

1. Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	December 3rd, 11:00am
Inviting person:	Juanjo Hierro
Minutes takers:	Juanjo Hierro, Miguel Carrillo. All the rest helping
Name of the meeting:	Joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall (December 3rd)
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	Engineering
Alex Glikson	IBM
Pascal Bisson	Thales
Hans Joachim Einsiedler, Matthias Baumgart	Deutsche Telekom
Torsten Leidig, Uwe Riss, 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

4. Objective and topics addressed during the meeting

Top priority topics:

Wrap-up FI-WARE Project Review

Juanjo sent raw minutes of the confcall we had on Friday with the PO (Arian) and the reviewers. Overall the outcome of the review seemed to be good enough and what is more relevant is that the PO mentioned that the project will now be marked as showing “acceptable progress”. Juanjo once again thanks all for their great effort towards achieving this result.

Arian will be on holidays for 2 months. He announced during the feedback confcall that a draft review report will be sent before Christmas. During an additional conversation on Friday afternoon, Arian explained that the official review report will likely be ready by the end of January.

We also expect that most of the deliverables will be accepted. Maybe some of them will come with comments that reviewers will ask to be covered in the version to be submitted linked to the FI-WARE 2nd Release.

Juanjo mentioned that the point that worries him more had to do with insistence in providing traceability of features in the backlog and justifications about architecture/design of chapters and GEs. He is worried about being asked to carry out an exercise that may be nice from a pure “academic” perspective but of little use at the end of the day, most probably irrelevant for many developers when facing a decision about whether to adopt FI-WARE or not.

The PoC with SafeCity in Stockholm was a great success. This helped us to strengthen our position as it proves that our sw works in the real world. Appreciation from the coordination to all the teams in the consortium for all the good work in supporting this PoC by SafeCity.

FI-WARE Architecture and Open Specifications for Release 2

Juanjo: We need to address refinement of 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. Juanjo has already a list in mind and feels confident that WPLs/WPAs have their own list also in mind.

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).

[Pier]: I2ND is having a f2f meeting next week (11-12 Dec). If topics to be addressed are already identified, then we could start this activity in our chapter.

AP on Juanjo/others to identify topics they propose that the I2ND can cover during their f2f meeting.

Pier: shouldn't we have confcalls on architecture issues involving WPAs ? Should we allocate a time slot during our regular joint WPLs/WPAs confcalls ? Juanjo: better to dedicate specific confcalls. Pretty sure that the weekly joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall will still be needed with the current location every monday just for following up management/coordination issues.

Davide: Before setting up any architecture confcall and, mostly any f2f, we should first identify topics. Nevertheless, having f2f in January may be helpful.

Axel: better to prepare soon some sort of scenarios/prototypes that may drive the discussion. This will be expected in the next review.

AP on WPL/WPA to identify Architecture topics to be addressed not only for their chapters but also cross-chapters. Deadline: Thursday this week. Juanjo will try to consolidate them as proposal of Epics to be incorporated in backlogs after this identification phase.

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

We also need to start applying Agile rigorously here. Clearly not following an Agile approach and this makes it difficult to follow-up progress and lead to inconsistencies. Bear in mind that the only deliverable that we were not able to submit before the FI-WARE Project Review was the one on the backlog and this was simply because we found that the picture that reviewers had obtained from it would be rather negative. TID is going to be very strict with this in the new phase we are facing.

There was an **AP** that hasn't been completed despite the multiple times it was mentioned: update the stakeholder field in the Epics/Features backlog available in the public wiki. Strict deadline: December 12th. 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>

Another **AP** has to do with updating the Technical Roadmap. Please implement the necessary changes so that the Technical Roadmap accurately matches the current status.

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.

We should then carry out a peer-review process. Let's organize it during our next follow-up confcall and try to have this whitepaper available before Christmas.

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

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.

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

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 setup 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.

Juanjo: we have to try using the FusionForge Eclipse plug-in as front-end to the trackers. This may enhance usability. The webinar on Wednesday, starting at 11:00am, is a good opportunity to get some training. **AP** on all FI-WARE GEi owners and WPLs/WPAs to attend.

Validation process by UC projects

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.

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

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

Validation questionnaire - current status and next steps

After integrating every feedback received, current plan is: Within the this/next week the questionnaire to be send to the Use Case projects will be compiled and can then be send to the UC projects.

Final list of questions:

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/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](#)) to be finalized and submitted (doc: [D1051_v4_generated.docx](#))

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

Validation planning and execution

Feedback needs to be collected for questions being asked to the UC projects in terms of the

validation phase.

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/1362/2012-09-10-M18_validation_process_and_template_v3.docx

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/1363/2012-09-10-FI-WARE+Testbed+Questionnaire_answers_ENVIROFI_TEST.xlsx

- do we really want to pose this huge amount of questions to the UC projects?
- have you additional questions or do you think we can skip certain questions?
- general feedback

Target deadline for sending the questionnaire to UC projects: end of October.

next steps:

1. AP: WPL/WPA for feedback & (optionally) present the questionnaire on the WPL/WPA meeting. Deadline: EOB Wednesday October 24
2. Collect feedback from WPL/WPA
3. compile the xls-sheets with the stable list of questions for every use case
4. We send out the validation plan and the answer-sheets next week or the week after

The plan was presented during the last FI-PPP AB. Their feedback was also requested. AP on Juanjo/Stefano to double-check that the validation questionnaire was sent to the UC projects.

Focused workshops:

There was an **AP** on SAP to make a proposal on how to organize the workshops with UC projects. The following is a summary.

We should be clear on what we (can) expect from the meeting

- For UC projects: they have up-to-date information on the availability of required GEs and if they and how they can base their PoC on which GE.
- For FI-WARE: Strong message on the next review which GEs && turning some E into U or Ds (within the public UC matrix). And potentially some feedback about the "usage" of our GEs (as requested by the commission)

In general: organize a "desirable" event, where you need to be, rather than where you need to be dragged to.

This as well means that we really schedule one or two "days" with a suitable virtual collaboration platform (Which one do you have in mind?)

In order to contribute towards this goal, the rough agenda would be a combination of:

- **Inviting all UC projects: classical keynote session**, where the ACTUAL state of the project is presented to the UC projects
 - o Pitch to UC: "Get the overview on what we currently offer and where we can

- help you to full fill your goals.”
 - *There might be a live demonstrator (ideally the same or a similar one, we want to show at the review)*
- **Inviting all UC projects: deep dive session on the Testbed**
 - Pitch to UC: “Did you know that X servers are waiting for you? We run you through our premises (virtually) and show you tricks on how to use our core assets”
 - *There is definitely running software involved in this one*
- **Sessions per UC project (3 out of 5)** – UC can apply for deep dive sessions with a small WPL/WPA team which explains and discusses architecture mapping already known.
 - Guiding asset can be the “validation scenarios” provided by the use case projects
 - Session is restricted to at max 10 people. We offer 3 Sessions (not more)
 - *This is to the desirability part: if this really flies, we can offer another X session after the virtual weeks, especially with the learning’s from the first ones J*
- **Open Plenum Session:** we offer dedicated sessions on request towards particular GEs, this is a fixed time slot and we offer “offline”-sessions after the virtual architecture weeks for every GE, iff they are requested (Juanjo: UC projects then can take advantage of the calendar of webinars that should have already been setup in the parallel workstream)
 - For every chapter it needs to be decided if the chapter is offering a chapter-based or a GE-based presentation
 - § Cloud: NN
 - § IoT: NN
 - § Data: NN
 - § Apps: chapter-based
 - § Security: NN
- **Potential further break outs** (in relation to clear topics and not technologies)
 - Use Case learnings from FI-WARE
 - § Pitch:
 - Service ecosystems
 - § Pitch:
 - Developer tools (FI-CoDE framework)
 - § Pitch:
 - Preparation of call-2 proposals and Q&A
 - § *(might be the wrong forum here)*
- **Final plenum session:** Wrap up with possibility to ask questions
- Optionally one can think of **some additional sessions** as well:
 - A panel discussion with use cases, FI-WARE chief architect and one of the service providers coming out of the use case projects

Enhancement/re-design of the current website for impact creation

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.

Continuous AP - All WPLs/WPAs to come up with additional ideas that may help to enhance the current website.

Carlos Ralli will lead the team and will brief WPLs/WPAs during our joint follow-up confcalls.

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

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)
- Matteo and Davide (Engineering)
- Juan Quemada’s team (UPM)
- Carlos, Juanjo and Miguel (TID)

Promotion of FI-WARE within the wider community of developers (includes definition of webinars, 3rd Open Call, etc)

AP on Juanjo to put the UPM team (Juan Quemada) in contact with Matteo/Davide to start discussion regarding their involvement in the Tools chapter and particularly start discussion regarding the platform to be adopted for webinars in the future.

As all know, 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.

AP on Juanjo to create a mailing list to deal with these activities and launch discussions regarding writing of the text related to the 3rd Open Call.

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

Regarding webinars with UC projects in phase 1, every FI-WARE GE owner has to fill the following shared spreadsheet to share with UC projects:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdDRKeUpILUxzTjNNUFZBQUhfM0U4aFE#gid=0>

Webinars are not just limited to the Architecture Chapters but also the Tools Chapter.

There may be several webinars per FI-WARE GE or for the Tools Chapter. Regarding FI-WARE GEs, it is mandatory to have one (the one titled “<name-of-GE>: A primer” in the initial version of the spreadsheet). Others can be added (we suggest to adopt the title “<name-of-GE>: <title-of-specific-webinar-for-the-GE>”) Two dates should be programmed per webinar to ease attendance by UC projects.

Regarding webinars, first date should fit beginning of November while second date may be later but trying to make it still in November. Juanjo reminds that you may add more webinars linked to a GE (just add additional rows in the corresponding section of the spreadsheet).

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.

AP on rest of WPLs/WPAs to come with additional ideas and suggestion for new releases of the live application demo. Deadline: Thursday EOB.

Usage terms and conditions of Open Specifications and FI-WARE GEis (including Open Innovation Lab)

REMINDER: FI-WARE GEi owners should complete the task force regarding description of terms and conditions of FI-WARE GEis in the FI-WARE Catalogue. If they are not able to complete the task, they should at least provide date at which they commit to get it finalized at the following shared spreadsheet:

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

AP on Axel to report on progress during next follow-up confcall.

Standardization

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

Other topics

Next General Assembly

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

Risk management plan - organization

Not addressed during this confcall

=== 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>
-