ADMS.SW WORKING GROUP MEETING 2012.06.05

Meeting minutes

JOINING UP GOVERNMENTS

ADMS.SW Working Group Meeting 2012.06.05 – Meeting minutes			
Venue	Virtual Meeting	**Meeting date**	2012.06.05
Author	MDK	**Meeting time**	14:30 – 15:30
Reviewed by	SG	**Issue date**	2012.06.05
Status	For review	**Version**	0.03

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Olivier Berger	OB	FR - FusionForge / TELECOM & Management SudParis
Patrice-Emmanuel Schmitz	PES	BE - Unisys
Szabolcs Szekacs	SS	EU – ISA Programma
Stijn Goedertier	SG	BE - PwC
Michiel De Keyzer	MDK	BE - PwC

Excused attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
José Angel Diaz	JAD	ES - CENATIC
Phil Archer	PA	UK - W3C
Sander van der Waal	SW	UK – OSS Watch

AGENDA:

Agenda Item	Owner	Subject
1	All	Roll call
2	SG	Introduction
3	SG	Licensing: ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1 and the ISA Contributor Agreement 1.1 (PDF version here)
4	SG	Adoption of minutes of previous meetings: • ADMS.F/OSS: Virtual Meeting 2012.02.28 • Software Forges: Webinar 2012.05.22 on the technical aspects

		interlinking software forges
5	SG	Overview activities during the public review period.

6	SG	**Issues**
		
		A. General
		    1. The name "ADMS.F/OSS" is too restrictive: the specification can also be used to describe non-F/OSS software
		    2. What can be reused from SPDX?
		    3. Provide a mapping to ISO/IEC 19770-2 Software identification Tags
		    4. Add a conformance statement
		    5. Static Data vs. Variable Data
		    6. Should schema.org/SoftwareApplication be reused?
		
		B. Use Cases
		    1. Use case: provide better metadata categorization
		    2. Relevance for Software Asset Management
		    3. ADMS.F/OSS Use Cases: Identifier of a software asset
		
		C. Conceptual model
		    1. Naming of concepts Software Project - Software Asset - Software Distribution
		    2. Different Understandings of term Software Asset
		    3. Software assets are not necessarily executable software
		    4. Software project or initiative
		    5. ADMS.F/OSS: How to deal with a software asset located in different repositories
		    6. Metrics: Lines of Code
		    7. Measure: average time to close support tickets
		    8. The set of syntactic formats specified in ISO8601 is very rich
		    9. The use of internationalized domain names should be allowed
		    10. Improve description of geographic coverage
		    11. Description of date of creation
		    12. Forge as a purpose built platform
		    13. Correct Typos and unclarities in the specification
		
		D. Controlled vocabularies
		    1. Licence Type: foresee a term to indicate that a licence is OSI approved
		    2. Consider the use of Debtags as an alternative to the Trove classification system for software
		    3. Vocabulary for Asset Type
		    4. Selected comments on Licence Type
		    5. Audience classification
		    6. Use of Trove
		    7. Provide additional input to the controlled vocabularies
		    8. Is it allowed to create new code values?

		E. RDF Schema
		     1. Change the preferred namespace prefix into admssw
		     2. Add examples in RDF Turtle notation to the specs
		     3. Selected comments on the RDF Schema

7	SG	**Wrap-up**: next steps

Meeting minutes

1. Roll call

2. Introduction

3. Licensing: ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1 and the ISA Contributor Agreement 1.1 (PDF version here)

Discussion

- PES explained that the ISA Contributor Agreement was developed in close collaboration with Stefano Gentile (EC JRC) and the EC Legal Service. The new agreement is based on the work of the Harmony Group.

- SG asked to clarify whether the contributor agreement can be characterized as a licensing or as a copyright assignment agreement.
    - PES explained that to be compliant with the ISA Open Metadata Licence, the ISA Contributor Agreement required to have the copyright on contributions assigned to the European Union as the ISA Open Metadata Licence assigns ownership to the EU. This should not be of concern to the contributor, as he in turn is assigned a licence back.

- SS remarks that till now only 5 people have signed the agreement.
    - SG answers that we will send reminders to all the persons who have contributed. This would include persons who have contributed review comments during the public review.

Documentation

- ISA Open Metadata Licence v1.1
- ISA Contributor Agreement 1.1 – Joinup Legal Document
- ISA Contributor Agreement 1.1 – PDF

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Remind the contributors to sign the ISA Contributor Agreement	SG	2012.06.08

4. Adoption of minutes of previous meetings:
    a. ADMS.F/OSS: Virtual Meeting 2012.02.28
    b. Software Forges: Webinar 2012.05.22 on the technical aspects interlinking software forges

Decisions

- The meeting minutes of the previous Virtual Meeting (2012.02.28) and the Software Forges Webinar (2012.05.22) are adopted.

Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS Virtual Meeting 2012.02.28 - Minutes](#)
- [Software Forges Webinar - Technical aspects of interlinking software forges - Minutes](#)
- [Software Forges Webinar - Technical aspects of interlinking software forges - Presentation](#)

5. Overview activities during the public review period

6. Issues

Discussion

SG gives an overview of the public review period:

- 9 people have made comments;
- 35 issues have been raised;
- ADMS.F/OSS v0.3 was downloaded 129 times.

Issues

A. General

1. ISSUE: The name "ADMS.F/OSS" is too restrictive: the specification can also be used to describe non-F/OSS software
   - The software catalogue on Joinup would most likely be restricted to F/OSS-only software. SS says we should change the naming to software (not only F/OSS) and thus widen the scope. However, an impact analysis should be done. What does this mean for the reuse of DOAP and SPDX?
     - SG agreed that the conceptual model is perfectly suited to describe non-F/OSS software, but that an impact analysis is required with respect to the reuse of the DOAP and SPDX vocabularies. For example, if SPDX were to require that spdx:Package can only be used to describe F/OSS, it would no longer be possible to sub-class (and thus reuse) it.
     - SG said that the licence metadata would then allow assessing whether a particular software package is free and open-source software or not. This could be easily assessed.

2. ISSUE: What can be reused from SPDX?
   - **SPDX** is a standard for describing the components, copyrights, and licences of a software package. The main use case is for producers of software packages to describe the licensing conditions in a machine-readable format and for consumers of software packages to more easily verify that they comply with the licensing terms of the software package.
   - SPDX is not concerned with metadata about "immaterial" concepts such as the "admssw:SoftwareProject" or the "admssw:SoftwareRelease", but it provides detailed licensing information about the "spdx:Package" and "spdx:File".

- o **Proposal**: SG proposed to the WG to model the "Software Package" as a subclass of the spdx:Package (admssw:SoftwareDistribution rdfs:subClass spdx:Package)
  - The proposal was accepted by the meeting participants.
- o **Proposal admssw: spdxDocument**: The proposal to link to an spdxDocument would allow users to obtain detailed licensing metadata.
  - The proposal was not accepted by the meeting participants, as such an inverse relationship would rather have to be added by SPDX community to spdx:Package.

3. ISSUE: Provide a mapping to ISO/IEC 19770-2 Software identification Tags

ISSUE: What can be reused from the ISO/IEC 19770 standard on Software Asset Management

ISSUE: ADMS.F/OSS Use Cases: Identifier of a software asset

- o SG explains that the ISO 19770-2 standards on Software Asset Management and Software ID Tags seems to be gaining traction in the industry. More and more software developers are starting to use it and the US Federal Government also promotes it.
- o The ISO 19770-2 allows the unique identification of software using so-called registration identifiers (regids). Regids are a unique identifier for a particular organisation and are based on an organisation's domain name and registration date of that domain. Within the identifying domain of a single regid, software publishers can use their own identifiers, guaranteeing global uniqueness.

The following XML snipped in an example for the Adobe X pro product:

```
<swid:software_id>
<swid:unique_id>AcrobatPro-AS1-Win-GM-MUL</swid:unique_id>
<swid:tag_creator_regid>regid.1986-
12.com.adobe</swid:tag_creator_regid>
</swid:software_id
```

- o SG deplored that that this identifying system is not URI based, although it could be used to mint de-referenceable URIs. In the public review, David Bicket confirmed this: as ISO 19770-2 requires unique_id to follow the restrictions for URI character use as specified in IETF RFC 3986, section 2, Characters.
- o OB remarked that the ISO 19770-2 data model is represented as an XML Schema, whereas ADMS.SW has an RDFS representation. He also deplored the fact that ISO specifications are free of charge and that no guarantee is given on related patents.
- o SG said that he would like to look into how both specifications could be aligned. A meeting has been planned with ISO to discuss this.
  - OB says he is not really interested in participating.
  - SS says that before putting too much effort in it there should be checked what the use case is behind this specification.
- o SG remarks that the SPDX community seems to ignore ISO 19770-2.

4. ISSUE: Add a conformance statement

- o SG explained that a conformance statement was already part of v0.3, but that the issue related to the way in which conformance can be asserted. He would contact Norbert Bollow, who promised a text for this.

5. ISSUE: Static Data vs. Variable Data
   - o SG explained that the current use case for the software description metadata of ADMS.SW is not to tag a single software package with its metadata, but rather to exchange software description metadata about software projects, assets, and packages between software repositories and catalogues. The RDF data model in any case easily allows users to separate triples containing "variable" data and "static data".
   - o OB remarked that this feature is not clear to most readers and that it should be made clearer what the purpose is of the specification.

6. ISSUE: Should schema.org/SoftwareApplication be reused?
   - o SG explained that the schema.org initiative is likely to gain traction in the future, as it is promoted by the major search engine vendors. For ADMS.SW to be future-proof it should reuse or align with relevant classes, properties, and relationships of schema.org.
   - o The Working Group agreed with this principle.

B. Use Cases
1. ISSUE: Use case: provide better metadata categorization
2. ISSUE: Relevance for Software Asset Management
   - o SG explains the issue: Add at least brief information about the relevance in the context of software asset management processes, as described and standardized in ISO/IEC 19770-1. Norber Bollow, who raised the issue is willing to provide a proposed text for this.
   - o SG will get back to Norbert Bollow on this issue.

3. ISSUE: ADMS.F/OSS Use Cases: Identifier of a software asset
   - o This issue was tackled when discussing the issue "Provide a mapping to ISO/IEC 19770-2 Software identification Tags".

C. Conceptual model
1. ISSUE: Naming of concepts Software Project - Software Asset - Software Distribution
   - o OB suggested renaming Software Asset to Software Release, as this better indicates that a release is a versioned construct. SG suggested keeping the concept 'Software Project'.
     - ▪ The Working Group agreed.
   - o OB proposed to rename Software Distribution to Software Package.
     - ▪ SG was in favour of this proposal, as this naming is also used by the SPDX specification. Software Package would subclass spdx:Package, enabling the reuse of licensing metadata.
   - o SS asked if it is possible to have more than one licence for a software package.
     - ▪ SG says there is no cardinality restriction on this, so it is possible. The only restriction there is, is that there has to be at least one license.
     - ▪ SS says that SPDX also provides the ability to add reviewer comments.

- ▪ SS suggested removing the note "if multiple licenses are given, these licences apply to all files in the Distribution" should be removed from the specification, as it might be too restrictive and not aligned with the SPDX approach.

2. ISSUE: Different Understandings of term Software Asset
   - o This issue is solved by the solution proposed in the previous issue: Software Asset will be renamed into Software Release.
3. ISSUE: Software assets are not necessarily executable software
   - o SG explained the issue: a software asset can also be non-executable software like fonts, graphics, audio and video recordings, templates, dictionaries, and documents.
   - o OB countered this proposal saying that this would increase the scope, and might not be relevant to the foreseen use case, i.e. facilitating the search for software across software forges.

4. ISSUE: Software project or initiative
5. ISSUE: ADMS.F/OSS: How to deal with a software asset located in different repositories
6. ISSUE: Metrics: Lines of Code
   - o This issue was brought up by Rashid Tariq. The lines of code metric lacks of context if you don't know the programming language. A "programming language" dimension needs to be added.
   - o The working group agreed this dimension property should be added.

7. ISSUE: Measure: average time to close support tickets
   ISSUE: The set of syntactic formats specified in ISO8601 is very rich
8. ISSUE: The use of internationalized domain names should be allowed
9. ISSUE: Improve description of geographic coverage
10. ISSUE: Description of date of creation
11. ISSUE: Forge as a purpose built platform
12. ISSUE: Correct Typos and unclarities in the specification

D. Controlled vocabularies

1. ISSUE: Licence Type: foresee a term to indicate that a licence is OSI approved
   - o Rashid Tariq proposed to extend the licence type vocabulary with a term to indicate that a licence is OSI approved or not.
   - o OB remarked that this information might already be contained in the SPDX specification.
   - o SG explained that the listing of licences on the SPDX website includes information on whether it is OSI approved or not. However, we was not sure whether this information was already encoded as RDF metadata. The specification does not mention such a property.

2. ISSUE: Consider the use of Debtags as an alternative to the Trove classification system for software
3. ISSUE: Vocabulary for Asset Type
4. ISSUE: Selected comments on Licence Type

- o PES proposed to add a description of every Licence Type to explain the exact meaning of the category.
  - ▪ SG asked if PES could provide a description for every Licence Type.
- o PES suggested dividing the "Share alike / copyleft" category at least in two parts: not compatible/interoperable with other copyleft licences and with compatibility exceptions for larger work and interoperability.
- o PES commented that in European countries it is not legally possible to use the license "public domain". There is however the licence "CC0", which has similar consequences. He suggests adding a comment to the specification that there are licences that are close to "public domain".
  - ▪ SG agrees.
- o SG confirms that a licence may be classified by "n" categories or attributes in this vocabulary.
- o OB says it is better to stick to SPDX. Since they are doing more or less the same work, we should differentiate too much from SPDX.
  - ▪ SG agrees that there has to be looked at how we can better align with SPDX (see also issue "Licence Type: foresee a term to indicate that a licence is OSI approved")

5. ISSUE: Audience classification
6. ISSUE: Use of Trove
7. ISSUE: Provide additional input to the controlled vocabularies
8. ISSUE: Is it allowed to create new code values?

E. RDF Schema

1. ISSUE: Change the preferred namespace prefix into admssw
2. ISSUE: Add examples in RDF Turtle notation to the specs
3. ISSUE: Selected comments on the RDF Schema

SG invited the Working Group to further discuss all issues via the issue tracker or mailing list.

Decisions

- Name of ADMS.F/OSS will be changed into ADMS.SW, to indicate that the metadata vocabulary can also be used to describe non-F/OSS. This does not change the vision of promoting the sharing and reuse of software solutions as F/OSS among public administrations.

- The note "if multiple licenses are given, these licences apply to all files in the Distribution" must be removed from the specification".

- Further reuse of the schema.org vocabulary is useful when updating the specification.

- Rename Software Asset to Software Release.

- Rename Software Distribution to Software Package.

- A dimension "programming language" should be added to the metric "Lines of code"

Documentation

- [ADMS.F/OSS issues logged on Joinup](#)
- [ADMS.F/OSS v0.3](#)
- [SPDX licenses](#)

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Provide a description for every Licence Type.	PES	2012.06.19
Impact analysis of broadening the scope by changing the name of ADMS.F/OSS. What does this mean for the reuse of [DOAP](#) and [SPDX](#)?	PA	2012.06.12
Add the information from [SPDX](#) about whether the licence is OSI approved or not to the RDF.	PA	2012.06.12
Remove note "if multiple licenses are given, these licences apply to all files in the Distribution" from the specification.	PA	2012.06.12
Set up a meeting with the [SPDX](#) Community	SG	2012.06.12
Contact [ISO](#) and see what is possible in terms of collaboration.	SG	2012.06.12
Add a conformance statement to the specification.	PA	2012.06.12
Take schema.org in account when updating the specification.	PA	2012.06.12
Get in contact with the raiser of the issue "[Relevance for Software Asset Management](#)".	SG	2012.06.12
Rename Software Asset to Software Release.	PA	2012.06.12
Rename Software Distribution to Software Package.	PA	2012.06.12
Add a dimension "programming language" to the metric "Lines of code".	PA	2012.06.12
Add a comment in the specification that there are licences that are close to "public domain".	PA	2012.06.12

7. Wrap-up: next steps

Discussion

- SG explained that he hoped to release version 0.4 of the specification next week and asked the Working Group to review it. The work needs to be finished by end of June.
- SG says he also want to contact [DOAP](#) (Edd Dumbill) about a minor issue he

would like to see changed in the DOAP specification.

- o OB says it is maybe more interesting to discuss this with Apache (who also implemented DOAP).
- o SG thinks this is a good idea. He can contact Ross Gardler, affiliated with Apache. He has also implemented DOAP (Simal).

- SG says we are also searching for implementation pilots. It would be nice if Adullact and FusionForge could be two of them.

- SG explains that a spreadsheet will soon be made available to create ADMS.SW RDF with Google Refine.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Contact Ross Gardler from Apache about the DOAP issue.	SG	2012.06.19