Minutes of Virtual Rapporteur Meeting for
MBT ES “Concepts for Modelling”

# Date & time

Tue 18.1.2011 3pm-5pm CET

# Participants

Stephan Schulz / Conformiq (Rapporteur), Wolfgang Grieskamp / Microsoft, Michael Mlynarski / Software Quality Lab/Cap Gemini, Cesar Viho / IRISA

# Summary

Reviews were received from Telecom Italia (on 0.4.1), Microsoft, FOKUS, and Software Quality Lab plus comments from Siemens. FOKUS and SQL reviews were most detailed and were reviewed in the meeting. Others were evaluated were noted but not discussed since they contained mainly editorial and minor change proposals.

Two reviewers requested the scope to be broadened beyond functional testing. In the last iteration the multiple reviewers mentioned the scope is unclear/too broad and should more clearly identify that this standard is about functional testing. The group rejected the extension proposal as it feels that yes man or even all concepts may be useful also for other types of testing, e.g., security or performance, but it is also likely to missing also additional required concepts for these types of testing.

It was confirmed that some aspects will deliberately not to be handled in this first version of the standard but could be handled in a second version:

1. Extension of scope to also include other types of testing such as structural, security, performance testing.
2. Deeper overall integration of workflow based model specification. The current standard emphasizes at this point more state based approaches
3. Further requirements for annotating models with informal requirements. Such annotation has a strong relation with test generation which is a topic that is at this stage planned to be addressed in a separate standard. In other words the group expects that such a standard will have anyway impact on this standard.
4. A nice to have would be a class diagram reflecting/summarizing the relation of all concepts specified in the standard as part of the annex. In principle this sounds easy to do. In practice there were concerns shared by the group that the development of such a section (especially its accompanying text) may open up again the discussion about adding more lower level details for required behavioral semantics in this standard (for which we just have reached consensus in the last meeting not to do this). Nevertheless it remains a good idea for a future version.