

# 1. Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	July 23, 11:00am
Inviting person:	Juanjo Hierro
Minutes takers:	Juanjo Hierro, Axel Fasse, Miguel Carrillo, Carlos Ralli. All the rest helping
Name of the meeting:	Joint WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall (July 23)
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
Dénes Bisztray, Lóránt Farkas	NSN
Pascal Bisson	Thales
Hans Joachim Einsiedler	Deutsche Telekom (left at 12:35)
Torsten Leidig, Uwe Riss, Axel Fasse	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

Reminder:

The following measures are in place:

- Partners involved in development of a given FI-WARE GE that is not delivered by July 23rd will not be allowed to justify any PM in WP3-WP8 until they deliver. Once they deliver, it will be assumed that the PMs consumed had been those that were **reported** until month 12, so that no additional PMs will be accepted. Planning of PMs for the remaining of the project will be adjusted accordingly.
- Delivery of software that doesn't work or proves to be rather unstable in the FI-WARE Testbed will not be considered as actually delivered. This intends to prevent that some partner delivers software which doesn't meet enough quality by July 23rd just to avoid costs rejections.
- Partners that deliver by July 23rd will be allowed to justify the PMs planned until July 23rd (provided that the software they have delivered is not rejected as stated in the previous point). This means they would not suffer any impact.
- PMs of any partner within a given WP (WP3-8) are distributed from month 10 on across deliverables as follows (note: we propose to include whatever distribution gets approved in the next amendment of the DoW):
  - Contributions to WP2 deliverables: 10%
  - FI-WARE Open Specifications: 20%
  - SW Release: 40%
  - Installation and Admin Guides: 7,5%
  - Users' and Programmers' Guides: 7,5%
  - Unit Testing Plan and Report: 15%
- Deliverables of a given WP rejected by the WPL will be rejected. TID and the WPL agree on any amendment of the above rules that may apply (e.g., failing to deliver a given GE may not be the fault of all partners involved in development of that GE so they may agree not to apply penalizations to some partners). TID may reject some additional deliverables if it considers that they do not meet the defined guidelines or expected quality, after discussion with the WPL.

- Similar rules would apply to WP9 (development tools)

	<p><b>Review of status of deliverables due by end of June as per our internal planning (announced to the EC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Deadline: 23 of July for all deliverables</b></li> <li>• <b>Do not generate pdfs yet (or do it at your own risk!)</b></li> <li>• <b>The previous review is “formal” but an ok does not mean that the deliverable will pass the “technical” review</b></li> </ul>
	<p><b>Documentation of Features linked to FI-WARE GEs</b></p> <p>TID will check available Features and will provide results of analysis by July 24. As a result of this analysis, documented Features can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accepted</li> <li>• rejected with a deadline on July 26th EOB to fix a number of identified issues</li> </ul> <p>Cost rejection measurements will be applied to GE owners failing to deliver fixed set of features by July 26th EOB.</p>
	<p><b>Unit Testing Plan and Report</b></p> <p>TID will check available Testing Plan and Reports and will check whether they fulfill the defined guidelines at:</p> <p><a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables</a></p> <p>Results of this check will be provided by July 24. As a result of this checking, Unit Testing Plan can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accepted</li> <li>• rejected with a deadline on July 26th EOB to fix a number of identified issues</li> </ul> <p>Cost rejection measurements will be applied to GE owners failing to deliver fixed set of features by July 26th EOB.</p>

	<p><b>Software and accompanying documentation</b></p> <p>All the following was explained to the partners and agreed, particularly the schedule.</p> <p><b>Regarding Software:</b></p> <p>As already mentioned several times and recorded in last follow-up confcall, VM images are not acceptable as sw delivery. Juanjo has also sent an email on Friday clarifying this.</p> <p>Binaries or source code (the latter when the product is open source) have to be delivered for all GEs that will be hosted on the FI-WARE Testbed datacenter facilities as well as for GEs to be deployed on UC projects' owned infrastructures (e.g., Cloud proxy). These binaries or source code should be uploaded to the Public or restricted access projects in FusionForge by July 23rd.</p> <p>Regarding those GEs hosted on GE owner's premises and provided "as a Service" there is an open consultation with the PO about means to provide access to the binaries. The deadline of July 23rd will be extended accordingly.</p> <p>TID will check available software and will check whether they fulfill the defined guidelines at:</p> <p><a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables</a></p> <p>Results of this check will be provided by July 24. As a result of this checking, released software can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accepted</li> <li>• rejected with a deadline on July 26th EOB to fix a number of identified issues</li> </ul> <p>Cost rejection measurements will be applied to GE owners failing to deliver fixed software releases by July 26th EOB.</p> <p><b>Regarding Installation and Admin guides:</b></p> <p>They have to reflect the actual Installation &amp; Administration of the GE, no matter what premises the GE is deployed on. Therefore, this cannot elaborate on the deployment of a VM or the access to a remote server.</p> <p>Regarding those GEs hosted on GE owner's premises and provided "as a Service" there is an open consultation with the PO about means to provide access to the</p>

	<p>Installation and Administration Guides. The deadline of July 23rd will be extended accordingly.</p> <p>TID will check provided guides and will check whether they fulfill the defined guidelines at:</p> <p><a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables</a></p> <p>Results of this check will be provided by July 25. As a result of this checking, the guides can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accepted</li> <li>• rejected with a deadline on July 27th EOB to fix a number of identified issues</li> </ul> <p>Cost rejection measurements will be applied to GE owners failing to deliver the guides by July 27th EOB.</p> <p>Installation and Administration Guides which do not contain the mandatory sections established in the defined guidelines will be rejected.</p> <p>Several partners express objections to the request for the delivery of the Installation and Admin Guide in the case of GEs offered “As a Service”. These need to be provided at least for auditing purposes.</p> <p><b>Users’ and Programmers’ Guide</b></p> <p>TID will check provided guides and will check whether they fulfill the defined guidelines at:</p> <p><a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/FiwareDeliverables</a></p> <p>Results of this check will be provided by July 25. As a result of this checking, the guides can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accepted</li> <li>• rejected with a deadline on July 27th EOB to fix a number of identified issues</li> </ul> <p>Cost rejection measurements will be applied to GE owners failing to deliver the guides by July 27th EOB.</p>
	<p><b>Resubmission of M9 deliverables</b></p> <p>AP - Juanjo to contact Arian to make sure that he is aware of our planning regarding</p>

	<p>resubmission of M9 deliverables. Juanjo already sent an email to him last week briefing him on the status but it would be worth trying to discuss all this over the phone and make sure he's aware.</p>
	<p><b>Technical roadmap</b></p> <p>Once we have finished revision/update on the Features, we are supposed to address the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• review Technical Roadmap so that features supported by GEs is described for each of the releases. <b>AP</b> - Telefonica to provide template on how to do this (but this not being an excuse for working in defining the Features). Target deadline: EOB July 23rd. <b>AP</b> - All to review Technical Roadmap deliverables once Features are stable (previous defined deadline by July 26th EOB), i.e., from July 26th until July 31st. Miguel to supervise this</li> <li>• review "stakeholder" field linked to each Feature. We should document whether a Feature is required by any of the FI-WARE partners, some UC project (for this, we should review the "Theme/Epic/Feature requests" tracker) or both. This will allow to solve the issue about traceability raised by reviewers. <b>AP</b> - All to review stakeholders field by July 31st. Miguel to supervise this.</li> </ul> <p>We should try to get these tasks finished by July 31st.</p>
	<p><b>White paper documenting "encompassing usage of GEs" by Application developers and FI-WARE Instance Providers</b></p> <p>This is the paper that was referred to in the review as to be linked to the FI-WARE Architecture part of the wiki, dealing with the comment made by reviewers on the need to define an "Encompassing Architecture".</p> <p>We should elaborate this document using Google docs first, then port it to the wiki.</p> <p><b>AP</b> - Juanjo to prepare a ToC and sketch of the document where we will distribute responsibilities about editing the different sections. It was planned for this follow-up confcall but is suffering a bit of delay and will be available by Wednesday.</p>
	<p><b>Action points to improve communication between FI-WARE and UC projects (to be</b></p>

## reviewed during the confcall

### Handling of tickets on trackers

Now that more detailed information about what FI-WARE is developing and therefore going to provide, and based on the several lessons we have learned, we have reviewed the processes that are going to be followed from now on dealing with interaction between UC projects and FI-WARE, trying to be more Agile and efficient.

The redesign of these processes was guided by the need to add speed and fluency to communication. This without going out of control, unable to monitor what's going on, therefore still using trackers to track progress.

The design of the new process is provided below for your convenience. Carlos Ralli and Axel Fasse will form the dedicated team in FI-WARE taking care that tickets issued by UC projects are handled properly. Axel was on vacation but Carlos has carried out an analysis of the new tickets that have been issued after the educational weeks. An email has been sent to all WPLs.

Chapter leaders are asked to provide here a short summary about progress in their chapters:

#### Data & Unknown:

- Unknown: 1886 (GEs PoC), 1695 to be closed (test).

1963: "Where to look (which GE(s)) to find transaction manager capabilities? (Finest)"

This needs more analysis & perhaps more details. Carlos to handle.

- Data:

1923 about providing GE PoC, 1961/1957/1932 specific to CEP features and F2F with Safecity (handled by IBM-IL)

1959 ("Are there any assets that provide functionality for an open data platform?", Outsmart) & 1754 ("What capabilities does Data&Context offer wrt. data uncertainty?", Finest) need more analysis & perhaps feedback. To be handled at WP level.

-> We agreed to tackle them this week (given the 10 days deadline we set in the previous call) just after today, due the the high number of relevant commitments for this 23rd deadline.

#### Cloud:

Most of the tickets are waiting for issuer's input

#### IoT:

Tickets waiting for revision by users: how can we push users to provide an answer?

Today: revision of tickets "under evaluation by FI-Ware" to close some of them

Tickets: 1972, 1893, 1891, 1795

Apps:

weekly check of the tickets: currently no tickets to react upon.

We need a closer collaboration with the UC projects in order to bring FI-WARE GE into the UC architecture!

I2ND:

Handling of tickets in both trackers progressing (although not all tickets yet closed). Requested details on guidelines to manage tickets in the FI-WARE General Support Tracker. Several tickets waiting for inputs by Issuers.

Tickets: 1974 assumed to be ready for closure. Who is going to close a ticket, Issuer or FI-WARE member?

There is also 1617: waiting for Issuer to respond.

Security:

Awaiting for the formal process to be officially communicated together with guidelines. Information was passed to the team already.

New process announced as to come may have prevented UC projects to use previous one and submit next tickets following the two educational sessions which took place. At least questionable ...

1976??

=== background info:

Following these two principles (speed-fluency and ability-to-measure-progress), here it is the design of the new process:

1. We will use the "FI-WARE General Support" Tracker [1] to request the initiation of any interaction between FI-WARE and the UC projects around any topic
  - Tickets can be issued by any UC project (e.g., to get more info about FI-WARE GE <A>) or by FI-WARE (e.g., to further discuss how FI-WARE GE <X> can be used as part of the Architecture of UC project <Y>)
  - We have to understand that tickets are mostly created to keep record about interaction so that we can push from both sides whenever communication gets blocked or slowed down. Teams at both sides involved in resolution of a ticket should be ready to setup dedicated virtual or f2f meetings when required as a mean to speed up the processes.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dedicated communication teams will be defined both at FI-WARE and each of the UC projects. They will be the ones that will monitor progress of tickets and regularly report on progress to the FI-PPP AB.</li> <li>○ The "FI-WARE General Support" Tracker doesn't require so much formalism to create a ticket. Creating a ticket declaring in the Summary "We would like to learn how NGSI can be used with OGC standards" or "We would like to find out whether Microsoft Windows can be supported in the FI-WARE Testbed" should be enough.</li> <li>○ The more we record on the trackers while interacting, the better. Attaching notes/minutes from virtual/f2f meetings or relevant documents or pointers to the wiki which help to answer the questions, would be considered a good practice. FI-WARE teams should try to derive enhancements on existing documentation or entries for a FI-WARE Technical FAQ. It would be nice to keep track of those results as attachments to each ticket.</li> <li>○ Tickets should be merged when clearly link to the same topic (note that several UC projects may formulate similar questions). This may be helpful to improve throughput of FI-WARE Teams answering questions (e.g., they will be able to setup the same virtual meeting to address issues about a given GE raised by several UC projects)</li> </ul> <p>2. Management of tickets in the "FI-WARE General Support" Tracker will typically lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ enhancements in existing documentation, potentially creating a new items of the FI-WARE Technical FAQ</li> <li>○ creation of a ticket in the "FI-WARE Theme/Epic/Feature requests" tracker [1]</li> </ul> <p>3. UC projects will not submit any ticket to the "FI-WARE Theme/Epic/Feature Requests" tracker until there has been enough discussion between the UC projects and FI-WARE (typically around some ticket in the "FI-WARE General Support" tracker) as to reach an overall consensus at both sides that it is worth creating a ticket on that tracker which maps to a new Theme/Epic/Feature not yet considered in the FI-WARE Backlog (reaching the level of detail of something that can be categorized as Feature is highly desirable) .</p>
	<h2>Other points</h2>
	<h2>Installation on Testbed</h2> <p>TID will provide access details and a description of the VMs to install the enablers on the Testbed. <u>The partners are fully responsible for the installation and maintenance of</u></p>

	<p><u>their instances on the testbed</u>. TID will only provide support to the infra and communications.</p> <p>The Testbed will provide a secure ftp server for those who prefer sending a KVM image instead of installing themselves. Other hypervisors will not accepted.</p> <p>The IP addresses allowed to access the testbed are the ones on one of these two lists (the representatives of each partner in the testbed must make sure that these IPs are provided):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V1_Operations_Cockpit">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V1_Operations_Cockpit</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V1_Implementation_Cockpit">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V1_Implementation_Cockpit</a></li> </ul> <p>The integration process will be conducted using a dedicated tracker on the testbed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/tracker/?atid=224&amp;group_id=18&amp;func=browse">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/tracker/?atid=224&amp;group_id=18&amp;func=browse</a></li> </ul> <p>To understand how this works go to “Integration Process” here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V1_Integration_Plan">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V1_Integration_Plan</a></li> </ul> <p>Paolo provided a document to guide in the installation process.</p> <p>Date when the GEs not installed on the testbed must be available and fully usable: end of July</p>
	<h2>Population of the FI-WARE Catalog</h2> <p>Still in place: <b>AP</b> - All chapters to submit description of GEs that will be available on the FI-WARE Testbed so that they be published in the FI-WARE Catalog by end of July. Don't hesitate to ask Matteo and Davide for support if necessary.</p> <p>Population of the FI-WARE Catalog is going slower than desirable.</p> <p><b>It is expected to have all the GEs available into the testbed by the end of July also well described into the Catalogue.</b></p> <p><b>Please, remind that into the catalogue you should not copy\paste what already written in the wiki, the purpose and the message is different, from the Catalogue you have to “sell” your products.</b></p> <p><b><u>To note:</u></b></p> <p><b>If the descriptions, tutorials or documents provided in the wiki are worth as is to be published in the catalogue and then comprehensible to everyone also outside the PPP, this will be fine as well but be accurate in not doing (as said above) a trivial copy/paste.</b></p> <p>Follow this link for further info:</p>

<https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Tools.Catalogue>

### **Examples and guidelines:**

The description of the Service Description Repository is a very good example of the description that is expected in the Catalogue. However what we are aiming at is the following one: <http://labs.ericsson.com/apis/captcha>.

### **Clarification:**

The name of the catalogue is FI-WARE Catalogue but this does not mean it is only for FI-WARE people. The idea is to make it available, initially, to all the the PPP and later to the “world” (in terms of target, not in terms of restricted contents; the Catalogue is a public portal).

As in the catalogue there should be just that information necessary to make the GEs appealing and marketable, then it is convenient to provide in the catalogue also information about the licences, costs, etc.

**AP** - Matteo to update status of this task as part of the minutes. What follows was the last report available.

### **Status:**

At the right moment this is the situation.

All the WPL have been contacted requesting them to publish their GEs (at least those that will be available at the end of July together with the Testbed).

There have been also point-to-point contacts (e.g. SIEMENS, SAP, ORANGE, TID, TELECOM ITALIA)

To date (23/7/2012) these are the GEs described into the catalogue (in brackets those described but not yet published by the editors) :

#### **Apps Chapter:**

- Marketplace (SAP)
- Service Description Repository (SAP)
- Service Instance Registry (SAP)
- (Ericsson Composition Engine)
- Mediator (TI)

#### **Cloud Chapter:**

- IaaS Data Center Resource Management (IBM)

#### **Data Chapter:**

- BigData Analysis (TID)
- CEP GE (IBM)
- Meta-data Pre-processing (SIE)
- Multimedia Analysis (SIE)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Query Broker (SIE)</li> </ul> <p><b>IoT Chapter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IoT Gateway (EAB)</li> <li>- Protocol Adapter (EAB)</li> </ul> <p><b>I2ND Chapter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- API mediation (Orange)</li> <li>- (Device Connectivity Platform) (EAB)</li> <li>- (WSC) (Orange)</li> </ul> <p><b>Security Chapter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Context-based security and compliance (ATO)</li> <li>- DB Anonymizer Security Service (SAP)</li> <li>- Identity Management (NSN)</li> <li>- Service-Level-SIEM (ATOS)</li> </ul> <p><b>Reminder:</b></p> <p>However will find bugs or problems please add this here:  <a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/tracker/?atid=208&amp;group_id=15&amp;func=browse">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/tracker/?atid=208&amp;group_id=15&amp;func=browse</a></p> <p>(Please remind to specify in the “asset” field the name catalogue)</p>
	<p><b>“Third party innovation enablement in FI-WARE” (D.2.5.a) - month 15</b></p> <p>This deliverable is now due by end of July (confirmed by Juanjo after the confcall by means of reviewing Arian’s official response to our re-planning request). As a reminder, the planning for this deliverable is as follows:</p> <p>Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 9. July – introduction provided to partners/chapters - DONE</li> <li>- 9. July – 20. July contributions by partners/chapters</li> <li>- 20. July – final version ready for review</li> </ul> <p>Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 23. July – Peer reviewer 1</li> <li>- 25. July – Review by Deliverable Lead</li> <li>- 30. July – Release to commission</li> </ul> <p>SAP and TID have worked on the initial contents and produced a first draft which should contain all the hints necessary for each chapter to contribute. Now it's available</p>

	<p>at the following link:</p> <p><a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HnmGAJ7LuHJs9oBIhVwbR9LuKMK-Xhb_c7SF-EVQi_Q/edit">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HnmGAJ7LuHJs9oBIhVwbR9LuKMK-Xhb_c7SF-EVQi_Q/edit</a></p> <p>Juanjo provided an overview of the ToC of the document and what is expected by all.</p> <p>Some chapters hadn't provided their contribution, so they have to provide that during this week. Also TID/SAP have to cover the general sections.</p> <p><b>AP</b> - Uwe to come up with updated calendar and action plan for next weeks.</p> <p>== background info:</p> <p>This deliverable was not there in our original proposal but was required by Arian. Here it is the description of the deliverable in the DoW:</p> <p><i>During the design of FI-WARE, the FI-WARE project will make choices that will affect the way FI-WARE can be used by third parties. Some of these choices will allow and some will limit the possibilities that third parties will get to innovate on top of the platform. It is expected that such choices relate to architectural design and/or to the business model of FI-WARE. This deliverable will document the key choices made and will analyse their effect on future third party innovation. As such, it will provide a justification of these choices against the ultimate objective of enabling third party innovation. It is expected that the deliverable will address topics such as architecture and innovation; neutrality issues; openness; lock-in; data portability; interoperability; patents; standards; specifications; access rights; open source and licensing; and so on.</i></p> <p>Shall we take it to the wiki? For the moment being on google docs and then we will decide how to distribute it.</p>
	<p><b>Standardization Plan (D11.4.b)-M15</b></p> <p>An emails has been sent this morning regarding the status. There are missing contributions that were needed by EOB today.</p> <p>It is agreed that all missing contributions should be ready by Wednesday EOB, but this will be the very last deadline.</p> <p>Following is provided as background info:</p> <p><b>Outline of Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <b>FI-WARE WPLs identify which Generic Enabler interfaces are important</b></li> </ul>

**and therefore crucial for standardization.** It is essential that a FI-WARE software architect complete such a list/diagram immediately to focus the work.

- **FI-WARE WPLs nominate responsible partners and persons who will input the plan and status for standardization at specific SDOs, for each of those important interfaces (a subset of all interfaces)**
- **The nominated responsible persons input their plan into the private Wiki as described below**, and update the Wiki [FI-WARE Standardization v2 \(private wiki\)](#) with (their) past contributions as well as planned future ones. FI-WARE management team has promised weekly oversight of this activity.
- **NEC summarizes results in last week of July, creating D11.4b pdf from the Wiki**

**General content required (to be generated by FI-WARE partners)**

- identify what standardization makes sense for FI-WARE (targets), taking account of specific gaps which the EC requested fixed
- identify where to do it (selected SDOs) /note: should reference "Section 2 CONTRIBUTE" actions in D11.4a/
- explain (if it is planned) where IP generated in FI-WARE is inserted into SDOs specifications
- for each selected SDO and FI-WARE target, show the timeline of how to achieve the target, with "concrete steps" and partners, starting work "even before usable results" as requested by EC
- show how ongoing actual contributions to SDOs fulfill the "concrete steps" (i.e. ongoing status)

**Step by step Format**

- WPLs create a webpage [mapping important FI-WARE interfaces/protocols to the Target SDO which could be responsible](#). It should also indicate any IPR which FI-WARE may bring in. This webpage would satisfy (D)6.a and (D)6.b and (D)6.c above. In the opinion of NEC, standardization is most valuable for the exposed interfaces, and in a secondary way to efficiently design the internal interfaces. Therefore all exposed interfaces are important, and some internal ones. As an example of some important interfaces, the (old) picture [https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/iot/index.php/Snapshot\\_2012.06.01\\_of\\_Deliverable\\_Page\\_for\\_D2.3\\_Architecture\\_Specifications](https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/iot/index.php/Snapshot_2012.06.01_of_Deliverable_Page_for_D2.3_Architecture_Specifications) could be used.
- WPLs create a webpage showing which partner is responsible for each [important interface](#) and their [responsible person](#) to make it standardized. The format can be a table ("[Target SDO / Responsible Persons](#)") with entries <SDO><Exposed Interface><responsible partner><responsible person><comment>.
- [Responsible persons](#) add to [FI-WARE Standardization v2 \(private wiki\)](#)

	<p>page, for each <b>Target SDO</b>, a <u>timeline</u> based on the SDO meeting schedules and methods, which is designed to get the exposed interface standardized. A partial example is given for ETSI M2M. This satisfies (D)6.d. This can only be created by the responsible persons who also ensure that that Target SDO work happens. It should indicate the <u>phases</u> as e.g. (1) feasibility-study (2) architecture (3) datamodels and protocols. The format can be a table ("<u>Target SDO / Contributions Table</u>") ordered by date, so later it is easier for the information to be integrated into a complete project plan, e.g. &lt;dates&gt; &lt;SDO or Event&gt;&lt;contribution title and SDO ID&gt;&lt;Exposed Interface&gt;&lt;responsible partner&gt;&lt;responsible person&gt;&lt;phase/IPR/comment/status&gt;</p> <p>d. The <u>responsible person</u> updates the <u>Target SDO / Contributions Table</u> every week, with new planned inputs and new results. Care should be taken to note any IPR. This satisfies (D)6.e.</p> <p>e. NEC creates an integrated timetable showing the aggregated copies of all tables from step (c) above, which is the overview for the EC. NEC will combine it with (a) and (b) – assuming all partners have strongly contributed – so as to resolve all EC requests.</p> <p>f. <u>Optionally</u> partners can extend the information in (c) above, to include highly relevant non-FI-WARE results which are monitored (M). Also partners can include relevant work they do which however is not part of the agreed <u>important interface</u> work. Monitoring standards is also part of the standardization plan and this work should be reported to the EC, <u>as long as it is shown as supporting a significant amount of active contributions work</u>.</p>
	<h2 data-bbox="293 1291 488 1333">Open Calls</h2> <p data-bbox="293 1371 1414 1545">Results of 1st Open Call were circulated. No objection has been received so approval has been asked to the FI-WARE PCC (this expected to happend by a confcall tomorrow). Therefore, we ask the PCC to approve the incorporation of the partners and the start of negotiations with them, including the elaboration of the necessary changes in a new DoW amendment (subject to prior approval by the PO).</p> <p data-bbox="293 1549 716 1581">Recommended start of activities:</p> <ul data-bbox="342 1585 826 1659" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Middleware: beginning of October</li> <li>• BM&amp;BE: subject to SAP's criteria</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="293 1705 1385 1776">TID would directly drive the negotiation of the middleware related activities. Question mark: separate WP ? Apparently is the best option.</p> <p data-bbox="293 1780 1300 1852">We recommend that SAP drives negotiation of BM&amp;BE related activities (to be included as part of a new redaction of WP3) under supervision of TID.</p>

	<p>The 2nd and 3rd Open Calls have been tackled during the last FI-PPP AB meeting. Still no decision has been taken regarding 2nd and 3rd Open Call and the FI-PPP AB will setup an extra call most probably this week to take a final decision on what would be considered in the 2nd Open Call. It was also agreed that we would like to launch 3rd Open Call by not later than end of October, so there would not be that much a difference.</p> <p>Nevertheless, current situation is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2nd Open Call. Most probably the following topics will be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Stream-oriented GEs</li> <li>◦ Advanced Web User Interfaces (3D, Augmented Reality plus one of the topics brought by FI-WARE on multi-device access)</li> <li>◦ Cloud Proxy related GEs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 3rd Open Call. These are the topics that are candidate but it has been remarked that discussions/clarifications are needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Security aspects</li> <li>◦ Data Uncertainty</li> <li>◦ Semantic-related GEs</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>AP</b> - Juanjo to provide info about what would be the scope and topics to be covered in the Security workshop before the concall of the Security chapter this week (friday)</p> <p><b>AP</b> - Carlos to fix the date for the f2f workshop dedicated to Semantic technologies involving ATOS and HI Iberia (Safecity project) asap. This should be this week or next week.</p>
	<h2 data-bbox="293 1163 1159 1205">Look &amp; feel styleguide for web pages and portals</h2> <p>The UPM has produced a first set of guidelines for FI-WARE webs and portals:</p> <p><a href="https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/1125/Look%26Feel.zip">https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/1125/Look%26Feel.zip</a></p> <p>Teams to try adapting to this as much as possible for the Testbed by end of July. FI-WARE Webs and Portals should definitively align by the upgrade of the FI-WARE Testbed planned by end of September.</p> <p><b>AP</b> on WPLs to start sharing this with their teams for consideration. Again, no strong requirement to follow the guidelines for the FI-WARE Testbed available by end of July but for the upgrade of it by end of September.</p> <p><b>AP</b> on WPLs to come to the next follow-up concall with feedback on whether they see any issue complying with the guidelines by end of September.</p> <p>Telefonica has already setup a mailing list for discussing about the guidelines (fiware-webdesign@lists.fi-ware.eu).</p>



	<p><b>AP-</b> Telefonica to add all WPLs and WPAs to the mailing lists by default. WPLs can designate alternative or additional representatives of their respective chapters.</p>
	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Matteo reminds Juanjo to answer question about roadmap. To be discussed off-line.</p>
	<p><b>How to make it easier how to find information</b></p> <p>Matteo raises the point that we should work on how to make more visible <b>ALL</b> the FI-WARE results (e.g. publishing them directly on the web site and, not only, on the wiki!!!)</p> <p>Actions to take:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add some sort of introduction that explain where to go for what</li> <li>• Add links from the website to the relevant points of the wiki</li> <li>• Investigate on how to improve navigation within the wiki (if technically feasible)</li> </ul> <p><b>AP</b> - Telefonica to prepare a plan for implementing the above actions.</p> <p>Discussion on the appropriateness of using pdf generated files took place.</p> <p><b>AP</b> - send email to Arian on the matter</p>
	<p><b>“State of the art analysis” (D.2.6.a) - month 18</b></p> <p>We have to start planning/working on this deliverable. Following is the description of this deliverable in the DoW:</p> <p><i>This deliverable provides a view on the state of the art, concerning technologies that are considered relevant to the Future Internet. The document will analyze the most recent technological advances as well as innovative market disruptions and user trends that may impact or are already impacting the Future Internet. It will also analyse the activities and recent results of the most relevant initiatives and projects at national, European and International level.</i></p> <p><i>This analysis will help to identify which are the major differentiation points of FI-WARE components released in month 12, 24 and 33. It will also help to identify gaps as well as technologies in which to focus further work.</i></p>

	<p>This is a deliverable that will require contributions by every chapter. Those can be developed independently by each chapter. Besides this, we should have a section/chapter elaborating on how it is the state of the art regarding development of a holistic/integrated solution (here it is where we should elaborate there is a major differentiation point).</p> <p><b>AP</b> - Telefonica to provide common ToC to be followed. We suggest that we develop this document using Google docs, later we will translate into the Wiki, although maybe this doesn't need to be part of the wiki. Proposal was planned to be delivered in this follow-up confcall but TID hasn't been able to make it. TID to try it for the next follow-up confcall.</p>
	<p><b>Next General Assembly</b></p> <p><b>AP</b> - Juanjo to launch thread of discussion on the email.</p>
	<p><b>Risk management plan - organization</b></p> <p>The document in its present status is here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AhTmk3UgJVcbdDlxU05GbnZwb2duZ3RycWdhMmtmaVE#gid=0">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AhTmk3UgJVcbdDlxU05GbnZwb2duZ3RycWdhMmtmaVE#gid=0</a></li> </ul> <p>On our weekly confcall we will prepare beforehand a number of items for discussion (10?)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>AP- Telefonica to define the meaning of the terms (risk, impact, high, low, medium...)</p> <p>AP - Telefónica to send the list of 10 items for discussion the next week after each confcall and add them to a dedicated wiki page where we will discuss it.</p>

## 6. Summary of action points (TBR)

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

IdAP-2	Action point	Responsible
--------	--------------	-------------

AP-1	Provide a template to fill in Features associated to a GE	Telefónica
AP-2	Start identifying Features associated to a GE(do not wait to have the template!)	WPL/WPA
AP-3	review “stakeholder” field linked to each Feature	
AP-1	We have to officially ask all UC projects to share any documentation they may have regarding their Architecture, and do it ASAP.	Telefónica
AP-2	We have to document and be able to monitor progress of our communication, so using a tracker system is still the right thing to do. However, we have to decide which one (or define a new one). My proposal would be not to use the "FI-WARE Theme/Epic/Feature Requests" but the "FI-WARE General Support" tracker because it will more agile. Use of the tracker would be bidirectional, so that we can open tickets on UC projects.	All WPL/WPA
AP-3	Each FI-WARE chapter should carefully study the Architecture documentation by UC projects (available after Action-1) to find the places where they believe there is an opportunity of using FI-WARE GEs that should be explored, then open the proper tickets on the UC projects to launch the discussion. Note that discussion doesn't need then to be carried out always off-line. Chapters should be ready to setup confcalls, f2f meetings, whatever when necessary.	All WPL/WPA
AP-4	We will re-inforce the role of the dedicated team (in this case, Carlos and Axel) that has to push Action-3 first, and then follow-up progress and push communication afterwards. Creation of a dashboard that allows us to monitor progress will be key.	Carlos and Axel
AP-5	Communication between the UC projects and the FI-WARE chapters may lead to the need to	All WPL/WPA

	support new features in existing FI-WARE GEs, define new FI-WARE GEs, etc. These case should lead to creation of a ticket in the "FI-WARE Theme/Epic/Feature Requests" backlog but, this time, the description of what is required will be much more concrete and well understood from both sides	
AP-6	UC projects to make a quick review of tickets in the "FI-WARE Theme/Epic/Feature Requests" tracker to get rid of those tickets that are rather generic or they have now the feeling they can formulate more precisely.	
AP-7	Raise issue about attendance and commitment by projects attending the Educational Session during the AB. Also about quality of presentations made by presentations.	Juanjo
AP-8	Push for adoption of concrete actions during the FI-PPP AB that will ensure that UC project members have read our stuff before the Educational Sessions: - send a summary of relevant links they should focus to review they can distribute - push for creating a mailing list or some tool to communicate publishing of any valuable stuff that we believe they should read	Juanjo
AP-9	Launch an activity to create white-papers describing how FI-WARE can be used in several scenarios (e.g., FI-WARE in Smart Cities). Juanjo to launch discussion off-line about where to place contents and how to structure them.	Juanjo
AP-10	Contribute to complete the standardization deliverable for M15, end of this month, reacting to what NEC, task leader, in the mail of 5th July, ask from you: - Identify a responsible partner per WP - Provide the inputs required in the wiki - Review content and format requirements	All WPL/WPA

## 7. Reference documentation

- FI-WARE DoW:
  - <https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/7/681/FI-WARE+DoW+vfinal+reviewed+11-11-21.docx>
- Info on Architects's Week
  - [http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Collaboration\\_activities#FI-PPP\\_Software\\_Architects\\_Week](http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Collaboration_activities#FI-PPP_Software_Architects_Week)
- Architects's Week agenda
  - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0ArcymbqnpOfkdGJqeEFIbINEUkdxdki2NW1sM0FWUUE#gid=0>