ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.02.21

Meeting minutes

CESAR VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.01.27 – Meeting minutes			
Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	**Meeting date**	21/02/2012
Author	MDK	**Meeting time**	14:30 – 15:30
Reviewed by		**Issue date**	
Status		**Version**	0.01

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
Sander van der Waal	SW	NL/UK – Simal
Patrice-Emmanuel Schmitz	PES	BE – Unisys
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	SVW	Introduction and outlook
3	SG	Licensing: ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.0 and the Collaborator Licence Agreement
4	SVW	Adoption of minutes of previous meeting
5	SVW	Use cases (quick)
6	SVW / PA	Proposed conceptual model (version 0.1 of the spec etc.)

7	SVW / SG	Controlled vocabularies
8	SVW	Wrap-up and summary of actions
9	SVW	Next meeting date and time: February 28 2012 14:30 CET.

Meeting minutes

1. Roll call / welcome new ADMS.F/OSS Working Group members

2. Introduction and outlook

Discussion

- PA explains the outlook for the coming week:
  We aim to be ready with the conceptual model and the specification document that defines the conceptual model by next week and have then a version that can be agreed by the Working Group to release for public review. In that case next week's meeting will be the last of the weekly Working Group Virtual Meetings.

3. Licensing: ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.0 and the Collaborator Licence Agreement

Discussion

- PES gives a status about the CLA (Collaborator License Agreement): it still needs to be clarified at some points.

- PES asks if he has to circulate the draft to the Working Group members.
    - SG says this question should first be reviewed and approved by the European Commission's legal service.

- PES explains that the CLA is likely to be aligned to Apache or Harmony license, which will make it easier to reuse.

- SG says that the CLA can be shared within one or two weeks, after the European Commission has approved the proposals of PES based on the Apache and/or Harmony license.

- PES says a *draft* version can be shared earlier, depending on the choice for Apache or Harmony. He will send a draft version to SG and SVGwill make sure that it is put on Joinup.

- SG will put the ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1 (modified by PES), under which we want to publish ADMS.F/OSS, on Joinup.

- RG says that it will not be a fast process for him to sign the CLA because he first needs to check it with the legal department of his organisation.

Decisions

- The CLA will be shared with the WG after the approval by the European Commission

Documentation

- ISA Open Metadata License v1.0
- ISA Open Metadata License v1.1
- Collaborator License Agreement

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Send the *draft* CLA to SG	PES	28/02
Publish the *draft* CLA on Joinup	SVW	28/02
Publish ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1 on Joinup (done)	SG	28/02

4. Adoption of **minutes of previous meeting**

Discussion

- SVW goes through the action points in the minutes of the previous meeting:
  - RG says that he has the approval for making the Trove software map (Trove © SourceForge 2012 CC by) documentationfrom SourceForge available.
    - PA asks RG if it is the actual list of classifications that he is going to share.
    - RG confirms this.
  - The other action points are all related to the conceptual model and are therefore discussed during the corresponding agenda item (item 6: Proposed Conceptual Model)

Decisions

- The meeting minutes are adopted

Documentation

- ADMS.F/OSS Virtual Meeting 2012.02.14

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
PA talks to OB about OSLC	PA	28/02
Make the documentation available from SourceForge on the different categories (taxonomies)	RG	28/02

5. **Use cases** (quick)

Discussion

- SG says that the use cases document has not changed and he needs to have a look at the comments made by OB.

Documentation

- Use cases

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Process the comments of OB on the use case document	SG	28/02

6. **Proposed conceptual model** (version 0.1 of the spec etc.)

Discussion

- PA goes through the different parts of the model:
    - Right side (white): ADMS; this is going through its final stage before going to public review
    - Left side: ADMS.F/OSS :
        - A Software Asset (green) is a specialisation of an Asset and therefore inherits all the attributes of an Asset
        - On the top (yellow) we have everything that is related to the technical description of a Software Asset. We reuse the categories of Trove Software Map for that. The class "Operating Environment" has been removed as agreed on in the previous meeting.
        - The measurement of a Software Asset (brown) can be done in three ways: metrics, who is using the software (there is a relationship between Organisation and Software Asset) and via the Assessment class (more subjective)
        - Because it is possible that an Organisation doesn't want their assessment to be public, this is linked to a Licence. We don't need to specify this Licence class further except the Working Group specifically wants it.
        - Project and everything related (Forum, Person, Organisation ...) to this class (purple) is not finished yet.
- PA says the first version of the draft specification is also ready (release).
- OB asks if we are going to put a timestamp on the assessments and metrics.
    - PA compares it with a software asset. A new version of an Asset is a new Asset.
    - OB asks if the Release class is not there for the versioning and what's the difference between a Version and a Release
    - SG answers that a certain version of a Software Asset can have different Releases. The meaning of a Release in this model is all the different files or manifestations which a Software Asset can have (e.g. source code and binary manifestation). SG concludes that the name of the Release class can maybe better changed to Distribution as it is in ADMS.
    - SG says that we do not version the actual Work, i.e. the Project.
    - SG gives an example to illustrate the present conceptualisation.
        - Project: Apache HTTP Server Project

- - Software Asset: Stable Release 2.2.22
  - Software Release (or better Distribution): Unix Source (httpd-2.2.22.tar.gz) / Win32 Source (httpd-2.2.22-win32-src.zip)

- SVW asks if the measurement classes (metrics, assessment ...) shouldn't be linked to the level of Release.
  - SG agrees that this might be needed for some properties.
  - PA will change this in the conceptual model

- SVW asks if a Software Asset can have multiple licenses because there now is a 1 to 1 relationship with Release. This happens for instance in the case of dual licensing.
  - SG agrees that this relationship should be changed.
  - PA will check this with the ADMS Working Group.

- PA asks SG to give more explanation of the function of ADMS Representation Language class in ADMS.F/OSS.
  - SG explains that for a Software Asset this is just the Programming Language.
  - PA suggests to make Programming Language a subproperty of Representation Language.
  - OB and SG agree.

- OB asks PA to provide the examples.
  - PA says the examples will be provided by next week.

- SVW has a question about the vocabulary we will need to use but will put this on the agenda of next week (shortage of time).

Decisions

- The relation of the measurement classes with the Software Asset is on the level of the Release.
- The relationship between License (ADMS) and Release must be changed so that a release can have multiple licenses (e.g. dual licensing).
- Programming Language is a subproperty of Representation Language.
- SVW's question about vocabulary will be discussed on next week's meeting.

Documentation

- ADMS.F/OSS Proposed Conceptual Model
- ADMS.F/OSS Specification
- ADMS.F/OSS release v0.01 (conceptual model + specification)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Add a relation in the model between the measurement (metrics, assessment, ...) classes and Release	PA	28/02
Check the change of the relationship between License and Release and change it.	PA	28/02

Make Programming Language a subproperty of Representation Language.	PA	28/02
Documentation of examples	PA	28/02

7. Controlled vocabularies

Discussion

- SG explains we have come to an initial proposal for a controlled vocabulary for all the properties.
- The main principle was to reuse as much as possible existing taxonomies. For properties that don't have an existing taxonomy or controlled vocabulary we looked at the proposals of EMS and the CENATIC study.
- SG goes through the different tabs in the file:
    - Database: no existing list of terms. There is a link to a list on Wikipedia.
        - SG remarks that we should remove "Other DBMS" and that it is better to not classify then to put "Other". This is also valid for other taxonomies.
        - PA agrees.
    - Domain: re-use of the Eurovoc domains.
        - SG remarks that it would have maybe been better to use "Sector" as a name instead of "Domain".
        - EMS prefers "Sector".
        - SG says this is a mandatory property in ADMS but he is not sure if this also should apply to software assets.
        - PA says this is not mandatory in the ADMS.F/OSS model
    - Function: we haven't haven't found an equivalent for this so EMS's proposal has been adopted.
    - Intended audience
        - SG asks why we need more detail for public administrations then e.g. for business. Is this detail necessary?
        - EMS says it is important because this indicates if it is interesting to re-use for a certain public administration on a certain level.
        - SG says we will then maybe have a further categorisation for business too.
    - Geographical coverage: this comes from ADMS. (ISO 3166-1; NUTS; FAO)
    - License: re-use of the SPDX license taxonomy
    - Programming language: re-use of the DBpedia URI's
    - Sector: Here we have NACE (European) and ISIC (International). It would be good to recommend both of them: NACE because we have all the European translations, ISIC because of the international character.
- SG says that the taxonomies will be recommended and not imposed.

       o   The Working Group agrees.

- SVW says the rest of the initial proposal will be discussed offline via the mailing list.

Decisions

- The taxonomies and controlled vocabularies will be recommended but not imposed.
- Discussion and feedback on the initial proposal via the mailing list.
- No value "*Other*" in the controlled vocabularies for the different properties.

Documentation

- Initial proposal taxonomies and controlled vocabularies
- Proposal EMS
- CENATIC study

8. Wrap-up and summary of actions

9. Next meeting date and time: February 28 2012 14:30 CET.

Documentation

- ADMS.F/OSS Working Group Virtual Meeting 2012.02.28