

# 1. Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	Feb 25th, 2013, 11:00-12:30, 14:30-16:00 terms
Inviting person:	Juanjo Hierro
Minutes takers:	Juanjo Hierro, Miguel Carrillo. All the rest helping
Name of the meeting:	WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall (Feb 25th, 2013)
Place of the meeting:	
Phone details (if PhC):	powwownow (PIN: 050662) webex details circulated
Version	

## 2. Attendees

Please unmark your name in the table below if you have attended the meeting.

Name	Company / Organization
Pierangelo Garino	Telecom Italia
Stefano De Panfilis, Davide Dalle Carbonare, Paolo Zampognaro, Andrea Manieri	Engineering
Alex Glikson	IBM
Pascal Bisson, Daniel Gidoïn	Thales
Hans Joachim Einsiedler	Deutsche Telekom (joined 11:34 - 12:30, 14:42 - 14:56)
Torsten Leidig, Axel Fasse, Thorsten Sandfuchs	SAP

Thierry Nagellen	Orange
Juan Bareño	Atos
Juanjo Hierro	Telefónica I+D
Miguel Carrillo	Telefónica I+D
Manuel Escriche	Telefónica I+D
Carlos Ralli	Telefonica I+D
Sergio Garcia	Telefónica I+D

## 4. Objective and topics addressed during the meeting

### Top priority topics:

#### FI-PPP Architects Week

Finally, the FI-PPP Architects Week (extended FI-PPP AB f2f meeting) will take place from April 2 until 5th.

The agenda is defined high-level as follows:

- April 2 (starting at 11:00am): FI-WARE to provide a thorough introduction on FI-WARE scope, goals, basic concepts, methodology, planning, available documentation, resources, tools, etc as well as a detailed description of the way the FI-PPP AB works.
- April 3 morning: FI-WARE to provide detailed info about the FI-WARE Second Release, training planning, etc.
- April 3 afternoon until April 5 17:00 CET: sequence of half-days workshops per UC Trial projects where UC Trials will present a sketch of their envisioned architecture, their current plans regarding usage of FI-WARE GEs, needs regarding setup of their trials, questions on which they need responses, etc. FI-WARE will provide feedback during these workshops that will help UC projects to program their planning of activities taking the most of FI-WARE.

The meeting will take place in Madrid.

Potential venues:

- Telefonica District
- ATOS' auditorium in C/ Albarracín 25 (at least April 2-3)

## **Appointment of coordinator by TID**

## **Addressing of urgent topics with the PO**

A confcall took place with Arian addressing some urgent topics:

### **M18 review report**

Arian explained that it should arrive either this week or next one (most probably next one). Juanjo has pointed out that late arrival may mean that we don't have enough time to implement recommendations. Arian understands this.

**AP** on Juanjo to check whether M12 costs related to resubmitted and accepted deliverables should be considered accepted. (official rules from the Commission)

### **Dates for 2nd period review**

Because of official rules from the Commission, the 2nd period review meeting cannot be postponed until September this year as suggested. We should expect this to be sometime in June or early July.

Juanjo: should we push for July ? **AP** on WPLs to come with feedback regarding this point.

### **Re-planning of some short-term deliverables**

Arian agreed with the re-planning of the FI-WARE Architecture Deliverable so that it is submitted by end of March.

Arian is happy to agree that the second Release is closed by end of June, provided that there is enough software linked to the second Release that is available for review in the 2nd period review. It doesn't need to be the whole software expected for the second Release but significant enough.

Juanjo's suggestion: prepare a delivery of software matching end of minor release 2.2, planned to close by end of March according to existing planning of releases/sprints:

[http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Releases\\_and\\_Sprints\\_numbering\\_with\\_mapping\\_to\\_calendar\\_dates](http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Releases_and_Sprints_numbering_with_mapping_to_calendar_dates)

Juanjo: Can we make it clear in the Technical Roadmap ? **AP** on WPLs to capture what would be available for 2nd year official review in the Technical Roadmap as part of what will

be available on the 2.2 minor Release.

Pier: Do we need to have a version of each FI-WARE GEi planned in the 2nd Release delivered by end of April ? Juanjo: not necessary, however, Arian and reviewers expect that there will be a significant number of new FI-WARE GEis for which a first version would be ready by end of April.

### **Decision regarding connection of cities to FI-WARE OIL**

Up to FI-WARE partners to decide what to do with remaining budget for funding not allocated after 1st and 2nd Open Call. It's fine if we just report the agreement reached at PCC level.

### **Selection of evaluators for third open call**

Mail sent to Arian with candidates. Ok on his side. He has proposed additional candidates.

### **PMs reallocation (next amendment)**

Juanjo made aware that some PMs reallocation is critical, overall when dealing with management of withdrawal of some partners. Agreement: Juanjo will send an official email with description of major reallocations so that at least we get confirmation by Arian this is Ok and will be implemented in a next amendment.

Thierry: the email should include the dates from which partners have started to consume the allocated PMs. Juanjo: agreed.

email will also incorporate the request for incorporating TUB as Third Party of DT.

## **FI-WARE Backlog deliverable and follow-up of Agile implementation**

Significant progress on fixing status of the FI-WARE backlog. It seems like we can bet for submitting a single deliverable comprising all backlogs. Nevertheless, Manuel will continue carrying out a final review.

**AP** on Chapter leaders to quickly answer any demand that may come from Manuel along today and tomorrow.

There were some issues that had been reported by Manuel which were based on some rules that can be relaxed at least for this delivery of the backlog. Agreement: Chapter leaders will try to implement as many changes proposed by Manuel as possible that they find reasonable. Manuel will then generate a report tomorrow morning with last issues to be fixed for the final delivery.

**AP** on Miguel to link pre-releases of the backlog, the final document and the submission date within

[https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Deliverables\\_cockpit](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Deliverables_cockpit)

Status ?

Regarding follow-up of Agile process implementation, there is an **AP** on TID to perform the

agreed simplifications (see relevant background). Thorsten: Apps chapter needs to keep the Chapter field. Juanjo: Ok.

### **=== Relevant background:**

TID has appointed an Agile Project Manager (Manuel Escriche) that will be devoted to ensure that Agile is applied more rigorously within the chapters. A more strict follow-up on how Agile is being applied will be carried out. Justification of costs by partners who don't record their activities planning on the trackers may be rejected. In other words, we cannot assume you have carried out any work during a given month (matching a given Sprint) if there is no record of that work in the proper backlog tracker. We will implement the necessary changes during the rest of February.

A number of simplifications will be implemented to avoid inconsistencies between the tickets on the tracker associated to Epics and Features and the corresponding entries on the public wiki. The idea is to drop a number of fields from the backlog entry template on the public wiki. These fields will only be captured on the trackers. The change is easy to implement, we just need to comment out fields on the template for Epics and Features. Fields to be dropped from Epics and Features on the wiki:

- version
- scope
- Status
- MoSCoW priority
- Relative priority
- Enabler (not needed, derived from id)
- Complexity
- Source (we propose to just keep owner)

We need to address the refinement of the FI-WARE Architecture or the FI-WARE 2nd Release. We also have to find out a process for carrying out this activity in an organized manner so that we can actually follow-up the process and monitor progress.

There are a number of architectural issues that have to be addressed inside each chapter and cross-chapter. Some are common to all chapters while others are specific to each chapter.

A way to plan this work is to adopt Agile approach. It should be feasible to map Architecture topics to be addressed into Epics. There may be some Epics that would be identified at chapter level, while others could already be identified at GE level. Sprints (starting with the one of December) could be organized so that teams can deal with a number of Epics and try to refine them further through discussions that take place during those sprints. Discussion may lead to organization of virtual or f2f meetings when necessary. Refinement of Epics in a given Sprint should lead to definition of concrete architectural ideas to be captured in revisions of the FI-WARE Architecture (either at chapter or GE level).

Contributions to general FI-WARE Epics or cross-chapter Epics are summarized in:

[https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Global\\_Epics](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Global_Epics)

A snapshot of the backlogs with date Feb 8th was made available on the “Backlog” folder within the docman system of the “FI-WARE Private” project in FusionForge:



Instructions on how to update the contents of a given backlog were emailed by Miguel

## FI-WARE Technical Roadmap

TID had implemented the rearrangement of contents of each chapter placing description of features of first release at the end of each chapter as part of a new section titled “Previous Releases”. This way roadmap for each chapter will start talking about the 2nd Release which makes more sense.

Rest of pending points has been addressed:

- How to incorporate global and other cross-chapter Epics we agreed to cover in Release 2 during our meeting in Rome. Regarding Global Epics it could be considered final but need review of other cross-chapter Epics.
- Improved introduction. Thorsten already introduced some changes fixing some evident errors but still room for improvement.
- How to incorporate Technical Roadmap of Tools chapter

**AP** on all chapter leaders to review introduced changes to provide feedback and make sure there is nothing wrong.

Juanjo: Please let us know whenever you introduce last-minute changes

Juanjo: Global Epics agreed in Rome have been listed in the Technical Roadmap (see definition of Global Epics provided in Technical Roadmap as compare to other cross-chapter Epics) and are announced for the second release.

Other cross-topic Epics refer to rest of Epics brought by the Security chapter. Juanjo: What should we do regarding the following ones ?

- Integration of Android Security Flow Monitoring GE in CDI
- Integration of IoT Fuzzer GE in IoT chapter

Proposal: leave them as planned for future releases. **AP** on I2ND and IoT chapters to come soon with a position.

Juanjo: What about the others (e.g., using of Complex Event Processing GE in Security Monitoring Architecture) ? Pascal: leave them also for future Releases.

### === Relevant background:

**DEC** - Technical Roadmap should reflect what is/will-be available on the FI-WARE Catalogue, that is, ready for use. In some cases, this doesn't mean necessarily

available on the FI-WARE Testbed. If so, we have to capture that through a footnote on the corresponding table of features published in the Technical Roadmap.

## FI-WARE Architecture for Release 2

It was agreed to propose that the FI-WARE Architecture be delayed to month 23 (end of March). Mail sent to PO proposing that and agreed during bilateral confcall.

Chapters should stick to the following plan, of which the first milestone is quickly approaching:

1. First draft of contributions by chapter ready for peer review: end of February
2. Comments on first draft due by March 8th
3. Second draft of chapters ready for peer review: March 15th
4. Comments on second draft due by March 22th
5. Final version: April 5th

### === Relevant background:

Thierry: How to handle inclusion of ETSI M2M in the deliverable given the fact that the corresponding FI-WARE GEi owner will join later ? Juanjo: At least try to fix the overall architecture with high-level description of all the pieces. Then, regarding those parts to be covered by the ETSI M2M platform, bring text that states that there will be further refinement so readers should stay tuned and check progress on the wiki.

Thierry: try to involve Fraunhofer for some inputs for the architecture description. Juanjo: Yes.

## Cross-chapter Epics

### Architecture topic OAuth-based Access Control

**AP** on DT/NSN to distribute documentation regarding IdM GE. Status: still open, AP on Pascal to remind NSN/DT. This documentation is not currently available. **AP** on Juanto to open discussion on the matter at the mailing list.

[Pier, Hans]: Please add us to the list. **AP** on Juanjo to check their inclusion.

**AP** on UPM (as part of the Cloud chapter) regarding how the proposed access-control architecture can also be accommodated in the current Cloud architecture and impact on usage Keystone (Juanjo: any feedback from Cloud f2f meeting in Haifa ?). We agree to setup a dedicated slot on Part II of the next joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall where UPM

will present their findings. (due to a communication error, UPM is not present in this confcall so should present in the next one) **AP** on Juanjo to ask UPM to send an email elaborating on the results of the Haifa meeting in the meantime in order to make discussion during our next follow-up confcall more productive.

### **Architecture topic on Accountability and generation of Security Monitoring events**

Pascal: we need to carry out an analysis of the consequences of incorporating Accountability in the proposed architecture. UPM have a proposal on this matter that will be worth reviewing.

**AP** on Juanjo to ask UPM for this proposal ⇒ Done, introduced in welcome message to fiware-API-cross mailing list.

### **Architecture topic Security Monitoring Integration and CMDB**

**AP on Cloud chapter and Testbed team** to work together with the **Security team to** define how knowledge about topology of the Cloud (number of VMs, Object Storage facilities, network resources) and the topology of the physical infrastructure can be made available to Security Monitoring components.

**AP on Cloud chapter and Testbed team** to work together on the characterization of potential attacks that can be common to a FI-WARE Instance (e.g., patterns of malicious login attempts, shortly repeated invocation of APIs, access to VMs of a given tenant from VMs associated to a given tenant, etc)

**Alex:** two attack scenarios has been identified during the Cloud WP F2F last week, to be discussed by the task force.

**AP** on Juanjo to create a mailing list dedicated to this cross-topic where the above can be discussed off-line. Juanjo: Still pending. Will do right after this confcall.

### **Architecture topic “Multitenancy”**

**AP on Cloud:** approach GE owners with concept and collect requirements for automated deployment of GE instances, using Cloud GEs (DCRM, SDC, SM, etc). Status: Cloud chapter will meet f2f this week and will come with a plan to be shared with rest of WPLs/WPAs in next follow-up confcall regarding when documentation/info will be available for FI-WARE GEi owners that help them to understand what they have to provide.

**AP** on Cloud to circulate first proposal on the guidelines for FI-WARE GEi: March 11.

**AP** on Testbed, based on input to be brought by Cloud team, come with a plan on when FI-WARE GEi owners will have to provide input for the automation on the Testbed (customized images, plus chef recipes, etc). Juanjo: let's discuss this when guidelines from the Cloud chapter arrive.



## **Incorporation of Android Security Flow Monitoring GE in CDI**

This was a cross Epic between Security and I2ND.

The Android Flow Monitoring GE is a java application that has been tested on a Java VM deployed on Android. Therefore it should be feasible to deploy it in CDI-compliant devices.

**AP** on I2ND chapter to investigate the possibility to use this GE and further elaborate this Epic as to map it into specific features or work items (e.g., prepare a demo of this GE running in CDI-compliant devices).

Juanjo: If this is a GE that just only requires a Java VM, then it might be feasible to deploy it also on the Cloud Proxy. **AP** on I2ND to explore whether this GE is also applicable in the Cloud Proxy.

Status: still working on it. I2ND chapter will contact the owners of the FI-WARE GEi in the Security chapter. Pascal: contact was in the slide set presented in Rome.

## **IoT Fuzzer GE**

This was a cross Epic between Security and IoT. IoT Fuzzer GE (from INRIA)

Seems interesting, agreement between Security and IoT to tackle this issue:

Points to check for IoT partners

- Contiki OS: is it a constraint?
- 50 protocols from the Scalpi library (what are these 50 protocols)
- Interest for Zigbee but also IETF Core

## **FI-WARE Release 2 Open Specifications, Software and accompanying documentation**

We need to make it clear in the Technical Roadmap what can be available:

- by end of April (work finished by end of March, matching end of release 2.2, then having the month of April for final review)
- by end of July (work finished by end of June, matching end of release 2.3, then having the month of July for final review)

**AP** on Juanjo to review calendar of peer-reviews to carry out during April and July, prior to submission of deliverables by end of April and end of July.

## **FI-WARE Product Vision revision (was whitepaper on description of FI-WARE addressing usage scenarios/patterns)**

Work still delayed because activities derived from phase 2 negotiations and recent news in TID.

However, Juanjo will do his best to stick to the original plan. Bear in mind this is not an official deliverable.

### **=== Relevant background:**

This whitepaper will be addressed as a review/evolution of the contents in the “FI-WARE Product Vision” part of the wiki. Major actions that will be carried out are:

- Drop general description of each of the GEs in the FI-WARE Product Vision. It is suggested that these contents are moved/merged with overview section of the Architecture Description of the GE (also part of its Open Specifications). This will save us from inconsistencies between contents of the Product Vision and the most recent Architecture Description and Open Specifications.
- The FI-WARE Product Vision would just keep the overview section per chapter but this will be just the initial content. The idea is to add sections dealing with usage scenarios which describe, high-level, how GEs can be used in an encompassed manner to cover those scenarios.
- TID made an initial proposal on the new sections to be added.

Juanjo has checked with Arian that the approach was fine to him. Indeed, Arian confirmed that reviewers expect that this whitepaper describe the encompassing usage of FI-WARE GEs on usage scenarios like the ones suggested. A whitepaper following the proposed structure are in the right direction from his perspective.

A first draft/template of the target whitepaper was available at:

<https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/1333/FI-WARE+Product+Vision+New+Draft+12-10-01.docx>

Contributions to the whitepaper had to be placed in the “FI-WARE Product Vision Revision M18” subfolder within the “FI-WARE Product Vision” folder of the docman system of the “FI-WARE Private” project in FusionForge. Don’t forget to mark files as “private” after uploading them.

It was agreed during the f2f meeting January 21-24 in Rome that we will rely on the live demo application as much as possible for description of these usage scenarios.

### **FI-WARE Testbed (status report by Stefano de Panfilis)**

**AP** on Miguel with support of Andrea to update of the Project Handbook regarding description of the processes that will be followed and the guidelines that FI-WARE GEi owners have to comply with in order to approve publication of a FI-WARE GEi on the FI-WARE Catalogue.

Juanjo: The version of the FI-WARE Handbook that is due by end of January should include the mentioned guidelines.

AP on Stefano/Carlos to write a post on the Safecity PoC in Stockholm so it becomes visible on the FI-WARE website. Juanjo sent an email referring to description of the Safecity PoC in Stockholm provided in the last FI-PPP "snack" newsletter distributed by CONCORD. This may work very well as basis.

Juanjo: shouldn't we provide info about new PoC of Safecity in Madrid planned by March 7th ? What about the rest of PoC ?

Juanjo: we need to review what the status is regarding development of the web page that will be used to inform about news, etc of the Testbed.

**=== Relevant background:**

## **Monitoring of log/trace files**

In order to proceed with the "monitoring of logs" we need to have some further information about the overall purpose and some technical requirements:

### **the purpose:**

- what's the reason for monitor the logs?
- who's the users of that monitoring activity?
- are we monitoring the GEs installed on the testbed and something else, VMs, network, web servers, allocated memory to a DB?

### **the technology:**

- XACL is a standard for logs (e.g. <http://www.research.ibm.com/trl/projects/xml/xacl/xacl-spec.html>) will the GEs owner be available to provide the logs in a standard format and use agreed procedures to provide the logs?
- IBM Trace Analyser need to have a set of sample logs in order to be able to verify if they may manage them. However, since Trace Analyser is an interface through the Eclipse platform, it may not be the best option for that work.
- Alternate log manager exist, including as part of SIEMs such as AlienVault, Splunk, etc.

AP WPAs/GE providers to send to the WPA mailing list and to IBM (Marcel Zalmanovici <MARCEL@il.ibm.com>) an example of log/trace files produced by their GE implementations by end of Feb

## **FI-WARE Support - general and FI-WARE GEi-specific**

We still have to decide where to create FI-WARE GEi dedicated trackers:

- within the FI-WARE project in FusionForge
- within the corresponding FI-WARE chapter project in FusionForge
  - There could be a direct link from the catalogue. So the users will not get confused with the location of the info on the forge.

Note that these trackers are different from the tracker associated to the backlog tracker of each chapter (which in turn contains the backlog tracker of each FI-WARE GEi being implemented within the chapter).

In section about relevant background there is a summary of the pros and cons of the two possible options. However, prior to a final decision, we would like to explore whether using JIRA will be more suitable. TID will carry out an analysis on this matter during coming weeks.

**AP** on WPLs/WPAs to provide feedback on JIRA based on experience in projects run in their companies.

**AP** on WPLs/WPAs to arrive at next follow-up confcall with feedback about best option in case of going for the existing tracker tools (check description of options in section below)

### **=== Relevant background:**

We have to provide support to UC projects in phase 1 but with a forward-looking vision into what will be required regarding support to UC trials in phase 2, users in phase 3 and, overall, users of the FI-WARE Open Innovation Lab.

It has been agreed at FI-PPP AB level to set-up a separate tracker per FI-WARE GEi. A link to these tracker should exist from the Catalogue. We need to find out whether the best place to allocate these FI-WARE GEi trackers is the FI-WARE project in FusionForge. Tickets can be easily moved from one tracker to another within the same FusionForge project but not across projects.

There are two options regarding trackers to handle interaction with users of FI-WARE GEis. In both of them, public visibility would be allowed (all agree?) and anonymous posting would not be allowed. The trackers could be configured so that anyone can see the tickets but only registered users (e.g., users who have agreed with the terms and conditions of the FI-WARE Open Innovation Lab or are already members of the FI-PPP) can issue tickets. **IMPORTANT NOTE:** making a tracker publicly visible doesn't mean that the other existing trackers become publicly visible, i.e., visibility can be governed per tracker within a FusionForge project. If we define a "FI-WARE User" role, for example, we may also configure trackers so that they can post tickets in the issue ticket trackers but still not see other trackers on the same project because visibility can be configured per each role. However, this requires careful admin of users so that whenever you accept a new user joining a project you assign him/her the

“FI-WARE User” role.

Option A) As many trackers as needed on the FI-WARE Project

*Pros:*

- Trackers easy to locate for external users (a link from the catalogue will ease this anyway)
- Tickets can be easily moved from one tracker to another within the same FusionForge project but not across projects. Creating FI-WARE GEi trackers within the FI-WARE project in FusionForge would have the advantage of moving tickets from the General Support tracker to FI-WARE GEi-specific trackers rather easily.

*Cons:*

- This would result in a very long list.
- Translating a ticket issued by a 3rd party into an item of the backlog of the FI-WARE GEi (part of the backlog tracker within each chapter) would not be easy since tickets cannot be moved between trackers that belong to different projects

Option B) As many trackers as needed on each one of the chapters on the forge.

*Pros:*

- much clearer and under the control of each WPL/WPA
- Creating FI-WARE GEi trackers within each chapter project makes it easier to translate tickets issued by 3rd parties into items of the backlog of a FI-WARE GEi (e.g., cloning then changing the clone to transform it into an Epic, Feature or Work Item that you finally move to the backlog tracker)

*Cons:*

- trackers tricky to locate for external users if they navigate directly to FusionForge (however, a link from the catalogue will solve this and since the catalogue is intended to become the single entry point for developers, it shouldn't be so much an issue)
- It means carefully handling permissions so that public visibility of the issues tracker does not compromise visibility of the backlog tracker.

Juanjo: what should we do regarding using the FusionForge Eclipse plug-in ?

## **Validation process by UC projects (status report by SAP)**

Status: 2013-02-18 (status same as 2013-02-11 as topic was not part of the meeting)

There were the first xls-based feedbacks by INSTANT MOBILITY

Deadline for UC projects to submit this feedback files was end of their projects. Stefano: I don't expect this until mid of March. **AP** on Stefano/Juanjo to send a reminder and also ask for those projects who will continue in phase 2 to prepare presentation on feedback for the Architects Week.

It was decided WP10/WPL level to wait for further feedback to come and push the use cases to finish as well the DOC-based parts. Then GEi providers will be contacted directly.

WPL accept the decision: feedback will be directly distributed to the relevant people & the related WPL.

## **Status pre 2013-02-11**

Stefano (reported by Davide): the questionnaire has been sent to the AB.

Juanjo: SAP is leader of the validation task in the FI-WARE Testbed WP so we expect them to lead this part and report regularly on progress during our joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcalls.

Juanjo: should we link the focused workshops that were discussed some weeks ago with this validation process ? Just FYI, FI-PPP AB requested us to make a presentation/workshop on our live demo application ... could they work as a workshop that may work as a common kick-off of subsequent focused workshops per UC project ?

AP on SAP to bring status report to next follow-up confcall and come up with a plan on how to proceed and what concrete APs are required. Axel by email has said he will discuss this the Thorsten and they will send a draft until Wednesday this week.

=> Status was and is (2012-12-17): Questionnaire is ready to be send to the UC projects, and was submitted by project management (Stefano)

AP on SAP to update contents of "Relevant background" section below so that is prepared for next follow-up confcall.

=> done (2012-12-17)

### **Further points:**

the validation process defined on

[https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-review/index.php/The\\_FI-WARE\\_Recommended\\_Validation\\_Process](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-review/index.php/The_FI-WARE_Recommended_Validation_Process) suggests to have dedicated contacts for the various use cases within FI-WARE & the use case projects, so far these contacts, although they existed are not documented and/or made explicit.

Open Question: should we emphasize on identifying these contacts and make them more visible?

### === Relevant background:

#### **Validation questionnaire - current status and next steps**

After integrating every feedback received, current plan was:

- questionnaire to be send to the Use Case projects by end of business 2012-12-17 (AP on Stefano).

Final list of questions:

[https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-review/index.php/The\\_Validation\\_Plan\\_Template](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-review/index.php/The_Validation_Plan_Template) (later this week to be released in the fi-ware-review wiki)

Related deliverable ([D.10.5.1.Report on Validation process including Validation with Use Case projects front page](#)) was finalized and submitted

(doc:[https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/7/1521/D.10.5.1.Report\\_on\\_Validation\\_process\\_including\\_Validation\\_with\\_Use\\_Case\\_projects.pdf](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/7/1521/D.10.5.1.Report_on_Validation_process_including_Validation_with_Use_Case_projects.pdf))

#### ***Executive Summary***

Task 10.5 focused actually on planning the validation process for the FI-WARE Testbed and the FI-PPP Use Case Project. Furthermore an initial feedback survey was designed and handed to the use case projects.

This deliverable outlines the designed and recommended validation process for the use cases to follow. Additionally the initial feedback survey, which was initiate and send to the use case projects and the main findings are outlined. Although as time of writing not all answers of the use case projects could be integrated within this deliverable, the first impression of the Use Case projects looked reasonable well. There were initial operational challenges, which are quite normal for a project in this size and given the overall complexity.

The FI-WARE project is thankful for all submitted comments

#### **Communication, Collaboration Dissemination, including enhancement/re-design of the current website for impact creation (status report by Carlos Ralli)**

We are progressing according to the tasks agreed in the document created with Nuria(ATOS) in December last year.

- MWC:

There is the **FI-PPP stand there in the MWC** where Fi-WARE slot is programmed for **Monday 25th 16-19h**. We will share the stand with the FI-PPP overall exhibition. The previous slot is Finseny's one so we are discussion potential shared tasks with them too.

**Additionally, there is the specific FI-PPP 2-days event in Barcelona** (not in the MWC but

nearby). Feb 28th and March 1st.

In the MWC the setting is a 3x5m stand with 3 screens (50", 42" and 32"), two tables, Wifi (private NATed IPv4 access) and fixed Internet connectivity with 5 fixed public IPv4 addresses. Per-project cost is 3,500 eur.

We are showing there FI-WARE videos/presentations in the 50" screen, in the 42" the catalogue and the list of the enablers so we can explain Fi-WARE building blocks and promote our public communication channels (Web, Wiki, Youtube channel, Twitter, etc.) There is also a printed poster to help our explanations too. I have sent the poster for your comments during this call.

We are discussing with some UCs if some basic PoC might be shown from such a demo place. However, we do not think that will be an option for the MWC, but might be ready for Dublin FIA in May 2013 (as an optional setting completing the FI-WARE official demo, when ready).

In the MWC, in the unlikely event someone with deep technical skills is interested, we might only make a very simple connection from one laptop to some GEs in the testbed known to work well in advance (to get the version, etc).

#### **-- Previous feedback:**

A draft overall plan has been elaborated together with Nuria (ATOS) and will be circulated to WPI once discussed with Pepe and Juanjo. It includes all kind of actions and potential relevant events. The list provided by WPIs before the past review is actually one of the inputs.

- A new version of the video (including your comments) and a short video (only animations) will be delivered by mid-January.

- Twitter has reached 360 followers (our internal goal for this year was 350) and we would like to improve much more during this year as this social tool is checked by relevant market/policy makers and potential users. Maybe it should be one of the metrics -among many others- for the winners of the 3rd Open call.

**Continuous AP** - All WPLs/WPAs to come up with additional ideas that may help to enhance the current website. The initial defined team (Thorsten Sandfuchs (SAP), Matteo and Davide (Engineering), Juan Quemada's team (UPM), Carlos, Juanjo and Miguel (TID)) hasn't yet provided any input.

Note: Matteo left the team.

#### **=== Relevant background:**

A Task Force was created whose mission was to design and implement enhancements. The team will be led by Carlos.



Initial team:

- Thorsten Sandfuchs (SAP)
- Davide (Engineering)
- Juan Quemada's team (UPM)
- Carlos, Juanjo and Miguel (TID)

Some little enhancements, following a "quick win" approach, have been implemented in the website (e.g., home, making-it-happen pages). However, we need to keep pushing.

Carlos to report on latest news about the video.

- Processing comments received. A date for the video will be provided end of this week.
- A short video, with no interviews, executive style will be produced and available soon too.

## **Promotion of FI-WARE within the wider community of developers - includes definition of webinars, 3rd Open Call, etc (status report by Davide Dalle Carbonare / Juanjo)**

### 3rd Open Call:

The 3rd Open Call was launched which is focused on promotion and uptake of FI-WARE results by the wider community of developers. Text of the call was drafted within the fiware-community-building mailing list. You can check contents at:

<http://www.fi-ware.eu/open-call/>

**AP** on all to activate their contacts regarding potential submitters so that they become aware of the call.

### FI-WARE Webinar platform:

Here is my (Davide) take on how providing the training on FI-WARE assets. It's essentially composed by two approaches:

- 1) recorded lessons: these are eLearning objects always available. They are built starting from scratch or from the presentations (or other documentation) already prepared for the first training sessions. These modules need to be SCORM compliant (this allow the traceability for monitoring and reporting). These modules can be made available directly from the Catalogue and are related to FI-WARE as a project/initiative, GEI page, FI-CoDE platform (how-to-use).
- 2) live sessions: these are webinars that can be organized on demand for gathering additional information and asking questions about a specific topic. The webinar is used when the FAQs and the Forum is not enough. A live session can imply an update of the FAQ page and can be made available as learning object too.

The main entry point for that can be the FI-CoDE. We (ENG) can integrate the FI-CoDE with the Moodle to store and monitor the learning objects, making them available for direct access from the FI-WARE portal, OIL Portal, Catalogue.

#### FI-CoDE Handbook:

Davide: is the FI-CoDE Handbook been circulated to the FI-PPP AB?

<http://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/7/1601/D9.2.a+FI-CoDE+Handbook+%28System+Software+Engineering+Method+for+FIWARE%29.pdf>

**AP** on Juanjo to distribute it to the FI-PPP AB.

#### **=== Relevant background:**

The 3rd Open Call to be issued by FI-WARE will be devoted to incorporate partners who will help promoting FI-WARE in the wide community of Internet application developers and entrepreneurs, going beyond the current community of FI-PPP or EU FP7 projects.

The fiware-community-building mailing list was created to carry out discussions regarding community building and writing of the text related to the 3rd Open Call. It was created with the following members:

- Davide
- Carlos
- Jimenez
- Juanjo
- Philipp Slusallek (dfki, member of the FI-PPP AB, now also in FI-WARE through 1st Open Call)
- Jean-Marie Dautelle (Thales, member of the FI-PPP AB)

Two documents were initially circulated: initial official letter by the EC (Jesús Villasante) and notes from a confcall between Jesús Villasante and Juanjo. Subsequent interactions lead to the text that was published.

#### **Live application demo**

Candidate list of functionalities to be covered in the live application demo were discussed during f2f meeting in Rome.

Current application demo will be documented/described as part of the work of the FI-WARE

Product Vision.

A task force team will be created to deal with the live demo app. Will be led by TID (Fermin Galán) and involve TID, UPM, SAP from the previous live demo and anyone who needs to join. Dedicated mailing list will be created and will be ready by tomorrow.

All WPLs/WPAs will be registered in this mailing list by default. Those who believe don't need to be there, please tell Juanjo.

**=== Relevant background:**

## **Usage terms and conditions of Open Specifications and FI-WARE GEIs, including Open Innovation Lab (status report by TID)**

Status: 2013-02-18 (status same as 2013-02-11 as topic was not part of the meeting)

As requested and agreed on the last WPL/WPA (2013-01-30) call, SAP prepared the relevant page on

[https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FI-WARE\\_Open\\_Innovation\\_Lab\\_Terms\\_and\\_Condition\\_Ingredients](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FI-WARE_Open_Innovation_Lab_Terms_and_Condition_Ingredients)

Feedback from JH on AP “check with Telefonica’s legal department”:

- 

*This AP is considered [closed|still open with major issues| still open with minor issues] and should be finalized by [ ]*

Feedback from JH on AP “circulate the current draft of the Legal Notices among WPLs/WPAs”:

- 

*This AP is considered [closed|still open with major issues| still open with minor issues] and should be finalized by [ ]*

Feedback from Chapters on AP: “fill spreadsheet”

- Apps:
- Data:
- Cloud:
- IoT:
- Security:
- Tools:

*This AP is considered [closed|still open with major issues| still open with minor issues] and should be finalized by [ ]*

Feedback on AP on XXX “need to verify the protection of the FI-WARE and FIWARE OIL

brand”

*This AP is considered [closed|still open with major issues| still open with minor issues] and should be finalized by [ ]*

Feedback on AP on XXX “setup a logo for the OIL”

*This AP is considered [closed|still open with major issues| still open with minor issues] and should be finalized by [ ]*

### **=== Status pre 2013-02-11===**

#### **FI-WARE Open Specification Legal Notices:**

AP on Juanjo to check with Telefonica’s legal department whether they had already initiated the discussion with the rest of legal departments. As per suggestion by Axel, AP on Juanjo to circulate the current draft of the Legal Notices among WPLs/WPAs to check whether they have also comments.

#### **Use Terms and Conditions of FI-WARE FI-WARE GEis beyond the FI-PPP**

Few inputs pending regarding date at which FI-WARE GEi owners commit to get it finalized at the following shared spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdDdGQn1eTRSLXdRSHd5cHd4LUhnOFE#gid=0>

AP on Chapter leaders to make sure that all FI-WARE GEi owners in their chapters fill the spreadsheet above.

#### **Use Terms and Conditions of FI-WARE OIL**

Initial legal contract produced by SAP circulated among WPLs/WPAs but only covered some aspects (contribution by users of FI-WARE OIL). Some additional input gathered during f2f meeting in Rome.

### **=== Relevant background:**

## **Standardization**

We’ll discuss with NEC how to proceed. We need to follow-up this on a regular basis.

AP on Juanjo to ask NEC to join every two weeks at defined time (e.g., 12:00 CET).

Next meeting of the FI-PPP Working Group Standardization: January 10th 2013 in Munich. Juanjo: is NEC attending this ? AP on Thierry to check.

### **=== Relevant background:**

## Other topics

### Next General Assembly

AP on Juanjo to launch thread of discussion on the email.

### Risk management plan - organization

(mcp) Sent right before Christmas. We need to focus and avoid endless discussions. We will have to discuss and find a balance between collaboration/consensus and effectiveness.

#### === Relevant background (contents extracted from previous confcalls):

The document in its present status is here:

- <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AhTmk3UgJVcbdDlxU05GbnZwb2duZ3RycWdhMmtmaVE#gid=0>

Thales stresses that the Impact column is risky and should be kept strictly internal. Telefonica agrees but acknowledges some impact on the quality of the deliverable if this is missing. We will fill it in and then we will decide whether to deliver this with or without the column.

Telefonica will define the meaning of the terms (risk, impact, high, low, medium...)

On our weekly confcall we may prepare beforehand a number of items for discussion (10?). Telefónica would send the list of 10 items for discussion.

## 6. Reference documentation

- Planned usage of FI-WARE GEIs by UC projects (phase 1 of the FI-PPP):
  - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdEd6bGhLQWtNai1jeGN5UnJMeEdxZ0E#gid=0>