## == Attendees ==

Shane Coughlan
Mark Gisi
Imada San
Kate Stewart
Nathan Kumagai
Gary O'Neill
Stanley Bernstein
Endo San
Matsumoto San
Takimi San

## == Project Update ==

Shane outlined developments in the following areas:

- Activity in the China, Japan and Korea (CJK) region
- Engagement from consumer product and medical providers
- OpenChain Japan Work Group
- OpenChain @ Open Source Leadership Summit

## == Specification Work Team ==

Mark noted that we are close to a 1.2 version of the spec. Our meeting in March will be when we finalize the document. Our release is scheduled for April.

We proceeded to open the specification document to run through items. The first was page four, adding the FAQ link under "Additional clarification of the specification can be obtained by reviewing the Specification Frequently" to help keep it clear.

We proceeded to examine page 5, "Identified Licenses — a set of FOSS licenses identified as a result of following an appropriate method of identifying such licenses that govern the supplied software." This was a clarification to help frame things for our audience.

We proceeded to note that one page 6, Section 1.1 a word has been deleted for consistency:

"Verification Material Artifact(s):

- ? 1.1.1 A documented FOSS policy--exists--.
- 1.1.2 A documented procedure ——exists—— that makes all Software Staff aware of the existence of the FOSS policy (e.g., via training, internal wiki, or other

practical communication method)."

In 1.2 we clarified what precisely "current" meant and we moved it to uppercase to make it clear that there is a definition.

In 1.2.3 we adjusted the language quite significantly to improve clarity around the term "Current"

"The 85% may not necessarily apply to the entire organization, but to the totality of those specifically responsible for the design,

development and delivery of each Supplied Software release reviewed under an OpenChain conforming program. That is, all of the Software Staff participating in the conforming program represents 100%."

The rationale around Section 1.2 was also adjusted for clarity.

We proceeded to explore Section 1.3.1, removing the word "exists" and making it clear that there must be information to document obligations etc. We deleted the phrase "governing the Supplied Software" to more clearly frame the task.

Mark noted that the specification does not have any radical changes over version 1.1. The changes are all about making things clear.

We proceeded to review section 6. In 6.1 there is an alteration of "certified" to Certified. The challenge is whether an organization is conforming or a piece of software that has passed through an OpenChain Certified program.

Mark drew a connection between having Organic labeling for food. Gary raised a question about how and if we could have clarity for which products are conformant. Mark clarified that at this juncture there is a focus on a conformant PROCESS rather than a conformant PRODUCT. He further noted that we might have to address this, and continued that if products are released that are not conformant with the process it can be confusing and dilute the meaning of the mark.

Shane raised the concern that if we equated conformance with a whole entity rather than a program it would prove challenging for multinationals to conform.

Mark concurred and noted we are killing two birds with one stone, improving the clarity, and how it fits to a specific release.

= Any Other Business =

No further business was raised and the call closed.