

= Role Call =

Mark Gisi  
Fukuchi San  
Kate Stewart  
Gary O'Neill  
Nathan Kumagai  
Matsumoto San  
Takemi San  
Imada San

= Project Updates =

OpenChain Case Studies - new automotive releases

OpenChain Partner Program - two new partners

OpenChain @ Events - FOSS Backstage and compliance seminar in Germany

OpenChain Japan Work Group - ad hoc meeting in Tokyo, full meeting Nagoya

OpenChain website - revised to make it easier to find material

= Specification =

Mark outlined that there is some discussion about how Section 1.2 should be understood moving forward. He outlined that it currently has three views being expressed as a potential future, with position 1 being the stance the current spec was drafted around. He noted that the discussion can begin here but needs to go wider than the call or a single mailing list.

He proceeded to outline the Training Objective Proposal Summaries:

Position 1: All those that impacted a release should be trained

Position 2: Identified the key roles in your organization and train accordingly

Position 3: The spec would not suggest what topics to cover but instead leave it to the organization seeking conformance.

He proceeded to outline the details for each position.

Position 1: Training is important for those who could include opens source, makes decisions about the use of open source or review the supplied software with regard to open source should have a basic understanding of their organization's FOSS policy, supporting processes, basic open source licensing and who is responsible for what.

Position 2: Identified the key roles in your organization that organize others and are responsible for the outcome. Further we propose to identify a management stakeholder. All these key roles are informed and trained specifically for their position and responsibility. They require materials to guide others and to define the general policy on handling open source. We would consider a set of training guidelines for different positions.

Position 3: Consider an approach to producing compliant OSS that are flexible and not necessarily tied to mandated list of training topics. The guiding directive would be: Reasonable practices can be implemented to help ensure that OSS software is developed and distributed in compliance with the relevant associated OSS licenses. This can be achieved, for example, via training, policies, and/or systems as appropriate for the organization. The spec would not suggest what topics to cover but instead leave it to the organization seeking conformance.

Fukuchi San noted that he liked position 2 because it would address the requirements he has seen in dealing with suppliers.

Mark suggested that we collaborate to define a minimum set of roles to cover in the requirements were to identify these as critical to open source compliance. He further noted that their activities should be considered.

Mark further suggested that we may benefit from a survey to explore this question.

Mark provided some reference roles:

- Developers
- Procurement decision-makers

Kate noted that there may be granularity in the developer roles (inbound versus upstream).

Mark concurred but noted that upstream was focused on Section 5, while he suggested we limit the focus on Section 1.2 at this juncture.

Fukuchi San noted that it was very important for a manufacturer to comply with licenses for effective procurement, a situation that may require additional education for the procurement department.

Mark concurred and noted procurement was traditionally central to dealing with inbound software. However, he noted there was an additional challenge with developers having the ability to pull code in independently.

Fukuchi San concurred.

Nathan noted there may be a way to build more consensus by looking at the outcomes we are seeking with some flexibility for granularity rather than discussing the choice between solutions – the three positions outlined above.

Mark noted that perhaps we can ensure flexibility by not being overly prescriptive about which roles are described.

Mark further noted that the discussion appears to indicate that the focus was around position 2.

Nathan concurred but noted he would prefer to ensure that no position is precluded, rather we focus on the outcomes to ensure flexibility in the implementation.

Mark lead the discussion towards the current Spec requirement of 85%. He wanted to know if it should be kept or removed.

Shane suggested that it may be more useful to use language along the lines of "relevant personnel should be trained" rather than prescriptive.

Fukuchi San concurred.

Mark proceeded to suggest that perhaps the spec should suggest testing or re-training every 24 months.

Nathan noted that this language may be less useful if we focus on outcomes.

Shane suggested "relevant personnel should be trained and kept current."

Mark noted that this focus on outcomes may lend to the type of changes suggest above.

Mark summarized the discussion.

Gary noted that the current language becomes problematic for large companies and the change in language would address this. He further noted that there was value in promoting education and certain roles do require 100% training.

Gary noted release engineers as important.

Kate suggested project management as important.

Mark concurred.

Mark closed this section of the call. He noted he will take position 2 with a focus on outcomes to socialize with a broader audience.

= Onboarding =

Nathan noted there was discussion about how to make onboarding more effective. He noted there were two avenues being explored:

(a) Path to Conformance

(learning about compliance, learning about solutions, moving towards OpenChain conformance)

Nathan noted that as we bring together our existing material and fill in any additional points we can proceed to using LF Marketing to produce more handouts.

(b) One page handouts:

(1) product management

(2) IP teams

(3) developers, and

(4) sales teams

Mark asked what considerations for a sales team were being discussed. Nathan noted that this was a suggestion made by another party. He further noted that the item was really about making the trademark acknowledged as a useful addition to the sales department.

Mark concurred and noted that it might be useful to have it marketing/sales team as these teams work so closely together.

Nathan concurred.

= Any other business =

There was no other business. Shane ended the meeting with a note that he will see the Japanese members tomorrow during the OpenChain talk at Open Source Summit Japan.