

1. Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	Jan 14th, 2013, 12:00 CET
Inviting person:	Juanjo Hierro
Minutes takers:	Juanjo Hierro, Miguel Carrillo. All the rest helping
Name of the meeting:	Joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall (Jan 14th, 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
Matteo Melideo, Stefano De Panfilis, Davide Dalle Carbonare, Paolo Zampognaro, Andrea Manieri	Engineering
Alex Glikson	IBM
Pascal Bisson, Daniel Gidoïn	Thales
Hans Joachim Einsiedler	Deutsche Telekom
Torsten Leidig, Axel Fasse, Thorsten Sandfuchs	SAP

Thierry Nagellen	Orange
Juan Bareño	Atos
Carlos Ralli	Telefónica I+D
Miguel Carrillo	Telefónica I+D
Juanjo Hierro	Telefónica I+D
Jose Jimenez	Telefonica I+D

4. Objective and topics addressed during the meeting

Top priority topics:

FI-WARE Architecture and Open Specifications for Release 2

The WPLs/WPAs F2F meeting will take place in Rome, hosted by Engineering. It will go from January 21st starting at 11:00 until January 24th ending at 15:00. All WPs should be properly represented at the meeting. WPLs are welcome and highly desirable although WPAs are probably even more critical.

A doodle was setup to register attendance (by 10/01/2013 EOB):

<http://www.doodle.com/ggggzdnr7knxfiu9#table>

Cloud, IoT, Data, I2ND, Security, Tools and Testbed WPs confirmed already in the previous confcall. Apps Chapter (SAP) has recently confirmed that Thorsten Sandfuchs will attend on behalf of SAP.

Logistic info is available on the doodle page and also at:

<http://cloud.eng.it/xwiki/bin/view/Main/How+To+Reach+Us>

Juanjo sent an email on Friday describing the goals on which the different teams should concentrate their efforts during January. Main points:

- we will focus during January on trying to document the functionality we are aiming to cover in the form of Themes/Epics/Features. We are now at the beginning of a minor release (2.2, see [1]). Therefore:
 - Features in the backlog of your chapter should match concrete functionality that a given GE in your chapter will provide, which we can COMMIT will be developed in just 3 months during the current minor release (which ends by the end of March) or the next (which starts beginning of April and ends by end of June)
 - Epics in the backlog of your chapter may be related to functionality we want to see in a given GE but we will need to further analyze until it becomes a Feature (i.e., we reached a point at which we can COMMIT in what minor release will be planned)
 - Epics may also relate to cross topics that we all agree have to be covered (e.g., how OAuth is going to be adopted in all APIs in a non-intrusive manner). They will evolve from Epics registered in a general FI-WARE backlog tracker (that I'll setup in the FI-WARE private FusionForge project) and we will evolve them through joint discussion until they become Epics at chapter level and then chapter partners shouldn't stop their refinement until they transform into features of GEs (all the existing ones, just some of them, or a new GE)
 - We can have some Themes as well, mainly to pencil topics we shouldn't forget to deal with at some later stage
- Once we have it ready, we'll be able to quickly generate two of the deliverables that were due by end of January:
 - FI-WARE Technical Roadmap
 - FI-WARE Backlog
- A first draft of the FI-WARE Architecture Deliverable linked to Release 2 of FI-WARE has to be ready by end of February, and from then, we will carry out a number of peer reviews until official delivery by end of March.

Any objection with the approach ?

Nothing relevant to report regarding progress on contributions to general cross-chapter Epics (see relevant background). Epics so far summarized in:

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Global_Epics

(note: still AP pending regarding adding Epics proposed by Security Chapter).

Juanjo reminds there is an AP on all WPAs to provide input.

Regarding the agenda of the f2f meeting, there was a list of topics proposed by SAP around which the agenda could be defined. However, Juanjo believes that some of the topics, though important, don't need to be covered during a f2f meeting. There are a number of architectural issues we should cover and we should make sure they are deeply discussed during the f2f meeting.

As a mean to reach consensus, Juanjo proposes the following. AP on all WPAs to mark those points they actually believe should be covered during the f2f meeting (critical, nice-if-addressed, can-be-handled-offline) using the following google docs spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdHdwYUUzdURyN0pgMI9KMlg3M1V2UEE#gid=0>

WPAs are also welcome to make proposals on new items.

=== Relevant background:

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

Agile FI-WARE software releases and planning of updates of the FI-WARE Testbed

There was a strict deadline defined for the **AP** on updating the stakeholder field linked to Epics/Features in the FI-WARE Wiki: December 12th. Miguel will take care of reviewing the status and send email to the defaulting chapter leaders along this week.

Status ?: (mcp) Delayed

There was another **AP** had to do with updating the Technical Roadmap. Juanjo highlighted that the most critical thing is to ensure that what is said there regarding Release 1 is accurate.

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.

Every FI-WARE Architecture Chapter leader to report on status: (at the time of distribution of shared draft, following text was the text from previous meeting, please update)

- Cloud: Roadmap had been reviewed. They need to take some decisions regarding whether to move some features from Release 2 to Release 3. Have to update info regarding Release 1 to capture agreement/decision above.
 - Data:
 - Stakeholders field: Done, as reported by Partners. To be checked (Carlos, Miguel reviews on progress).
 - Technical Roadmap: should be aligned already.
 - IoT: Not all pages have correct stakeholders, resubmit action IoT weekly meeting on 9th of January.
 - Apps:
 - Stakeholders: doubt it is done so commit to get it done by end of this week, will be validated within this week
 - Technical Roadmap: Seems like status is the same as in the previous confcall. AP on SAP to fix this urgently because of inconsistencies. Juanjo: be aware that the current Technical Roadmap doesn't make the distinction between different Composition GEs. Still the old "Composition Editor" and "Composition Execution Engine" distinction applies and this should be fixed soon.
 - Security:
 - Stakeholders: did a push before the review the meeting. it should be done.
 - Technical Roadmap. At least the contents are aligned regarding Release 1. Have to make fixes to cover the fact that the Secure Storage GE is not yet available. Juanjo: let's try to agree on a decision regarding this GE offline.
 - I2ND:
 - Tech Roadmap under update.
- ===== Relevant Background from past PhCs
- Stakeholders: not all pages have 'correct' stakeholder (excluding those pages for which no input from UCPs was available), to be completed (by this week).
 - Tech Roadmap: Roadmap revision under consideration after f2f meeting last week. Final check about alignment with Release 1 by today. Alignment according to revision and decision taken right now to be applied.

=== Relevant background:

We must apply Agile more rigorously. 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.

The stakeholder field in the Epics/Features backlog available in the public wiki should be updated. The rule was easy to follow: add UC project <X> as stakeholder in all Epics and

Features of FI-WARE GE <A> IF UC project <X> has labeled the row corresponding to an implementation of FI-WARE GE <A> with a “U” or a “D” in the shared spreadsheet regarding planned FI-WARE usage by UC projects:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdEd6bGhLQWtNai1jeGN5UnJMeEdxZ0E#gid=0>

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

Stefano (reported by Davide): WP10 to take care of the approval of pending entries on FI-WARE Catalogue. Agreed.

We need to update the contents in the wiki where we describe the processes that are followed and the guidelines that FI-WARE GEi owners have to comply with in order to become publicable 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. Miguel will be responsible of this and Davide will provide the necessary support.

Status ? (mcp) Discussed with Davide right before Christmas, this will be done asap

There was an AP on Stefano/Carlos to write a post on the Safecity PoC so it becomes visible on the FI-WARE website. Status ? Carlos: I think I did not receive the input from Stefano. Please, let me know if I overlooked any input from your side. AP on Carlos to send a friendly reminder to Stefano so that we can write down the post one day after input from Stefano.

Status ?

During our last confcall, Stefano commented about early feedback provided by Safecity about concerns regarding delays in transference of data in some scenarios tested during their PoC in Stockholm. They were asked to send detailed feedback. Juanjo has sent an email to Safecity (Peretz) with cc/ Stefano asking again.

=== Relevant background:

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

We still have to decide whether 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.

There was an **AP** on Juanjo to summarize the options so that a final and informed decision is taken.

(mcp and juanjo) Summary of options

In both of them, public visibility allowed (all agree?) and anonymous posting is not 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 ?

=== 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.

During the last FI-PPP AB, it was agreed 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. 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. Creating FI-WARE GEi trackers within each chapter project makes it easier to merge those trackers with the tracker associated to the backlog of a FI-WARE GEi but we have to ensure that third parties can create tickets.

AP on TID to analyze what is the most suitable approach and deal with the first setup of those trackers to be revised during our next follow-up confcall.

Validation process by UC projects (status report by SAP)

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 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 (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)

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)

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.

=== 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:

Davide: I've created a Google doc in order to collect the requirements for the webinar platform. This document is shared among me, Juanjo and UPM team. I'm planning (for this week) a dedicated conference call with UPM team about the platform they already have. Inputs from Fiona Williams (Ericsson) on improvements/features for the webinar platform has been reported into the shared document.

AP on WP9 regarding definition of platform for video-conferences/webinars: will bring a proposal to the WPLs/WPAs f2f Rome meeting in January.

AP on all to come with requirements about the webinar platform.

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:

Davide: UPM is taking over the responsibility for the FI-WARE Catalogue (replacing Ericsson), some more time to solve problems in the next future can be due to this transition.

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:

- Matteo
- 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.

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

The reviewers and the EC have highlighted the relevance of this whitepaper (let's call it from now the new contents of the FI-WARE Product Vision).

AP on Juanjo to gather all the inputs received so far and try to generate a first consolidated draft by end of this week - Still ongoing (got problem to access files during holidays)

We talked about carrying out a peer-review process to be organized during the confcall today but submitted contributions are not so homogeneous and we have to carry out a first task trying to homogenize contributions. **AP** on Juanjo to come with concrete actions along this week.

=== 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.

Live application demo

AP on TID to come with a list of functionalities to be covered in the live application demo, some of them dealing with inclusion of additional FI-WARE GEs - Still pending.

AP on rest of WPLs/WPAs to come with additional ideas and suggestion for new releases of the live application demo. Deadline was last Thursday EOB but no input was received. New deadline: end of this week.

Thierry and Axel reported that they had been discussing about extensions of the demo including GEs in their chapters. Juanjo: please send email with specific suggestions.

Another AP should be to document the current application demo. Would it be useful to make it part of the FI-WARE Product Vision document ? We need to decide what collaborative tool to use for gathering ideas for extending the demo as well as documenting the current (and future) version(s) of the application demo.

=== Relevant background:

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

Regarding the Legal Notices to be included in the FI-WARE Open Specifications: 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.

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=0AqGGeaQGro3fdDdGQnl1eTRSLXdRSHd5cHd4LUhnOFE#gid=0>

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

SAP reports that they are about to send a first draft of the legal contract to be bound to the FI-WARE Open Innovation Lab by EOB today. AP on SAP to distribute it among WPLs/WPAs for discussion.

=== 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>
-