Minutes for OpenChain First Monday call – 12-03-2018

You can get the agenda slides for this meeting (and the agendas and minutes for all previous meetings) here: https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/openchain/minutes

Our latest call was recorded. You can go directly to the video and audio minutes here: https://youtu.be/o4L-HynQ2tQ

== Attendees ==

Steffen Herz
Shane Coughlan
Mark Gisi
David Marr
Gary O'Neall
Miriam Ballhausen
Indira Bhatt
Alexios Zavras
Sami Atabani
David Rudin
Matija Šuklje
Jilayne Lovejoy
Andrew Katz
Jake McGowan
Jim Hutchison
Nathan Kumagai

== Overview ==

 Project Update – Key Announcements

• Significant presence at the Open Compliance Summit in Yokohama, 6th and 7th • OpenChain Spec in Hindi and German:
• https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/08/openchain-specification-in-hindi
• https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/07/openchain-specification-in-german
• Updated OpenChain Open Source Compliance Training Slides in Korean
• https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/28/updated-openchain-open-source-compliance-tra
ining-slides-in-korean

 Project Update – Events

• OpenChain @ Kansai Open Forum – 10th November https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/20/openchain-kansai-open-forum-10th-november
• OpenChain @ Intellectual Property Owners Association https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/19/openchain-intellectual-property-owners-associatio

n
• OpenChain Japan Work Group – Ad Hoc Meeting – 20th November
https://www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/15/openchain-
japan-work-group-ad-hoc-meeting-20th
-november

• OpenChain @ greymatter Real World DevOps https://
www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/30/openchain-greymatter-
real-world-devops
• OpenChain @ Global Automobile Manufacturers https://
www.openchainproject.org/news/2018/11/30/openchain-the-nama-
meeting

  Project Update – Request for Comments

• New Open Source Policy Draft
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/
1Rij2Er_aS3U6gcEBAhIh1pNvVQ98PahmSh5u03rdwLM/edit#gid=0

• New M&A Checklist Draft
https://docs.google.com/document/d/
15Mmj3Ngbb3mLStUBCBAhVBelgucG3tTgRp9JWPpv8_w/edit?
ts=5c02594b#headi ng=h.bq6xpwi423wu

• New Conformance Logo
(see agenda slides)

== Specification ==

• Discuss Latest redrafting of Section 2 of spec (moving from
identifying roles to identifying tasks)
• Current draft w/o mark up: https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/
_media/openchain/openchainspec-2.0.draft.pdf
• Current draft with markup https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/
_media/openchain/OpenChainSpec-2.0.draft.MarkUp.pdf

Mark raised Section 1.4 for review:

1.4 Program Scope

Different compliance programs may be governed by different
levels of scope. For example, a program could govern a single
product line, an entire department or an entire organization.
The scope designation needs to be declared for each program
seeking conformance.

Verification Material(s):
- 1.4.1 A written statement that clearly defines the scope of
the program.

Rationale:
Provide the flexibility to construct a compliance program that
best fits the scope of an organization's needs. Some
organizations could choose to maintain a compliance program for
a specific product line while others could choose the program
scope to govern software releases of the entire organization.
Large organizations may prefer the former example while smaller
organizations may prefer the latter.

There were no objections raised to this approach.

Mark raised Section 2 for review:

Please see Section 2 here for the full text. It is lengthy for
the minutes:
https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/_media/openchain/
openchainspec-2.0.draft.pdf

Input was provided but no objections were raised to this
approach.

== FAQ Revamp Launched ==

Alexios has kicked off a revamp of our FAQ(s). His activity sees
the consolidation of four FAQs (general + spec, conformance,
curriculum) into one unified FAQ:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/
1I1qJm6BPwx25jzYc0jWGHFUTuHLXc1mfkVaDLFOxK1U/edit

There were comments about:
(1) Whether Spec should have a separate FAQ to help people
specifically going through the document
(2) Whether any lack of clarity in the Spec should be addressed
in the Spec via markup

Two additional comments were submitted via our chat window:

Jim Hutchison: Indeed, the "F" [in FAQ] suggests a high-level
topical, and not a spec replacement. Perhaps the spec needs some
clarity on how some details are left to the implementer. Like
the explanation of FOSS is highly illuminating to the GPL
license, perhaps the FAQ to Open Chain would be illuminated by
such a high-level thematic note?

Steffen Herz: [The] FAQ is for me guideline - to help others.
When we think [content] needs to be in spec - we should add. If
not we should not

The end consensus was:
(1) We proceed with building the unified FAQ
(2) We add markup to the Spec where needed to clarify items
(3) In light of all comments, we discuss again the appropriate

break point for the FAQ and for the Spec markup.