Hackathon 24. and 25 Feb. 2016 Gaimersheim

Feedback

Author: Mathwig

Please send one Page per Company with author until 2. March

Company: Daimler AG

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	thank‘s for the great interesst of the meeting and the engagement from BMW Stefan Ebeling, he gave a strong direction for our July milestone	Gerwin.Mathwig @daimler.com
what was good?	hosting	Gerwin.Mathwig @daimler.com
what was bad?	nothing	Gerwin.Mathwig @daimler.com
my recommendation	Reflection of the Hackathon in the projectmeeting, March, 17. in Stuttgart	Gerwin.Mathwig @daimler.com
risks for the future I see		

Company: Gigatronik Ingolstadt GmbH

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	I think the event was very useful for our company Gigatronik. The discussed BMW architecture proposal helps us to develope the MDMWeb Client. Further we got a positive feedback for our MDM5API definitions from the MDM developer participants	sebastian.dirsch @gigatronik.com
what was good?	Technical discussions with MDM developers. BMW proposal with technical focus on WebClient requirements. Idea of Canoo mdm component template	sebastian.dirsch @gigatronik.com
what was bad?	Nothing	sebastian.dirsch @gigatronik.com
my recommendation	More such technical events and meetings in the future	sebastian.dirsch @gigatronik.com
risks for the future I see	The proposed architecture is useful for the first WebClient implementation and the first MDM components. For the future we have to implement other data transfer and communication channels because it is not useful to transfer mass data via REST calls.	sebastian.dirsch @gigatronik.com

Company: AUDI AG

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	Good opportunity to see the API and the architecture requirements, but worries if the realization of the client can suffice further functional requirements	Franz.woehrl@audi.de
what was good?	Hosting, opportunity to use the api, discussion between developers on how the AC requirements can be realized	Franz.woehrl@audi.de
what was bad?	Unsifficient amount of time to realize a small real use case.	Franz.woehrl@audi.de
my recommendation	Give more input opportunities to developers	Franz.woehrl@audi.de
risks for the future I see	The power of MDM4 is its component structure, implemented on service oriented platform. I wonder how this can be managed on a Webserver. Using an ApplicaitonServer does make sense in my opinion (dependency on implementations, EJB & JPA technologies hardly useful here)	Franz.woehrl@audi.de

Company: HighQSoft GmbH

Questions	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	Thank you Sebastian for organization and Gigatronik for launching and support. There were too many discussions on organisation of group and architecture of openMDM, less hacking action.	andreas.hofmann@highqsoft.de
what was good?	Getting feedback about the tooling that is defined and the software that is already booked in GIT hub, even if we were not able to use it in time. Thank you Andres and Franz-Josef for introduction, discussion, teaching and support.	andreas.hofmann@highqsoft.de
what was bad?	Too much discussions on high level requirements at a hackathon.	andreas.hofmann@highqsoft.de
my recommendation	The architecture proposed by Canoo makes a good overall impression for utilization in openMDM. It seems that it is sacrificed by an approach that follows only one top level requirement. We're not sure the understanding of Canoo's proposal was understood well enough by all stake holders.	andreas.hofmann@highqsoft.de
risks for the future I see	Canoo's architecture is the result of our requirement collection. The base of the collections is the knowledge we got about unresolvable problems and issues of the openMDM 4 architecture. Leaving that overall path is a risk. Following the argument „we can implement things later / afterwards" will result into an openMDM 4 scenario. It is really difficult to change the architecture afterwards and when we already have multiple components and companies utilizing the previous one. The architecture definition must be flexible and must cover the most complicated situation. Canoo's proposal covered that as well as fulfilling top level requirements derived from other specific artifacts, e.g. the REST interface presented by BMW.	andreas.hofmann@highqsoft.de

Company: NorCom Information Technology

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	Canoo client introduction, BMW Deployment & Coding guidance, lazybones usage example from Franz-Josef	omy@norcom.de
what was good?	Hosting, Java 8 code	omy@norcom.de
what was bad?	The community was not informed about the architecture committee decision to go with BMW architecture.	omy@norcom.de
my recommendation	For the new developers, would be great if the authors of the new API/client/module would prepare a small tutorial what classes to use, or alternatively make some examples together with the auditory.	omy@norcom.de
risks for the future I see	The Blue print of BMW can lead to a grave limitation of the new technology usage in the project.	omy@norcom.de

Company: BMW AG

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	It was important to define a clear direction and guideline for the whole community.	ulrich.bleicher@bmw.de
what was good?	Hosting, Infrastructure. Participants with profound Know-How. Consistent understanding for the further proceeding with WebClient 5.0.	
what was bad?	Some participants didn‘t know the state of decisions of the committees (e.g. no OSGI, BMW Architecture, etc.). Implementation of an example component (goal of hackathon) was not really reached.	
my recommendation	Repeat of a Hackathon desired.	
risks for the future I see		

Company: Peak Solution GmbH

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	Provided information about current Architecture RoadMap of openMDM 5, which was not otherwise communicated (publicly). Provided good insight to new promising API structure.	Markus Renner (m.renner@peak-solution.de) Marc Günnel (m.guennel@peak-solution.de)
what was good?	- The event hosting - The impression of the new API	Markus Renner (m.renner@peak-solution.de) Marc Günnel (m.guennel@peak-solution.de)
what was bad?	The impression one got from Canoo‘s client project. Canoo obviously was quite surprised by BMW‘s discardment of its client. The project communication seems to be quite sub-optimal in this project, which gives us as service provider not a very good feeling about these projects.	Markus Renner (m.renner@peak-solution.de) Marc Günnel (m.guennel@peak-solution.de)
my recommendation	It would be to reconsider OSGi, but the decision has obviously been made already.	Markus Renner (m.renner@peak-solution.de) Marc Günnel (m.guennel@peak-solution.de)
risks for the future I see	- Discarding OSGi may lead to same problems that made openMDM4 quite difficult to maintain (workarounds, custom implementations of functionalities where an available functionality was simply ignored) - With BMW‘s architecture it is possible that a serious error causes the system	Markus Renner (m.renner@peak-solution.de) Marc Günnel

Company: science + computing ag

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	Interesting to see how Gigatronik and Canoo proceeded with their work.	a.nehmer@science-computing.de
what was good?	Idea of coding together and share first impressions	a.nehmer@science-computing.de
what was bad?	* Lack of information on the developers side concerning the architecture proposed by BMW (non-usage of OSGi etc.) * Impression that the last years efforts to find a suitable architecture for the openMDM5 requirements as well as the requirements themselves were not adequately considered	a.nehmer@science-computing.de
my recommendation	Find an architectural solution that does not leave the impression to just be one companies standard (web)application development approach and is not solely driven by a current project and it‘s current specific needs. That was one of the base ideas for designing openMDM5.	a.nehmer@science-computing.de
risks for the future I see	Is everybody willing to set up openMDM5 as a project where all OEMs have their requirements fulfilled and have a future oriented, easily extendable system as openMDM5 was meant to be a model kit.	a.nehmer@science-computing.de

Company: Canoo Engineering AG

Questions to the Hackathon	Feedback	Author email
Summary of the event	Minor effect for the two-day effort	Franz-Josef.Basler@canoo.com
what was good?	Thanks again to Gigatronik GmbH for hosting the event; Constructive criticism and proposals for the OpenMDM API were provided Opportunity had been given to the dedicated users of the OpenMDM API (=developers) to dig into the code and ask questions, certainly leading to a better understanding	Franz-Josef.Basler@canoo.com
what was bad?	The presentation of the OpenMDM architecture should have been done before the presentation of the BMW approach as it bases on the first one. Not enough time for coding	Franz-Josef.Basler@canoo.com
my recommendation	Plan more time for acutal coding	Franz-Josef.Basler@canoo.com
risks for the future I see	Following the BMW approach will help to get a presentable result in July but will lead to monolithic appliactions which will be hardly shareable among the community	Franz-Josef.Basler@canoo.com