ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.02.28

Meeting minutes

JOINING UP GOVERNMENTS

ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.02.28 – Meeting minutes

Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	**Meeting date**	28/02/2012
Author	MDK	**Meeting time**	14:30 – 15:30
Reviewed by		**Issue date**	
Status	For review	**Version**	

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Roberto Galoppini	RG	IT – SourceForge
Elena Muñoz Salinero	EMS	ES – Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Administrations
Alisson Randal	AR	US – The Perl Foundation / The Python Foundation / Harmony
Phil Archer	PA	UK – W3C
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE – PwC
Michiel De Keyzer	MDK	BE - PwC

AGENDA:

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
1	All	Roll call / welcome new ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members
2	PA	Introduction and outlook
3	SG	Licensing: ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1 and the Collaborator Licence Agreement
4	PA	Adoption of minutes of previous meeting
5	PA	Proposed conceptual model
6	PA	Controlled vocabularies and Issues
7	All	Wrap-up and summary of actions
8	PA	Public Review

Meeting minutes

1. **Roll call / welcome new ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members**
2. **Introduction and outlook**
3. **Licensing: ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1 and the Collaborator Licence Agreement**

Discussion

- PA has some questions about the mentioning of the licensing of Trove (CC-BY).
  - o RG says that he doesn't see a problem since this license is asking the same as the license the European Commission uses for the publication ADMS.F/OSS
  - o SG confirms this.
- PA asks RG if the re-use of the Trove categories in the Software Asset attribution is ok.
  - o RG suggest to put a link to the CC-BY licence since not everybody is informed what the licence is about.
- PA says that explaining that we re-used the Trove categories, where this comes from and why we did that is not a problem. He asks RG if the CC-BY license has to be put everywhere if a software asset is published and it uses Trove directly or indirectly.
  - o RG says that in his opinion the use of Trove doesn't have to be a problem but he will has to pass this question to his legal department and he will provide an answer by email.
- EMS asks if the list of values of the Trove categories is also available.
  - o PA says it is the list of values that is very interesting for ADMS.F/OSS.
  - o RG says this is not on the wiki for the moment. Also the values (terms) under each Trove category should go under the CC-BY licence. He will confirm with the legal service how they can make this clearer on the wiki page.
- PA explains how he will put the usage of the controlled vocabularies in the specification:
  - o Reuse of the Trove categories as developed by SourceForge.
  - o For public sector ADMS.F/OSS a set of values is provided.
  - o In addition there are other classifications available, including those of Trove and we except these to be available in the near future.
  - o For the ADMS.F/OSS values we start from the proposition of EMS
- PA asks if this is reasonable for RG.
  - o RG says the values of the Trove categories can already be used but he will have a quick check with the legal service of SourceForge. He doesn't see this as an issue.
- PA asks if the publication will be in a machine readable format.
  - o RG says that is in machine readable format but he will have to check what format exactly. He will provide an answer on this by mail.

- o PA says that a RDF would be the best for ADMS.F/OSS.
- SG says that the Collaborator Licence Agreement work is on the way and it will be based on Harmony.

Decisions

- Collaborator License Agreement will be based on Harmony.

Documentation

- ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1
- Collaborator Licence Agreement
- CC-BY
- Trove Software Map

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Check the implications of the licensing of Trove on ADMS.F/OSS with the legal department of SourceForge	RG	06/03
Check the publication of the values (terms) of the Trove categories with the legal department of SourceForge.	RG	06/03
Check the format of the publication of values (terms) of the Trove categories.	RG	06/03

4. Adoption of minutes of previous meeting

Decisions

- The meeting minutes are adopted.

Documentation

- ADMS.F/OSS Working Group Virtual Meeting 2012.02.21 – Meeting Minutes

5. Proposed conceptual model

Discussion

- PA explains the conceptual model and the changes that has been done to it:
  - o Grey: ADMS
    - It is required to have an asset type in ADMS. For ADMS.F/OSS the asset type is always software. This has been communicated with the ADMS Working Group.
    - "Has Asset Type software" will be a fixed characteristic of a

Software Asset in the RDF Schema.

- o Yellow: Properties that reuse the Trove categories.
- o Purple: Project and related classes
- o Brown: Assessment and Metrics

- EMS asks what "Representation Technique" class in ADMS is.
  - o SG explains that Representation Technique is a property of a semantic asset that show the language they are represented in such as UML, XML, ... The counterpart for software could be Software Language.

- PA explains that Assessment, Metrics and Trove properties are linked to Software Asset but for Metrics and Assessment there is also a link to Distribution.
  - ▪ PA asks if this is ok for EMS.
  - ▪ EMS agrees.

- GS says we will have to divide the model into packages.

- PA goes through an example:
  - o EMS asks what Turtle is.
    - ▪ PA explains that this is a way of writing RDF.
  - o EMS says she was expecting something in XML and asks if in the future an example in XML can also be provided.
    - ▪ PA says he will convert the example to XML so this is also disposable.
  - o PA says that any text can be tagged with a language in order to support the multi language requirement.
  - o EMS remarks that she found it difficult to find the properties in the example that we have defined in the conceptual model (e.g. in the example we don't have name but we have product, title, ...).
    - ▪ PA explains that in the Conceptual Model we tried to draw what we want to see but to fill the model with e.g. this example the rdf:foaf tags have been reused.
    - ▪ EMS asks if it wouldn't be good to change the names of the conceptual model to what we use.
    - ▪ PA says this can be changed but in the specification document I have in the definition the actual property that will be used in the rdf schema.
    - ▪ PA says he agrees this is confusing.
  - o EMS asks how the association between Project and Software Asset is represented in the example.
    - ▪ PA explains this.
  - o SG says that it was decided in the working group to reuse DOAP and asks why we are now using FOAF instead?
    - ▪ PA explains that if you start using the terms of DOAP, you are automatically saying that everything is a DOAP project and we have separated the software asset and the project.
    - ▪ PA explains it with an example: DOAP project class has a property of operating system. If you use the DOAP operating

system property you are automatically saying that the thing that is using the DOAP operating system property is a DOAP project.

- PA concludes that DOAP can't be used because of the domain and range restrictions on its properties.

- SG says that not using DOAP will make it much more difficult. We should set up a meeting with Edd Dumbill (DOAP) to see if these restrictions can fall away so we can reuse DOAP.

- SG says it is important to be aligned as much as possible to DOAP.

Decisions

- "Has Asset Type software" will be a fixed characteristic of a Software Asset in the RDF Schema.

- A meeting with Edd Dumbill from DOAP must be organised to see if the domain and range restrictions can fall away because this restricts us from reusing DOAP.

Documentation

- Proposed conceptual model

- ADMS.F/OSS Specification

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Make "Has Asset Type software" a fixed characteristic of a Software Asset in the RDF Schema.	PA	06/03
Convert the example in Turtle to XML.	PA	06/03
Organise a meeting with Edd Dumbill (founder of DOAP) to see if the if the domain and range restrictions of DOAP can fall away.	SG	06/03

6. Controlled vocabularies and Issues

Discussion

- EMS proposed to drop user interface type (issue).
  - PA proposes to keep this as this is a part of Trove.
  - EMS agrees since this is not that important for them and Rashid Tariq asked via the mailing list to keep User Interface Type.
- PA says that everything in the model is optional, besides name and description.
- EMS raised an issue that the SPDX License controlled vocabulary is maybe to detailed and asks if we can't define a more simple set.
  - PA says that on base of SPDX for most licenses you can group them on a higher level on base of the URI and identifier.
  - SG says that for the purpose of ADMS.F/OSS it is preferred to have the lowest level of detail for licensing and it is always possible then to have

an aggregation for the implementation in a system.

- o EMS says that SPDX is good but they have to think how to make it more simple for their own use.
- o SG says SPDX is not final yet.
- o PA critiques the fact that the SPDX project has assigned new URIs to Creative Commons licenses.
- PA says that he will put the vocabularies EMS created in the schema and provide the English labels.

Decisions

- For ADMS.F/OSS the full detail of SPDX will be kept.
- User Interface Type will be kept in the conceptual model.

Documentation

- SPDX
- ADMS.F/OSS Logged Issues
- Controlled Vocabularies

7. Wrap-up and summary of actions

8. Public Review

Discussion

- PA says the discussions will be continued on the forum, the wiki and the mailing list.
- PA says that version of the specification document to go to public review will be ready by the end of the week.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Finish the version of the specification document to go to public review.	SG	06/03