

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

== Attendees ==

Matija Suklje
Mark Gisi
Joshua Kast
Jake McGowan
Shane Coughlan
Andrew Katz
Gary O'Neill
Dave Marr
Catharina Maracke
Nathan Kumagai
Kelly Williams
Miriam Ballhausen
Jilayne Lovejoy
Karen Copenhaver
Alan Tse
Kate Stewart
Hung Chang

(If I missed anyone please let me know)

== Project overview ==

Shane noted that the key news items for this call were the transition to having a Project Director and the contributions offered from OSADL (a German automation alliance) and Commons Conservancy. They have contributed or committed to contributing material from a reference license requirement project and an “including license information” guide respectively to the OpenChain Curriculum.

A reminder was shared regarding the October 24th Board Meeting and face-to-face meeting at Open Source Summit Europe in Prague on the 24th of October.

== Onboarding ==

Nathan outlined that we have been pulling together the onboarding material in recent days. Nathan noted that he will be placing the recently collected and edited material into a new Google Doc, merged with our infographic. This will give us a “pack” to be used at events.

Shane noted that our first opportunity to deploy the new onboarding material is the Open Source Summit Europe in Prague from the 23rd of October.

== Specification ==

Mark noted that we have had quite a lot of translation activity. He raised the issue of how we might be deal with this, especially with regards to official and unofficial translations.

Shane noted that unofficial versions have some value in being available, as noted with the Korean unofficial version ignited engagement from other teams, and ultimately lead to the creation of the first official translation, the Japanese translation.

Mark suggested that unofficial versions should be hosted on GitHub. Gary agreed with Mark's proposal.

Dave concurred, and also noted that he believed it was useful to have a link to translations in progress, with unofficial status signifying that further review was necessary.

Andrew noted that some parties would not be comfortable with GitHub and having a direct link to the unofficial documents would be useful. Mark suggested that the translation page have a "translations in progress" section to contain the links to GitHub.

Mark noted that each translation has a cost. Mark suggested the we have some party to lead translations and that we focus on a handful of core languages that we map to each version of the spec, with other translations being opportunistic.

Dave asked if this proposal was motivated by any missing translations. Mark noted that it was not related to a gap seen now but thinking ahead about where we put the emphasis on translations down the road. Mark noted that the translations he would regard as important were Spanish, German and Japanese. Kate noted Chinese is probably an important language to seek.

Sami suggested that we seek gatekeepers for each language, with maintainers taking responsibility for addressing updates.

Miriam suggested that we have comparisons between the old and new specification versions to help people understand the specification through previous translations.

Dave noted that the key outcome would be to have identified languages with short turnover periods between the release of the spec and availability of those translations. Mark noted that it's really about making sure that our key identified languages are ready. Shane took the action item to prepare a proposal with Mark.

Mark noted that the website is for finished items, while GitHub is work in progress.

Mark asked if it makes for the specification to have a dedicated translation page. He noted that the current list does not differentiate between whether translators are working on just the translation or other items such as the curriculum. Miriam noted that not all teams will work on all items. Catherina concurred on this point and further noted that other parties might do translations if and when they allocate resources.

Mark noted that at this point we will continue with the current format. His preference is to split things out, but at this juncture it is ok to keep the current structure.

Mark noted that we have a survey to record feedback on the conformance process. He reiterated that we recently sent out the link, that it would be really helpful if people could look at this and share it with other parties, as it will help with the next revision of the spec.

Matija asked if there was any deadline for this survey. Mark said that at this juncture it was regarded as an on-going survey but agreed that it made sense. He decided to give it a week, then will send a reminder to create a two-week deadline from then.

Mark wanted to clarify that OpenChain Spec would not include any license interpretation. He raised this issue over the proposed contribution of license requirement checklists to the OpenChain Curriculum from OSADL. It was decided to have a three-way call with Karen, Catharina and Shane to dig further into the topic.

Mark opened a review of spec feedback. He discussed the use of the work "evidence" in the place of "verification artifacts." Dave noted that "evidence" might be a little heavy on the legal side. Karen noted the same. Hung suggested that we call it "things that you need to show to support your claim" or "how to show your work", keeping it very simple. Sami concurred. Mark suggested "verification practice."

== Conformance ==

Miriam deferred her time to Mark to allow further discussion on Spec Feedback.