean that you you want A to say another view where you are light the the lines?

0:17:28.600 --> 0:17:35.730  
Speaker 2  
I mean sort of the the big thing would architecture management in my case is, is, is really the interfaces and the connections.

0:17:35.740 --> 0:17:43.390  
Speaker 2  
So what's important is to make sure that typically you have this components which are well understood and then they have these interfaces.

0:17:44.20 --> 0:17:53.100  
Speaker 2  
But what is becoming sort of the challenge is that moving from well understood that say hardware architecture management where these interfaces you know how to connect them.

0:17:53.500 --> 0:18:0.430  
Speaker 2  
Suddenly, in our case, we're, you know, in the cyber physical domain that say suddenly we have to do the same thing but for also for software.

0:18:0.770 --> 0:18:5.940  
Speaker 2  
So how do we make a unified sort of architecture view where we can still use the same principles?

0:18:6.90 --> 0:18:8.280  
Speaker 2  
Of interfaces and connections in the architecture.

0:18:9.100 --> 0:18:18.270  
Speaker 2  
Uh, and in that case, essentially with the the components are the same, only that now they have more interfaces that need to be matched.

0:18:18.280 --> 0:18:20.450  
Speaker 2  
Let's say if that makes sense.

0:18:20.460 --> 0:18:20.950  
Speaker 2  
I don't know.

0:18:22.270 --> 0:18:22.430  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:18:21.820 --> 0:18:26.600  
Speaker 2  
So so when I say when when I say view what I more mean is that it's important.

0:18:26.660 --> 0:18:26.930  
Speaker 2  
What?

0:18:26.940 --> 0:18:30.110  
Speaker 2  
What's important for me when I do this is that the interface is is.

0:18:30.120 --> 0:18:31.130  
Speaker 2  
What's the highlight?

0:18:31.140 --> 0:18:32.630  
Speaker 2  
Let's say uh.

0:18:32.410 --> 0:18:32.690  
Speaker 3  
OK.

0:18:32.160 --> 0:18:32.890  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:18:33.360 --> 0:18:39.450  
Speaker 1  
So in in general, what you would, yeah, let's say if we try to sum up, is that OK?

0:18:39.460 --> 0:18:56.130  
Speaker 1  
This is our view which is the starting point, but then in your specific case you also would like to have a view that it makes explicit the different interfaces of components, basically, and then it can be.

0:18:56.320 --> 0:19:0.230  
Speaker 1  
Probably it's something textual because yeah, you need to read the, yeah.

0:18:59.280 --> 0:19:0.730  
Speaker 2  
Yeah, that's that's fine.

0:19:0.820 --> 0:19:8.80  
Speaker 2  
That's how how you can reason if you have component a, component B, you know how can I interface them and sort of what is not allowed.

0:19:8.90 --> 0:19:8.870  
Speaker 2  
What is allowed?

0:19:8.880 --> 0:19:10.600  
Speaker 2  
When is it allowed this sort of things?

0:19:10.610 --> 0:19:11.460  
Speaker 2  
That's what's important.

0:19:11.990 --> 0:19:12.620  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:19:12.770 --> 0:19:14.620  
Speaker 1  
No exactly constrains on this.

0:19:14.710 --> 0:19:15.80  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:19:15.90 --> 0:19:41.810  
Speaker 1  
Yes, we we recorded this and OK then if we move on the top right quarter or whatever it's called chart, then here you have the the place, the editor where using a simple let's say language very intuitive you can start to define your own architecture no.

0:19:41.820 --> 0:19:57.190  
Speaker 1  
So you basically say I don't know if you can read, but in general, what yet what is written here is that you define a component with the name and the which component from the reference architecture implements.

0:19:57.250 --> 0:20:8.520  
Speaker 1  
So essentially the second line here it says I define component small A which implements the capital a component from the reference architecture.

0:20:8.850 --> 0:20:25.160  
Speaker 1  
And while you do this, the idea is that while you write on, like let's say, near real time, you have this, uh, and they manage on the bottom right corner that is updated with what you what you write.

0:20:25.250 --> 0:20:52.60  
Speaker 1  
So this image area represent this major area represented the software architecture that you are developing textually in this uh in this quarter where you and again this is I think that the discussion that we had done till now for the view for the reference architecture probably still holds.

0:20:52.230 --> 0:20:57.710  
Speaker 1  
This is just one potential view that you can have of the architecture, of course.

0:20:59.900 --> 0:21:0.930  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:21:1.0 --> 0:21:21.590  
Speaker 1  
The other, uh, let's say feature that we envision is that while while you develop or design textually your architecture, in addition to have it represented graphically, you also have this validation on the left, bottom left.

0:21:21.960 --> 0:21:38.790  
Speaker 1  
So basically where it tells you OK, in accordance to the reference architecture that you specified and the possible further constraints on interface or any other concern that you have, you may have this violation or this warning.

0:21:40.40 --> 0:21:41.710  
Speaker 1  
And this again, it's done.

0:21:42.280 --> 0:21:43.580  
Speaker 1  
Let's see near real time.

0:21:47.360 --> 0:22:0.110  
Speaker 1  
This is also a described graphically from by this uhm yeah, chart over here.

0:22:0.120 --> 0:22:1.420  
Speaker 1  
I don't know to call it now.

0:22:0.980 --> 0:22:2.300  
Speaker 2  
Spider chart I think.

0:22:2.960 --> 0:22:3.610  
Speaker 3  
Spanish.

0:22:3.620 --> 0:22:3.890  
Speaker 3  
Yeah.

0:22:2.320 --> 0:22:4.410  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, I think it's a bit.

0:22:3.940 --> 0:22:5.270  
Speaker 3  
Or rather, rather chat.

0:22:4.420 --> 0:22:5.920  
Speaker 1  
It's a yeah, rather.

0:22:5.660 --> 0:22:7.860  
Speaker 3  
I think that it is made of like rather chat.

0:22:8.580 --> 0:22:23.40  
Speaker 1  
It's a bit small, but the idea is that for reasons in this case, uh, this chart, whatever it's called on each edge, is a component that is of the software architecture and then.

0:22:23.850 --> 0:22:38.600  
Speaker 1  
And uh, let's say the the area that is colored is the is based on how much this component is compliant to the definition given in the reference architecture.

0:22:40.830 --> 0:22:48.520  
Speaker 1  
And for instance, in this case, yeah, we see that there is this a mapped component be true be true that is not compliant, then blah blah blah.

0:22:49.130 --> 0:22:51.331  
Speaker 1  
So this is what we E.

0:22:53.540 --> 0:22:53.541  
Speaker 1  
E.

0:22:53.810 --> 0:23:12.990  
Speaker 1  
We yeah are uh working on in managing and so going back to this requirements that we basically presented to you of course the first requirement is pretty much like a self.

0:23:15.110 --> 0:23:15.380  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:23:15.390 --> 0:23:38.550  
Speaker 1  
Checked then the the second requirements in in a way is uh yeah, provided by the fact that all this is done as we said continuously uh and automatically and it is non blocking in the sense that as we said even though here you have the the the warnings or the.

0:23:39.590 --> 0:23:59.140  
Speaker 1  
Uh or the the the message is, let's say you can still develop your architecture and we are also working on this skeleton code generation, so you will still be able to generate the skeleton code based on what you wrote.

0:23:59.790 --> 0:24:8.650  
Speaker 1  
And yeah, well, the rest is I all the other requirements I think are pretty much, uh explained, they are.

0:24:8.720 --> 0:24:12.630  
Speaker 1  
It's collaborative in a way that yeah, it's web based.

0:24:12.640 --> 0:24:14.910  
Speaker 1  
It can be used by different stakeholders.

0:24:15.100 --> 0:24:19.760  
Speaker 1  
You don't have to install many tools or resolve dependencies or anything at all.

0:24:20.670 --> 0:24:22.580  
Speaker 1  
And also uh.

0:24:24.760 --> 0:24:29.310  
Speaker 1  
Because of the way, uh, we decided to implement this tool.

0:24:29.320 --> 0:24:38.370  
Speaker 1  
Basically, you can easily modify, uh everything, even while you are developing your architecture.

0:24:38.380 --> 0:24:56.780  
Speaker 1  
Basically, because it's just enough to, uh, load and you, let's say reference architecture and then all the things that you already done will be mundane and updated to the new reference architecture basically, yeah.

0:24:54.700 --> 0:24:57.290  
Speaker 2  
Umm yeah, I'm.

0:25:0.310 --> 0:25:2.900  
Speaker 2  
Yeah, I have some questions, but maybe we do that at the end.

0:25:3.30 --> 0:25:4.510  
Speaker 2  
I'm not sure or is this the end?

0:25:8.890 --> 0:25:9.90  
Speaker 2  
Yep.

0:25:11.890 --> 0:25:12.380  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:25:5.620 --> 0:25:12.500  
Speaker 1  
No, I mean, yes, this was pretty much the end, the last slide, very last light was if you have any remark.

0:25:12.430 --> 0:25:12.980  
Speaker 2  
No, no, no.

0:25:12.990 --> 0:25:19.80  
Speaker 2  
But it's good we can stay up there requirements because first comment in general I think is very nice.

0:25:19.90 --> 0:25:30.820  
Speaker 2  
I think this is a much more thoughtful way of doing it and what we did or what we tried to do, which is I think good because I like the ideas.

0:25:31.300 --> 0:25:32.500  
Speaker 2  
Some of it is not.

0:25:32.510 --> 0:25:35.60  
Speaker 2  
Maybe how do you say this?

0:25:35.70 --> 0:25:48.860  
Speaker 2  
At least my context I I think that some of these things you're highlighting is requirements are simply perhaps not that interesting because in the end it would not be a web tool in our case, because that's not something that that would be invested in, let's say.

0:25:50.10 --> 0:25:54.10  
Speaker 2  
And the same thing is with this thing with the with the real time.

0:25:54.20 --> 0:25:56.670  
Speaker 2  
It's really not a requirement in this case.

0:26:3.130 --> 0:26:3.330  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:25:56.680 --> 0:26:5.550  
Speaker 2  
What we have as requirements in our case was just that you should be able to get one when you want it, so sort of on demand instead, and that works perfectly fine for our case.

0:26:7.20 --> 0:26:17.370  
Speaker 2  
But as I understand that you were you were trying you, you're making some some small little language to do this and then are you implementing this in Eclipse or?

0:26:17.370 --> 0:26:17.530  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:26:19.790 --> 0:26:23.740  
Speaker 1  
And I mean yes

0:26:23.750 --> 0:26:25.0  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:26:25.490 --> 0:26:25.850  
Speaker 3  
OK.

0:26:25.80 --> 0:26:27.130  
Speaker 1  
Give you more practical, yeah.

0:26:27.70 --> 0:26:27.330  
Speaker 2  
Umm.

0:26:25.860 --> 0:26:35.200  
Speaker 3  
They yeah, the idea is that at the end the the model is stored using EMF.

0:26:35.850 --> 0:26:36.510  
Speaker 2  
OK. Yeah.

0:26:40.700 --> 0:26:41.30  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:26:37.140 --> 0:26:41.100  
Speaker 3  
So this is basically the the idea, OK.

0:26:43.780 --> 0:26:43.980  
Speaker 3  
Yeah.

0:26:41.40 --> 0:26:46.290  
Speaker 2  
So if you have an EMF compliant sort of language or something like this, you can sort of go with it.

0:26:46.560 --> 0:26:47.80  
Speaker 2  
OK.

0:26:47.90 --> 0:27:0.130  
Speaker 2  
But because that's something that, yeah, that that was what we ended up deciding on as well, that the MF is a good sort of common ground because then you can do it in different languages and you can find mappings between them.

0:27:0.140 --> 0:27:1.130  
Speaker 2  
And it's it's a nice way.

0:27:1.140 --> 0:27:2.110  
Speaker 2  
So I I think that's good.

0:27:21.310 --> 0:27:21.680  
Speaker 3  
And.

0:27:3.400 --> 0:27:23.770  
Speaker 2  
I think that this is nice and I in my case, since I'm coming more from the hardware system side, I think EMF sometimes it's not appreciated, but in this case I think it's it's fine because many of the tools that you might use have support for these kind of things, especially if you're looking to languages like system ML, UML.

0:27:23.780 --> 0:27:25.10  
Speaker 2  
You know then then definitely.

0:27:25.20 --> 0:27:30.540  
Speaker 2  
It's easy to make the integration to EMF, which is good, and so that was something I was curious about.

0:27:31.640 --> 0:27:34.510  
Speaker 2  
But what's your general timeline for this?

0:27:34.970 --> 0:27:46.160  
Speaker 2  
And you know, gathering requirements, you have this prototype, but are you are you gonna try and make some sort of snack and a bigger prototype and then do this again, was that sort of what you're expecting to do?

0:27:47.80 --> 0:27:47.710  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:27:48.280 --> 0:27:48.610  
Speaker 2  
Umm.

0:28:1.540 --> 0:28:1.750  
Speaker 2  
Mm-hmm.

0:27:47.720 --> 0:28:15.610  
Speaker 1  
So basically we are expecting to in the next weeks to work on on their functionalities that are ranked the with the higher priority according to the interviews and the other uh in beautiful activities that we did and basically in yeah maybe one month release or maybe less release a proof of concept tool.

0:28:15.800 --> 0:28:26.430  
Speaker 1  
So then our idea is that to have again a short meeting with you and other people and to show and to really show you how the tool work works in in practice.

0:28:26.780 --> 0:28:32.230  
Speaker 1  
So to get some more feedback on the validation, let's say, but also yeah.

0:28:32.240 --> 0:28:41.840  
Speaker 1  
In your case, if, then we won't do on the G and develop new research or collaborative research is pretty fine.

0:28:42.540 --> 0:28:42.870  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:28:42.880 --> 0:28:47.470  
Speaker 2  
I mean, to me it looks like I know that this is very relevant for my context.

0:28:47.480 --> 0:28:51.730  
Speaker 2  
And yeah, I don't know if you know I'm [redacted for double blind]

0:28:51.740 --> 0:28:54.410  
Speaker 2  
I'm working in that regard closely to architecture.

0:28:54.420 --> 0:28:56.930  
Speaker 2  
That's why I think this is also very interesting for me.

0:28:58.10 --> 0:29:4.840  
Speaker 2  
And, but that's very nice if you want to continue this later, you know next year or so, I'm sure we can find some common ground.

0:29:4.850 --> 0:29:10.690  
Speaker 2  
If you want to have more, maybe more structured feedback, or some use case or something that could be very interesting, I think.

0:29:11.450 --> 0:29:12.40  
Speaker 2  
And it's.

0:29:12.150 --> 0:29:14.390  
Speaker 2  
But yeah, in, in in general, I think this is very nice.

0:29:14.870 --> 0:29:15.190  
Speaker 2  
Umm.

0:29:15.440 --> 0:29:15.820  
Speaker 1  
Yep.

0:29:26.0 --> 0:29:26.200  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:29:16.460 --> 0:29:36.60  
Speaker 2  
But again, just as I think it's an important disclaimer that at least my architecture deal with this really systems and really systems of different sort of concerns because software architecture and I think that's also partly why some of these requirements are are are here and that's completely fine.

0:29:37.270 --> 0:29:46.80  
Speaker 2  
But for example, the tools I use are, you know, their database sort of oriented, so you don't want to have this real time thing because that would just be unnecessary.

0:29:46.90 --> 0:29:52.560  
Speaker 2  
Let's say yeah, it it's not good socially and and the same thing with the web based.

0:29:52.570 --> 0:29:53.60  
Speaker 2  
It's.

0:29:53.130 --> 0:29:55.330  
Speaker 2  
It just makes it very clunky, let's say.

0:29:57.750 --> 0:30:0.250  
Speaker 1  
Yep. Like.

0:29:58.40 --> 0:30:0.910  
Speaker 2  
But yeah, in overall I think it looks good.

0:30:0.920 --> 0:30:3.560  
Speaker 2  
Is there anything else you you need from me or?

0:30:4.130 --> 0:30:8.380  
Speaker 1  
No, for the moment I think it's, uh, it's fun like that.

0:30:8.390 --> 0:30:14.160  
Speaker 1  
I think we can stop the transcription somehow, so we don't.