Meeting Notes

Subject: USF Technical Working Group – Data Objects Review – Meeting 2
Date: 01.10.2003
Attendees:

Mark Bodger –	Siemens
Janet Ansell –	Siemens
Brendan Mason –	Tenet
Lawrence Jordan –	Amey-Datel
Stephen Corlett -	Thales
Brian Robinson -	Peek
Mandi Patel -	Independent Consultant
Ian Cornwell -	Mott MacDonald
Gary Umpleby -	Mott MacDonald

Action Items:

- **Data Objects Baseline**
  - See "Updated" original meeting notes

- **Data Objects Registry Management**
  - **Registry data types**
  - Number character and date – insufficient, needs additional description
  - IDL approach could be considered but do all suppliers use the same IDL ?
  - Common Database needs to remain relational for Version 2 Baseline (future OO may be considered)
  - Agreed = Registry data types should be those actually used in the Common Database IDL

  - **Registry Implementation**
  - The existing spreadsheet method of recording the data objects is not a valued approach
  - Other alternatives for consideration are:
  - (1) Glasgow BIAS Access Model -
    - Move from Exel to Access ?
    - MM have produced a prototype tool for managing data objects for the Glasgow BIAS Project – could this be shared as a common "industry tool" – would need some modification for general use – distribute for comment ? (see Post-Meeting Note below)
    -
  - (2) HA Registry -
    - Scope of the HA Registry is wider and the context is different but ....
    - Scope is centered on the TIH but it is hoped that it will be useful to others
    - Implemented using UML but with software tools to aid the import of other formats
    - UML and XMI files can be imported from different suppliers
    - XML scheme can be exported with additional information such as the registrar, registry status
    - There is a web-facing capability
    - Imports from Rational have been proven
    - MagicDraw has also been proven
  - (3) XML Schema –
    - Could be considered
  - Tools used by TWG representatives -
    - SQL Server
    - Rational Rose (UML)
    - XML + XML Spy (for Web Applications)
    - Sybase Power Designer
  - Lowest common denominator is the use of Access which is a step improvement on using Exel
  - XML Spy costs £300-£400 ... but would not handle Data Registry Management ?
  - XML would define the interface and link to the underlying data structures
  - Entity Relationship Diagram – a central view is needed but what do we use to generate it ? UML ? XML ?
  - How do we handle optional links to other objects ?
  - Who will manage the Registry – will they have the necessary skills ?
  - Will the Registry be managed by a single person with the knowledge of the data structures ?
  - Will the Registry be managed by a body – everyone throws in their requirements ?
  - S&S-SG could provide the secretariat function in terms of advising enquirers of latest versions
  - Would DfT fund a "party" to manage the Registry ?

- Once Version 2 achieved then the status-quo needs to be maintained to avoid the same situation of diverging implementations developing again
- The USF has achieved a level of co-operation to avoid conflict
- Therefore, suggestion is – Registry is held by the S&S-SG – format and tools to be used to be agreed by the USF
- S&S-SG pass down the data requirements
- USF jointly decide how to implement and update the Registry (members have to accept that the cost of this exercise is the cost of being in UTMC)
- This would require a new LA with new requirements to agree the changes with the UDG before going to tender
- IC to investigate of the possibility of issuing the MM Access Tool only if the existing Registry is held in this form or is easy to achieve
- Post Meeting Note:- The existing model is not sufficiently populated for distribution and would need some advanced effort to develop it sufficiently for general distribution and comment. However, this approach should still be considered a candidate for consideration post-Version 2 release.
- If not – will have to use Exel for December deadline .... But could consider building an Access approach as the Data Objects come back into the Controlled Registry after review ?

- **AOB – Session Management**

- Is there a need for a central management of user views and data transfer from the sub-systems to the common database ?
- Should a sub-system automatically populate the common database with new “items” ?
- What level of management and filtering should be adopted ?
- Should we be looking at a more “plug-and-play” approach ?
- Common Database control issues requests to sub-systems for the data it wants – the sub-system advises the common database of new items that then appear on the common database pick-list
- Research project needed to determine how this might be done ?