

Is it possible (useful) to evolve from a common tool baseline?

exchange formats are important (e.g., OMG)

example: ETI project (Dortmund, Germany) - not what anyone wants

common-language approach can lead to least common denominator

*try to develop an ontology to address semantic differences & retain memory of parts that differ
standardizing notation could stifle progress*

Alternative: people working on common approaches could try to integrate their approaches

but merging requires obtaining a common semantic domain

Researchers should at least think of the connections between their tools and other parts of the process

Should identify the elements of the current practice (e.g., Ford MoBIES report)

Would help to have a centralized glossary-translator of terminology, both technical terms and tool terms

New trends-buzzwords can be a smoke screen

A common point of view is impossible

Document an existing process and identify where tools & languages fit and what's needed to use them and what they generate

reference model

e.g., OSI 7-layer communication model

*should make it specifically for embedded systems
could be a lattice to capture multiple tracks in the process*

look at how group discussions map onto this process chain

makes it possible for researchers to identify people working on adjacent tasks

end-to-end reference model helps us identify the holes

is reference model prescriptive or descriptive?

do we need variants for the reference model?

important to get initial version

benchmark problems

e.g., benchmarks for EDA (hardware verification)

it takes a long time to document a real process

could demonstrate tools & results in context of a

"notional problem"

ultimate goal needs to go from natural language to

implementation

benchmark problems will be first step toward getting
metrics

industry needs to be involved

web site

a central repository for program results/contributions

place for reference model & benchmark problems

need support for design by refinement