

Here are the minutes from our call. You can always find our agendas and minutes online here:
<https://wiki.linuxfoundation.org/openchain/minutes>

== Attendees ==

Shane Coughlan
Mark Gisi
Fukuchi San
Takemi San
Arita San
Honma San
Chris Ekren
Jilayne Lovejoy
Nathan Kumagai
Dave Marr

== Project Update ==

Shane covered the recent OpenChain @ Open Compliance Summit event, outlining the numerous OpenChain-related talks and the OpenChain sponsorship as items that provided great coverage.

He also highlighted the continued new translations, most recently of training material into Japanese, as aspects of the project that drive value.

He ended the project overview by discussing next steps (end of year events), such as the OpenChain talk at the LF Member Counsel event and the first meeting of the Japanese OpenChain Member's study group on the 27th December.

== Specification ==

Mark opened with a call for comments on the 1.1 and draft 1.2 Specification.

Mark shared the feedback for 1.2 and discussed moving the issue list from JIRA into GitHub. Mark noted that this was due to JIRA requiring explicit sign-in and a potential bottleneck or friction for contribution. There were no objections.

Mark continued the discussion by noting that one comment was about the definition of "Identified Licenses" being circular. Mark suggested a potential improvement based on 4.1.1, Dave concurred it appeared to be useful, and Jilayne requested further review. Mark explained that it consisted of a clarification based on adding the term "that govern the supplied software." Jilayne noted she was still a little concerned that it remained slightly circular.

Mark noted that one word that is potentially problematic is "govern." Jilayne concurred and suggested that we simply say "FOSS licenses." Mark, Jilayne and Nathan noted it might be useful to have a Word or Google Doc for collaborative editing.

Nathan noted it might be useful to define a term for FOSS obligations. Mark concurred that this may be useful.

Mark moved on to issue 7, covering potential confusion between FOSS roles. He noted that in 2.1 we identify a FOSS liaison role. Nathan noted that 2.1 and 2.2 could have slight classification with the use of the word "external" in 2.2 to match the use of "internal" in 2.1.

Mark proceeded to discuss the change of verification artifacts to verification material is locations such as 1.1 to ensure clarity.

Mark then proceeded to discuss the 85% requirement for training. Mark noted that there were two views, one that the requirement should apply to a program and one that the requirement should apply to a legal entity as a whole. Mark will move forward to propose the former for Spec 1.2. No objections were raised.

Mark raised the issue of how we should present the FAQ(s) to readers. He proposed that we should place the FAQ as a clarification to the Spec, split out between Spec, Curriculum and Conformance for clarity. There were no objections. It was decided to place it on the main website.

