

Project	OW2
Subject	QM - TC
Type of meeting	Face2face
Date	2008-05-15, 09:00 – 16:00
Attendees	GB- Gael Blondelle, EBM Websourcing, OW2 CN - Christophe Ney, Laurent Laudinet – Thales Antonio .Majori, Engineering Alexandro Toreli, Engineering Andrea Gioia, Engineering University of Milano, YE Dan, ISCAS SHI Dianxi, NUDT ZHAO Junfeng, PKU TENG Meng, NUDT ZHOU Minghui, Peking University Francois Exertier, JonAS, Bull Cedric Thomas, CEO OW2 Jeremy Casery, Bull, OW2 SysAdmin Pierre Dubois, Dysoweb, Requa Alexandre Lefebvre, FT R&D Thierry Humbert, Edifixio Stéphane Ribas - OW@INRIA
Excused	Petr Tuma (Charles University), André Freyssinet (Scalagent)

## Agenda

- Discussion about project Selection Criteria
- Trustie presentation
- Himalaya program

## Discussion about project criterias

### Introduction to project selection criteria by GB

Discussion about project selection criteria takes place on the mailing list and during TC conf call for a while. The main objective of this face to face meeting is to share information about these selction criteria and decide go forward in the process of project classification according to the new life cycle : Incubator, Mature and Archive

### GENERAL

- In general, the criteria must be considered as thing to think of and give your opinion befor voting pro or against the project.
  - . No need to do too much complex thinking.
  - . It is not a YES / NO criteria but more discussion based.

### Criteria to accept a project in the incubator :

- Is it middleware (at large)?
- Does the team show goodwill to synergize with other OW2 projects?
- Is the license compatible with the IPR policy (GPL v3 and LGPL v3 do not seem to be compatible)?
- Is the project competing with other projects (it could be good or bad, it is a criteria to evaluate)?

### About competition

- To answer the question “is this new project is competing with another OW2 project?”
  - Check the web page to see the list of projects, and their categories...

[gael.blondelle@ow2.org](mailto:gael.blondelle@ow2.org)

2008-05-15

1 of 6

- It is impossible to predict whether, in the future, a new project will compete or not with an existing one.
- However, as an example, we already have numerous component frameworks, so a new component framework could be too much for OW2.
- In the case of Azuki, it will depend on how their relationship with Fractal will evolve.
- Sometimes projects "appear as" competing, but in fact companies work hand in hand on their complementarity (example Exo and Xwiki on Content Management).

## CRITERIA : INCUBATOR TO MATURE

Discussion and update of the list

### Quantitative criteria (in absolute value and in trend)

- Source repository activity
  - Source code size [added today - number of files, of non-comment code statements]
- Team size
- Mailing list (or forum) activity
- Consistent download activity

### Qualitative criterias

- Does it work - Is there a user outside the project leader organization  
**problem: the TC does not have resources to test it**  
We could rely on "success stories", example of deployed usages of the software]
- Does it meet technical standards we want to uphold -based on a consensus at the TC
  - About continuous integration, integration tests, etc ....
  - About technology standards like OMG, JCP, W3C, ....
  - About a comparison with other similar open source projects
  - Documentation : README, documented APIs, developer's guide, user's guide [new today]
- Are there professional services around the project code base? A commercial support offer? [rephrased]
- Is there a web site [new today]
- Is there a data sheet [new today]
- Is it written in English, or, better, internationalised [new today]
- Is there a roadmap [new today]
- Is the project competing with another OW2 mature project [new today - note that Apache manages competition]
- Does this project reinforces the consortium as a whole? [new today]
- Is there a lead (one or several contact persons) who is an OW2 member [new today]

### Criteria for project migration to archive

- No more development activity (about 1 year since last commits) [updated] ?
- Project officially moved by project leader to another place?  
**Example of such projects to move to archive: Celtic, Oscar, ....**
- The project leader is not a member of OW2? [editor's note : like Enhydra projects]
- No binary, source, documentation available on OW2
- No identified project lead [new today]
- Projects that never released code or binaries ("ghost" or "fake" projects) will be deleted when moving to archive [new today]
- For each project, we should check that someone in the project lead is a member of OW2 (or their companies).

### What does it mean that a project is "moved to archive" :

- No more write access to svn+cvs, web site

- Include some kind of frame around the web page saying that the project is labeled "archived"

### **Review of project stats document.**

- Thanks to the work of Jérémi, we have a script to create the project stats.
- The stats show activity of the project (but do not help whether incubator or mature).
- For weak projects (no activity on files or on lists, only a few downloads), we have to contact the project lead. Note that we'll send an email to everybody anyway.

### **Project Communication**

- OW2 will communicate on members joining only
- No special communication about incubators projects, but communication on projects moving from incubator to mature folder.
- The marketing use of the OW2 "brand" should not be allowed for projects in the incubator.

### **Project Membership**

- Should only OW2 members be able to submit projects ?  
In ObjectWeb times, this was not compulsory. The idea was to encourage project submissions.
- **Result of the discussion:** To definitely accept a project, the new project members should register/join OW2.

### **Next actions:**

- To be implemented:
  - . Project incubator folder,
  - . Project mature folder, etc..
  - . In the URL could be appearing the word "incubator".
- Proposal (Christophe) : move all projects first to incubator, then apply the rules. We have the opportunity today to "start from scratch", and set up a fair filtering process, set up "hard requirements".
- A mail will be sent to all project leader to ask them if there project can be moved to archive, to incubator, or if they want to start the process so that there project will be directly moved to mature state.
- With no answer from the project leader, a mail will be sent on the project mailing to ask for a new project leader. And if nobody takes the lead, the project will be moved to archive.

## **OTHERS**

### **Licenses, IPR Tracking**

- License are checked by consortium and by FT lawyers (for OW2) before accepting...
- Ideas around IPR Tracking: Fossology, blacduke, protecode... to be followed ?
- No tool to help on licensing, only information sharing, based on knowledge on each one
- Proposition presented to Cedric Thomas: ask the "OW2" lawyers to send from time to time information about license, new license, and their incompatibility with other license on OW2 forge.

### **Next actions:**

We will probably ask lawyers work on GPL v3 and LGPL v3.

### **JAVA or NOT Java ;-)**

Discussion about Java being compulsory or not: it is not an issue, even though the language often lead to different ecosystems...

Example: Cardamom (CORBA and C)

OW2 already hosts projects written in several languages, and even if Java is the most used language, it could not be mandatory.

### **Hosting**

- Problem of projects which only partially use the OW2 Forge (downloads but not SVN for example).
- More extreme, projects who only have <http://theproject.ow2.org> (which is a redirection) but nothing hosted on OW2.
- What about projects who have the download on the OW2 Forge, but their web page somewhere else ?

### **Technical infrastructure**

- Use subdomains : <http://project.incubator.ow2.org> instead of <http://project.ow2.org> ?
- Warning : prepare redirections in the case existing projects already use the URL <http://project.ow2.org> and are moved to the incubator

### **Project Stats**

- The stats show activity of the project (but do not help whether incubator or mature).
- For weak projects (no activity on files or on lists, only a few downloads), we have to contact the project lead. Note that we'll send an email to everybody anyway.
- It would be nice to get general statistics and only project by project

-- End of the first speech

## **Presentation of Trustie project (slides by Shi Dianxi, NUDT)**

Scope of TruSTIE :

1. Production Line (PL) for component-based development
2. PL for Service oriented development
3. PL for runtime monitoring
4. PL for multi-platform integration

Powerful software infrastructure: resource sharing, cooperative development, trust-worthiness

Large-scale production environment :

- software tools, resource repositories, technique-oriented software production lines, cooperation platform, trust assurance mechanisms

Funded by H363 programme in China.

Cooperation projects with W3C, EU FP6/FP7...

The production environment includes requirement management, test management, resource sharing...

Actors :

- developers publish components and resources
- developers re-use components to produce their own products
- resource evaluation staff

On top of a collaborating platform for software development

- Interesting project
- Is the code, produced by this project, will be integrated into the OW2 Forge? YES
- Is the code re useable by others? YES
- Can it be integrated to the current OW2 Forge? YES
- Suggestions, Trustie should be submitted into smaller parts/component to the OW2 consortium
- Suggestions:

- . Present the slides of Trustie in another format: show what are the interest and impact for OW2, decompose architecture into smaller part for identifying OW2 interest, parts, etc.
- Suggestions:
  - . Precise which parts, component can be reused...

Description of the software trust-worthiness rating model (levels of trust)

### Q&A

- Discussion about the relationship with EU funded Qualipso project [www.qualipso.org](http://www.qualipso.org) ?
- What is the connection between TruSTIE and OW2, more precisely than what is in the slides?
- What is the concrete contribution to the OW2 code base?

### Answers:

- TruSTIE is developing software (funded by China H363).
- This software will be used by Chinese government and industry.
- The contribution will be software, which will be contributed to the OW2 source code, and OW2 software will be re-used.
- Note that JO2NAS is used in TruSTIE.

### SUMMARY

There seem to be many OW2 projects that should be used by TruSTIE (Salomé, CLIF, PEtALS, Spago, ....).

TruSTIE could be used :

- by OW2 users
- by OW2 itself on top of its Forge

TruSTIE should submit a project / several projects to OW2 for the code contributed by TruSTIE to OW2 (maybe as an initiative ?)

### Next actions:

- Can we get the slides?
- Can a slide be provided with the component that could be part of OW2 forge:
  1. existing OW2 projects re-used by TruSTIE (now and in the future)
  2. projects that TruSTIE will contribute to OW2 (now and in the future)

## Himalaya program (GB)

### SCOPE

OW2 should propose more than just code.

Himalaya is about project interoperability based on standards (OMG, OASIS, JCP, W3C, ....)

To achieve interoperability, we can work "bubble" (or "cluster", or "island") by "bubble".

### Bubble examples:

JOnAS & co  
PEtALS & co

Bubbles may have code (projects) in common : example JOTM for the JOnAS bubble and the PEtALS bubble.

The principle is to synchronize the versions of the common projects used by the bubbles.

**Example** : two projects using different versions of a given project (e.g. JOTM) may not work together.

There is no a priori relationship between Himalaya (technical perspective) and initiatives (business issue).  
Any project can volunteer to take part in the Himalaya program.  
Himalaya can be seen as a technical support for initiatives, to assure project (code) compatibility.

### **Discussion about Himalaya**

**CN** : it may be a wrong assumption that Himalaya is a technical-only project.  
There have to be some expressed requirements by someone.

**GB** : comparison with "Eclipse synchronized release".

### **What does it mean that "projects work together"?**

- SR raised a question about "license compatibility matrix". If two projects are technically compatible, but cannot be put together from the license point of view, code reuse becomes rather difficult.

- Who will do the compatibility / interoperability tests?

### **SUGGESTIONS**

- Idea to produce a compatibility matrix once a year.

Today, all integrators do such a job with the projects they use.

- Could be a great value for OW2, for OW2 users.