



ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.01.31

Meeting minutes

JOINING UP GOVERNMENTS



ADMS.F/OSS VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.01.31 – Meeting minutes

Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	Meeting date	31/01/2012
Author	MDK	Meeting time	14:30 – 15:30
Reviewed by	SG	Issue date	
Status		Version	0.02

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Olivier Berger	OB	FR – TELECOM & Management SudParis
Elena Muñoz Salinero	EMS	ES – Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Administration
Sander van der Waal	SW	UK – OSS Watch
Phil Archer	PA	UK – W3C
Michiel De Keyzer	MDK	BE - PwC
Alain Peyrat	AP	FR – FusionForge
Rüdiger Czieschla	RC	DE - Stadt Freiburg DE - Open-source Business Alliance
Szabolcs Szekacs	SS	EC – DIGIT B2
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE - PwC

AGENDA

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
1	All	Roll call/welcome new members
2	SS	Introduction
3	PA	Outlook
4	PA	Adoption of minutes of previous meeting
5	PA	Use cases
6	PA	Related work
7	PA	Proposal conceptual model
8	PA	Controlled vocabularies
9	All	Wrap-up and summary of actions
10	PA	Next meeting date and time

MEETING MINUTES

1. Roll Call/welcome new members

2. Introduction Outlook

Discussion

- SG explains the ambitious goal and time schedule of the Working Group
 - The goal of this working group is to specify and build consensus on the Asset Description Metadata Schema for Free and Open Source Software (ADMS.F/OSS), a metadata vocabulary to describe software assets on the Web.
 - The timing for the Working Group is ambitious: the draft of the specification should be finalised end of February and the public commenting period should start in the beginning of March
 - Luckily, ADMS.F/OSS can reuse existing specifications such as DOAP, the taxonomies of the Trove software map, and the more general [ADMS](#) (Asset Description Metadata Schema) specification , which is currently in public review.
- PA emphasizes that the short timing is realistic since a lot can be reused a from the [ADMS](#) specification. It would be nice if there were only a limited need to introduce new terms.
- SS explains that the initiator of this initiative is the European Commission (DG Digit) but the goal is to build something that can be used beyond Europe and the domain of public administrations.
- SS says it is important to have a process to work together with the [ADMS](#) Working Group if we for example want something to change to the [ADMS](#) specification. PA would be the best person to do this since he is in both the working groups.

Decisions

- PA will synchronise between the ADMS and ADMS.F/OSS Working Groups.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Define a process for working together with the ADMS Working Group	PA	07/02

3. Adoption of minutes of previous meeting

Decisions

- The meeting minutes are adopted.

Documentation

- [Meeting minutes previous meeting](#)

4. [Use cases](#)

Discussion

- SG reminds the Working Group of the use case introduced in the previous meeting:
 - Currently there are many software forges, repositories, and catalogues on the Web. It is however difficult to get an overview of what software exists from a single point of access. Therefore there is a need for a common way to represent software description metadata on the Web.
 - The [federated forges](#) on [Joinup](#) represent an exchange of software descriptions with a series of national and regional Open-Source Software Repositories (the “federated forges”) in Europe. Currently more than 2500 software project descriptions are federated from these federated forges. The federated forges are all running GForge 4.x / FusionForge. Because these forges are built on the same technology, it is possible to collect the following software project descriptions from these federated forges: software name; URL to the software project’s location on the original forge; and a short description of the software, which is afterwards machine translated.
 - This catalogue of F/OSS is still very limited in size and richness of descriptions, so there is currently no good way to find software in several instances from a single point of access
- [Issue 44177 Facilitating the setup of Institutional F.OSS contributions portals by including contributors metadata](#)
 - OB says that a forge may host different projects developing software, where different actors collaborate, from different institutions. In the same project, there can be different institutional partners that cooperate for a common development.
 - OB says that it is thus important that metadata relating to sponsors / funders / proprietors of the developed software can be managed in the case of cooperation, allowing the same project or software to appear in several institutional portals. Alternatively, the hosting forges may have the capacity to properly credit institutions participating to projects (or funding them, etc.).
 - OB says it is important for institutions to know where collaboration is happening.
 - SG asks if this issue can be expressed as the requirement to be able to represent that an organisation is a sponsor to a software project.
 - OB confirms this.
 - SW confirms that keep track of an organisation’s F/OSS projects was one of the concerns for the JISC to support the [Simal catalogue hosted on OSS Watch](#). SG asks SW to create a comment about this on the use case that OB created.
 - SS says that this is also important to know for the European Commission.
 - EMS remarks that a person is normally linked to an organisation and asks if it is important to know the person or just the organisation that is represented by the person.

- SG says that in ADMS every (software) asset has a publisher.
- PA says that we can probably reuse the [organisation ontology](#), originally developed for the UK Government.
- [Issue 44175 How does a catalogue compare to a conventional search engine?](#)
 - This issue was not discussed.
- SS says that in order to confirm quality of the software assets, we need more information about the asset; for example how many times used, how many times downloaded, ... This is not yet in the model and SS will raise an issue ([Issue 44328](#)) about the [inclusion of software metrics](#).
- PA says that, in addition to metrics, usage information – which persons or organisations use a software asset - is probably also relevant to determine whether a software asset is worthwhile or not.
 - SG confirms that usage of a software asset is an important indicator in order to assess quality. Usage credentials are currently already included in [Use Case 1](#).
 - EMS says that it is more important to know how much the asset is re(used) rather than to know the number of downloads.
 - SS agrees with this but remarks that this is a difficult thing to measure.

Documentation

- [Use Cases](#)
- [Use Cases – remarks OB](#)
- [Issue 44177: Facilitating the setup of Institutional F.OSS contributions portals by including contributors metadata](#)
- [Issue 44175: How does a catalogue compare to a conventional search engine?](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Create a comment about a Project's contributors (organisation, person)	OB	06/02
Make proposal about which metrics to add to the model (done: Issue 44328)	SS	06/02
Raise an issue about adding attributes to the model about usage of the asset (done: Issue 44381).	SG	06/02
Make proposal to include these properties in the Conceptual Model.	PA	06/02

5. [Related work](#)

Discussion

- SG gives [an overview of the detected related work](#)
 - [Description Of A Project \(DOAP\)](#)
 - [Trove Software map](#)

- [Asset Description Metadata Schema \(ADMS\)](#)
- [Software Package Data Exchange \(SPDX\)](#)
- [COCLICO project's "PlanetForge forge ontology"](#)
- OB contributed the PlanetForge ontology and gives some explanations
 - SG remarks that this working group is making a vocabulary to describe software assets and therefore has a much more limited scope than the Planet Forge ontology, which represents F/OSS development environments.
- SG tasks the Working Group to contribute any further related work.

Documentation

- [Related work - overview](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Share other related work	Any	06/02

6. [Proposed conceptual model](#)

Discussion

- SG shows the model. The blue entities are the new entities that are suggested to be included. The other entities in the model are entities that are already in [ADMS](#) or [DOAP](#).
- This proposition is taking in account the 4 issues that were raised:
 - [Issue 44173: Distinction between software projects versus software assets](#)
 - [Issue 44245: attribute for logos](#)
 - [Issue 44176: Identifier of a software asset](#)
 - [Issue 44247: How to deal with a software asset located in different repositories](#)
- PA briefly explains the model and the meaning of the symbols.
 - PA says that the distinction between a software asset and a project is important.
 - PA says that “programming language” should be removed from the entity “Project” after a remark of SS.
- PA: We will not put all terms in the namespace. We will only include these terms that we explicitly need for the schema.
- SG asks everyone to have a look at the model and raise issues if there are any.
- OB asks to create some examples alongside the model (e.g. [OpenCemetery](#)).

Decisions

- There is sufficient distinction between a Software Project and a Software Asset. This distinction must be retained in the [conceptual model](#). [Issue 44173](#) can be

closed.

- The attribute “programming language” will be removed from the entity “project
- Some examples will be created alongside the model

Documentation

- [Proposed conceptual model](#)
- [Issue 44173: Distinction between software projects versus software assets](#)
- [Issue 44245: attribute for logos](#)
- [Issue 44176: Identifier of a software asset](#)
- [Issue 44247: How to deal with a software asset located in different repositories](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Remove the attribute “programming language” from the attribute “Project	PA	06/02
Have a look at the proposed conceptual model and raise issues	all	07/02
Prepare a draft specification and add some examples in Turtle alongside the conceptual model (e.g. OpenCemetery)	PA	07/02

7. [Controlled Vocabularies](#)

Discussion

- SG says that EMS has translated [a study by CENATEC](#) in English that compared all the taxonomies that are used in the Spanish forges
 - EMS remarks that she translated only the final conclusion of the study. The study was done on 7 different forges.
 - The conclusion is that there are many concepts that were used in many of the different forges.
 - They have tried to put together all the concepts that they could find in the different forges.
 - EMS says that the problem for [Joinup](#) is the same as for the different Spanish forges and so they are looking forward for a common metadata schema for the description of software.
- EMS remarks that not every data item in the model should be mandatory because not all the different forges contain all this information
 - PA confirms this. There are a limited number of attributes (e.g. Name) that must be expected and the rest is optional
- SG asks if there are technical solutions to having controlled vocabularies for these classifications in order to be able to tackle the problem of different natural languages, synonyms, homonyms, etc.
 - PA says that for programming languages [DBpedia](#) can be used as a source. For example, DBpedia provides stable URIs for programming

languages, e.g. <http://dbpedia.org/resource/Perl>

- SG asks if this is allowing us to have translations. This will not really be a problem for programming language but it may be for other characteristics.
- PA says that a lot of terms in [DBpedia](#) already have translated labels.

Documentation

- [Controlled vocabularies](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Make proposals for the controlled vocabularies (e.g. DBPedia.org) and check whether they align with the proposal of EMS.	PA	06/02

8. Wrap-up and summary of actions

9. [Next meeting date and time](#)

Discussion

- AP says that OB will be the only one representing FusionForge for the next meetings.
 - SG says that at the time of implementation they will be in contact again
- SG informs the working group that the event [FOSDEM](#) is taking place this week in Brussels (4 and 5 February)
- SG says that there needs to be someone to chair the working group meeting for ADMS.F/OSS and asks the working group who is willing to do this. Please send a mail to SG if you want to take the chair of this meeting. Meeting preparations will still be done by SG and PA.

Decisions

- [Next meeting](#) will be on Tuesday 7 February from 14:30 till 15:30.

Documentation

- [Next ADMS.F/OSS Virtual Meeting](#)
- [FOSDEM](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Send an email to SG if you want to take the chair of the working group meetings.	All	06/02