Minutes of the Architecture Committee

Place: WebEx
Date/Time: September 18, 2015 – 11:00-12:00 CEST
Minutes: Andreas Benzing, ICS AG

Participants: Stefan Beese   EPOS
                Andreas Benzing   ICS (Daimler) (chair)
                Stefan Ebeling   BMW
                Gerwin Mathwig   Daimler
                Christian Rechner Audi
                Stefan Wartini   MBBM

Guests: Sebastian Dirsch, Sanjay Hande, Sibylle Peter, Hans-Dirk Walter, Jan Wiegelmann

Participants are referred to by their initials, i.e. GM refers to Gerwin Mathwig.

1   Build System

The proposals for build systems are discussed. Two core questions about the build system are raised which have to be clarified:

- Which build system can be used for the intended purpose? (TODO: Gigatronik)
- Which alternatives can be used in the Eclipse build environment? (TODO: Canoo)

The decision is postponed until these questions are resolved.

2   Technology Proposals

2.1   General Structure

During the last SC meeting, the necessity of having guidelines for technology proposals became clear. The following topics are identified to be mandatory fora technology proposal:

- Priotity: The priority should be specified in the according Jira ticket to allow the AC to sort upcoming decisions.
- Lock-In/Long-Term Availability: The proposal should must a description of long-term availability of the technology including possible vendor lock-in scenarios and community changes.
- Operations: The impact on operations must be evaluated. The information gathered from the openMDM members should be taken into account, especially the enterprise environments.
- Driving Requiremens: The driving requirements for the proposal must be stated. If the requirements are related to the openMDM architecture, they must be illustrated using a corresponding diagram. For other requirements, an explicit description of the

relation to openMDM is required.
- Possible Alternatives: Suitable alternatives to the proposed technology must be named. An evaluation matrix of all alternatives must be provided. If no alternatives are available, the reasons for the lack of alternatives must be described, referencing previous decisions where applicable.

All related documents must be made openly available to allow the AC to come to an informed decision.

2.2 Proposal by Gigatronik

The first proposal by Gigatronik is discussed and acknowledged as a first draft. The AC agrees that the proposal should be extended according to the previously identified guidelines and then be discussed in the next meeting.

3 Project Structure

Currently, the openMDM landscape is distributed across the two projects MDM@WEB and MDM|BL. Even after the renaming of MDM@WEB to MDM|COMPONENTS to clarify the project scope, this structure raises the question where services of the openMDM architecture should be hosted. In the SC meeting, a third project was proposed to hold such generic artifacts since they are more likely to be reused as they will not contain domain specific functionality. The AC is open to further suggestions and the structure will be discussed in the next conference call.

4 Next meeting

The next AC conference call will be on October 9, 2015, 11:00 CEST.