Meeting Minutes - Mi, 06.02.2013, 15:00-16:00

Participants: Matthias Wiebel, Harald Bräuning, Udo Krause, Susanne Jülicher, Solveigh Matthies, Günther Fröhlich, Ludwig Hechler, Alexander Schwinn (Protokoll)

1. Logical Problem in FESA-Development-Guideline

Problem: In chapter 5.3 we enforced to have the same name for a setting value-item and the corresponding acquisition value-item. But if both are send via the same property, we will have a naming-conflict.

- Clarification: For this use-case the application-team is not interested in the set-value which was send to the fesa-class by the client, but in the set-value which realy was used by the hardware when the measurement was done. (These values can differ from each other!)
- After discussion, we agreed on the following concept:
  - The postfix of the value-item to describe the set-value which was used by the hardware during measurement will be "_set"
  - The existence of the additional value-item "myName_set" will be optional.
  - Usage example: Whenever a new setting-voltage "voltage" is received by the client, and the new value is written to the hardware, the value is as well written to an acquisition-field e.G. "voltage_set".
    The Property "Acquisition" which returns the measured voltage will than as well have a value-item "voltage_set", which refers to the field "voltage_set".
- Alex will change the Guidelines accordingly. On the next FE-Int meeting we will re-check if everybody is happy with the solution.

Alex, 06.02.13