

1. Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	May 7th, 11:30am
Inviting person:	Juanjo Hierro
Minutes takers:	Miguel Carrillo, Axel Fasse, all the rest helping
Name of the meeting:	Joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall (May 7th)
Place of the meeting:	
Phone details (if PhC):	powwownow (PIN: 050662) webex details circulated
Version	

2. Attendees

Name	Company / Organization
Juan Bareño	Atos
Pierangelo Garino	Telecom Italia
Matteo Melideo, Stefano De Panfilis, Davide Dalle Carbonare, Paolo Zampognaro	Engineering
Alex Glikson	IBM
Dénes Bisztray, Lorant Farkas	NSN
Pascal Bisson	Thales
Hans Joachim Einsiedler	Deutsche Telekom (until 12:25)
Axel Fasse, Uwe Riss	SAP
Miguel Carrillo (partially)	Telefónica I+D
Carlos Ralli Ucendo	Telefónica I+D

Juanjo Hierro	Telefónica I+D
Thierry Nagellen	Orange

4. Objective and topics addressed during the meeting

Review overall status. Follow-up deliverables in month 12.

A summary of deliverables is provided at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1umd_HChUXX_G-B-o3h8v7m4IU1lvQ1WQsISxAWrkI08/edit

	<p>Deliverables due in month 12. Open Specifications.</p> <p>There haven't been further comments from partners apart from the ones already dealt with weeks ago, mainly from the security chapter. Anyway, it was agreed that any discussion or question about the provided template would be discussed on the mailing list.</p> <p>During our last confcall, it was agreed that chapters must show that they have drafts by the end of this week (on the private wiki)</p> <p>Report on status from the different chapters:</p> <p>Cloud:</p> <p>Draft Open Specifications available (at the private wiki):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCRM • Service Manager • Cloud Edge • Object Storage <p>Major issues or red flag ? Some issues regarding how to deal with avoiding duplication of existing specifications but they think that they have been able to handle it. They would like someone to review their approach. Juanjo: let's review it and see whether we can extrapolate and consider the approach for the future.</p> <p>No major red flag regarding delivery of specifications on time.</p> <p>Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Available Contribs: BigData, CEP, MetaData preprocessing, MM analysis, QueryBroker, Semantic Support - Pending Contribs : PubSub, Location, Semantic Annotation. <p>There will be one single NGSI Spec that will be linked by PubSub GE. Telecom Italia</p>
--	--

may add other APIs (Query language) if needed.

Major concerns about template ? No. People has fulfilled the template without any major issue.

Apps: Available Open Specification:

- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.RepositoryREST
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.RegistryREST
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.MarketplaceRegistration
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.MarketplaceOfferings
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.MarketplaceSearch
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.MediatorREST
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.GadgetAPI
- FIWARE.OpenSpecification.Apps.CompositionEngineAPI

Available in a first draft in the private wiki. Mostly pending on a peer-review.

AP to all: discuss and agree on the mailing list about how to carry out a peer-review of those specifications we consider stable enough. Juanjo will launch that discuss.

Some of them are not REST:

- Gadget API is fully browse-oriented
- CompositeEngineAPI is a Java API, Ericsson additionally thinking about providing a REST API

Juanjo: please provide technical explanation about why the CompositeEngineAPI is not REST (AP on Torsten)

Major issues with the template ? Not at this moment.

IoT:

We have found that there are elements in the Architecture Description that have to be revisited and we are discussing them. The Architecture is being stream-lined which will mean that less specifications have to be produced. We will explore whether to shift those components up to the level of GEs in future releases.

Nevertheless, it is pointed out that this would not represent a major impact in the FI-WARE NGSI API spec. In this respect, there is a relative stable version of the FI-WARE NGSI API specification for NGSI-9 and NGSI-10.

Peer review to be carried out once we upload the final specification on the Wiki.

Major issues with the template or deadline ? Not at this moment.

Security:

Regarding core Security GEs, available Open Specifications are:

- FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8-Identity Management GE
- FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8-DataHandlingGE is ready for peer-review

Paving the way towards: FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8 Security Monitoring GE:

- FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8-Attack Path Engine
- FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8-OSSIM SIEM

Some difficulties to comply with the template regarding some building blocks of this Security Monitoring GE.

Regarding optional Security GEs, the following open specifications are quite complete according to Pascal's vision, ready for peer-review.:

- FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8-DBAnonymizer

The FIWARE-8.1.a-OpenSpecification-WP8-Secure-Storage-Service is missing but issue was that the person who was in charge of this was on holidays but most of the content was there, it's just a matter of following the template.

They are working on USDL-Sec and wonder where to upload that part.

Juanjo to send an email explaining where to place specifications that are not APIs and also how to handle the cases when we are dealing with implementation of a specification that is being published any other place.

Any red flag to raise or any issue regarding the template or anything ? not that much, so they believe there may be some improvements/adjustments that would be worth considering for a review of the template for REST API specifications.

Pascal: we need per review. We have a rather critical need in that respect regarding the Identity Management GE.

Juanjo: AP on Security team to provide (probably after finishing our task force with delivery of Open Specifications) a report on improvements they would like to suggest regarding the template for REST API specifications. This to be sent to the fiware-wpl and fiware-wpa to have a fruitful discussion.

AP on all: To review the specification on Identity Management and assess how much it fits their demands and, overall, how they could evolve their APIs to become Identity-aware based on capabilities provided by the Identity Management GE.

	<p>Deadline; end of this week.</p> <p>I2ND: CDI GE: Draft available (webIDL specs) CE not yet drafted NetIC GE: Draft available as MS Word doc S3C: Partial draft available One remark: compliance with templates might be an issue for some of the I2ND GEs due to their specificity (e.g. not using RESTful API, see CDI). Juanjo: that is not an issue, similar to the Gadget API in the Apps chapter. One question/suggestion: a single wiki page to list all APIs of a GE (e.g. CDI) might be very long. We suggest to split it into a (reasonable) set of sub-pages. Juanjo: no problem with that approach.</p> <p>AP on Pier: Elaborate on the justification per each of specifications where a non-RESTful API has been defined.</p> <p>Major red flag ? We can make it thanks to decision taken regarding</p> <p>Pier: What about publishing things that were not committed for the FI-WARE first release but we could consider stable enough ? Juanjo: let's play with the concept of "PRELIMINARY spec". AP on Juanjo to make a concrete proposal on how to address this.</p>
	<p>Deliverables due in month 12. Software.</p> <p>Juanjo to send Arian question about how they will expect software to be delivered.</p> <p>Chapter leaders are welcome to comment on this:</p> <p>I2ND: Only CE GE is involved in first release. This will be a GE not included in the global testbed (Cloud Proxy/Edge is physically a separate HW/SW component).</p> <p>Tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● FI-WARE IDE (Eclipse based environment) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FusionForge connector (task/ticket mgmt) ○ FusionForge CDE mgmt (create/delete project, create user) ○ Collaborative Editing (3rd party plug-in) ○ Library and dependency mgmt (3rd party plug-in) ○ Source Code mgmt (3rd party plug-in) ○ Wiki edit (3rd party plug-in) ● Catalogue ● PROSA ● Trace Analyzer ● SoPeCo

	<p>Deliverables due in month 12. Installation & Admin Guides.</p> <p>A ToC was proposed and circulated end of April. Chapters leaders to make comments on the proposed ToC during that week. Point to check: have WPLs circulated them ? Any discussion on the ToC ?</p> <p>Engineering: no comments were received !! AP to send a final reminder not only with respect to request for comments but also a final reminders stating no reaction means no PM can be justified in the WP.</p> <p>During the last confcall, it was pointed out that any needed discussion should finish by end of that week so we could approve the proposed ToC in this joint WPL/WPA follow-up confcall.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Rest of text remains to keep track of previous discussions for our convenience:</p> <p>Again, difficult to create a common template for the rest of deliverables of M12.</p> <p>Note that the installation of the SW is not the responsibility of the WP10 coordinators (neither WP nor Task level). Each one is responsible for the installation of their enablers. AP on Stefano to propose templates for deliverables. Check status of this AP.</p> <p>Once again, they will be in wiki format, thus available on the public Wiki.</p> <p>-> Although most of the TOC is free, a couple of section requested from WP10 will have a fixed TOC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One thing that will be included here will be a sanity check, which is not a full complex set of tests but a checklist for the admin. He will use it after installing to perform a quick test that all looks fine. • The second thing that is necessary is to have a checklist to be used to diagnose the origin of a problem. <p>An entry in the private Wiki has been created (Miguel Carrillo, TID) with a template/ToC/guidelines for these chapters that have to be there as mandatory.</p>
	<p>Deliverables due in month 12. Unit testing plan.</p> <p>During the follow-up confcall on April 10th, the following proposal on how to handle this deliverable was made. So far, only feedback from the I2ND chapter was received. Following is the cut on what was proposed and the feedback from the I2ND chapter:</p> <p><i>We should use the chapter backlogs for this purpose. After carefully thinking we propose to adopt the following approach:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Create a comprehensive set of Features entries in the backlog describing all the features of the GE. Some of these Features should already be there, but</i>

	<p>others would map to features already supported in baseline assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I2ND: OK ● Each Feature to include a description on how the feature will be tested (how-to-test). This would mean filling a standard field of the backlog. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I2ND: In order to avoid duplicating descriptions, I2ND suggests that the 'how-to-test' should not be inserted in the ticket backlog, but rather in a wiki page (see next bullet) ● Note that since they would be features, they should have an entry on the public wiki referred from a ticket on the backlog. However, we need to discuss whether to make it part of the standard template on the wiki entry or just create a field in the ticket. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I2ND: we suggest that the how-to-test description of a complete GE be inserted in a unique (and separate) 'how-to-test the GE' wiki page, where each section describes the test procedures for a specific Feature of that GE. This is in our view an advantage, as an initial section(s) can be used to describe only once for the overall GE (or for large portions of the GE's functionality/Features) the common testing environment, as well as tools adopted. Each public wiki page describing a Feature can be updated, to host the link to the section of the test wiki page which describes the test for that Feature, and if the reader wants to get the global information on the test environment can take a look at the whole page ● It would be rather useful that the how-to-test field includes a reference to tools or testing clients that automate the testing of the feature. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I2ND: OK (see also above proposal) ● In theory, it may be argued that description on how-to-test should also be available for Use Case stories but this would be hard to cover in the first release, overall for features already supported in baseline assets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I2ND: It is strongly suggested to keep as minimum 'unit' for test description the Feature level, more granular descriptions would be useless (e.g. no possibility to test separately in many cases). <p>AP on Juanjo: to send final proposal accomodating I2ND' comments (only received so far) that all chapters have to comply with for the final deliverable due by end of June (officially end of June).</p>
	<p>Deliverables due in month 12. Exploitation.</p> <p>Juan Bareño sent an email summarizing the status and defining a concrete Action Plan until delivery of the documents.</p> <p>Juanjo: I have the impression that there has not been too much reaction to Juan's mail</p>

but Juan should give us an update.

11.1:Market Analysis

Market analysis sent last friday with pending review tasks by chapter for next week.

AP on Juanjo: to send email to chapters leaders stating that no contribution to the requests for comments, regarding the different WP deliverables, will be taken as justification to reject justification of any PMs with regard the WP on Exploitation.

11.2: Exploitation Plan, IPR Management and Sustainability

1. GE's Business Description: We will send a new mail with the 3rd review

- Cloud: More detail on the 4,5 and 6
- Data: 1,2,5, 9 y 10 pending to fulfill
- IoT:Need a further revision. There is a new structure empty.
- Apps: Some GE need to be reviewed (1.5, 1.6, 3.1 y 4.1)
- Security: Please review the Business Description Security Monitoring and the optional security enablers
- Interface to the Networks: Please review Cloud Edge

2. IPR Management (All pending)

We have considered that **at this stage of the project we should provide IPR information about every generic enabler implementation G.E.i. to be deployed in the first release of the test bed. WP leaders should check if the information is correct. To check if all G.E. agreed for the v1 testbed are included.**

Due to the fact that a G.E. could have several implementations, **we need to identify the IPR of every G.E. implementation and only for implementations which will be available in the Test bed first release**

For every chapter these are the links, please **WP leaders fill in**

- Cloud [link](#)
- Data Context management [link](#)
- Internet of Things [link](#)
- Applications & services ecosystems [link](#)
- Security [link](#)
- Interfaces to Networks [link](#)

3. Sustainability

We require the participation of Engineering to complete this section introducing the test bed part and new feedback.

4. Individual Exploitation Plans (All pending)

We moved the individual exploitation plans located in every chapter to a new section in order to

obtain a comprehensive overview of company interests in the project.

You can find the section [here](#). **Every partner should explain its strategy with regard to the project.** The plan should be divided into the following sections as you can see in the wiki:

- Organization profile
- FI WARE relevance in your current business model
- Main project outcomes
- How to exploit these results in different environments?

11.3: Market and Policy Awareness (Just Telefonica have reviewed, pending all partners for identify cities and WPLs to review main legacy barriers)

Atos will circulate on the 9th a draft version of the deliverable.

1. Market Awareness: To involve Relevant Actors, SmartCities and Companies

Identification of potential cities	here	All partners	09/05/2012
Identification of business associations and other bodies	here	All partners	09/05/2012
Commitment to host a national event	here	Thales	09/05/2012
Commitment to host a national event	here	Engineering & Telecom Italy	09/05/2012
Commitment to host a national event	here	SAP & DT in Germany	09/05/2012
Commitment to host a national event	here	Atos & Telefonica Spain	09/05/2012

Policy Awareness

CONCORD has identified the following barriers and FI-WARE is analyzing the barriers which directly affect them. Please review it and complete the pending content.

To fill the table Identification of relevance barriers	here	WP leaders	09/05/2012
---	----------------------	------------	------------

Stefano introduced the people from ICT Labs to Juan Bareño (WPL) and Juanjo so that conversations with them could start, trying to include ICT Labs as one of the

	<p>potential paths to stimulate market awareness and support sustainability. A confcall will be setup</p> <p>--</p> <p>Juan Bareño (WPL to WP11) provides guidelines to complete the current work(11.2) Then we will start 11.3.</p> <p>Need to finish contributing to D11.2 at the end of the month. Review meeting after Easter in Madrid. Juan to propose dates.</p>
	<p>Deliverable on Third party innovation enablement in FI-WARE. Delayed to month 15.</p> <p>We have to work on this soon despite it doesn't need to be a long document. Question comes about what approach and ToC would be most suitable.</p> <p>This is the description of the deliverable according to the DoW:</p> <p><i>During the design of FI-WARE, the FI-WARE project will make choices that will affect the way FI-WARE can be used by third parties. Some of these choices will allow and some will limit the possibilities that third parties will get to innovate on top of the platform. It is expected that such choices relate to architectural design and/or to the business model of FI-WARE. This deliverable will document the key choices made and will analyse their effect on future third party innovation. As such, it will provide a justification of these choices against the ultimate objective of enabling third party innovation. It is expected that the deliverable will address topics such as architecture and innovation; neutrality issues; openness; lock-in; data portability; interoperability; patents; standards; specifications; access rights; open source and licensing; and so on.</i></p>
	<p>Deliverable on State of the Art Analysis. Delayed to month 18.</p> <p>Despite we may think there is enough time, better we start to work on it also, at least defining what approach and ToC would be most suitable.</p> <p>We should make Universities work on this.</p>
	<p>FI-PPP Software Architects Week.</p> <p>Agenda, attendees list and other details at: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0ArcymbqnpOfkdGJqeEFibINEUkdxdkl2NW1sM0FWUUE#gid=0</p> <p>Tentative 'presentation guidelines' have been circulated for both UCs and FI-WARE.</p>

WPI/WPa are expected to clarify which GEs will be presented at each slot. This was requested last week but no reaction so far.

Logistic details have been sent. Notice there is a per-person fee.

("all inclusive": rooms, WiFi, lunches (3x), breaks (7x) CHF 170.00/person)

The host prefers to generate per-project bills (depending on the number of attendants) and forward them to the projects. For simplicity there are not n-day passes.

Shortcut for Zurich logistic details, including the attendance fee:

http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/FI-PPP_SW_Architects_Week_LOGISTICS_IN_ZURICH

The public description of the event and the necessary links, including Agenda, logistics, etc is available at:

http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Collaboration_activities#FI-PPP_Software_Architects_Week

*** e-mail with guidelines for FI-WARE/UCs presentations:

Additionally, we have produced some guidelines on how the UCs scenarios & FI-WARE GEs presentations might be:

A) For UCs:

The overall idea is to present to the FI-WARE team a number of selected scenarios (x) to understand the applicability of FI-WARE GEs.

The presentations can be as follows:

1 Description of Scenarios (x*20)

1.x.1 story-line (5')

1.x.2 High level description of the architecture (15')

- Diagram with all the components (provided but the UC or not) involved in the scenario.

- Role of each component and basic interactions.

2 Individual components description (technical approach, expectations, constraints) (60')

2.1 For the components to be developed by the UC: why they are domain specific & functionality in detail.

2.2 For FI-WARE components, expectations & constraints.

Considering a total of 3-5 scenarios. UCs should generally request 120-160 min.

	<p>At this point, standard 120' slots have been planned, but this can be modified depending on UCs requests.</p> <p>UCs may check/fill in with their details at:</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0ArcymbqnpOfkdENHZjVoNEpYaUI4NDRRbEd5RjNPSnc#gid=4</p> <p>B) For FI-WARE GEs:</p> <p>Fi-WARE chapters are expected to present to the UCs attendees the basic concepts and the specific GEs to ease their exploitation within UC scenarios.</p> <p>Each chapter will prioritize those GEs to be delivered in FI-WARE first release and those with a higher rating score as provided by UCs at:</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdC1zSUdIVjJ2WldESHZmZU13bTdjT3c#gid=0</p> <p>For the GEs presentations, the following structure is suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x) GE presentation (25-40') x.1) Overview and reference architecture (5') x.2) Basic concepts & Main Interactions (15-25') x.3) REST APIs & tools for developers (5-10') <p>FI-WARE WP leaders are expected to clarify which specific GEs will be presented at each specific slot in the agenda at:</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0ArcymbqnpOfkdGJqeEFibINEUkdxdkl2NW1sM0FWUUE#gid=0</p>
	<p>Handling tickets from UC projects.</p> <p>We have set up a dedicated team to follow up UC project tickets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlos Ralli, Axel Fasse to deal with tickets on the Globat Technical Support tracker • Miguel Carrillo, Axel Fasse to deal with tickets dealing with request for inclusion of Themes/Epics/Features in the FI-WARE Backlog • Miguel Carrillo, Axel Fasse to monitor progress on Chapter Backlogs <p>The teams are set up to follow up and push the teams to deal with the tickets. So they do not actually do the work but make sure that it is done.</p> <p>Miguel, Axel reported the status during this confcall.</p> <p><u>It is planned to follow a two phase approach in the Themes/Epics/Features in the FI-WARE Backlog:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Phase one, which has already started, we ask the Use-Cases to follow the naming conventions (subject) in order to be able to identify the addressed WP automatically. Afterwards we start the discussions with the WP-Leads and the Use-Cases should start in order to avoid open issues in the Review-Meeting. • In Phase 2, we establish a reporting that visualizes the open issues, and put this Overview XLS File on the share. This list will be updated once a week on Wednesday (EOB) • We will have a single person per UC Project (each one will have Miguel or Axel as contact point). Miguel and Axel will consolidate requests for the WPLs/WPAs to avoid multiple messages.
	<p>First year review.</p> <p>After negotiation with Arian about dates for the first year official review, June 21-22 has been finally decided. Definitively, better than June 25th-26th.</p> <p>We should plan a two-days rehearsal on June 19-20 also in Brussels.</p> <p>We should start discussion on how to approach it.</p>
	<p>First FI-WARE Open Call</p> <p>Juanjo sent a detailed mail briefing on the status. Tomorrow we will have an “educational session” with reviewers where we plan to share with them valuable information about the FI-WARE project as well as the specific goals of this Open Call that may help them during the evaluation process. We may also answer any question they may have as a result of a Self-training they were supposed to have carried out.</p> <p>It would be nice that SAP could attend the educational session at least with reviewers of the BM&BE topic (planned to start tomorrow at 12:00pm CET)</p> <p>AP on Juanjo: To launch activity within FI-WARE in order to prepare topics that we may wish to add to the second Open Call.</p>
	<p>FI-WARE look&feel for portals.</p> <p>Initial designs have been produced by UPM. Juanjo are currently reviewing them. Hopefully we can share a initial design tomorrow EOB. We will present some options so that people can choose and, from there, we will produce the final look&feel style guidelines.</p>
	<p>Promotional video.</p>

	<p>SAP video has been sent to the company producing the video. Some animations will be added and produce a first draft to be shared with all in the beginning of June.</p>
	<p>Catalogue</p> <p>Next confcall we will check the status: who has accessed and who has provided feedback.</p> <p>Matteo to add the status per chapter here and we will use as input to check with the chapters one by one.</p> <p>The only persons who provided feedbacks on the catalogues so far are: Thomas-Rolf Bannizi, Miguel Carrillo and Francesco Di Cerbo.</p> <p>AP on Juanjo: will send an email establishing a formula that will impact on PMs reported in WP2 by any partner when no contribution to activities like this one is exhibited.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Background info:</p> <p>To all the partners: test and comment on the Catalogue solution. http://fi-ware.cloud.labs.ericsson.net/</p> <p>The steps to follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Go to http://fi-ware.cloud.labs.ericsson.net - Register a user and log in to the site - Go to the "Enablers" section - Submit a new enabler by clicking the "Create new enabler" link at the top of the enabler listing and submitting the form - The proposed enabler is now in the validation queue and you will have to wait for an administrator (basically myself) to approve the enabler before you can progress to the next step. - After being approved your enabler will be listed in the enabler listing, but can only be seen by you and is tagged as "unpublished". - You can now edit the documentation, add downloads etc. and when happy with the content you can go to the edit tab on the main page of the enabler and change the status at the bottom to "published". The enabler can now be seen by anyone. - You can also use the "Group" tab at the top of the enabler page to add other people who should be able to help you in creating the enabler content.
	<p>Measures to improve Project Management and overall performance.</p> <p>Thierry, who raised some issues in this respect was not present so Juanjo decided to drive this discussion over the email. Nevertheless, a major problem in the project is</p>

	lack of contribution to common activities and discussions (as can be easily found out by checking the minutes). We will start to put instruments to make things happen, even if it needs to be the hard way (rejecting the justification of PMs)
	AOB

6. Summary of action points

Please note some detailed APs are included in the previous section.

IdAP-2	Action point	Responsible
AP-1	Create a plan to have Third party innovation enablement in FI-WARE (D2.5.a) on time	Telefónica
AP-2	Open Specifications: need to have drafts on the private wiki by the end of the week	WPLs and all
AP-3	Inform juanjo on dates and times of forthcoming confcalls from the individual chapters. He may join some of them.	WPLs
AP-4	TOC for specific sections of Installation & Admin Guides. WPL to circulate and make sure that if there are comments they are expressed by the end of the week. WPL to circulate email about the and make sure that there any comments are gathered by the end of the week.	WPLs
AP-5	Market analysis available in draft. The WPLs to check after the internal release at the end of the week.	WPLs
AP-6	Partners to propose events in other countries. Stefano to send contacts of people from ICT Labs to Juan Bareño (WPL) and Juanjo so that we can start conversations with them and include ICT Labs as one of the potential paths to stimulate market awareness and support sustainability.	Eng & All

AP-7	Juan Bareño (ATOS) will send an email EOB tomorrow summarizing the status and defining a concrete Action Plan until delivery of the documents. ATOS and Telefonica to meet off-line to develop this plan.	Atos & Telefónica
AP-8	Find a host for the 1st week of educational sessions (Univ of Zurich, very likely). U Zurich will provide as answer shortly.	Coordination
AP-9	Populate mailing list defined for the Educ. Sessions. So far we have all members of the Arch Board. Telefónica will add the WPLs/WPAs. The WPL to be appointed admins of the list, they will add the people from their WPs autonomously.	Telefónica & all
AP-10	Decide where to place efforts dedicated to the Ed. Sessions (possibly WP10).	Coordination
AP-11	Taskforce to handle UC tickets will put forward a proposal for tools and procedures.	Telefónica & SAP
AP-12	Carlos Ralli to make videos privately available to WPL	Telefónica
AP-13	Matteo to report who has provided feedback on the catalogue so far. It'll be used as input for discussion in the next WPL/WPA confcall.	Eng.
AP-14	Juanjo will formally ask Arian about dates for the first year official review.	Coordination

7. Reference documentation

- FI-WARE DoW:<url in FusionForge>