Minutes

Meeting: PESC Technical Advisory Board Meeting

Time: Thursday, September 2, 2010, 3 PM EDT

Call-in Number: 1-866-352-3799 code: *7696363*

Agenda:

Topic	Lead	Actual Time
Action Item Review	Michael	5 min
Component Architecture	Michael	47 min
SIFA overview	All	Not covered
Meeting Summary	Michael	5 min

Minutes: Morris

Please review the SIF data model with the intent of determining how SIF differs from PESC on the data modeling approach:

http://specification.sifinfo.org/Implementation/2.4/DataModel.html#DataModel

Attendees:

Gideon Sanstra
Steve Margenau
Kumar Shunmuham
Paul Fawver
Jeff Funck
Tuan Ahn Do
Tim Cameron
Michael Morris

New Action Items:

None.

Decisions:

1. The team instructed Kumar to block the function in the R&R that allows a core component to have child sector components

Discussion of Component Architecture:

The meeting was spend on a discussion of how we could best have a component architecture that will provide for the creation of single file schemas containing only those elements and types needed for the schema:

1. The only problem that appears to keep us from doing this practically is that we reuse type names across top level schemas, sector libraries and core. When a complex type is extended, the same name is used as the extended type.
2. Jeff pointed out that our key decision is at what level do we standardize on complex types. Some highly abstract concepts differ greatly across applications.
3. Jeff also pointed out that users don't want to use qualified tag names. For example, a student could have very different content for different applications. For example, users do not want to qualify student (e.g., ERStudent)
4. One solution to this problem is to have a process by which certain elements are classified as standard and must use the base type although extensions would be allowed.
5. Jeff suggested that we could avoid the name problem by changing the extended types in the sector library to sector library identified type (e.g., ERStudentType, ARStudentType etc. The element names would not be changed only the complex type names. For example, the element Student would not be changed but would reference the appropriate type such as ARStudentType. In this way, name-space conflicts that occur in creating a single schema would be eliminated. This change only changes the internal linkages between elements and types and thus would be transparent to the instance documents.
6. Kumar indicated that the multiple components in the R&R could have the same component name because there is also a business name associated with the component. It is the business name that must be unique.