



ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.02.14

Meeting minutes

JOINING UP GOVERNMENTS



CESAR VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.02.14 – Meeting minutes

Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	Meeting date	14/02/2012
Author	MDK	Meeting time	14:30 – 15:30
Reviewed by	SG	Issue date	
Status		Version	0.02

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Roberto Galoppini	RG	IT – SourceForge
Elena Muñoz Salinero	EMS	ES – Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Administrations
Olivier Berger	OB	FR – Telecom & Management SudParis
Szabolcs Szekacs	SS	EU – DG DIGIT B2
Phil Archer	PA	UK – W3C
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE – PwC
Kelly Liljemo	KL	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 v1.0 and the Collaborator Licence Agreement
4	PA	Adoption of minutes of previous meeting
5	PA	Proposed conceptual model
6	PA	Controlled vocabularies
7	All	Wrap-up and summary of actions



8	PA	Next meeting date and time: February 21 2012 14:30 CET .
---	----	--

Meeting minutes

1. Roll call / welcome new [ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members](#)
2. Introduction and outlook
3. Licensing: [ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.0](#) and [the Collaborator Licence Agreement](#)
4. Adoption of [minutes of previous meeting](#)

Discussion

- There are no comments on the [previous meeting minutes](#).

Decisions

- The meeting minutes are adopted.

Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS 2012.02.07 Meeting Minutes](#)

5. [Proposed conceptual model](#)

(https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ADMS.FOSS_Conceptual_Model_v0.04.png)

Discussion

- PA goes through the conceptual model that has evolved from the original one by SG two weeks ago. The model accounts for the comments that were made during the previous meeting and the ones that were sent to the mailing list.
 - OB remarks that the model should have a version number to be sure that everyone is watching the same version during the meeting.
 - PA agrees and will give the different versions of the model a version number.
 - PA says that a participating organisation can be described by means of the UK organisation ontology, which is already stable.
 - EMS suggests to call it just organisation.
 - SG en SS agree.
 - PA says this is only a small change.
 - EMS says it is useful to have a user's comments but identification of that user is even more important. Currently, the conceptual model does not show any attribute to identify a user. Furthermore, a user can also be an organisation.
 - PA says that a user can be an organisational (or institutional user) or an individual user, hence the stereotype <<agent>>.
 - EMS further suggests to distinguish software end-users and organisations who install the software.
 - SS says that at the moment user can be interpreted in many ways.
-

-
- PA responds that at the moment it can be any group of people or an individual.
 - OB suggests to use "Feedback" or "Assessment" instead of "User".
 - PA asks if we need two different relationships then: "installer" and "user".
 - SG suggests that we should maybe look at user as someone who gives his/her review of a software asset and register themselves as a user (analogy with the internet movie database).
 - PA asks if it would be useful to include a property to be able to distinguish the usage and whether or not a user has installed the software on his or her PC.
 - SS agrees that we need to make that distinction between user and installer. On the other hand we need to be pragmatic and see how we can collect these data.
 - SS asks if we don't have a privacy issue here on the exchange of user names and other personal data.
 - PA confirms this is an important issue.
 - SS asks if a private comment can be seen by everyone.
 - PA says that at the moment all comments are public.
 - EMS says that it is very important to have comments of the user but for the interchange between repositories this may not be the main issue.
 - OB suggests putting this discussion on hold, excluding usage information from the first version of [ADMS/F.OSS](#) and putting it on the agenda of the next version of [ADMS.F/OSS](#).
 - EMS asks if opinions can be shared/exchanged between forges.
 - PA answers that this depends on the forge.
 - SS says that user comments are very valuable since they are a very direct way to assess software.
 - PA asks if there is a difference with forum and if we can't remove the "User" class and rely on the forum.
 - SS says that some of the data can be optional.
 - SG says that usage information gives an important context and can be as important or more than metrics for assessment of the software. We may want to restrict this information to an organisation.
 - SS agrees this is important but he doesn't see how it can be easily implemented at the forge level.
 - OB asks if we aren't over specifying here. We may not need to standardise this yet.
 - EMS suggests to keep the "user" but only for saying the organization who has installed the software.
 - PA suggests to only record that a certain organisation is using it.
 - EMS agrees.
 - EMS says that in the repository of the Technology Transfer Centre they have usage information available at metadata level. However, information is necessarily incomplete, as it is very hard to collect this information. It is nonetheless useful to know which organisations are using a particular software
-

asset.

- SS says that usage information is important. F/OSS developers and users have no idea about who the other users are. Usage information is actually an important quality indicator.
 - EMS says that for them usage information is important information.
- PA concludes that we only want to record the names of the organisations that use the software. Other information is optional: comments, rating and usage.
- SS enquires about the difference between logo and picture. Do pictures include screenshots?
 - PA suggests that all video's and pictures should be removed from the model and be considered as documentation. Logos should remain a separate relationship and/or concept.
 - SS, SG, and EMS agree.

Decisions

- “Participating Organisation” should be called “Organisation”.
- Only the name of *organisations* that *use* the software will be mandatory information. Other recordable information such as comments, reviews, and ratings should be excluded from the conceptual model.
- Screenshots and videos will be considered to be documentation, with the exception of logos, which should remain a separate relationship and/or concept.

Documentation

- [Proposed conceptual model](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Give a version number to the different versions of the conceptual model	PA	21/02
Change “participating organisation” to “organisation”	PA	21/02
Provide a draft specification that explains the proposed conceptual model	PA	21/02

6. [Controlled vocabularies](#)

Discussion

- SG says that EMS made a proposition [for each taxonomy](#)
 - SG says that all the taxonomies originate from [SourceForge](#) or [Gforge](#)
 - SG asks RG if he has more information on this
 - RG answers that SourceForge has a wiki page describing all the different categories. This is not available for the public now but it can be made available after doing some changes (because this is now used for internal activities). The documentation can be made available within one

week.

- RG will make this link available but remarks that these taxonomies have to be maintained.
- SG says this information is very useful and can be compared to the [proposed taxonomies by EMS](#) and by the CENATIC study.
- EMS says that environment is not a crucial one
 - Everyone agrees
 - PA says that the environment issue can be dropped
- PA and OB say that operating system is very important
- OB asks to reuse what's in [SPDX](#).
 - SG confirms and says that at least the license taxonomy will be used.
- EMS says that the Technology Transfer Centre has simplified the terms in each taxonomy to facilitate categorisation and retrieval.
- OB remarks that also [freecode.com](#) and [DBpedia](#) have categories that are quite similar
- SS says we lack a functional classification in the model as is included in the [CENATIC](#) study.
 - PA agrees and says this should be included
 - SS says they had a functional classification on OSOR.EU but the problem was that it had only values that were relevant to the EC. This may not be sufficient. We could extend the classification with the best practices brought forward by EMS.
 - EMS says that it is important that the functional classification is applicable in practice
- SG says not all taxonomies should necessarily be standardised. Forges could continue using their own taxonomies and then do a mapping.
- SS says we should try to classify some software assets that are provided by the members of the Working Group.
 - EMS says that is exactly what the Technology Transfer Centre has done its software assets. They concluded that they could classify all their software assets using a simplified taxonomy.
 - EMS says that the classification she proposed is oriented to public administrations so if we want to extend we may need to add some categories.
 - PA concludes that we will need to come back on this.

Decisions

- The environment can be dropped
- A functional classification should be included in the model

Documentation

- [Controlled vocabularies](#)
 - [Proposed taxonomy of EMS](#)
-

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the documentation available from SourceForge on the different categories (taxonomies) used. 	RG	21/02
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a functional classification in the model 	PA	21/02

7. Wrap-up and summary of actions

8. Next meeting date and time: [February 21 2012 14:30 CET.](#)

Discussion

- OB raises an issue about the related work of the Open Services for Lifecycle Collaboration (OSLC): <http://open-services.net/bin/view/Main/AssetHome>
 - PA says he will discuss this issue with OB offline
- RG answers a couple of things that were asked in the previous meeting:
 - The Sourceforge Software Taxonomies (Trove taxonomies) will be made available under the CC-BY licence.
 - The approach of [SourceForge](#) on [DOAP: SourceForge](#) uses it.
- PA will update the [conceptual model](#) and create the document that explains the model for next week's meeting.
- [Next meeting: 2012.02.21 from 14:30 till 15:30.](#)

Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS Working Group Virtual Meeting – 2012.02.21](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Update the conceptual model .	PA	21/02
Prepare a specification document that defines the model.	PA	21/02