

Objectivity Case History

Customer Information

Customer: Cray Research (now part of SGI) Chippewa Falls, WI
Industry: Computer Hardware (Supercomputers)
Application Domain: Design Repository (They have created a standard set of tools for easily reusing existing designs in future products.)
Status: Customer – Reference (able)
Platform: Sun/OS, Solaris, now moving to SGI.
Compiler: Sun, SGI.
Other Tools: RogueWave Tools.h

Buying Criteria

C++ compatibility, reliability and speed.

Why Objectivity

Liked the browser and met the criteria of C++ compatibility, reliability and speed.

Contact Information

Objectivity Rep: Unassigned??
Customer Contact: Joel Garcia
Phone: 715-726-6457
Email:

Additional Information

Project Name:

HOODS (Hierarchical Object Oriented Database System)

Project Purpose:

Create a standard set of tools for easily reusing existing designs in future products.

When did the idea for the project first come about?

3 years ago - Mid 1994.

When did they first think they needed an ODBMS?

They suspected this from the beginning (3 years ago - Middle of 1994).

How was the ODBMS originally to be used in the project?

To store component parts (such as printed circuit board) and related connection information.

Where did they first hear about Objectivity?

Joe Gorman (who has now left the company) read about Objectivity in a DBMS oriented periodical.

When did they first hear about Objectivity?

Early to mid 1994.

When did they first Contact Objectivity?

Middle of 1994.

What DBMS' were they looking at initially?

ODI, Oracle and Ingress.

When did they start the evaluation?

September 1994.

How long was the evaluation supposed to last?

90 days

What problems were encountered in the evaluation (from our standpoint and/or theirs)?

They were not familiar with C++ and had to work through that learning curve.

They felt they took the training class too early and would have gotten more out of training if they had experimented on their own with the database and developed questions beforehand.

What other DBMS' did they evaluate?

ODI, Oracle and Ingress.

How long did the evaluation actually last?

Six Months.

When did they pick Objectivity?

January 1995.

Who made the decision to pick Objectivity?

Majority vote of 8 people.

Was the selection close, unanimous or other?

Six for Objectivity. Two for Ingress.

Why did they pick us?

Liked the browser and met the criteria of C++ compatibility, reusability and speed.

What did they like about the competition?

They had a lot more Tools.

Number of Developers purchased initially:

7

Number of Run Times purchased initially:

16

When did they start development on this project?

August 1995.

How is Objectivity actually being used in their project and how does this differ from #5 above (their original expected use)?

Same as they expected.

Features used:

Indexes - no

Maps - yes

Named Objects - no

Associations - yes

Iterators - yes

Versioning - not yet - will in future enhancements

SQL - not yet - might in future enhancements

ODBC - no

FTO - Considering especially if they implement at SGI California over a Wide Area Network.

DRO - Considering - same as above.

Schema Evolution - Considering

Other - Browser (they love it)

Features they considered using but aren't - why?

Versioning and SQL (FTO and DRO if SGI buys in). They are waiting for subsequent upgrades to their product.

How are they using Containers?

One per PCB in the component DB. One per project in product DB.

Biggest problems encountered since development started?

Lack of knowledge internally (C++, OO Design, Data Base).

How far along in the project are they now?

They have loaded several project designs into the "Data Base". They are rolling out the initial release which includes some scheduling, Allegro netlist generation and some rule checking. Documentation has been started.

When do they plan to deploy (alpha, beta etc.)?

Although they are deploying now, this will be a iterative process. They still need to add Full Scheduling, better Allegro Netlist support, more rules and their own browser.

Things like most about Objectivity:

Support and the Tool Manager.

Things they like least about Objectivity:

They want more tools.

Things about Objectivity that didn't live up to their expectations?

None.

Enhancements they would like to see:

None.

Would they buy again?

Yes.

Would anyone at site be a reference?

Yes. Joel Garcia.

What is the future revenue potential?

Run Times. Not that many in Chippawa Falls, maybe 10-30.
Possibly more if used on plant floor.
Significant additional potential if used by SGI - to whom they are demonstrating HOODS.