

== Attendees ==

Shane Coughlan
Gary O'Neill
David Rudin
Mark Gisi
Debmayla Biswas
Jilayne Lovejoy
Miriam Ballhausen
Kate Stewart
Akshu Thula
Josh Kast
Jake McGowan

== Project Update ==

Shane provided an update on the following topics

- OpenChain Conformance - New Entities
- OpenChain @ Legal and Licensing Workshop
- OpenChain Japan Work Group
- OpenChain Case Studies

== Specification ==

Mark noted that the 1.2 specification was released. He explained that we would kick off the process to create the next version.

Mark opened with a review of the guiding principles.

1. Build trust around the use of open source in constructing Software Solutions that are shared with others (with focus on license compliance)
2. Less is More
 - Avoid boiling the ocean - Focus specifically on providing the necessary and sufficient requirements of a “quality” compliance program
 - Focus on meaningful pain points based on actual practice use cases
3. Focus of the what and why (avoid the how and when)
 - Embrace the implementation of different practices to solve a given requirement
 - Avoid providing specific legal advice or specific best practices
4. Function as an open development initiative - open to all to contribute - inclusion via discussion and consensus that adhere to these guiding principles

Jilayne noted that the term Software Solutions may be defined, and queried if there was a formal definition. Mark noted that at this time it is not a formally defined term.

David asked whether "function as an open development initiative" needs more of a standards influence. For example, a due process, formal voting.

Mark noted that we probably have not injected enough of this approach in the past. He suggested that moving forward it may be worth adding.

David concurred and gave the final comment / release cycle / Japanese translation process as an example where more formal process could be a benefit.

Jilayne noted that there may be a difference between formal standards versus open source collaborative projects, especially around defining votes. She further noted that we had a process of announcing comment and release periods.

David suggested that avenues including participation as right to vote on changes. He noted his point was centered around if this is a community lead effort then it should probably should be a community focused formal review period.

Mark noted that there is value in having an extra level of vetting. He noted the value of taking best practices from standards.

Jilayne concurred. David and Jilayne agreed that having a defined location for formal happenings provides value.

Mark noted that the two key points were to document the process and to refine the process for practical use.

David asked if hardware was within the OpenChain mandate. Mark noted that it had not been a part of the project. He further noted we could add this point to the FAQ and solicit further feedback.

Mark proceeded to open a discussion about the Benefactors of the project:

1. Recipients of Software (e.g, supply chain, organization's customers)
2. Legal Group - Assurance that engineering is doing the right thing

He solicited feedback on whether these benefactors are still valid. Kate noted that we might want to include product managers. Mark concurred this could be a useful addition.

David noted that open chain provides a useful way to reduce negotiation and to reduce the timescale for deployment, providing value both to the provider and the recipient. Mark concurred and noted that he will also add providers as a benefactor.

Mark summarized the discussion and noted that at the moment we are on a yearly cycle, though this could be revisited.

== Conformance ==

Shane noted that Miriam and Gary were present.

Gary took lead and noted that the main item was the file format that should be used for the conference website, an item that impacts things like localization for the conformance web app. He cited maintenance as another key concern.

Gary explained that until now we used CSV files. He noted there was one issue, whereby reading the file through different tools, and this lead to altered documents. The only workaround was using a text editor.

He explained that this format is not very easy to use for translation, a key point moving forward for the project.

Miriam noted that there were two things to consider:

- (1) comfort in maintaining the questions in a format
- (2) what is useful for the web app

Gary concurred.

Gary outlined a proposal with two points:

(1) Multiple files – one per language

- Positive: Multiple files support a more natural localization workflow where there is a primary file edited by the conformance team and localization files maintained by local language experts
- Negative: Need to upload multiple files for any update. Can be solved by enhancing the website admin functions to pull changes from Github as a set of files.

(2) JSON file format

- Positives: Structure format, removes the need for section titles file, easier to validate, better for Github tracking
- Negative: More complex to read and update

Gary noted that items such as translations team interaction might be well-served by multiple files, and that we can support more languages.

Miriam asked if we need to upload all translations at once. Gary confirmed that incremental updates would be the general approach. Miriam noted this would be useful and is another reason for supporting multiple files. Gary concurred.

Gary continued with a note that the proposal for using a JSON format to allow for clearer notifications (such as section titles). He further noted that encoding issues would be addressed by using JSON because of its standardization on UTF-8.

Mark noted that he found JSON useful and familiar. Miriam concurred that while she is not personally familiar with JSON but she can learn to use it. However, she also noted that the structure of JSON may be a little daunting for non-programmers. Mark asked if we could work off a CSV file that would convert to JSON to address the human readability aspects.

Gary noted that the information ends up in a database, which guided the choice of file formats from the beginning, and technically JSON is closer to our tooling. He did note that it can appear more daunting than some other choices.

Miriam noted that we do not change so many items between versions of the specification and gave the transition from 1.1 to 1.2 as an example. She noted that this could feed into the decision about file formats. A less readable format may be fine given minimal on-going changing.

Gary concurred and displayed an example of the JSON format. The walkthrough explained the way the format can quickly provide information visually. Miriam noted this advantage appears to be useful compared to using Excel or CSV. Gary further noted that JSON can be stored and edited via Git.

Gary put out a call for further comments. Miriam spoke in support of JSON given the discussion above. There were no objections to using JSON from other members of the call. No objections were raised.

== Any other business ==

There was no other business.

