



Comments to Method Fragment Definition

Based on Comments of Brian Henderson-Sellers

31st FIPA Meeting, Barcelona, 18 March 2004

Objectives



- ❑ To go through the comments and to decide about their relevance



- ❑ 1. and 2. seem to confuse levels M1 and M2. If these nine are all components of a development process, they MUST be at the same Mx level.
 - 1. (a portion of process) is defined at M1 level (Process Model) and 2. (deliverables) expressed as SPEM WorkProducts are defined also at the M1 level.
- ❑ 6. I don't believe that a glossary is a fragment. In fact, it says it is used IN a fragment i.e. it is NOT a fragment itself. If we are going to create standard definitions, we have to be VERY careful. All these nine elements in the list must be the same kind of thing.
 - Glossary is necessary to explain concepts used in fragment. A fragment can define its own terms or can refer terms defined in a common methodology glossary. What is meant by “the same kind of thing”?



- ❑ 9. Similarly, Dependency relationships are said to be useful in assembling fragments. Sure, but that makes them NOT fragments, nor even a part of a fragment.
 - **Good point!** Dependencies should be extracted from the fragment specification and should be moved to the method base specification. A fragment should not “know” about other fragments. It’s a responsibility of the method base structure.
 - It was not said that dependencies are fragments.
- ❑ Section 3.1.1: Figure 4: Stereotypes reflect concepts at the M2 level. I do not believe that concept as applied here as a stereotype to ImData falls into this category/definition. Stereotypes are MUCH misused in the UML. We must NOT promulgate this misuse.
 - What is meant by “reflect concepts”? What category/definition? What’s the point of this finding?

- ❑ Section 3.4: The relationships in the heavy black oval were black diamond in previous figures. Note, by the way, that our research has shown the black and white diamonds of UML to be meaningless and must be defined locally i.e. in this document there must be a definition of this notation since UML doesn't provide one. ... In this context I would argue against the use of black diamond for Agent to Role. (But of course it depends upon how you define black diamond!)
- Good point! Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 should use the same aggregation kinds for Ontology metaclass.

→ UML 2.0 Superstructure:

- **aggregation** = a special form of association that specifies a whole-part relationship between the aggregate (whole) and a component part. Precise semantics of shared aggregation varies by application area and modeler. The order and way in which part instances are created is not defined.
- **composition** = a form of aggregation which requires that a part instance be included in at most one composite at a time, and that the composite object is responsible for the creation and destruction of the parts. Composition may be recursive.

→ Using of association types is matter of the metamodel definition. The whole PASSI MAS metamodel should be revised. But it is a job for method engineers. Maybe another example for method fragment should be used...

❑ Also why copyright 2000 and not 2004?

→ It will be changed to 2004 (?)