

Summary of ETSI MTS Open Session on new TTCN-3 major release

Date/Location: 09 September 2024, 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. (before MTS#93)

Location: Institute of Computer Science, Göttingen, Germany

Participants (Information taken from Screenshots):

- Ali Shirvani (Unverified)
- Axel Rennoch (Guest) AR
- Carlos (Unverified)
- Emmanuel Gaudin (External)
- Garcia Martin Juan... (External)
- Gusztav Adamis (Guest) GA
- Jens Grabowski (Guest) JG
- Lauer Thilo (External)
- Martin Hauch (Unverified)
- Mozart Teams Room (35 pax)
- Olivier Genoud OG
- Philip Makedonski (Guest)
- Sebastian Müller
- Thomas Wacker (Unverified)
- Tomas Urban (Guest)
- Virginie Bardaux ... (Unverified)
- Wiegert Corinna (1... (External)
- Wolfgang (MCC1... (Unverified) WS
- Xi (Unverified)
- Zhaobing (HUAW... (Unverified)

In person: Gusztav, Jens, Matthias, Philip, Harald

Agenda

- Presentation (AR): Overview and survey results
- Detailed results presentation(JG): Part 1, Parts 5-11, TTCN-3 extensions
 - Part4 shall be put into historical (no CR since years)
 - Import – basically only import all is used. (Candidate for simplification)
 - Procedure-based communication - rarely used, some old test suites (Devoteam) some internal projects and users. (Procedure-based communication may be moved to extension)
 - Goto/Label: Tool providers and users are questioned about the use of the constructs
 - Interleave construct: TF 160 uses it in some cases in a simple way
 - Attributes: rarely variants (encoding) not really used, but TF 160 may have some usage

- IDL mapping to be shifted to historic status
- Part 10 – no change in the past several years; but supported by some tools. May become a language extension
- TRI/TCI require special discussions. TRI/TCI is only supported by a few tools. There exist 2 TRI/TCI versions, either combine the 2 versions or move one version into a historic state.
- OOP extension: rethinking needed; probably exception handling is needed in some way; probably simplified version should be supported in Core.
- Call test component – is it needed?
- General discussion
 - Devoteam: In migration guide, a clear mapping from old standards to new structure is needed. Also statements about backward compatibility issues, e.g. keywords, namespaces, etc, are required.
 - OG: Currently no extensions to be moved to the core?
 - JG: still under evaluation, currently it is the case, not excluded
 - OG: access to results of questionnaire for future discussions needed
 - JG: if the participants agree, a anonymized version will be made accessible.
 - JG: extensions may be merged to one extension document with different options that can be implemented
 - GA emphasizes that if features are moved out, they are not deprecated, just compatibility and compliance are changing at first, so in practice little changes for tool vendors and developers, it is more a matter of reorganization
 - Ericsson filled-in the 'used' column in questionnaire; Elvior made notes at several points that it is implemented but not used
- Next steps
- JG: any problems with starting the follow-up TTF 3-4 months later?
 - OG: not necessarily, important that tools are ready
 - Devoteam: no problem
- WS: how to influence the process - a list of issues has been collected at TF160 that can be improved / simplified
 - JG will distributed the list to TTF T040.
- Slides will be distributed