

== Attendees ==

Imada San  
Dave Marr  
Fukuchi San  
Mark Gisi  
Endo San  
Matsumoto San  
Takemi San  
David Rudin

== Project Update ==

Shane outlined key news items for the project:

Events in China

<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/05/17/openchain-asian-legal-network-beijing>  
<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/05/16/announcing-the-openchain-workshop-linuxcon-china>

Events in Japan

<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/04/30/save-the-date-fourth-meeting-of-the-openchain-japan-work-group>

Release of kanban guides, checklists and tooling overviews

<https://www.openchainproject.org/uncategorized/2018/05/16/openchain-releases-compliance-process-kanban-guides>  
<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/05/11/meet-the-openchain-conformance-and-compliance-checklist>  
<https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/05/15/openchain-project-announces-tooling-overview-slides>

== Spec Update ==

Mark noted this is a good time for larger recommendations or changes.

He outlined the agenda for today:

"Review Spec Guiding Principles

<https://lists.linuxfoundation.org/pipermail/openchain-specification/2018-May/000145.html>

Review Spec Development/Release Process

<https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/openchain/openchain-specification-wiki-page#specification-developmentrelease-process>

Begin Discussion of the Issues from the Japan Workshop"

Mark outlined the four guiding principles for the project:

I) Build trust around the use of open source in constructing software solutions that are shared with others (with a focus on license compliance).

II) Less is More

\* Avoid boiling the ocean - Focus specifically on providing the necessary and sufficient requirements of a "quality" compliance program

\* Focus on meaningful pain points based on actual practice use cases

III) Focus of the what and why (avoid the how and when)

- \* Embrace the implementation of different practices to solve a given requirement
- \* Avoid providing specific legal advice or specific best practices

IV) Function as an open development initiative - open to all to contribute - inclusion via discussion and consensus that adhere to these guiding principles. Consider adopting best practices from standard initiatives which complement the open development approach.

There are two changes proposed:

In (I) we are considering adding that the spec is focused primarily on open source component license compliance (and not other considerations such as security, export, ...).

In (IV) we are considering also adopting practices from standard initiatives that complement the open development model.

Shane concurred with (IV). Dave noted that this means we can learn from and maintain the flexibility to make choices around standardization. Mark noted that one of our greatest strengths has been to take an open source approach and the importance of preserving that. Dave noted the value in being able to articulate what we have done and are currently doing.

Mark opened a discussion on the Development/Release Process. He noted that David Rudin had asked about what the process is and whether it would be useful to formally document it moving forward, particularly around final review of a draft specification.

Mark created an example workflow. For a given version of the specification the development process steps include:

- Hold a kickoff meeting and revisit the <https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/openchain/specification-questions-and-answers#what-are-the-specification-guiding-principles> | Specification Guiding Principles}.
- We accept and discuss feedback from anyone who wants to participate either at the working group meetings or on the <https://lists.linuxfoundation.org/mailman/listinfo/openchain-specification> | spec mailing list}.
- Currently an annual release cadence is followed (which may change for a given release). Any cadence changes will be announced on the <https://lists.linuxfoundation.org/mailman/listinfo/openchain-specification> | spec mailing list}.
- Suggestions are tracked in the specification's <https://github.com/OpenChain-Project/Specification/issues> | github issue tracking list}.
- A draft of the accepted modifications and additions are published monthly in an [openchainspec-1.3.draft.pdf](#) updated draft document}.
- Public Comments Period - Six weeks prior to the target release date we circulate a near final version seeking public comments for 30 days. During this period we accept only minor updates such as typos, grammar corrections and wordsmith recommendations that do not change the semantics of the content. We do not accept any material changes during this period. All other feedback and recommendations are queue for consideration during the next version release cycle.
- Freeze Period - Two weeks prior to release we freeze the draft and allow one last review for 14 days. This is to enable everyone to review any changes made during the Public Comments period.
- If the majority expressed concerns over any changes made during the Public Comments period we would i) make changes to accommodate those concerns followed by ii) an additional 14 day Public Comments period; followed by iii) another 14 day Freeze period. Anyone with significant reservations on the final draft should state their position/concerns via the spec mailing list. The changes will be accepted once we achieve majority acceptance for the final draft.
- In the event we do not have majority acceptance on the final version - we would repeat the following cycle until we have a majority acceptance: i) accommodate changes to address the majority concerns; ii) 14 day Public Comments period; followed by iii) a 14 day Freeze period cycle.

- In the event we do not have majority acceptance on the final version - we would repeat the following cycle until we have a majority acceptance: i) accommodate changes to address the majority concerns; ii) 14 day Public Comments period; followed by iii) a 14 day Freeze period cycle.

Mark noted the freeze period was explicitly designed to address David's concern. Dave (Marr) noted that this step appeared to accomplish the goal effectively.

David joined the call. Mark and Share recapped the discussion. Mark noted that the material displayed now was our first attempt to document the current and proposed future steps for completing the specification drafting process.

David noted that one of the useful things would be to learn from the ANCI standard process. He noted that the key things are to have a period for comment and to receive and acknowledge those comments.

David noted that rather than a majority to seek a consensus-based approach. He noted this is fuzzy by design. Mark concurred and noted that we update the wording of "majority" to consensus in the current wording of the process.

Dave noted that perhaps we should give an opportunity for people not on the call to comment, so perhaps we should flag this as a recommendation rather than a decision-made. Mark concurred and noted that capturing the history was important, and the current Spec list served this purpose.

Shane noted that we had received comments from the 3rd OpenChain Japan Work Group meeting regarding the OpenChain Specification Version 1.2.

These are random comments at the meeting, not by consensus of the participants.

- Items of Goal 5 of the specification are related to contributions to FOSS projects. These items seem to be not directly related to supply chain compliance. Why are these items included in the spec?
- It might be good for some business sectors if the specification items are prioritized for adoption.
- Some of the specification items define specific numbers such as 85%, 24 months, etc. What are the grounds for these numbers?
- I have been watching the specification since 2013. At the beginning, the discussion of the specification was to set a non-binding target that is simple and easy to follow.
- It is important to read the specification on the basis of the understanding of the OSS license compliance.
- It is important to prepare for the risk of litigation or notice for copyright infringement.
- It is important to promote OpenChain toward the active adoption of OSS.
- In the first place, we should explain our goal "we will use OSS actively and appropriately".

OpenChain should follow such spirit and encourage people to use OSS actively. It is good to write such intention in the foreword (or somewhere) of the specification.

- We understand the importance of contribution, especially from suppliers such as SoC vendors. It is good to explain the importance of contribution in foreword of the specification. On the other hand, from the point of view of small suppliers, it may be hard to have "contribution process" in their companies. It is good to set priority for each items of the specification.

Mark noted he sent out an email to each of these comments where they related to the Specification.

Imada San noted that the discussion via email was very useful. He further noted that no points were critical at this time.

== Onboarding Update ==

- There are some materials coming out that will be helpful for onboarding, such as the slides from Toyota and the case studies. I will be suggesting that we pull material from these to fill out gaps in our "journey" to conformance.
- Along with the journey description, I think we could also identify roles or touch points where OpenChain is perceived as adding most value. Basically, what audiences should we be trying to reach? (One contact from the Sonoma conference had suggested product management roles.)

Endo San suggested that we see IP contacts as critical touch-points in Japan. He noted that he has opened a discussion with the Japan IP association on this topic.

Fukuchi San noted the Sony supply chain is spread across the APEC region. He noted that Sony was focusing on education to developers. He noted the example of the workshop in COSCUP in Taiwan as part of this strategy. He referred to the relationship with a contributor called SZ Lin as an example of the result of this type of outreach.

David referred the sales team as an example of a fourth possible audience. He noted that there are likely to be highly motivated teams due to the potential for OpenChain to simplify their process.

Shane noted this indicated four target audiences:

- Product management
- IP teams
- Developers
- Sales teams

== Any Other Business ==

Dave noted that there have been some offline discussions around two items:

- (1) Criteria for the scope of conformance
- (2) The training requirement

Shane concurred. Dave noted the key thing was to stay focused on the desired outcome of the project, ensuring some confidence in the delivery of software being conformant.

Fukuchi San noted that at the last Japan Work Group the training issue was raised. He noted his personal idea was to separate the level (percentage) of training from the fact that the training exists. Perhaps the figure can be illustrative rather than required.

David noted that there are a lot of interesting ideas. He noted that perhaps we should be targeting the output of strong measures taken to ensure compliant software rather than the precise measures that companies use to accomplish this goal.

Dave noted that this conceptual approach appears to fit with what may be useful for the long term goals of the project.



