

== Attendees ==

Jake McGowan
Shane Coughlan
Andrew Katz
Indira Bhatt (KPMG)
Alexios Zavras
David Rudin
Gary O'Neall
Catharina Maracke
Mark Gisi
Miriam Ballhasen
Nathan Kumagai
Jan Thielscher

== Project News ==

Shane noted the following news items:

- Going big on case studies – OpenChain will release two Japanese case studies per week for the next month or so. We will also begin to release international case studies starting later this week or next week.

- Convening the Steering Committee / Outreach Committee • OpenChain Work Group in Japan – we will formally launch the committees included in our charter. This is another step towards formal standardization, providing a clear formal decision-making and vote for items after community input is considering. Shane will provide more information on this shortly.

There are several forthcoming events in June:

- OpenChain @ FOSS Backstage in Berlin, 13th–14th June
- OpenChain @ Open Source Summit Japan, 20–22nd June
- OpenChain @ LinuxCon China, 25th–27th June

== Specification ==

Mark outlined four key items:

- Spec Mailing list – With respect to the specification – If it does not happen on the Spec mailing list it did not happen
- Finalize Spec Guiding Principles <https://lists.linuxfoundation.org/pipermail/openchain-specification/2018-May/000145.html>
- Finalize Spec Spec Development/Release Process <https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/openchain/openchain-specification-wiki-page#specification-development-release-process>
- Continue discussing outstanding Issues

Mark noted that "If it does not happen on the Spec mailing list it did not happen" is an important way to contextualize what the boundaries for decision-making. David noted that this approach is useful for Apache.

Mark proceeded to note that we were after discussing the Spec Development / Release Process in previous calls. He asked for any additional comments. None were raised. Mark noted that he would proceed to move to the mailing list and finalization.

Mark proceeded to discuss the Spec Guiding Principles. He noted that OpenChain Spec was focused on the license compliance part of open source management. He noted that other parts of the project may have different focus, but that this is what the spec is for today.

Mark moved to item four, noting that we will always be an open community, and that we will also be introducing structure for being a standard. This balance will

Mark moved to a discussion regarding training requirements. He noted that the key thing was that people were trying to decide who should be covered by the training. The initial recommendation he made was to note that we need to decide the "What and Who" regarding who should be trained.

Shane raised the issue that 85% training for Software Staff might be too specific. Mark noted that the concept was to find the touch-point regarding where we put the inflection point.

David noted that OpenChain was focused on the output. He noted that we might need to rebase towards the output rather than how we get there. He further noted that we might need to consider very different methods of accomplishing their journey. He noted that companies with strong automation might not be a suitable fit for training requirements.

Mark noted that the intention is to ensure that people who are important touchpoint around open source, be they developers or other parties, have open source knowledge. Alexios noted that each organization can customize to their own needs.

Miriam raised the point that if this is about awareness, we might not want to limit training only to decision-makers, and that if it is not about awareness it might be focused on a wider audience.

Mark concurred and noted that he would like to have a focus on decision-makers around supplied software.

David noted that a focus on formal standardization might lead to a different wording. He noted that wording "the materials should come out in a conformant manner" might be useful to allow companies to set up completely different ways to accomplish their outcomes.

Mark concurred. He noted that the intent was do this (though the question remained open about whether we accomplished that).

Mark raised the issue about using the impact as an inflection point. David noted that this approach has value but raised that there may be ways to accomplish the outcomes without – for example – training parties in areas like IP law. David illustrated that in Microsoft feedback lead to evolution from developers having general understanding requirements to checklists on items.

Miriam noted that if we redefined the training requirement to anyone who makes a decision regarding decision-makers.

Mark noted we originally broke training out into different chunks. Basic understanding of copyright, open source license, open source models as the first half. The second half covered policy and process.

David noted that he would like to pull back again to high level, and ensure the wording is less prescriptive. Mark concurred. Mark noted he would take this discussion to the mailing list.

Mark noted that multiple issues are arising, we have a fair amount of work to do, and that's ok.

He noted that the first step is to decide out objectives. Then we can go back and revisit the specific areas in the specification that discuss items like training and decide what language is appropriate for meeting the objective.

Shane noted that this is useful.

== Conformance ==

Miriam noted that the discussion "What does conformance relate to?" needs to be nailed down. This discussion – given its important and scale – was pushed to mailing list and next call due to time constraints.

Shane noted that we could make this discussion the primary feature of the next First Monday call. He further noted that this could be used as one natural channel into our forthcoming convening of the Steering Committee, where a formal vote and decision could be made after input from the community.

== Curriculum ==

Alexios noted that the contributions from Software Compliance Academy which will shortly be integrated in the main materials.

Alexios noted the curriculum covers general knowledge. He noted that the pre-existing material was a little weak because it only presented one example of how large organizations would accomplish goals. While we flagged it as a reference and others

may exist. What the new contribution does is highlight how goals for a broader subset of organizations can be accomplished.

Catharina noted that this material was developed from practical engagement with clients and their actual questions.

Shane noted that there is more material similar to this on the way, for example the "how to accomplish goals with tooling" contribution being created with Siemens.

== Onboarding ==

Nathan raised three points:

- Collect and unify presentation of community-sourced content (see e.g., <https://github.com/OpenChain-Project/Onboarding>)
- Develop "Path to Conformance"
- Solicit and create content targeting (1) product management, (2) IP teams, (3) developers, and (4) sales teams

Nathan noted that we are getting materials contributed and collected via GitHub.

Nathan raised the issue of "Path to Conformance" as a guiding method of targeting existing or useful future material.

He further noted that the method of reaching out – targeting of different stakeholders – is a key consideration. Shane noted that we could potentially use the process for the previous "one pager", whereby the community created the text and our marketing budget was used for pro design. Nathan concurred.

Mark noted that one thought that came up in the specification discussions was how to bridge people who had come 80%–90% towards 100% of the journey towards conformance. Perhaps we could sync up the spec discussion to the onboarding group. Nathan concurred.

Nathan opened the Onboarding GitHub page, noting that the page displays the different levels of discussion. He noted that we might apply marketing budget here to enhance the materials.

Nathan noted that the collaboration with specification work team would be useful. Mark concurred and it was agreed to proceed shortly.

== Any Other Business ==

There was no other business.