FIWARE TC meeting minutes

Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	**January 12, 2016**
Name of the meeting:	**FIWARE Technical Committee (TC) meeting**
Venue/bridge info:	**Powwownow, PIN: 050662**
Version	**1.0**

Attendees

Name	Kind of seat	Attended (Y/N)
Alex Glikson	Cloud chapter	Y
Kenneth Nagin	Cloud chapter	Y
Santiago Martinez	Context Management chapter	Y
Sergio García	Context Management chapter	Y
Gilles Privat	IoT chapter	Y
Carlos Ralli	IoT chapter	Y
Philipp Slusallek	Advanced Web UI	Y
	Advanced Web UI	-
Alessandro Portosa	Apps/Services and Data Delivery	Y
Javier Soriano	Apps/Services and Data Delivery	Y
Pascal Bisson	Security	Y
Cyril Dangerville	Security	-

Pierangelo Garino	Advanced Middleware and I2ND	Y
Thomas M. Bonhert	Advanced Middleware and I2ND	-
Silvio Cretti	FIWARE Ops	Y
Fernando López	FIWARE Ops	-
Stefano de Panfilis	FIWARE Lab	Y
Alfonso Pietropaolo	FIWARE Lab	Y
Davide Dalle Carbonare	FIWARE Community Support	Y
José-Manuel Cantera	FIWARE Community Support	Y
Juan Jose Hierro	interim chair	Y

Proposed agenda topics

Following is a list of proposed agenda topics to be covered during the meeting:

- Background/Motivation
- Scope of activities/decisions taken in the FIWARE TC
- Rules for meetings and for the assignment of karma to FIWARE TC members
- Election of co-chairs
- Steps to setup elections of FIWARE TC members
- FIWARE Open Source Licenses
- Mechanism for reception of proposals for new Incubated GEs/GEris
- Mechanisms for creation of Domain Technical Committee
- Common structure on GitHub
- Status of QA activities

Following is a list of agenda topics that may wait for a next meeting but it will be worth starting to bear in mind:

- Use of JSON-LD in FIWARE APIs (starting with FIWARE NGSI)

Addressed topics

Background/motivation

One of the major goals in 2016 has to do with an effective transition from an open source initiative, as we have been working so far, into a truly FIWARE Open Community whose governance is based on the principles of:

- **Openness**: able to engage those who have something to contribute (following procedures)
- **Transparency**: well-defined, documented and publicly available procedures
- **Based on meritocracy**: only active technology contributors would be able to govern decisions on the technology
- **Market-oriented approach**: Those committed to transfer results to the market gain a prominent role
- **Don't reinvent the wheel**: follow models and best practices from successful OSS communities (concretely, OpenStack)

The Governance Model was defined and it is currently available on our website:

https://www.fiware.org/fiware-governance/

You can download an updated version of the slide deck summarizing major concepts behind this new governance model using the following link:

https://forge.fiware.org/docman/view.php/7/5410/FIWARE+Sustainability+presentation+-+transition+to+OS+community.pptx

Now, it is the goal to kick-off the FIWARE Community and one of the first steps will be to establish the Membership as well as the FIWARE Technical Committee (TC). We will put in place the necessary actions to move ahead during January.

In the meantime, we will setup an **interim** FIWARE TC (members listed in the table of attendees of this call) and also listed in:

https://lists.fiware.org/admin/fiware-technical-committee/members

ALL seats of this interim FIWARE TC will have to run through elections to be completed by mid February.   There will be more seats in the FIWARE TC according to the defined Governance Model, mostly because of 1/3 of the seats will be taken by individuals who have present their candidatures.   Note also that once members of the FIWARE TC are elected, they will run an election of the chairman (until then, Juanjo will simply run this role as interim).

Scope of decisions of the FIWARE TC

We have to establish what kind of decisions are run in this FIWARE TC.

Juanjo: I suggest that releases and sprint planning and follow-up of milestones/releases is managed separately so we concentrate on more strategic decisions, including also some more technical discussions.

Juanjo: Follow-up of releases, some other contents (e.g., the FIWARE Tour Guide) and certain activities (e.g., QA testing) is something that is relevant as part of the FIWARE OS community activities, i.e., something we should do no matter if there exist a funded project covering these activities (e.g. FI-Core).

Juanjo: On the other hand, a funded project like FI-Core should keep calls for coordinating specific project activities (e.g., handling of reviews).

What should we keep in the scope of FIWARE TC meetings and what should go in a meeting for the coordination of project WP Leaders (e.g., FI-Core WPLs)?

In other words, we have two meeting placeholders at the moment: Mondays from 10:30 to 12:30 (FIWARE TC meetings) and Mondays 14:30 to 16:30 (current regular FI-Core WPLs). What should go in each?

Stefano: attendants to the FIWARE TC meetings should contribute and discuss topics that have any binding with the EC projects. Creation of chapters of new Incubated GEs/GEris goes indepently.

Alex: we need Agile methodology in the community but I would consider changing the release cycle. For example, yearly releases make no sense. Juanjo: This is the kind of decisions to be made by the FIWARE TC and the it is up to the FI-Core partners/coordinators to align.

Pascal: we should keep things open and offer some flexibility. For example about contributions. Stefano: there are some principles that have been defined and MUST be followed (Juanjo: i.e., FIWARE Developers' guidelines, Stefano: need to produce technical roadmap following similar format, etc). Pascal: there were difficulties experienced in the OCTET project for example because there was no governance model in place.

Juanjo's proposal: Monday Afternoon-> review/follow-up of milestones, releases, planning and things to be delivered, performance monitoring of technical and support activities. Address the rest of things in the morning TC session. If anything from the TC session is not considered relevant and it relates to the project, the topic could be shifted to the afternoon.

Morning sessions: technical issues. Those issues that are FI-Core specific could be tackled in dedicated sessions.

AP-16.01.12-1: **Juanjo** to write down description of the scope of FIWARE TC meetings as compared to detailed planning/milestones/releases follow-up meetings and circulate it by email by next FIWARE TC.

Rules for meetings and for the assignment of karma to FIWARE TC members

Juanjo: We shall establish rules for attendance of FIWARE TC members to the meetings so that those who fail to attend x meetings in a row, or fail to attend y meetings of the last z meetings, will lose their seat. Their seat will be put on vacancy so that it is covered in the next election.

Juanjo: Also how Action Points (APs) will be recorded, assigned and followed-up. Suggestion is to use JIRA.

Juanjo: What about Karma. We may define objective rules that adds positive or negative Karma. This way measure performance of FIWARE TC members. For example: assuming APs gives points, leaving APs unattended so that they have to be reassigned to another FIWARE TC member gives negative karma, etc.

The Governance model was defined as a result of Fi-Core work. But once it's established, it can be changed by the board of directors. The governance models does not impose a mechanism about the governance of the TCs. The Governance Model does not define the karma mechanisms.

AP-16.01.12-2: **Stefano** to provide a set of governance rules including roles for assigning positive karma.

Election of co-chairs

Juanjo: I propose that two co-chairs are selected. Their role is to be able to replace the chair when (s)he is not present and also collaborate in preparing the agenda of meetings, chairing them, taking the minutes and making sure that Action Points are recorded (e.g., creation of ticket in JIRA).

Pascal: We need to define the role of co-chair.

Juanjo: Support on technical matters (minutes, tracking,agenda ...). It's just for the TC organization, not about election of positions.

AP-16.01.12-3: **Whoever** wants to co-chair, send an email with their plans and proposals (before Thursday noon). If there are more than one, there would be a voting in a doodle poll. Decision will be announced in next FIWARE TC.

Steps to setup elections of FIWARE TC members

Juanjo: Despite a call for membership has not been made yet, we may build a "census" of Chapter Active Contributors along January. Then, run the elections. Proposal: get the census finished by mid of February. Run elections following week of February.

Juanjo: Questions to solve:

- Precise rules for determining "Chapter Active Contributors"
- Mechanism for voting?

Stefano: following the current FIWARE Governance Model, we may adopt the following process:

1. Open a period that allows people to register as individual members of the FIWARE Community
2. Assess contribution of registered individual members so that they become Chapter Active Contributors. We have to decide two things: precise rules, who make the assessment
3. then FIWARE TC seats can be elected by the identified Chapter Active Contributors

Philip: Why don't we run elections now (just with Fi-Core members), and again in 6 months after the bounty programme or the acceleration programme allow others from the ecosystem to participate.

Stefano: It would be better to select now interim members and run elections in the short term later.

Juanjo: There might be people joining from outside now. It is a way to show that we are moving ahead.

Stefano: Currently, no external people can participate, therefore is about how we communicate it.

AP-16.01.12-4 **Stefano**: Launch email discussion among FIWARE TC members about what formula to adopt for running elections (i.e., run them now even though only current FIWARE GE owners can vote and run re-election soon, vs giving a period that will allow third parties to contribute and gain voting rights)

AP-16.01.12-5 **Juanjo**: Launch thread of discussion by email to define rules that will determine when someone becomes an active contributor. How relevant the contributions should be? How many? etc

FIWARE Open Source Licenses

A process has been launched aimed at gathering the most up-to-date information about open source licenses associated to FIWARE GEris (open source reference implementation of GEs):

We are also gathering feedback about issues migrating the open source licenses associated to a given FIWARE GEri to any of the two proposed open source licenses, namely Apache v2 and GNU Affero GPLv3.   In other words, we have asked FIWARE GEri owners to provide good reasons why they would object to migrate to any of the two proposed open source licenses.

It was expected that based on feedback collected, we would have a more clear view on how to proceed.

Status by Juanjo: based on feedback so far, I can anticipate that the matter of simplifying/migrating the open source licenses will not be so easy. While in some cases, it

seems like there would not be any obstacle, there are other cases where it will get complicated:

- Some GEris are derivated work of third party open source software which has an open source license that is neither Apache v2, nor GNU Affero GPL v3. This is the case of Kurento, for example, which further evolves the open source code of the well-known GStreamer technology licensed under GNU LGPL, therefore it is forced to adopt the same open source license.
- Some GEri owners (NEC) argue that Apache v2 requires that "every patent has to be literally checked for being included in the software" as opposed to the 4-clause BSD license which is easier to deal with in this respect.

Juanjo: While I guess the second case may lead to discussion that hopefully can be solved positively (I believe that NEC is wrong in their statement unless I'm not getting the point made by NEC) I'm afraid that examples like the first case cannot be solved.

Juanjo: Do we want that the adopted licenses become a barrier for contribution (mostly regarding technologies organizations may wish to contribute to FIWARE)?   If we had gone just for adopting Apache v2, someone who has developed something like MongoDB (one of the most widely used NoSQL databases in the market) would not be able to contribute their technology. If we even limit the licenses to Apache v2 and GNU Affero GPL v3, there will be some cases like Kurento that would have to drop from FIWARE ...

Juanjo: Reducing the number of open source licenses to be adopted is a clear goal for simplification matters, that's clear.   But I believe that allowing certain diversity (provided we do not enter into chaos) would become a distinguishable feature of FIWARE.   Something that even could make it more attractive to potential contributors (yes, some of them would not consider contributing if that means adopting Apache v2).   Since the FIWARE Technical Committee will have to ultimately approve the adoption of a new Incubated/FIWARE GE, we may explain that it won't approve contributions under licenses other than those in a reduced list (Apache v2, GNU Affero GPL v3, maybe GNU LGPL v3) unless there is a very good rationale and provided it preserves the general cornerstone rule that the software will not contaminate applications/software that merely uses the Incubated/FIWARE GE.   We would obviously have, as already agreed, a very visible are on the website where we would make the necessary statements regarding open source licenses of FIWARE GEs, particularly this condition about no "contamination".

Sergio: Proposal to prepare a guide for FIWARE users about licensing, covering issues like:

- What does it take to use several GEs with different licenses combined
  - when integrating through APIs
  - or linking libraries
  - or offering services through the web based on them (Affero issue)
  - or changing the GEs themselves
  - or creating new components (eg. Wirecloud widgets, Kurento filters…).
- Which code has to be released as open source if any?
- Can we provide some examples?

Typically the answer will be: you don't have to release anything unless you change the GEri's themselves.

: **Sergio** to write down the description of the proposal: FIWARE license guide:

Summary of action points

Numbering of action is just temporary (following the convention "AP-"<date using format yy.mm.dd>"-"<number>). It will be replaced with the corresponding ticket number in JIRA once the ticket is created:

- AP-16.01.12-1

    - Description: Write down description of the scope of FIWARE TC meetings as compared to detailed planning/milestones/releases follow-up meetings

    - Assigned to: Juanjo

    - Target date: next FIWARE TC (January 18th, 2016)

- AP-16.01.12-2

    - Description: Define internal processes including rules for assigning positive Karma

    - Assigned to: Stefano

    - Target date: next FIWARE TC (January 18th, 2016)

- AP-16.01.12-3

    - Description: Sending of candidatures for co-chairing the FIWARE TC

    - Assigned to: All

    - Target date: next FIWARE TC (January 18th, 2016)

- AP-16.01.12-4

    - Description: Launch email discussion among FIWARE TC members about what formula to adopt for running elections (i.e., run them now even though only current FIWARE GE owners can vote and run re-election soon, vs giving a period that will allow third parties to contribute and gain voting rights)

    - Assigned to: Stefano

    - Target date: next FIWARE TC (January 18th, 2016)

- AP-16.01.12-5

    - Description: Launch discussion regarding conditions to become an Active Chapter Contributor

- ○ Assigned to: Juanjo
- ○ Target date: next FIWARE TC (January 18th, 2016)
- ● AP-16.01.12-6
  - ○ Description: Elaborate proposal on the approach to adopt regarding open source licenses
  - ○ Assigned to: Sergio
  - ○ Target date: next FIWARE TC (January 18th, 2016)