

OpenChain Project Open Session 14:00-16:00 Central Europe Time, October 24th

The OpenChain Project Open Session was a public meeting of the OpenChain Project Governing Board members, Work Team chairs and volunteers or other interested parties. From parties directly affiliated with OpenChain the following were present:

- Mr Marr (Governing Board)
- Mr Fendt (Governing Board)
- Ms Stewart (The Linux Foundation)
- Mr Shibata (Observer)
- Mr Seki (Observer)
- Mr Ueda (Governing Board)
- Mr Imada (Governing Board)
- Mr Coughlan (Project Director)
- Ms Lovejoy (Governing Board)
- Mr Gisi (Governing Board / Specification Work Team Chair)
- Mr Holland (Governing Board)
- Ms Ruff (Governing Board)
- Mr Katz (Pilot Partner Program)
- Mr Bain (Pilot Partner Program)
- Ms Flannigan (Pilot Partner Program)
- Ms Maracke (Pilot Partner Program / Strategic Advisor)
- Mr Suklje (Strategic Advisor)
- Ms Ballhausen (Conformance Work Team Chair)
- Mr Zavros (Curriculum Work Team Chair)

Additionally the following parties were present:

- Mr Steenbergen (HERE)
- Mr Swirtun (FOSSID)
- Mr Bergelt (OIN)
- Mr Kato (Panasonic)
- Mr Fukuchi (Sony)
- Mr Bethencourt (CodeThink)

Other parties were joining and leaving the Open Session throughout.

Mr Coughlan and Mr Marr opened the meeting. Mr Coughlan noted that we would begin the Open Session with the Discussion of Priorities from 2018 that had been tabled during the Governing Board meeting. Mr Marr suggested that a round of introductions would be useful prior to this. The suggestion was duly enacted and the conversation proceeded to the first order of business.

It should be noted that the Governing Board slides related to the Discussion of Priorities in 2018 were used to frame the discussion.

Platinum Member supplier adoption

Mr Ueda noted that we need to be careful regarding the definition of what a supply chain is. He noted that immature in understanding and we need to look closely at how these organizations face challenges. Mr Marr asked how we may address the challenge.

Mr Ueda suggested that we ensure open source is not only an engineering issue but also support and marketing and so on. The conclusion he proposed was that organizations should open channels to technical experts and training should be increased.

Partial or full organizational conformance

It was noted that Mr Katz noted that as long as it is clear whether compliance is for the full or part of the organization it seems perfectly acceptable. Mr Gisi noted that allowing partial conformance is important. Ms Ballhausen noted that there was a discussion in the very beginning of the project and that the focus at that time was on conformance legal entity by legal entity. Mr Gisi noted that it may be useful if we could certify that a release was OpenChain conforming.

Mr Katz noted that one point to consider is that some activities are customer facing and some are completely internal, and the current documentation is not completely clear on how we deal with these matters.

Mr Bain noted that we need to clarify whether conformance is by a program or a legal entity. Ms Lovejoy that from a legal perspective it is easier to define conformance by legal entity but in practice it may be easier by program. Mr Fendt noted that it may be useful to allow different stages of conformance (full organization, partial conformance) to encourage a pathway to full conformance.

Ms Lovejoy noted that we can allow flexibility to help build trust. The potential problem is that if it is not by legal entity then warranties may be challenging. Mr Katz agreed that we need to allow a situation that is clear and simple. Ms Lovejoy noted that we may need to ask what is the project trying to achieve. She noted that the goal of the project is to create trust and this is not done through contract.

Mr Ueda noted that in practice not every supplier will be asked to be openchain conformant in a supply chain, but rather it will be focused on situation. Mr Zavros noted that we would need clarity of whether we are covering the whole company or not.

Mr Gisi noted that our current understanding of the spec is that it applies to a program, and 85% of the staff related to a program need to meet the requirements of the spec (rather than the company as a whole).

Ms Ballhausen noted that if there is confusion we need to address it. Mr Gisi noted that we make a claim that a product has gone through an openchain conformant program. Ms Lovejoy noted that a company could claim that a product has gone through a program and the associated business group was openchain conformant.

Mr Gisi noted that today we are only talking about a program. Mr Marr noted that there seemed to be support for the idea of division conformance. Ms Ballhausen noted that we have the logos for different companies, but if we are talking about business unit we may need to adjust this, and identify the difference between whole company conformance versus specific business unit.

Mr Bergelt noted that there is an expectation of a company being conformant. He noted that there may be a detrimental reliance issue. He noted that if it is not full entity conformance there will have to be a lot of clarification. Mr Marr noted that companies undergoing acquisition need to think about how to provide clarity.

Mr Steenbergen noted that it might be useful to have a star system. Mr Ueda noted that looking at standards like ISO it had organizations being partially conformant but in open source we need to have complete conformance. He noted that our goal must be to live together with the open community and that this is our challenge.

Mr Fendt noted that it is hard to trust that a conformant company always delivers open source conformant products because we are conforming overarching processes rather than the specifics of each process. He further noted that it might be useful for organizations to show step by step conformance. Mr Ueda concurred and noted that some companies may work well within this type of framework.

No firm conclusion was reached and the discussion was tabled for further discussion via the OpenChain mailing list.

Regional strategy

Ueda San noted that Sony's proposal was based on the experience of the companies in the Asian supply chain and that his approach was to share open source training. He first tried to train in English but there were requests to present in Japanese or Chinese.

Ms Ruff noted that the challenge was to ensure understanding. Ms Maracke asked if the top down approach for Europe was most effective. Mr Marr noted that America and Europe the bottom down approach was used for many years. The idea of a top down approach was based on the stage we have reached now.

Mr Ueda shared some slides and emphasised that he wanted an open discussion. He suggested that having open discussions at community events would be useful to share knowledge. He would like to start Japanese or Asian regional discussion.

Ms Ruff noted that Japan was much more mature than many countries in Asia. Mr Ueda noted that Korea also was pretty sophisticated. Ms Ruff that all of us depended on ODMs and concurred that an industrial approach. Mr Kato noted that it was important to work together in this matter.

Mr Ueda noted that he believes it would be useful to have workshops or seminars in Taiwan and China, with a focus on software engineers to bring people together. There was general consensus that this would be useful.

Japanese study group

Mr Imada noted that this is a way to promote openchain in the Japanese and eventually wider market. He is not suggesting an exclusive group but rather a way to bring people together to share information. He suggested a schedule of monthly meetings to exchange ideas and thoughts. He noted that the suggested actions were not limited but rather open to share many different discussions and outcomes.

Mr Ueda noted that he hopes this type of activity can be harmonized with global activities and welcome Korean participants as well.

Mr Bergelt noted that the extension of the European Legal Network events via an Asian Legal Network. He believe that there was room for collaboration but noted that many of the participants were secured from a bottom up approach. He further noted that OIN was happy to collaborate with OpenChain on such events moving forward and support these activities

There was general consensus that a Japanese study group and potential collaboration would be useful.

Internationalization of website

Mr Imada noted that he was a member of the Japanese translation team and that it would be useful to have the OpenChain website language selectable moving forward. He noted that this would be useful to ensure new stakeholders would feel comfortable to engage. Mr Ueda noted that having such translations were very useful, and that for example Korean language or Chinese language versions of our site would be helpful.

Mr Fukuchi noted that it was extremely useful for adoption to have translation. Mr Steenbergen noted that he had translated the OpenChain Specification before. Ms Ballhausen noted that it is

often more than translation, but also a localization program. She noted that perhaps a gradual roll-out is useful with language priorities.

Mr Steenbergen noted that having the project on GitHub helps to ensure that we have strong collaboration. Ms Lovejoy noted that priorities for translation would be useful, for example meeting minutes ahead of news items.

There was general consensus that internationalization of the website would be useful.

Define a reference workflow for using open source projects. (SPDX, Fossology, Quartermaster, sw360)

Mr Fendt noted that his overall idea that openchain was a good medium for spreading information around a set of reference tools. He wanted to see whether we can agree a certain set of tools that can establish a free and open source supply chain that supports modern deployment requirements. He noted that if we can collaborate around this matter we can accomplish an effective way to show how companies can meet basic license requirements. He further noted that it would be useful to show references how companies can implement various processes.

Mr Steenberger noted that it may be worth syncing up with the TODO Group. He further noted that it may be useful to show how companies can address specific challenges (use cases). Ms Ballhausen noted that in the beginning we agreed not to advocate certain tools. She concurred that we may want to give certain examples.

Mr Gisi noted that the OpenChain Specification wants to avoid suggesting any particular practice. However, the OpenChain project has a broader scope. He noted that it may be useful to have multiple reference documents to address compliance challenges. Ms Lovejoy noted that it might not matter if we reference specific solutions. Mr Gisi noted that he believed it would really be about talking about a workflow white paper.

Ms Lovejoy noted that it would have a different tenor if OpenChain encouraged, endorsed or raised awareness of proprietary versus open source solutions. Ms Ruff that if we really want to lower the barrier for adoption we really need reference documents. Mr Fendt noted that OpenChain is for the benefit of the community. Mr Gisi clarified that the goal is about ensuring high quality compliance artifacts. Mr Marr noted that the curriculum project exists to address similar challenges. Mr Gisi noted that he would like to see multiple examples. Ms Ruff noted that OpenChain may be able to learn from TODO Group in this respect.

Mr Ueda noted that talking about open source tools like FOSSology can be used as a health test for open source programs. Mr Coughlan asked whether it may be useful to begin by providing reference documents for use cases via the curriculum. Ms Lovejoy noted that there seemed to be no disagreement on the current proposal.

Mr Gisi noted that using the terminology of case studies or use cases would ensure we do not create stigma. Ms Lovejoy noted that it may be a different viewpoint with regards accepting white papers from tooling vendors. Mr Ueda noted that some information about interoperability regarding interaction between open source and commercial projects can be useful. He noted that such information is useful.

Mr Bethencourt noted that perceptions can be managed by having clear references to open source projects. He noted that the issue might be catalogs, but this is mediated with such references.

There was general consensus that reference documentation around this topic would be useful.

Grafeas

Mr Coughlan outlined the project based on the homepage. Mr Gisi noted they are delivering a reference model for management. Mr Coughlan noted that we may be able to address overlap/lack of overlap with OpenChain through a FAQ item.

Mr Steenbergen noticed that there is a way to get further details (to be followed up). Mr Gisi noted that various market developments may have been one reason for the Grafeas project to be launched and that it may become more substantial and more clearly documented over time.

There was general consensus to address the differences between Grafeas and OpenChain through a FAQ item.

This concluded the Discussion of Priorities for 2018. Mr Marr noted that there was general consensus heard regarding regional strategy, a Japanese study group, internationalization of the website and the creation of reference documentation for the project. It was further noted that the question of full or partial organization conformance would need further discussion.

Specification Overview

The discussion proceeded to cover the OpenChain Specification. Mr Gisi noted we have 1.1 of the OpenChain Specification out now and the project is running a questionnaire that can provide feedback evolve the specification in the future.

In response to a question by Mr Coughlan, Mr Gisi noted that we are tentatively on an annual release schedule. Mr Ueda noted that certain companies dealing with industrial companies such as Hitachi or Toshiba may have a preference for longer cycles.

Ms Lovejoy noted that minor changes in minor revisions of the OpenChain Specification (i.e. 1.1 to 1.2) might not need formal re-conformance by existing conformant organizations. Mr Gisi

noted that an annual review might be useful regardless to ensure processes and policies are double-checked.

This concluded the discussion around the OpenChain Specification. There was general consensus that adopting an approach of clearly signally minor changes to the specification (1.1 > 1.2) should imply no additional requirements are required for conformance, but regardless organizations should be encouraged to double-check conformance on a regular basis.

At this point the meeting was adjourned due to time constraints and it was agreed that further discussion could take place on work team calls and via email.

