



## **ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.02.07**

Meeting minutes

**JOINING UP GOVERNMENTS**



## CESAR VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.01.27 – Meeting minutes

<b>Venue</b>	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	<b>Meeting date</b>	07/02/2012
<b>Author</b>	MDK	<b>Meeting time</b>	14:30 – 15.30
<b>Reviewed by</b>	SG	<b>Issue date</b>	09/02/2012
<b>Status</b>		<b>Version</b>	0.02

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Olivier Berger	OB	FR – TELECOM & Management SudParis
Elena Muñoz Salinero	EMS	ES – Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Administration
Sander van der Waal	SW	NL/UK – OSS Watch / Simal
Phil Archer	PA	UK – W3C
Rorberto Galoppini	RG	IT - SourceForge
Savino Sguerra	SS	IT – nexB - SPDX
Michiel De Keyzer	MDK	BE - PwC Belgium
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE - PwC Belgium

## AGENDA:

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
1	All	Roll call / welcome new <a href="#">ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members</a>
2	SS	Introduction and outlook
3	SG	Licensing: <a href="#">ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.0</a> and the <a href="#">Collaborator Licence Agreement</a>
4	PA	<a href="#">Adoption of minutes of previous meeting</a>
5	PA	<a href="#">Use cases</a>
6	PA	<a href="#">Related work</a>
7	PA	<a href="#">Proposed conceptual model</a> issue: <a href="#">Metrics to assess software assets / projects</a> issue: <a href="#">Information about the usage of a software asset</a> issue: <a href="#">pictures/videos for project/asset, logo for repository</a> issue: <a href="#">Identifier of a software asset</a>
8	PA	<a href="#">Controlled vocabularies</a>
9	All	Wrap-up and summary of actions
10	PA	Next meeting date and time

## Meeting minutes

### 1. Roll call / welcome new [ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members](#)

### 2. Introduction and outlook

#### Discussion

- RG ([SourceForge](#)) is welcomed as new joiners of the Working Group
- SV will chair the [ADMS.F/OSS](#) Working Group meetings

#### Decisions

- . SV will do the chairing of the weekly [ADMS.F/OSS](#) Working Group meeting

#### Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members](#)

### 3. Licensing: [ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.0](#) and the [Collaborator Licence Agreement](#)

#### Discussion

- SG explains this item:
  - the intension is to release the ADMS.F/OSS specification under an open licence: the ISA Open Metadata Licence
  - Everyone on the Working Group will be asked to sign this licence
- SV asks how the collaborator licence agreement can be signed
  - SG says that since for the moment it is not possible on [Joinup](#) to digitally sign documents, everyone on the working group will be asked to print the licence, sign it on paper and send a scan of that signed version.
  - OB asks if it has to be signed by the employer.
  - SV answers that this depends on the structure of your company
- RG asks to clarify following sentence in the licence: *"You will not use the name of the European Commission and that of its Contributor(s) to endorse or promote products and services derived from the Use of the Works without specific prior written permission"*
  - SG explains that this means that anyone who uses the specification cannot say that the European Commission approves of the products and services that are derived from the [ADMS.F/OSS](#) specification. This statement protects the European Commission against false statements of endorsement.
- EMS asks why we don't use digital signatures. In Spain, the open-source application "[Cliente de firma electrónica de @firma](#)" is available to digitally sign documents which supports the most comment eID solutions in Europe.
  - SV points out that not everybody in the Working Group will have an

electronic ID.

- SG suggests EMS to propose this topic via the mailing list.

#### Decisions

- Discussion whether to use digital signatures or not will be held offline.

#### Documentation

- [ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.0](#)
- [Collaborator Licence Agreement](#)

#### Action Items

#### Responsible

#### Deadline

Discuss the use of digital signature offline

EMS  
SG

14/02

### 4. [Adoption of minutes of previous meeting](#)

#### Discussion

- There are no comments on the meeting minutes
- SV asks for a status of the action points out of the previous meeting
  - Define a process for working together with the [ADMS](#) : PA says that there no further process on that. SV says this action item is moved to next week.
  - Create a comment about a Project's contributors: OB says that has not yet been done. SV says this action item is moved to next week.
  - Make proposal about which metrics to add to the model. This has been done ([issue 44328](#))
  - Raise an issue about adding attributes to the model about usage of the asset: this has been done ([issue 44381](#))
  - PA says that all the action points that were about adopting the conceptual model will be addressed
  - Prepare a draft specification and add some examples in Turtle alongside the conceptual model: PA says this will be addressed
  - SV says that he accepted the invitation to chair the weekly [ADMS.F/OSS](#) Working Group meetings.

#### Decisions

- Meeting minutes are adopted.
- SV will chair the [ADMS.F/OSS](#) Working Group

#### Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS Virtual Meeting 2012.01.31 – Meeting Minutes](#)

- Metrics to add to the model : [issue 44328](#)
- Attributes to add to the model about usage of the software asset: [issue 44381](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Feed the requirements of the ADMS.F/OSS Working Group back to the <a href="#">ADMS</a> Working Group ( <a href="#">Issue 44683</a> ).	PA	14/02
Make the changes to the conceptual model according the actions in the <a href="#">meeting minutes of the ADMS Working Group Virtual Meeting of 31/01</a>	PA	14/02
Prepare a draft specification and add some examples in Turtle alongside the conceptual model ( <a href="#">Issue 44684</a> )	PA	14/02

## 5. [Use cases](#)

### Discussion

- PA says that this is a very important document and invites everyone to have a look at it.
- PA explains that this is a very important document because if something is not in the use case, there is a good chance that it will not be in the specifications as well.
- OB has already commented on this document.
- SG comments that the main purpose of this working group and project is to describe a metadata model to describe software assets so software assets can be described in the same way and particular software assets are more easily findable
- SS says that the scopes of [ADMS.F/OSS](#) and [SPDX](#) are not overlapping because [SPDX](#) is looking at a software assets from the perspective of licensing
  - SG will raise an issue for this so that the commonalities and differences can be made explicit.

### Documentation

- [Use cases](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Consult the <a href="#">use cases document</a> and comment it or add substantial use cases	All	14/02
Look into the differences/similarities in scope of <a href="#">SPDX</a> and <a href="#">ADMS.F/OSS</a> ( <a href="#">Issue 44686</a> )	SG	14/02

## 6. [Related work](#)

### Discussion

- PA asks if there is anything missing
  - OB suggests ORG
  - SG suggests [FOAF](#)
- PA says that we have to take a look at the different cases if they are trying to solve the same problem as [ADMS.F/OSS](#) wants to do
- PA says that the case of SPDX looks similar
  - SS says [ADMS.F/OSS](#) is different, because [ADMS.F/OSS](#) is not only from the perspective from licensing. SS says it is related to each other but the scope is not exactly the same.
- PA asks if [SPDX](#) has been used in forges already.
  - SS says that [SPDX](#) is not used in forges and he doesn't know if it will be in the future
- RG says that having open APIs comes first. He says that the [Allura](#) software – on which SourceForge is based – is fully open source and they have open API's
- SG add to that that SourceForge currently exposes all its open-source software projects in the DOAP format using an API:  
<http://sourceforge.net/apps/trac/sourceforge/wiki/API>
- SV asks RG what are the plans with their vocabulary
  - RG says that he doesn't have a direct answer on this and he will have to check this.
- SG comments that regardless of popularity of [DOAP](#), we still have a lot of work in this Working Group.
  - E.g. How do we identify software, how are we able to see that two software assets are the same, ...
  - SG says that this is not in [DOAP](#)
  - SV responds there is the concept of release and versions in [DOAP](#) so : there might be something in [DOAP](#) or in another standard that is not used for intensively but that may be useful

### Decisions

- Include ORG and [FOAF](#) in [related work](#)

### Documentation

- [SourceForge API](#)

### Action Items

### Responsible

### Deadline

Include ORG and [FOAF](#) in [related work](#)

PA

14/02

Discuss the future of the vocabularies

RG

14/02

## 7. [Proposed conceptual model](#)

### Discussion

- The model shown during the meeting is not the most recent version of the conceptual model, unexpectedly.
- PA will put the most recent version of the conceptual model on [Joinup](#) directly after the meeting
- PA says that all the issues that are mentioned on the meeting's agenda are processed in the new model:
  - issue: [Metrics to assess software assets / projects](#)
  - issue: [Information about the usage of a software asset](#)
  - issue: [pictures/videos for project/asset, logo for repository](#)
  - issue: [Identifier of a software asset](#)
- PA says that a software asset is a specialisation of an asset, which is already described in [ADMS](#)
- PA says we need to recognize that there is an important difference between the software asset itself and the project, but wonders whether the wide usage of DOAP somewhat blurs this distinction.
- SV asks if there is no need for a for a “project” concept at all
  - OB suggests to keep either [FOAF](#): Project or [DOAP](#): Project
  - PA says that the concepts related to project should be included but if you have both concepts as an entity there will be discussions about which attribute to put where
  - PA says that at the moment he wants to investigate whether a software asset and a project can be conceived to be as one entity. Of course this is open for discussion.
  - SG en SS are in favour of reusing [FOAF](#) for this
  - SV says it's important to remain compatible with [FOAF](#) than with DOAP.
  - SG says that the decision to distinguish a project from a software asset was already made in previous meeting.
- SG suggests to first focus on developing the conceptual model and afterwards have a look at and discuss on which existing vocabularies can be reused.
- PA says that he also has added a user to this model. User is not necessarily the end user but the institutional user, the owner of the asset.
- About [the metrics to assess software asset issue](#), PA says there are well developed methods existing, which we can just refer to via a “Literal” linked to the asset concept.
- SG points out that modelling Quality Assurance as a Literal will not make information of software metrics better exchangeable between software forges. This would require specifying what should be inside such a Literal.



## Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS Conceptual draft model](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Put the most recent version of the conceptual model on <a href="#">Joinup</a> (done)	PA	07/02
Provide comments on the current conceptual model	all	14/02

## 8. [Controlled vocabularies](#)

### Discussion

- This topic was not further discussed, but will receive more attention in the next meeting. The Working Group is invited to share controlled vocabularies for properties such as Programming Language, Localisation, Operating Environment, User Interface Type, Intended Audience

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Provide additional input to the controlled vocabularies ( <a href="#">Issue 44688</a> )	all	14/02

## 9. Wrap-up and summary of actions

## 10. Next meeting date and time

### Decisions

- Next meeting: [14/02 from 14:30 till 15:30 CET](#)