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Attendees Ed Daniel (EDA), Consulting
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Guillaume Sauthier (GSA), Chairman of the OW2 TC

Agenda

Next TC meeting

Status

Infrastructure
  Project wiki migration
  Projects
  SQuAT

Discussions
  SQuAT
  Forge
  Interactions between Board and projects
  Feedback about the programming contest

Actions

Next TC meeting

We are planning to host an IRC TC meeting at the beginning of May.

Status

Infrastructure

Status by JCA to be provided by e-mail to the TC mailing list.

Project wiki migration

GSA has migrated the JOnAS wiki.
An automatic migration mechanism has been developed for the JOnAS wiki migration.
The new JOnAS skin could also be made available as an example template.
Next steps: GSA cleans up the migration mechanism, hands it to JCA, in order to be used by other projects for the migration.

Other projects on the old XWiki include JASMINe, EasyBeans, ... (full list available from JCA).
The new XWiki include Contails, Kerneos...
Target is to remove the old XWiki instance.

Action ALE: Re-contact OBS people for management rules about using greedy resources (Bamboo, Sonar), in order to make sure that such scarce resources are used fairly among projects, which services we offer to all projects and which limits we set (the idea being that specific requirements are not guaranteed to be fulfilled, but we could guarantee one build per branch on a regular basis). Idea to write guidelines for project leaders about continuous integration practices.

Projects

GSA is cleaning up the OW2 Utilities licensing issues. Will then require legal change of license (Bull, Serli).
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OW2 Spec project will be submitted soon (with legal clearance too).

4 projects from Trustie which were in the 2011 programming contest. 2 projects have already submitted a first version, to be completed.

TC: note that some (new) members (strategic/corporate) do not have a member representative at the TC. They are entitled to in the ByLaws. 
GSA/ALE to invite members to appoint someone in the TC. 
Check beforehand whether they are already present in TC. 
Includes Fraunhofer, SugarCRM, UJF (check other members).

SQuAT

11/34 OMM self-evaluations received. 
OMM self-evaluation spreadsheet has been simplified by the Management Office.

Next steps: reminder to projects + new simplified form. 
Insist that the OW2 Management Office can help.

Idea that MO pre-fills a minimum set of questions while looking at the website, to bootstrap the questionnaire. 
• documentation PDOC1

Action ALE: get back to Antelink about next steps. 
Double check about the false positive that we got from the Antepedia OW2 Utilities analysis.

Discussions

SQuAT

Beyond the current SQuAT tools, what about intellectual property management? 
Are there projects who do not manage at all intellectual property? 
Should we ask projects to publish their intellectual property management rules? Could this be part of the OMM questionnaire in the license section? 
• Does the project have an intellectual property policy? 
• Does the project publish its intellectual property policy?

Forge

• Financial aspects to be evaluated (cost of maintaining it internally versus cost of a hosting offer) 
• Strategic aspect: does OW2 really need to have the project source code in "our infrastructure"?

This is still an open question. 
• The real need is to have access to the project source code. 
Does it really matter that the source code is on our machines? 
Why do we need to have the source locally? What are the reasons?

Options: 
• SourceForge 
• Cloud-based hosting (CloudBees?) Cloud solutions? 
• Need to look for providers of Forge-like services.

The main request is a unified SSO access to all services. 
Would it be possible to have SSO with part of the infrastructure at OW2 (e.g. Atlassian), and part with Sourceforge? 
Would that be feasible at all?
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Note that JCA has installed Crowd -> we need an update from JCA on the level of integration with our LDAPs and the perspectives. Need to re-launch the unified LDAP work with Clément Oudot (possibly with a service form Linagora).

Get back to the project needs: ease of use, set of loosely coupled services with unified access.

- **Essential needs**
  - Version management system (SVN, Git, …)
  - Tracker
  - Project news
  - Files for releases
- **Optional**
  - Continuous integration
  - Sonar

Other community related tools:
- Jabber

Discussion: could we envisage a Github partnership with additional services? Code and collaboration on Github (which works, may includes a tracker, a wiki, ...). And OW2 proposes additional tools (XWiki, others?), provides the governance (incl. SQuAT tools e.g.). What about SVN projects -> idea to propose a migration? See OPS4j which had its own infrastructure and migrated to Github, but has their website, wiki (confluence), other tools.

On the side question about GitHub: what is their database/data technology?

**Interactions between Board and projects**

**GSA** questions the lack of interaction between the Board and TC. Example of the Future Internet Initiative, which is an information that is not communicated to projects. It gives, from the projects viewpoint, the impression that the Board lives in its own ivory tower. Other examples include choice of events where the MO and Board decide with little input from the projects.

Topics of common interests:
- Presence at events
- Technical strategy: everything that may have an impact on projects.
- This includes initiatives (decision of launching them), ...

Idea to have more exchange projects <-> board (via ALE, GSA):
- CTO/TC Chair inform projects and TC about discussions in the Board which may impact projects
- CTO/TC Chair inform the Board about feedback from projects

**Feedback about the programming contest**

**GSA** notes that little code has been re-used.
- There is too little contact with the contestants
- We **may NEED** to make sure that there is a bi-weekly update/exchange between the students and the project team

**Should we make compulsory?**
1. That the students contact at least one the project (topic) contact
   - Up to the topic contact to define the rules for interacting with the project (e.g. feedback every 2 weeks, send an e-mail to the topic contact with the Trustie URL).
2. If the contestant team does not respect the rules, this is an eliminatory

Should we ask TC/project leaders about feedback from projects who have submitted a topic which has been chosen about what went well, and what can be improved?
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Action **ALE**: Does Trustie offer Git, and plans to mirror on GitHub for open source projects.

Idea to have a look at Google Summer of Code, and what works well there.

**Actions**

**EDA** to help **JCA** with LDAP/SSO architecture of OW2.

**GSA** to get feedback from Goulven about NovaForge: precision about roadmap, is NovaForge still interested as being the OW2 Forge, what technical services are offered, integration with other tools (Atlassian, XWiki, Gitorious, ...)? Note that this goes back to an integrated approach.