

Project	OW2
Subject	QM-TC
Type of meeting	Face2face
Date	24/09/08
Attendees	

See <http://www.ow2.org/view/Events/OW2QuarterlyMeetingParisFrance> for the list of presentations

Architecture

Presentation by Jean-Bernard Stefani (see slides in the Meeting page)

4 levels:

- Component substrate (eg Fractal)
- Architectural framework (eg JORM)
- Distributed system services (eg Perseus)
- Platform and personalities (eg Speedo)

What happened:

- OW2 consortium expansion (members and projects)
- little update of component technology
- little reuse
- little crossfertilization

What to do:

1- nothing

-> community à la Apache (little interaction) : differentiation with Apache

-> just a Forge (no interest whatsoever)

2- revive part of an old vision

-> small scale, around existing interested projects

- need a rallying cry, technical impetus

Rallying cry = **Architecture-based programming.**

Technical impetus =

- small core of projects

around Fractal, Frascati, Jade/Jasmine, Petals and other Fractal-based projects

- to serve as a showcase

integration, extensibility and automated management

- and provide a new generation middleware core for OW2

We want to position OW2 as a technical innovator

Explicit software architecture

Selective, architected reflection

Basis for distribution and automated management -> beyond OSGi and IoC containers

Galaxy INRIA project (7 teams)

Consolidate and extend Fractal

Goal integrated SOA environment

Expected output :

gael.blondelle@ow2.org / alexandre.lefebvre@ow2.org

2008-09-24

1 of 2

- ADL for dynamic architectures incl workflows
- IDE/MDE support
- support for distributed deployment and configuration
- support for monitoring and supervision

Discussion

Legacy projects can continue and join the component movement

Fractal versus OSGi -> what should be OW2's position?

PYG compares the difference to that between trains and maglevs!

JBS insists that Fractal is not an obscure component model: Frascati is a good example.

There is little reuse in OW2 today. There are several cases of redundancy of technical functions.

JBS is trying to put in place a germ to show that we can do better than that.

Common view to build middleware.

What should the TC do : PUSH a technical vision !!!! (not just approve projects)

Build a showcase !!

Petr : some projects have overhead concerns for using other other frameworks.

3 questions

1. What is OW2 technical vision?
2. Is this vision OK to position us as innovators in the Gartner quadrant?
3. How do we make this vision realistic?

Visibility is a global OW2 question (even for JOnAS).

JBS asked whether the technology council do more than approve projects ? The answer is YES!!

We need to plan a half day to discuss this point.

Actions

- list all middleware functions available as Fractal components
- list all projects using Fractal
- list all known Fractal limitations which are not being solved currently
- build a showcase : show that we can build a middleware kernel that implements the vision