



IEEE Draft Discussion

Dr. Judith Dahmann, DMSO

12 August 1998

Background and Purpose

- **Background**
 - At AMG25, the AMG reviewed issues raised with Draft1 of the IEEE draft HLA standard (1516) and SDG recommendations
 - AMG supported the recommended SDG actions
 - TSTCore and Specification POCs reviewed Draft2 released by the SDG in late July, in terms of
 - the acceptability of draft changes to DoD needs
 - outstanding issues and their potential impact on DoD users
- **Purpose**
 - Review results of the Draft2 review
 - Review outstanding issues and proposed actions

IEEE Draft 1516 Draft 2

- **IEEE SISO SDGs meet in July to review comments on Draft1 and as a result Draft2 was released**
- **Draft 2 reflects the SDG recommendations presented at AMG15 in June**
- **Recommend that the AMG endorse this draft**
- **No plans to update the specification at this time**
 - **This is an interim draft; process is continuing**
 - **DoD will stay with version 1.3 final 1516 is adopted and endorsed by DoD**
 - **AMG endorsement of Draft2 is an official sign that cooperative efforts are moving forward toward common standards to support both industry and DoD**

Outstanding Issues

- **With the issuance of Draft2, there were a set of issues still to be addressed**
- **TSTCore and Spec Reps met to review these issues**
- **Review process included discussions with the users who expressed needs for certain capabilities and queries of representations who might be affected by the changes**
- **Issues**
 - **User supplied time**
 - **Unique object instance handles**
 - **Multiple routing spaces**
 - **Federate failure notification**
 - **OMT tables and data typing**
- **Each issue is discussed in terms of the user need, background on AMG experience with the issues, and recommended actions**

User Supplied Time

- **Issue**
 - **Certain realtime users (RPR-FOM group and others) have the need to send 'user defined time' with all attributeupdates and interaction**
 - **This 'user defined time' is to be used by the recipient in the process of the update or interaction**
 - **This user defined tag is substantively different from the current time management services where time values are processed by the RTI to support event synchronization**

User Supplied Time (Continued)

- **AMG/HLA Experience/Assessment**
 - This need is unrelated to the current time management services which support event synchronization; these users was recieve order delivery of attributes and updates
 - The existing user supplied tag provides the desired atomic attribute association but limits the associated data representation to a string.
- **Recommendation**
 - Employ the user supplied tag service argument mechanism.
 - Enhance the definition of the user supplied tag to permit arbitrary values.
 - Add a new OMT table to document the use of the user supplied tag mechanism.
- **Action**
 - Submit comment to the IEEE SDG

Unique Object Instance Handles

- **Issue**
 - Prior to Spec 1.2 the RTI was required to generate federation execution-wide unique object instance handles.
 - In Spec 1.3 the object instance handles were only required to be unique to a given Federate and object instance names were introduced.
 - Users feel that names are cumbersome and resource consumptive for use across the federation at execution time.
- **AMG/HLA Experience/Assessment**
 - DMSO canvassed current RTI developers and found no perceived implementation issues with a reversion to federation-wide unique object handles.
- **Recommendation**
 - Go back to federation execution-wide unique handles
- **Action**
 - Have Randall submit comment to IEEE SDG

Multiple Routing Spaces

- **Issue**
 - RPR-FOM group has asked that a given class attribute/interaction class be allowed to have multiple routing spaces assigned to it.
- **AMG/HLA Experience/Assessment**
 - DDM assessment during review of STOW experience suggested that the current routing space flexibility supported the range of anticipated uses and can be implemented efficiently
- **Recommendation**
 - No change to Spec at this time
- **Action**
 - Investigate with actual users (Perceptronics and LADS) the extent to which there may be real limits in the current specification and possible options for addressing these
 - Assess how applications are supported with current, thorough experimentation

Federation Execution Failure Model

- **Issue**
 - Execution managers have difficulties determining the status of participating federates in the presence of certain failures
 - Internally the RTI is aware of failures on the part of participating federates and it is desirable for this information to be made available to federates
- **Recommendation**
 - Add federate status information to the MOM
 - Perform additional research on a standard Federation Execution Failure Model (what does 'failure' mean under different RTI development strategies)
- **Action**
 - Submit comment to IEEE SDG

OMT Tables

- **Issue**
 - Users suggested that the data type mechanism in the OMT is limited and there needs to be a new way to capture the representation of certain types.
- **AMG/HLA Experience/Assessment**
 - Cadre, RPR-FOM, and IEEE SDG comments have all pointed to these issues.
- **Recommendation**
 - Make Annex B a table and add new type construction functions (fixed and variant records, arrays, and simple type definitions) to the OMT.
 - Investigate the impact of these new and changed tables on the OMT DIF.
- **Action**
 - Submit to IEEE SDG
 - Review DIF formats and investigate use of applicable existing industry standards.