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

== Attendees ==

Shane Coughlan
Sami Atabani
Catharina Maracke
Mark Gisi
Akshu Thula
Andrew Katz
Nathan Kumagai
Hung Chang
Jilayne Lovejoy
Kate Stewart

== Project Overview ==

Shane covered the following topics:

The OpenChain Open Session on the 24th of October:
• Platinum Member supplier adoption
• Partially or full organizational conformance • Regional strategy
• Japanese study group
• Internationalization of website
• Define a reference workflow for using open source projects. (SPDX, Fossology, Quartermaster, sw360) • Updated website

Participation in the SFLC Fall Conference

Upcoming participation in the Open Compliance Summit

== Specification ==

JIRA is a very good tool but it is challenging to allow easy access. It requires everyone to have a log-in account. If we migrated to GitHub it would allow easier access. It is therefore recommended that we move from JIRA to GitHub.

Sami wanted to clarify if the barrier was to provide comments or just to view details.

Mark clarified that the issue was that viewing or contributing in JIRA both require log-ins.

Sami noted that we could create a regular report but perhaps this might become difficult to view over time.

Mark noted that the issue was ease of access, and while JIRA is a more elegant tool, GitHub provides easier access.

Sami offered to talk with the ARM technical team to see if anyone can provide suggestions to make it easier to use.

Mark concurred to wait and see what feedback was obtained.

Mark proceeded to share a screen showing items open to cover for the next version of the specification.

The first item was confusion between compliance and verification artifacts. Mark pointed out that verification evidence was suggested but the legal contributors did not like it due to similarity with phrasing used in legal contexts.

Andrew noted he was quite keen with the term "materials" over artifact, potentially for both items

Mark noted that we would potentially adopt one term with materials, i.e. compliance artifacts and verification materials. He also suggested moving the discussion to the mailing list.

Sami noted it might be worthwhile to reference the terms from first principles when moving the conversation to the mailing list.

Mark proceeded to open the discussion to the question of 85% training for software staff. Mark noted that the specification was never intended to read 85% of *all* software staff but rather 85% of the software staff involved in the compliance program. He referred to the discussion at the Open Session (24th October).

Shane mentioned that during the Open Session Miriam mentioned that during the early days of OpenChain the idea was to cover a legal entity.

Mark pointed out that all the material around the 1.1 specification is clear that the compliance effort is focused around a compliance program.

Mark further noted that this may be conceptually understood as being similar to certifying some products organic and others not. In the context of OpenChain the "organic" product would be something that has gone through the relevant compliance program.

Mark opened the floor to comments.

Jilayne raised a point of clarification, asking if we are talking about something broader than the training, and talking about OpenChain applicability as a whole.

Mark confirmed this point, and noted the training discussion opened the issue, but it would be addressed by covering the larger conceptual issue.

Jilayne pointed out there are a number of issues for a large company conforming. For example, different business groups may have different requirements.

Jilayne noted the legal entity focus may be challenging given what we are trying to achieve.

She further noted that if we are not going to certify an entire company, would it be possible to give flexibility over what is covered?

Mark noted that we need to get to a point where we don't require a whole entity to be conforming. He further noted that the spec explicitly addresses the idea of a "program."

Sami noted that we need to ensure that companies using the spec have a clear understanding of what needs to be covered by our various requirements.

Mark noted that we will continue discussion on the mailing list.

== Onboarding ==

Nathan noted he wanted to collect information on existing material to help set the context for creating new material. He further noted that it may be timely to solicit new members for the onboarding work team. He muted the idea of running a survey for broader feedback.

Nathan noted that he had feedback from Jim Hutchinson that checklists would be useful. Shane noted that at the recent SFLC Conference there was feedback that two types of checklist would be useful:
(1) covering the specifics of what engineers should do (i.e. inbound software), a topic that appears suitable for the curriculum
(2) covering the overarching shape of a compliance program, a topic that appears to be bridgeable either via onboarding or curriculum

Nathan concurred and noted that he would address these matters in consultation with Alexios (chair of curriculum) via the mailing list.

At this juncture Nathan turned the call over to Shane.

Shane noted that Alexios and Miriam could not be present on this call due to other obligations. He further noted that Alexios would shortly be putting out a call for volunteers to help curate the

curriculum material, and Miriam had previously stated at the Open Session that she was going to engage with the topic of "what is covered by OpenChain Conformance, legal entity or program?"

Shane concluded by noting that further discussion would take place via the mailing list.