1. Meeting Information

Date/Time of the Meeting:	**October 14, 2013, 11:00-12:30, 14:30-16:00**
Inviting person:	**Juanjo Hierro**
Minutes takers:	**Juanjo Hierro, Miguel Carrillo. All the rest helping**
Name of the meeting:	**WPLs/WPAs follow-up confcall (Oct 14, 2013)**
Place of the meeting:	**Virtual**
Phone details (if PhC):	**powwownow (PIN: 050662)**
Version	**1.0**

2. Attendees

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

Name	Company / WP-Chapter	Morning	Afternoon (N/A)
Pierangelo Garino	Telecom Italia / I2ND	X	X
Stefano De Panfilis	Engineering / WP10-Testbed	X	X
Davide Dalle Carbonare	Engineering / Tools	X	X
Alex Glikson	IBM / Cloud	X	X
Pascal Bisson, Daniel Gidoin	Thales / Security	X	X
Hans Joachim Einsiedler	Deutsche Telekom / I2ND	X	X
Matthias Baumgart	Deutsche Telekom / I2ND	X	X
Markus Heller, Torsten Leidig, Thorsten Sandfuchs	SAP / Apps	X	X
Thierry Nagellen	Orange / IoT	X	X
Juan Bareño	Atos / Exploitation	X	X

Juanjo Hierro	Telefónica I+D	X	X
Miguel Carrillo	Telefónica I+D	X	X
Manuel Escriche	Telefónica I+D	X	X
Kay Hänsge	Deutsche Telekom / I2ND	X	X
Carlos Ralli	Telefonica I+D / IoT	X	X
Sergio Garcia	Telefónica I+D / Data	X	X
Christof Marti	ZHAW / MiWi	X	X

3. Objective and topics addressed during the meeting

Part I (morning)

Re-submission of exploitation deliverables

Juanjo has sent message this morning on the matter.   See relevant background below.

A discussion takes place about the contents of the email proposed by Juanjo. Thierry proposed to make it clear that any decision regarding stopping of funding some GEi development would come from the EC. Juanjo: point taken.

Regarding update of the Catalogue a hot debate took place regarding how to achieve scalability on revision of the Catalogue.

AP on Stefano to send a email to fiware-wpl and fiware-wpa that summarizes the status of each of the entries in the FI-WARE Catalogue so that WPLs can take the necessary action. Once WPLs consider that the necessary changes for a given entry have been implemented, then the will send a message to Stefano so that he can make a final review and approve.

Juanjo: how could we speed up the process about updating the "external availability" ? Stefano doesn't find this a particular issue.

========================

Relevant background:

The following email is proposed:

Dear FI-WARE GEi owners,

I hope that you have already had time to review the outcome and detailed report of the Y2 review.

Despite generally speaking the results of the review are nice, there are a number of points that require immediate action and one of them has to do with exploitation plans by the FI-WARE GEi owners.

You all know that the EC has always stated that external (i.e., beyond the FI-PPP) availability plans regarding FI-WARE GEis should be clear and publicly available. We have always responded that the place where external availability would be stated is the FI-WARE Catalogue (http://catalogue.fi-ware.eu). However, as pointed in [1], this commitment has not been fulfilled by the majority of GEis.

On the other hand, the EC and reviewers clearly seem not to be satisfied by the confidential individual plans delivered by the partners (see [2]). They lack of references to the FI-WARE GEis owned by the individual partner submitting each of the exploitation plans. They stated that, with a few exceptions, those exploitation plans are weak, and also lack of positioning with respect to FI-WARE in general and FI-LAB in particular (at the point in which the review report was produced, still being referred as FI-WARE OIL).

In order to cover these different issues, the EC has asked for a resubmission of the individual exploitation plans and the fixing of the situation in the Catalogue before end of October, which we ask you to handle the following way:

1. Fix the "External availability" section in the "Terms and Conditions" tab of each of the FI-WARE GEis you own. Don't forget to review the guidelines on contents of that section provided at:
   a. http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Working_with_the_FI-WARE_catalogue#Terms_and_Conditions
2. Produce a new confidential individual exploitation plan which should:
   a. covers your general exploitation plan regarding FI-WARE, which should include a description of what is the role that FI-LAB plays in that plan
   b. elaborates on the individual exploitation plans you have with respect to each of the FI-WARE GEis you own. Although this is not strictly required for the GEis that are made publicly available as open source, we also encourage you to elaborate on those as well, explaining what are your exploitation plans for them, or at least what are your commitments regarding support to the open source software.

Note that failure to cover the several action points for a given FI-WARE GEi may lead to decision by the EC to discontinue the funding of the development of that FI-WARE GEi in the project.   The corresponding funding would then be reassigned to work in other GEis.

It would be highly advisable that you take the opportunity to review that the entry linked to each of the FI-WARE GEis you own in the FI-WARE Catalogue follow the general guidelines provided in:

http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/Working_with_the_FI-WARE_catalogue

Therefore, we ask you to work diligently addressing the above action points.   Note that, regarding the Catalogue, this is not work that is new but should have been address long time ago (as pointed out by the reviewers) so it should not be that difficult. If your exploitation plans are clear enough as they should be at this point in the project, updating the individual exploitation plans accordingly should also not be a big issue and sharing it confidentially with the EC and reviewers shouldn't be also.

Whenever you update the "External availability" section in the "Terms and Conditions" part of a given FI-WARE GEi in the Catalogue, please send an email notifying this circumstance to Juan Bareño <juan.bareno@atosresearch.eu> and copy your WPL, Miguel Carrillo <mcp@tid.es> and me <jhierro@tid.es>.

Other elements of the FI-WARE review report

There was an AP on Juanjo to discuss how to organize or at least trigger the reaction to the most urgent deliverables requested by the reviewers. Clarify who has to do what when it is unclear. Important: do not act as a bottteneck wasting time when we could be working on this now.

An email was sent also this morning. Let's take it as basis for the discussion today:

Juanjo: Regarding re-submission of rejected deliverables, or deliverables not submitted, following is my take:

- D2.1.3 - FI-WARE Requirements Backlog (not submitted, no re-submission required)
- D2.1.4 - FI-WARE Requirements Backlog (no re-submission required)
- D2.1.5 - FI-WARE Requirements Backlog (no re-submission required)

    This is a sign that we have to be more serious with description of the backlog.   We insist once more: looking at the backlog of each chapter in its tracker within a given month (matching a Sprint) it would be feasible to understand what every company in that chapter is doing.   You should track all kind of activities through WorkItems as well as development activities (development of user-stories or at least refinement of Epics and Features).
    Note that the next (and theoretically last) release of this deliverable is end of this month !   (with an extension of 4 months to the project, it may lead to definition of an

additional release of the deliverable, but we should definitively be able to address this in this release)

At the confcall, Manuel reported that a lot of efforts have been done so that the new release of it will be reasonable better but still there is space for enhancement. At least we will be able to show that things have improved.

The deliverable to be submitted will incorporate sections to describe how their comments have been addressed and how the pending "bugs" have been fixed. We will also provide analysis, based on several graphic tools developed by Manuel, about how the backlog has evolved over time to make it visible the effort that we have made.

Alex: it is important to present the analysis that can be derived from the tools in a positive way. Agree.

AP on all WPLs to contribute and cooperate in this effort until the end of the month.

Work should not finish by end of this month but continue until the very end minor releae of release 3 ends. We will see whether this will lead to delivery of additional formal submissions of the backlog deliverable to the EC.

- D2.4.2 - FI-WARE Technical Roadmap (no re-submission required)

  Still analyzing the comments. However, my view on this is that the reviewers don't criticize the approach but point out several aspects in which there is actually a space of improvement:
  - ➔ The Technical Roadmap ends referring to the backlog, so that every weakness in the backlog propagates to the roadmap. In particular, there is a lack of detailed description for some features of several GEis (they are too high-level or vague) including non-functional features (e.g., it is stated that "mass provisioning of users" should be supported, but no target values are provided). There are also some inconsistencies found which has been reported by the reviewers.
  - ➔ Correlation with demands from UC projects. This proved to be unimplementable with phase 1 projects, but should improve in phase 2 with the implementation of the JIRA projects for each of the FI-WARE GEi. We may require UC projects to provide feedback through JIRA and, if not provided, at least we would have a justification for the lack of traceability with respect to requirements by UC projects (hopefully it won't be the case but UC projects will actually provide their feedback).
  - ➔ Cross-chapter Epic/Features and cross-GEis Epic/Features within a chapter should be captured

  Next release of this deliverable is in month 33 so we have time to incorporate evidence about how feedback from UC projects in phase 2 has been taken into account.

Thierry asked about documenting the interaction with UC projects. This is Ok but it is not strictly related to the Technical Roadmap but would be helpful for generating the new releases of the Validation deliverable.

<mark>AP</mark> on sending a proposal about how to track record of interaction with the UC projects (mailbox suggested for that purpose). We will see afterwards if we would use it and how to use it.

- D2.5.2 - Third party innovation enablement in FI-WARE (not submitted, submission required after 1 month of the review report)

We all know that this deliverable was not submitted because there was no one willing to lead the task of editing it. This is not acceptable.
I expect proposals on the matter given the fact that this project is a cooperative project.

TID will take up the editing role but will just compile the contributions from the chapters. <mark>AP</mark> on all chapters to provide input in terms of changes to the existing version of the document as per the requested date to be communicated over the email.

- D2.6.2 - State of the Art Analysis – Emerging Technologies (no re-submission required)

We have to carefully analyze the review report comments. It theory, there is plenty of time (next version of this deliverable is planned to be month 36, i.e., end of April 2014) but we should at least start discussion about how we will organize its development.

<mark>AP</mark> on Juanjo to trigger a thread of discussion over the fiware-wpl and fiware-wpa mailing list as to be able to agree on an approach by the end of this month.

- D8.1.2 - Security Chapter GE Open Specifications (re-submission required within 1 month of the receipt of the Review Report).

I believe this re-submission is already being handled.
Next follow-up confcall to be held this Thursday in the afternoon.

- D9.1.3 - FI-CoDE Basic Framework (no re-submission required)
- D9.2.2 - FI-CoDE Handbook (no re-submission required)
- D9.3.2 - API IDE Support (no re-submission required)
- D9.4.2 - Application Testing and Deployment Support (no re-submission required)

Engineering should come with a plan here. They should provide an analysis of the comments and a concrete action plan about how to address those comments.

- D10.5.2 - Report on Validation Process including Validation with Use Case projects

(re-submission required within 1 month of the receipt of the Review Report).

SAP already proposed an action plan so unless other feedback, we will stick to it.

- D11.2.2 - Exploitation Plan, including IPR Management (re-submission required by Month 30)

(see previous point in the agenda).

AP on Juanjo to double-check whether the received review report can be considered final with regards to the technical reviews or there is something still to come derived from the analysis by Lutz.   This AP is pending.

Documentation release 2.3.3 versus public wiki for R3.1

Update on Oct, 7: this planning is still pending

- Note that there are changes in the deliverable tables (dates and deliverables)
- Backlog should be ready for the end of the month
- R3 is due on M33 (Jan 2014)

AP on TID to come up with the definition of a process and send it to the WPL/WPA. If accepted, it will be sent to all the consortium.

FI-WARE at ICT 2013

Thierry asked what are the plans regarding ICT 2013. Juanjo answered that our intention is to spend the minimum set of resources required.   Focus should be on other kind of events, more clearly helpful to achieve market impact (such as Campus Party Europe event or other national-level events).   We will offer support to CONCORD assuming that they will setup a specific stand for the whole FI-PPP.   We will also deal with the session on FI-PPP/FI-WARE that has been approved by organizers.

Basic policy to use FI-WARE GEs in another research project
- The first priority is the use of FI-LAB as an open platform where GE instances are available, instead of dealing directly with partners (GEi owners)
- In case of trial, maybe a specific "partnership" could be established to have more dedicated resources on FI-LAB
- Inform partners that the FI-PPP external research project expect to test or use some of the GEs on FI-LAB (part of dissemination activities)

Community building activities (was Campus Party Europe and next

public events targeted to developers)

There was an <mark>AP</mark> on Juanjo to create mailing list where requests can be forwarded to Ogilvy and discussion about communication can take place.   List has been created (fiware-marketing).   We will add all WPLs plus Nuria.   <mark>AP</mark> on WPLs to tell if they should be dropped out.

Another mailing list has been created to deal with announcements and management of activities within the Campusero community (fiware-campusero).   In principle, ATOS, TID and Futura Networks and Ogilvy will be added.   <mark>AP</mark> on WPLs to tell if they should be included.

Event programmed in Santander is evolving well.

FI-WARE GE use in a French national project related to Smart Grid (no commercial issue). Could it use FI-LAB ?   Juanjo: yes.

========================

Relevant background from previous meetings:

An internal wiki page has been setup to collect internal input about how to improve in the next public events targeted to developers:

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Campus_Party_Europe:_report_on_FI-WARE_activities#Internal_inputs_for_potential_improvement_of_next_events_for_external_developers

The Spanish Ministry has proposed a big national event on FI-WARE focused on Smart Cities:

- it will not only comprise dissemination activities (panels, speeches) but will comprise training targeted to SMEs and a hackathon with prizes.

- Planned to be October 16-18 in Santander.

- It will be widely announced in media and through SME associations and Technology Centers in Spain.   It will be presented to SMEs and startups as an opportunity to gain knowledge and make hands on FI-WARE towards participation in FI-WARE challenges (to be announced during September) and involvement in phase 3 of the FI-PPP.

- Presence of the EC is expected.

We believe it would be a rather good idea if events like this are replicated in other countries (mostly Germany, France and Italy).   Linked to Smart Cities or not.

Davide reported on conversations that are taking place in Italy towards setting up a similar

event.

Training material

Update on 30/Sept: the new branding has to be incorporated to the portal

We have to start producing good stuff to be made available on the eLearning platform.
http://edu.fi-ware.eu

The Cloud portal team as well as the Store/Wirecloud portal team are producing some videos that may help people who create their accounts in FI-LAB to have some quick start guidelines.

The Tools team created/updated manuals in the public wiki; organized a dedicated conf call on 02/08/2013 (only one attendee); sent a reminder for content publication on 06/08/2013; still pushing GE WPLs and owners directly.

Juanjo: we should take this more seriously. It's quite crucial and high priority at this point.

AP on Juanjo to send WPLs/WPAs a list of GEis currently available on FI-LAB so that we can prioritize which contents to provide first.

AP on Davide to re-send guidelines to fiware@lists.fi-ware.eu . You can reinforce that people whose GEis are available on FI-LAB should provide training material by end of this month.

Updates of FI-WARE Catalogue

Neither Stefano nor Miguel are here to report on progress.

AP on Juanjo to ask Stefano to send an email regarding description of current status and guidelines to follow from now on.

AP on Juanjo to verify entries for Tools on the FI-WARE Catalogue. Deadline this week, otherwise we will go for publishing as they are.

(following contents are there from previous confcall)

Update on 27/aug: extension of the catalogue. Urgent guidelines sent by email, they will be incorporated to the online tutorials.

Question by Pascal: how to deal with sw delivered as a service (e.g. IDM) - this is not for the OIL so part of the changes requested are not needed.

Juanjo: the treatment for different GEs may not be the same (some may work as global instances, for instance)

Update on 5/aug: Stefano has been helping the coordination taking charge of the review of the catalogue. The catalogue is part of the announcement at the end of last week to the whole PPP. The announcement does not cover all the GEs and some will get incorporated in the future.

Be aware that this review may have impact on the availability of a given GEi for the OIL and the Campus Party.

Davide: mail sent to Juanjo with a link to an example of a tool published in the catalogue, now waiting for comments. AP on Juanjo to validate or provide comments.

AP on Telefonica and Engineering to circulate a table, by EOB today or early tomorrow morning, which helps to determine for which GEis the new "Creating instances" tab should be completed prior to the Campus Party.

AP on Juanjo to approve or provide comments.

========================
Relevant background from previous meetings:

Nothing relevant to discuss. Juanjo remind chapter leads that they have to create/update entries in the FI-WARE Catalogue for each FI-WARE GEi in Release 2. They have to be ready for consumption by third parties outside the FI-PPP.

Special care has to be taken conditions for external availability.

WP9 providing entries regarding Tools very soon also in the FI-WARE Catalogue. Provided we agreed on the structure, content-wise it would be ready by end of July.   AP on Davide to send email to Juanjo describing the new structure proposed : ~~STILL pending~~ done.
Davide: mail sent to Juanjo with a link to an example, now waiting for comments.

Entries have to comply with the guidelines provided at:
http://wiki.fi-ware.eu/Working_with_the_FI-WARE_catalogue#Guidelines_on_what_to_write

A good reference example (despite there are some few changes they have to incorporate) can be found at: http://catalogue.fi-ware.eu/enablers/application-mashup-wirecloud

Entries which do not comply with the guidelines or whose contents are considered weak will not be finally public on July 31st and corresponding FI-WARE GEis will therefore not be made available as part of the FI-WARE OIL and Testbed, with potential implications in rejection of costs.

Don't forget that FI-WARE GEi have to make public their terms of availability beyond the FI-PPP ("External availability" in the section on "Terms and Conditions").

Information in the FI-WARE Catalogue has to be consistent with the new cockpit that will replace the current cockpit on FI-WARE GEi planned usage by UC projects, to incorporate info about baseline assets, detailed info and availability of FI-WARE GEis. The current draft, which will soon be announced to the rest of FI-PPP partners was shown during the FI-WARE review and is available at:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqGGeaQGro3fdEQ4TlBJT1JwT1ZfMVUwQzhzRWExOEE#gid=8

Suggestion by Thierry (endorsed): the GE owners should be requested to add the WPL/WPA as extra editors to enable them to perform internal reviews

SAP (Thorsten) asks for a calendar (deadlines) for the process. Eng (Stefano) replied this also depends on the amount of resources dedicated to this task.

Closing of FI-WARE Major Release 2 (minor release 2.3)

Update on Oct, 7

- Need to pass a review to the chapters who have sent updates
- Reviews from Engineering pending to be taken care of
- Duplicate pages still there?

=====

Miguel asked chapter leaders not keep him on copy of every mail linked to communication between them and the FI-WARE GEi owners. Messages consolidating status required. We still keep on getting direct messages from individual GE owners - we may ignore them as it is impossible to keep track of all of them, this needs to be grouped per WP.

AP: Take all the manuals to the definite location (public wiki or PPP restricted wiki). We will continue working there. Use the "pagemoved" template and ensure that there a single page (not "R1" and "R2"). Update links in placeholders. Link properly from "Materializing…"

Status per Work Package

Apps	Update: 2nd updates by Apps chapter is submitted - pending check/Approval (mostly fixed, still waiting contributions from 2 partners (TID, iMinds); Review sent on 25/07; Technical review from Engineering sent on 19/aug)
Cloud	Update: review if manuals sent on 19/Aug and SW on 20/Aug Alex sent an update today: one pending thing (intel) plus edgelets in bad shape, the other should be ready for review and in near final state
IoT	Update: on 5/aug - conversation with Carlos, who provided an update - he must

	have distributed comments. IoT is in general looking good but it needs another pass. Last review sent late on 26/08 (yesterday!) - mostly ok! Thierry: actions done Technical review from Engineering sent on 19/aug To be discussed tomorrow, some links do not seem the right links
Data	Review sent on 21/aug Still being solved. Technical review from Engineering sent on 19/aug -> content updated according the comments Everything expected to be fixed by Thursday. I'll notify by mail.
I2ND	Status on 16/Sep: manuals updated and moved to final wiki locations. Still under update one page of CDI (UTP). Review of manuals sent on 16/Aug (and sw review on 21/Aug) Update: Mostly fixed but still ongoing (some updates/checks still missing).
Security	Review sent on 31/07 - some discussions on concrete aspects - needs a last review. On 2/Aug we sent instructions to unblock a number of issues. The answer is most possibly "yes" but we'd better confirm. Pascal, can you confirm that this is 100% ready for review? **Background from previous meetings** ===================== low quality. Sw delivery, installation and user manuals reviewed. Just reviewed the first UTPs and stopped in the view of the situation. Will review the UTP once there is a serious internal review (now it is highly inconsistent with the roadmap) - when? Comments from Pascal: There has been an internal review to align the UTP to the technical roadmap and now it is asked to checked UTP against Backlog (what we will do - but always changing the target is not easy even more that we're working on the backlog to get addressed review comments from Manuel and we discovered there was risk to create inconsistency. In the meantime there are things we can't figure calling for software whereas delivered as a service ? Thus calls for review that come to us to be taken also more seriously also to ease the correction process by providing us with the necessary

	explanations also guidance to correct the issues. even more the guidelines don't cover all the cases and we have 12 GEs we decided to resubmit for June (for only 1 new one the others being just refreshed!). AP on Pascal to come with proposal on how to improve the process. Process was the one already put in place at Chapter level. This with further involvement of WPL/WPA to check issue, call GE owners to get them fixed or address them directly and review before delivering answers. It should be noticed that some of the issues were disputed since disputable and it even appeared that some of the reported issues were indeed not. In any case it is important to be crystal clear on how an issue need to be fixed to avoid waste of time from both sides (reviewer, fixer). Comments from Daniel: With Pascal, I conducted a careful review in order to satisfy ourselves of the high quality produced. It is not fair to say that this work is low quality. Our partners have shown strong commitment to the release and have generously contributed their professional time and resources to the work. Further progress is definitely possible here, We are working on this with our partners. In the future, we want fairer assessments of our work. issue: on GEI delivery delivery when: this week but this will depend also on the support for understanding we may receive since not everything is crystal clear (even more that there are things wrong!) Delivered awaiting for review.
Tools	This WP is not in the scope of these reviews . Comments from Davide:? [Davide]: Most of the features have been released at M24. Some improvements for some tools will be released for R2.3 Items planned for FI-CoDE/CDE-Manager will not be released and are under review (after the discussion in Malaga, Juanjo/Davide) in order to come up with the new schedule for the "myForge" development. The roadmap will be updated to drop out all aspects that were somehow redundant with developments in the Cloud chapter. Also to reflect re-planning of development activities.

Caveats:

- We will not add the new deliverables to the cockpit - this is for formal deliveries to the EC

- We will regenerate new pdf files but later (August). We will organize wiki pages with the covers at some point (not urgent - not our priority)
- We will focus on delivering the manuals/sw on the wiki/files tool
- We will only review the docs linked from this link and exclusively the "June" block
  - https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Fiware DeliverablesR2#FI-WARE_Project_R2_Deliverables_Placeholders_for_commo n_edition

=====

Background from previous meetings

We are about to close release 2.3, which is the final minor release within the major Release 2.

A detailed and more thorough and demanding revision of FI-WARE GEi software and accompanying documentation will be carried out as to avoid publication of FI-WARE GEis that we may foresee can receive criticism by developers beyond the research community.

This revision will be carried by programmers from Telefonica and Engineering, other volunteers are welcome.

Note that FI-WARE GEis that have been allowed to be part of FI-WARE r2.2 in our recent submission to the EC may be rejected to be made available in OIL.

Be aware that:

- There are specific backlog items for R2.3 in many GEs in the roadmap
- **New functionalities, expressed in terms of backlog items on the roadmap imply changes in Unit Testing Plans (they trace them)**
- In these cases, there is a new software delivery
- **They may imply changes in the Installation & Admin manual and the user & prog. manual**

Coordination proposed that the edition could be possible in the private or the public wiki for the new documentation expected with Release 2.3 as long as properly linked from the internal wiki. Pascal complains and expects "clear guidelines" - direct edits on the public wiki are not advisable quality wise

Thorsten: it is not the major topic for the OIL to improve the Installation Manuals because for the OIL, 3rd parties will not install themselves but only use the GEis.

Miguel: but for the OIL we (the consortium and WP10 team for sure) need good Installation Manuals to install the GEis on the OIL and be sure that they will run properly.

Thales asks to concentrate in new GEs for R2.3 and those who were delivered in R2.2 should not be so urgent. Old GEs in R2.2: changes (if directly) in the public wiki

are not so clear how to peer-review them. They ask for clear guidelines.

SAP asks treat this item with the right priority in relation to the other activities outlined (e.g. OIL preparation). Potentially even content improvements need to be communicated previously (e.g. focus on customization and not installation). There should be a clear timeline for a review process and potentially a move of this delivery to the end of July. In the end it should be prioritized with the other needed work rightly. Thorsten foresees the usual delays as in the previous deliveries (the consortium might be getting to it)

<u>TID to circulate an email with guidelines</u>. Juanjo proposes to update on the public wiki the ones already delivered in R2.2 and use the private one for those appearing for the 1st time in R2.3

FI-LAB and FI-PPP Testbed.

Update on Oct,7

- Need to renew the FI-LAB page with a better layout, tutorials and the new branding (ongoing)

===

We have to update the FI-PPP internal testbed so it becomes aligned with what we have in FI-LAB.

Requirements and instructions to be followed for GEi owners to make their GEis available on FI-LAB will be publish next week and rigorous process will be followed accordingly. Note that some requirements have still to be met by some of the GEis that were made available at Campus Party Europe.

(remaining is copy of previous minutes)

An Integration Action Plan was distributed by Stefano within the Testbed WP. AP on Stefano to circulate version among WP/chapter leaders. DONE already - Stefano awaiting a clarification from Salvatore Longo (NEC).

(at the time we were revising this minutes, Stefano already circulated them:

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V2_Integration_Plan)

Status of the deployment of the FI-WARE GEi is captured in the following cockpit:

https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/testbed/index.php/Testbed_V2_Implementation_Cockpit
Stefano, Miguel and Juanjo to meet this afternoon to discuss the status.

AP: Alex proposes an offline discussion on the possibility of experimenting with new versions of the same GEs on the extra cloud environment we will have in the Campus for emergencies (if we run out of resources)

===

Revision of the Testbed cockpit has taken place. The following agreements have been made:

- The DoW planned date should be updated to be 31/07/13
- We should have three columns about topics for which to measure progress (Global Instance, Recipes, Configured Images). For each of these columns we should have two subcolumns:
  - % of progress
  - actual date for 100% (empty otherwise)
- The "Actual Date" should have the following meaning:
  - Date at which the "Global Instance" progress up to 100% (real availability of the Global Instance)
  - Date at which the recipes for creating "Dedicated Instances" progress up to 100% (real availability of the recipes)
  - Date at which images containing a "Dedicated Instances" progress up to 100% (real availability of the images)
- The note should capture (when applicable):
  - the service end point of the Global Instance
  - the URL from which to download the recipes
  - the name of the configured image in the Cloud image catalogue
- We'll update the semantics of the % of progress (previously as "dedicated instance" which is now divided into "recipes" and "images")
- We agree that we will put "N.A." in all the three columns regarding "Global Instances", "recipes" and "configured images" and will put a note "downloadable software" for those FI-WARE GEis that will not be deployed on the FI-WARE OIL Cloud (e.g., IoT gateway related GEis or Cloud Proxy)
- We will mark as "N.A." those columns of "Global Instances", "Recipes" and "configured images" that won't be covered according to what was declared in the FI-PPP global cockpit on "FI-WARE GEi planned usage and general information". That way, "N.A." would be handled differently than "0%".

Regarding the OIL Cockpit, that cockpit will only be created and maintained by the team who will take care of deploying the FI-WARE OIL. FI-WARE GEi global in

Finally, we agreed to drop the integration tracker in R2.

====

Red.es has started to provide the infrastructure needed for contingency until receiving the final servers. AP on Miguel to provide an update on the status either today or tomorrow.

Currently, discussion taking place regarding version of OpenStack to rely on. The TID team is working on an email elaborating on the technical implications derived from porting to Grizzly as to take an elaborated decision.

Alex: two workstreams at the moment: one to setup a DCRM Release 2 (based on OpenStack Grizzly) on the FI-WARE Testbed this week. A second workstream to test whether the rest of GEis in the Cloud chapter could work on top of OpenStack Grizzly. We'll define a control point on Thursday this week.

Inputs regarding dependencies between GEs have been gathered from the different chapters.

Stefano confirmed that request for information about dependencies/requirements with respect to base software was issued to the different FI-WARE GEis and then the owners are supposed to have updated the defined cockpit.

=====

Background from previous meetings

 The teams in WP10 will have to work hard in order to setup three different FI-WARE Clouds, namely:

- internal developments within FI-WARE (testing of patches, development of new releases)
- the FI-WARE Testbed offered to UC projects
- the FI-WARE OIL, dealing with quotas

Proper security mechanisms have to be put in place (firewalls, etc).

The deliverables that had to do with Integration Plan and Report will have to be planned and submitted.

Red.es has started the public RFQ and they will award it in September. Red.es are aware of the importance of the current work of FI-WARE and the Campus Party. They will provide the infrastructure needed before receiving the new servers - they have spare capacity that they will temporarily allocate to us.

FI-LAB: recipes for automated deployment of FI-WARE GEi dedicated instances

The webinar took place on the 17th. From 10 to 12.

Update on 5/Aug: It was recorded and we are uploading it today to the forge (slides + video)

Request to upload it to the training platform.

Engineering (Davide) will provide to Miguel all that is necessary to do the administration of the easy bits of the Elearning platform.

=====

Background from previous meetings

Some FI-WARE GEis may be deployed as a global instance, accessible "as a Service" so that functions can be invoked through well-defined Service End Points and APIs.

however, it is highly desirable that some FI-WARE GEis can also be instantiated by application developers on top of the virtual infrastructure they will setup to run their application (Dedicated instances).   For this, it is highly recommended that FI-WARE GEi owners support one or several of the following options:

- virtual machine images with the FI-WARE GEi properly installed and configured
- deployment "recipes" that can be used together with the FI-WARE Cloud tools enabling automated deployment of software on individual VMs
- deployment "recipes" that can be used together with the FI-WARE Cloud Blueprint management tools

GEis Support

Availability of first chunk of GEis on the FI-WARE Testbed was announced by Stefano last Friday.

JIRA instance is up up and running. We need to close the integration with the forge.

e-mail sent to the GE owners.

Background info

==

Miguel expresses a concern: have all the GEs who need JIRA told us so? Manuel has about 70 requests - this points at the 50-100 range in the JIRA licensing scheme. This gives us a margin of 30 users approx.

A JIRA environment will be setup per FI-WARE GEi and for each of the three Cloud environments to be defined (internal, FI-WARE Testbed and FI-WARE OIL)

A workflow will be defined regarding how tickets can be issued, monitored and resolved.

Access to the corresponding JIRA should be made available from the FI-WARE Catalogue.

The fusionforge support team is about to start testing the single sign-on between FusionForge and instances of JIRA they have developed.

2013.09.30 (Manuel)

- No significant progress - investigating how to channel emails into JIRA trackers

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

It has been agreed at FI-PPP AB level to set-up a separate tracker per FI-WARE GEi. A link to these tracker should exist from the Catalogue.

A decision to adopt JIRA was taken and has been validated in the FI-PPP Architects Week. Prices of licenses are low enough so that payment can be absorbed as part of the budget associated to support of the collaborative environment.

CONCORD has expressed their intend to provide coverage of license expenses for JIRA.

No news this week regarding access to the forge by new PPP projects.

Mail sent Miguel Carrillo to FI-PPP projects clarifying that we cannot grant access to private projects in FusionForge until the PPP Collaboration Agreement is signed.

Thorsten (from previous confcall): we have to look as well for a process on phasing out accounts. UC projects which left the PPP and their respective accounts need to be discontinued. Juanjo: maybe they have rights to access information during certain period after the projects close. AP on TID to confirm with legal department. Send request to CONCORD making use case project extensions transparent to FI-WARE.

Thierry (from previous call): need to see how to deal with this in the PPP AB (with their own repositories outside FI-WARE) because we can share also some "private" information (FI PPP level) in these specific meetings. We have to be consistent in all places. Juanjo: we haven't yet received an email from CONCORD clarifying which tools will be supported for the AB work ... Apparently, working AB documents will be shared through the Eurescom docman system (BSCW) and minutes will still be edited in Google docs but this shouldn't impose any obligations on what tools we should use to share FI-WARE documentation privately ...

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

AP: Manuel to put forward a proposal for general discussion next week (or alternatively, earlier than that) . The primary focus is looking good (we also want to be good!)

(Manuel Escriche)
2013.10.13
meetings held with WP3-Markus(Apps), WP4-Alex(Cloud), WP5-Thierry(IoT),
WP6-Sergio(Data), Pier(I2ND) - today with Pascal (Security)
- Roadmap
  - available: Apps, Data and IoT
- Sprint planning
  - missing for some enablers yet
- Backlog error corrections
  - little progress this week
- Next actions:
  - pending inclusion of WP10(Davide) and WP13(Christof)
  - mass fixing - to be concreted
  - integration of roadmap into backlog reviews and progress reports

=== Relevant background:

TID has appointed an Agile Project Manager (Manuel Escriche) that will be devoted to ensure that Agile is applied more rigorously within the chapters.   A more strict follow-up on how Agile is being applied will be carried out. Manuel will have regular meetings with WPLs every month to make sure that each sprint has been properly planned, backlog entries addressed in previous sprints have been covered or should be re-planned, etc.   He will also take care there is synchronization between the backlog and the Technical Roadmap.

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.

A number of simplifications have been implemented to avoid inconsistencies between the tickets on the tracker associated to Epics and Features and the corresponding entries on the public wiki. The idea was to drop a number of fields from the backlog entry template on the public wiki.   These fields will only be captured on the trackers.

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).

Relevant feedback received from the EC review
- Page 10 - Recommendation 4 - needed effort to clean up the backlog, to keep it updated and synchronized with the wiki
- Page 14 - insufficient synchronisation and traceability between backlog, technical roadmap and architecture. Quality of deliverables need to be improved with regards to concreteness, clarity and fit-for-purpose
- Page 18, Deliverable D2.1.3-M17 was not submitted
- Page 19, Deliverables D2.1.4-M21 and D2.1.5-M24 rejected
- Page 22, How the backlogs coming from the Use Case project are considered while defining the prioritisation of the features to be developed
- Page 22, scalability of the system to attend third parties
- Page 32, lack of reference to the requirement sources (FI-WARE, Use case project),
- Readability and understandability is low. Lack of structure. Level of abstraction and details provided for the different items differ significantly.
- Page 33, difficult to distinguish between Feature, User Story and WorkItem
- Noticeable the lack of quality control
- Backlog as driver for development - hard to see how this is done

FI-LAB Terms and Conditions

Final version available at:

http://wiki.fi-ware.eu/FI-LAB_Terms_and_Conditions

Also a note on management of privacy data is available at:

http://wiki.fi-ware.eu/FI-LAB_Personal_Data_Protection_Policy

Both are referred in the footnote that is present in all FI-LAB web pages.

FI-WARE Legal Notice

An email wll be sent this week to fiware-legal and fiware owners stating that those who do not adhere to the approved legal notices may need to send an explanatory message for the EC. There was an AP on Juanjo to send this email but was on hold until the FI-WARE OIL terms and conditions were finished.
There was also an AP on Juanjo to send detailed instructions on how FI-WARE GE Open Specifications have to be updated to include the reference to the final Legal Notices.   That AP was pending of the previous one and will be resolved this week.

=== Relevant background:

All FI-WARE specifications have to be updated (if not already) to make a reference to any of the two final Legal Notices that have been finally approved:
with implicit patents license:

http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/FI-WARE_Open_Specification_Legal_Notice_(implicit_patents_license)

- with explicit license on essential patents:
  http://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fiware/index.php/FI-WARE_Open_Specification_Legal_Notice_(essential_patents_license)

Detailed instructions about how to update the corresponding sections will be provided. We will send this along this week and FI-WARE GEi owners will have to implement the necessary changes by end of July.

Form describing achievements in the FI-PPP

Nothing relevant to report from the update on July 8:

- Delivered and will re-deliver in July
- Are all the concerned GEis there?

Juanjo: the form submitted to the EC may not include information about all FI-WARE GEis that will become available on the FI-WARE Testbed/OIL.   Indeed, an update of the form may be convenient once the FI-WARE Catalogue is updated with info about all FI-WARE GEis that will be made available on the FI-WARE Testbed/OIL.

=== Relevant background:

The EC has formally asked us to fill a form summarizing achievements of FI-WARE. See mail forwarded on 06/05/13, subject: "Future Internet Public Private Partnership".

A shared version of the form for FI-WARE is available at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1f4lBauFu2Tn1Fs6TiWi19_fI-b1-zyRAlUE3z_-Elvg/edit

Regarding Part A, we agreed that we were going to make references to contents of entries in the FI-WARE Catalogue, which indeed should contain complete info answering questions about:

- Description of the Generic Enabler
- What does this Generic Enabler offer in terms of functionality
- What potential use could it have in the development of services and applications

Actually, the standard sections on the catalogue titled "What you get" and "Open Specification Reference" should answer the two first questions, while the standard section titled "Why to get it" should answer the third one.

We should be able to answer the question on "What is the market position in relation to competitive products? What is the competitive advantage?" based on the contents of the State of the Art deliverable that it is supposed to be under way.

AP on all WPLs/WPAs to provide entries associated to FI-WARE GEis of Release 1 in their chapter.

on all WPLs/WPAs to provide input to the different sections and review contents of entries in the catalogue to ensure that they can be used for answer to Part A.

Telefonica committed to prepare draft answers for the rest of the form while WPLs committed to provide their input.

We shall prepare an update of the form once Release 2 is delivered and entries linked to new FI-WARE GEis are registered in the FI-WARE Catalogue.

We have to be aware that content is likely to be published.

Amendments under way

Once we close the current NEF session devoted to reporting on costs we will open a new amendment (Amendment #6). Topics already considered:

- Inclusion of Startup Weekend as new beneficiaries (was part of original consortium who was selected as a result of Open Call 3).
- Addition of new beneficiaries devoted to connection of Smart Cities to FI-LAB.
- Other ?

=== Relevant background:

Official approval of amendment 4 has been received. Amendment 5 is currently under negotiation covering the points described in relevant background.

An agreement has been reached with SAP regarding the IPR issue.   We will replace the conflicting text in section B.3.2.4 which currently reads:

> Access Rights to Foreground and Background needed for the execution of the FI PPP projects shall be deemed granted on a Royalty-Free basis. Other than in exceptional circumstances and only for Background specifically identified, no costs shall be charged for granting such Access Rights. The FI-WARE beneficiaries will not charge any such costs to the project.

by the following one:

> Access Rights to Foreground and Background included(*) in FI-WARE GE implementations needed for the execution of the FI-PPP projects and users who carry out experiments in the FI-WARE Open Innovation Lab as long as the FI-WARE project lasts, shall be deemed granted on a Royalty-Free basis. Other than in exceptional circumstances and only for Background specifically identified, no costs shall be charged for granting such Access Rights. The FI-WARE beneficiaries will not charge any such costs to the project.
>
> (*) "included" means "everything needed to run the GE implementation in such a way as to make it satisfy the interfaces specified in the GE specification, common standard libraries and underlying operating systems excluded"

We expect to get it finished by end of this week.

We will open a new NEF session regarding amendment 5 inmediately afterwards. Topics that will be covered in that amendment:
- adding new beneficiaries from Open Call 2 and 3
- definition of budget associated to remaining funding not allocated in Open Calls 1 and 2 that will be devoted to extensions of the FI-WARE Open Innovation Lab (connections of Smart Cities)
- definition of budget associated to remaining funding not allocated in Open Call 3: this will be devoted to awards in developers' contests and hackatons as established in the text of the 3rd Open Call
- anything that may be required to solve the issue on IPRs to background of FI-WARE GEis

Inclusion of new governance model is likely to be postponed

Branding

Update on Sept, 30: this includes updating the style of:

- the catalogue
- the learning platform
- the fi-ware page (done!)
- the FI-LAB page
- the FI-WARE wiki

==

 Ogilvy one has been working on a number of actions dealing with FI-WARE branding. A number of decisions on branding have been made towards the Campus Party which we found appropriate, overall considering their expertise on the matter.

Major resources:

- Branding elements: https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/2767/FI-WARE+branding+elements.pdf
- Sweatshirts design: https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/2768/Sweatshirts.jpg
- T-shirts design: https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/2773/FI-WARE+T-shirt.pdf
- Wristband designs: https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/2769/FI-WARE+wristbands.pdf

Brand colors will be sent to UPM so that they can update the look&feel guidelines for web portals.

3rd party innovation deliverable

Still on hold. Nothing to report or discuss this week.

=== Relevant background:

On hold until the lead editor is appointed.

1st issue was delivered last summer

Accepted by the EC. Needs updating & comments from the review should be incorporated.

Need to collect inputs from the partners.

Main editor: SAP refuses as SAP already contributed heavily towards the first version and pure collaborative task can be taken without major knowledge on how it was done in the first place.

Periodic Management Report

The Periodic Management Report was submitted on 29/July/2013.   Final version will be closed matching closing of the reporting on NEF (NEF session to be opened once current amendment gets approved).

VERY IMPORTANT: As per announcement already made by Javier de Pedro, companies will have one week to report their data once the NEF session is available.   After this, the NEF session will be closed and the reporting data submitted.   This means that those companies who don't deliver on time will have to wait until end of the project to get paid even for the 2nd reporting period of the project.

Live application demo

Nothing relevant to report at this audio.
Just mentioning that the source code of the specific application modules developed as part of the Live demo will be made available as open source.

=== Relevant background:
A task force team dealing with the live demo app was setup. The task force team will be led by TID (Fermin Galán) and will involve the developers/engineers of relevant partners as definition of the live demo app evolves.

A dedicated mailing list has been created (fiware-demo). Permanent AP on all WPLs to send email to Miguel cc/ Fermín and Juanjo regarding members of their teams they wish to include in the mailing list.   All WPLs/WPAs will be registered in this mailing list by default. Those who believe don't need to be there, please tell Miguel.

The home page to the Live Demo information is the following:
https://forge.fi-ware.eu/plugins/mediawiki/wiki/fi-ware-private/index.php/Live_Demo_Evolution

Live Demo was successfully executed during M24 project review. New Live Demo executions:
- ~~July 1st (afternoon): Seville (only the cloud and mashup parts)~~. CANCELED
- July 5th (morning): Málaga (only the cloud and mashup parts)

Ongoing activities:
- Epic/Features documentation for R1 and R2. UPM is working on the "core" wiki structure
- IoT Broker and Conf Man integration
- Integration on GEi from I2ND interface. Waiting for proposal coming from the WP

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

Development of FI-WARE Product Vision will now be synchronized with definition of Live Demo. Consequently, the two sections will be merged in future versions of the minutes. See section on Live Demo for further details.

=== 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 ecompassed manner to cover those scenarios.
- TID made an initial proposal on the new sections to be added.

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

A first draft/template of the target whitepaper was available at:
https://forge.fi-ware.eu/docman/view.php/27/1333/FI-WARE+Product+Vision+New+Draft+12-10-01.docx

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

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

Cross-chapter Epics or global architecture matters

(note: this section will be expanded for the next joint WPLs/WPAs afternoon sessions to resume discussion on cross-chapter global architecture matters)

IdM GE on FI-LAB

There are a number of actions to be done:

- Develop a public and complete specification of the IdM GE

- Publish entry of IdM GEi provided by UPM

- Planning by each of the IdM GEis providers regarding compliance with IdM GE specifications

Availability of the IdM GEis from NSN and DT on the FI-PPP Testbed was not announced precisely because of the incompleteness of the current IdM GE specifications.

AP on Stefano to send email to NSN and DT explaining that in response to previous email from Pascal.

AP on Juanjo to drop an email on the api-cross mailing list to raises the pending issues (listed above) and launch task force to get things fixed ASAP.   A dedicated mailing list for discussion will be created.

Other topics

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

- After the last successful event in Malaga, our main focus is the Campus Party.
As the notes for this event are included in a section above I've deleted them from here, please refer to that section for more info.

Exploitation Industrial partners to send individual exploitation plan to the EC directly. Major players are particularly encouraged not to forget this commitment. In coordination with Telefónica, Juan Bareño is following up the process to be informed of the status and to be sure that there is an actual answer from the consortium. At the end of the day, this is direct between the partner and the EC. A good number of Exploitation plans already sent. Still ongoing.
WP10 - Experimentation & Testbed AP on **all**: Stefano asks all to provide inputs for the Integration Plan (that we will finish this week)

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