

Here are the minutes from our call. You can always find our agendas and minutes online here:
<https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/openchain/minutes>

== Attendees ==

Kate Stewart
Alan Tse
Karen Copenhaver
Endo San
Gary O'Neill
Homa San
Takami San
Arita San
Mark Gisi
Dave Marr
Fukuchi San
Yamaoka San

(If I missed anyone please let me know)

== Project overview ==

Shane noted the following:

OpenChain Project has two talks the Open Source Summit Europe:

<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2017/10/05/openchain-project-announces-two-talks-at-open-source-summit-europe>

OpenChain Project has an Open Session on the 24th October:

<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2017/10/10/openchain-project-announces-open-session-at-open-source-summit-europe>

The OpenChain Specification is in Chinese:

<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2017/10/11/%e4%bd%a0%e5%a5%bd%ef%bc%81the-openchain-specification-is-in-chinese>

The OpenChain Project now has a quick-start package:

<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2017/10/12/openchain-project-releases-quick-start-package>

It was further noted that Endo San will talk at the DLA Piper Global Intellectual Property Symposium in Nagoya and Tokyo this week, and he will have a further talk co-presented with Shane at the Open Compliance Summit, Yokohama, during November.

== Specification ==

Mark presented an update on the OpenChain Specification survey feedback, noting that the formal deadline is October 30th, but preliminary findings are now available. He shared some information from the survey now to help frame responses so far and to encourage further contributions.

Mark noted we have seven respondents so far.

People generally feel the spec has the right number of requirements. Adoption is the most important, and there may be scope to expand later. Dave concurred with this approach.

Some people felt that G5 requirements were not necessary. Gary noted that he had the opposite feedback from one company. Mark noted that one option was to have a separate set of requirements for companies contributing out.

Gary discussed how companies need a policy to clarify if employee contributions belong to the corporate entity or the individuals. Mark noted that it can be framed as part of an open source maturity discussion. He further suggested that a potential break out of Section 5 of the Spec might allow this item to be discussed in detail. Dave concurred that it would be good for more people to talk about these issues.

Mark noted feedback that Section 3 is an area of the spec may be a little confusing. It was also noted some feedback suggested that artifacts may be confusing during initial read, but later it became clear.

Proceeding to feedback regarding internationalization, when it comes to languages it seems that the OpenChain Project's current coverage is good.

Arita San requested clarification on what Section 3.1 of the OpenChain Specification meant by "Bill of Materials". Mark noted that companies have freedom to decide what the Bill of Materials contains. He further noted that the OpenChain Spec was focused on the fact that the Bill of Materials exists. Dave added that he was glad to have this question raised to help bridge the concepts.

Arita San asked for clarification around article 1.2.3, the requirement that 85% of the software staff are current in their open source training, and wanted to clarify what precisely "software staff" are. Mark clarified that the intent is to mean the staff who touch software in the section of the company that is made conformant. He gave an example of Wind River, where the engineering group is conformant, and the professional services group is not.

Dave concurred with this assessment and further noted that the definition can be read to mean that every software developer in a given subsidiary that will be openchain conformant, every software product marketing person and every software product manager should have training. He further noted that every company has its own roles.

Endo San noted that there was some concern about engineers not involved in open source needing training in large companies such as Toyota. Mark noted that it is possible to only count a small group in the company conformant, so there is no need for all engineering or software staff to have such training. He noted that the key thing was that when a company delivers software that is claimed to be OpenChain conformant, all those who touch it are trained appropriately.

Alan noted that this understanding might be confusing as the current definitions do not make it explicit. Mark concurred that while we do clarify this point in the FAQ, it is probably not clear enough. Mark took a note that we need to work on this item. Alan suggested it was important to make sure we do clarify beyond the FAQ that Conformance can be for subsets of a company, and flagged that while he understands the spec fairly well, he had never realized it was program specific and not overall to the company. In addition, he flagged that the "OpenChain Conformance Logo" was not clear that it may only apply to a portion of a "conformant" company.

Mark returned to discussing the spec questionnaire and noted that the requirements contained in the Specification might be expanded to fit into a modular system, with contribution (Section 5) broken out into an optional component.

Mark then proceeded to review the online certification process. There was some feedback that more templates and flowcharts would be useful. Another respondent noted that it may be useful to have conformance graded (percentage of completed). A further respondent noted that it would be helpful to have independent third party auditors.

On the question of auditors Mark noted that right now we are trying to build traction around self-certification, but in the future it might be useful to implement. Karen concurred that the current approach is very useful, with an example being the feedback from companies like Toyota providing invaluable knowledge to improve the process. She further noted that the current approach allows companies to reflect on their embrace of open source.

Gary opened an issue to explore the idea of "graded" conformance for the future:
<https://github.com/OpenChain-Project/Online-Self-Certification-Web-App/issues/12>

Regarding adoption, some respondents noted that it was important to have a mix of company sizes in the community of conformance. Another respondent noted that in their view the flexibility of implementation was useful. Another respondent has the process underway, and noted that the spec was a good guide or target for their organization.

Mark then proceeded to address the question of what the project can do to support companies after conformance to the spec. One respondent noted that it would be valuable to make materials available in more formats beyond the PDF like HTML and Markdown. Another respondent wanted more templates and flowcharts to support the conformance process. Another suggested it might be useful to have tests or similar offered.

== Onboarding ==

Shane noted that Nathan was unable to join today due to illness. Shane covered the key news on his behalf. The primary news was the release of the new onboarding package. Version 1.0 is now available on the Quick Start section of the website.

Shane flagged that Nathan raised a suggestion as follows: "An idea for checklists [was raised] from Jim Hutchison. This could be the next project for the onboarding team if the group thought this sounded good. We could create a list of basic OpenChain elements and ask whether the reader's organization had put these into place. Or we could list common difficulties of using FOSS in supply chains that OpenChain helps address."

Gary said that common difficulties of using FOSS in supply chains that OpenChain helps address sounds most interesting out of the two options.

Dave suggested specific scenarios to catch where people tend to get hung up in the practice of implementation would be useful. Gary said training has been an issue for large organizations as delivery and status has been challenging to track.