Conformiq Comments on TDL v0.0.2

General: The language seems quite massive. The current only example of a language based on this meta model only uses a fraction of the current definitions. Also I think short examples would really help the understanding of definitions.

Section 4 “cyber physical systems”: I advise o use an actual listing of actual industrial application domains. I have never heard this term before reading this document.

Section 4 first paragraph: For me a key motivation missing is “the trend that industry is moving to higher levels of abstraction in test specification since years”

Paragraph under Figure 0 is missing references

Section 6 “A test configuration is mandatory”: As you may know I am not a fan of this. Actually I look at the 3GPP syntax which supposedly conforms to this document and it does not mention test configuration either (it is implicit). I suggest (or insist) that at minimum a NOTE that clarifies that it is a tool implementation issues as to how the specification of test configuration information is realized. Information on test configuration can also be gathered from test descriptions and does not have to be formally specified separately.

Section 8: For me this section need reordering. When I started reading I expected definition of action and interactions (that is the only concepts the introduction uses) and they come 20 pages later … as the last definitions. So for understanding I believe this document would really profit greatly from moving the sections describing “Atomic Behavior” (and whatever below) to \_before\_ 8.2.2 Behavior

8.2.4 “CombinedBehavior”: The term “Combined” is for me confusing reading this first time. I would suggest to use “BlockBehavior” (what this seems to be at the end all about)

8.2.7: Do we really mean \_parallel\_ behavior? Or unordered interactions? Can this be clarified in a note?

8.2.8: What means here “no action will be taken if no guard evaluates to true”? None out of the block? So execution continues with next block or atomic condition? Then it should be phrased this way. Also what happens to time when you “take no action”?

8.2.11 “Integer”: Why integer? why not positive number? what is the precision you expect otherwise? Isn’t this a bit much detail.

8.2.13 “Optional behavior”: What is the relevance of this in the light os “alternative behavior already existing”? The text is nearly identical. Again “otherwise no action will be taken”.  
“First event allowed” In general the term “event” is used in definitions while never been properly introduced (in context of action/interaction). I suggest it is introduced in the introduction.

8.2.15 “Default”: Do not understand this. Default in sense of case switch or in sense of TTCN-3?

8.2.14 “Exceptional”: For me in general the line between event vs exceptional behavior is a bit unclear.

8.2.16 “Interrupt”: For me an interrupt is an event triggered by an external event/interaction. This definition makes little sense here.

8.2.19 “Atomic Behavior”: Move this and followings sections to 8.2.2.

8.2.20 “Interaction”: For me a constraint missing that it is not legal to specify interactions A->B<-C at same time.

9.2 Timers: welcome back to TTCN-3? For me in respect to other part of the standard way too detailed.

9.2.1 Dimension: Suggest to either remove this definition or make it less specific. This is a tooling issue. Fix it here to seconds in meta model.

9.2.6 Time constraint: do not understand how this will work. Example is needed.

9.2.11 Timeout: Why is this again not an event?

10. Miscellaneous: Test objective -> test purpose.