Project	OW2
Subject	TC
Type of meeting	Physical meeting
Date	15/03/10
Attendees	Benoît Héricher, Ministère de l'Intérieur
	Gaël Blondelle, Chairman of the TC
	Rafaël Marins, Neociclo
	Cédric Thomas, CEO
	Alexandre Lefebvre, CTO
	Matthieu Leclercq, INRIA
	Charles Souillard, BonitaSoft
	On the phone
	Denis Caromel, INRIA
	Guillaume Sauthier, Bull
	Clément Escoffier, Akquinet

Slides for the Cloud directions, TESS/CRS and MIND presentations are available on the meeting page http://www.ow2.org/view/Events/OW2TCMeeting20100315

OW2 Cloud directions by Cédric Thomas

Code name Jetstream - see slides

Message (slide 14): we have to understand where we (OW2) fits in the Cloud.

Last slide: OW2 homework! Questions:
- What is our definition of Cloud computing?
- Is Cloud computing an opportunity for OW2?
- What is our window of opportunity?
Do we have time?
CS: We have to start something very very soon.
BH: The area is immature enough so that OW2 can give directions.
- Should OW2 develop a Cloud computing strategy and how?
- What can OW2 contribute to Cloud computing? What are our resources?
- Which OW2 members have an interest in Cloud computing? A strategy?
- What do we want to do? What can OW2 do?
- What should we expect from the TC do? From the MO?

DC: There are many definitions of Cloud.
What we need it is the position of OW2 on the cloud computing map.
RM: The definition problem is always source of misunderstanding, so we need to be precise.

GB: The slides are a good state of the art, but we also need a short 3 slide max presentation to position OW2.

Q: Is Cloud an opportunity for OW2?
BH: We HAVE to address the issue of Cloud to survive, at least from the "marketing" point of view.

CS: Do we want to build a PaaS or just participate to the Cloud?
Do we want to build something for us (for OW2) or also for other users?

GB: Look at the BI initiative. People work together to provide a better stack for the rest of the world, integrating OW2 technology.
OW2 itself does not sell the result of the BI initiative. Business is left to the members.
The initiative is here to build the solution.

Note that the "usual suspects", INRIA, Bull and France Telecom, are interested in the Cloud initiative.
CS: It would be good to publicise this to attract other members who could be interested!!
CS: Each member should also position itself on the Cloud map (where they are in the picture).

DC: We should put a 1st presentation on the web soon, with a clear statement.

Action plan: circulate something among project leaders:
1. Position paper
2. We pull the project leaders and ask them to respond, and present their position, their ambition.
Asking them: if we launch a Cloud computing initiative, do they want to be part of it, and where ?
3. List the cooperative projects where people / projects / members are already taking part.

OW2 projects and Cloud

DC: ProActive is mainly on the IaaS level.
ProActive is also providing Cloud Portal, which can be seen as a SaaS for software delivering IaaS.

CE: They use Chameleon as a flexible and elastic platform, which can be adapted on demand. This is a very good stack for OW2, which can be used as IaaS or in support for SaaS.

CS: BonitaSoft are trying to participate in IST project with Bull on Cloud.

Q GB: what is the timeframe ?
CT: There is a Data Management in Cloud Computing event at the beginning of May in Paris (5 and 6 May), and Cedric has agreed that OW2 will participate.
http://www.datacenter-cloud.com/
The aim is to have a booth there.
We could use the booth to launch the initiative then and have presentations and workshops.

Technology vision document

http://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXH0rX-FCD5HZGcyd3ZjamtfMTZ2Z3pjN3gz&hl=en_GB

Technology, licensing scheme, ...
The document was started some time ago, with some contributions.
We need more people involved in this document, and strong discussions on the mailing list about this document.

CT: The Board is asking us to develop a "technology vision".

Sections:
- OW2 mission (extracted from the executive summary)
- Community survey
People want the consortium to promote flagship projects.
OW2 as a whole should take the decision to communicate more on flagship projects.
Members expect an interoperability architecture, which we don't have.
See Eclipse which is OSGi-powered, whereas OW2 is many-things powered.
We have too many component models.
GB: We must remember why we are together. GB thinks we need a common interoperability between architectures.

RM: They have different technologies: how can they be combined ?
The driver of interoperability: example how to combine Bonita+Petals to provide value for customers.
Should we propose a map of the technology showing the interoperability?

AL We have UShareSoft as a mean to disseminate appliances.
CT Be careful that we have dependency on UShareSoft (we depend on their good will).
GB PetalsLink has created a VM for Petals, with all Petals software pre-installed.
CT would like that we have something independent (like the Eclipse plug-in architecture), where anything you build would interoperate.
OW2 does not have it yet, Apache does not have it yet.
OW2 is missing this "technology glue".

We already had a discussion at the TC on the "glue" issue, we can use OSGi and/or Fractal (which now interoperate).

BH: The OW2 code base is not as "strict" as Eclipse. This is more fuzzy.
CS: Example of Bonita which work with other software, through APIs.

At OW2, we have endless discussions because we don't have and don't want a license.
Licenses are source of problems for interoperability.
GB: We cannot be stronger on licenses.
AL: Except that projects should tell us when they change their license, PLEASE!

The facts are: projects have different licenses and different interoperability technologies.
The good side is that, in 2009, we've made progress on the OSGi-Fractal integration.
BUT not many people know about the Fractal-OSGi links, and not many people in the world use it.

Also, OSGi is sometimes only used as the next generation class loader, but not really as an interoperability technology.

GB: Look at the Eclipse evolution. Start: IDE foundation.
RM: Eclipse is technology oriented, OW2 is market oriented.
So it is natural that Eclipse projects interoperate.
CS: Since OW2 does not have such a layer, it is impossible to have this strong interoperability.

CT was discussing with Mike Millinkovitch, who puts the Eclipse plug-in architecture forward.

DC: from the technological point of view, finding a unique framework would be impossible. We already have some generic technology which helps us to do that, out there (OSGi) and inside (OW2).
The software engineering and architecture issue is so difficult that it would be impossible to have a "magic framework" that would make everything work together...

ML: This makes sense for a subset of OW2 projects, though.
BH: The initiatives should try, on a subset of projects, to use a common framework for such integration.

GB: This was the goal of the Himalaya project, to create some "islands", some "peaks" of interoperability.
We should explain it better.

GB: Should we just establish good practice ?
GS: If we fix rules, what do we do when people break the rules.
We have too many different projects with too many different technologies ?

Action: write rules clearly on the Technology Council page
(such rules appear in Technology Council minutes, but are not explicit/visible enough):
- use / implement standards when possible
- componentize projects (no monoliths)
- re-use existing OW2 components

GB Let's reload the matrix with Cloud Computing!!
GS: The cloud initiative could be a good thing to start doing "clean".
GB: Moreover, Cloud is a good topic for both academics and industry.
The community should be an actor.
CT: Make Cloud strategic, and use it to implement the technology vision.
But not put the whole consortium in the cloud.

OW2 projects

NovaForge

Decision: OK for NovaForge to become a mature project.

Action: Alex and Gaël formalize process for going from incubator to mature.

Tess/CRS Presentation (Christophe Dousson)

Note that Tess is now available on OW2.
Some cleanup on CRS will have to be done before sharing it with OW2 (some non open source libraries to be removed).

Q&A
CD: Users of CRS already exist (long history), and is used for chronical recognition.

Tess was introduced for finer control.
Before OW2, only the library was shared. The community at the moment is mainly users.
Tess/CRS as an open source will be presented at a workshop in May.
Users are mainly research labs and universities.

Interactions with other OW2 projects: yes, should be possible.
The links with other projects should be further analyzed and looked into.

CD continues to use the package internally at Orange Labs.
The development is also continuing (new components for example). Not all components are made open source.
E.g. SIP message components could or not be provided as open source.

GB finds it impressive: it should be an opportunity for OW2 to be relevant in the CEP domain.

MIND presentation (Matthieu Leclercq)

Q&A
GB: What after the funded project ? With which business model ?
ML: We will continue. We will use it. Various partners will use it (ST for example), France Telecom will probably continue to use it (Orange Labs in Grenoble). Schneider Electric might be interested in using it.
Opensourcing it should help the development and evolution effort of the current technology. Possibly attract new members.
ST and FT are the main contributors, and Logica + INRIA Adam for the IDE.

GB: This is a core foundation focused on embedded software.
OW2 thought in the past of creating an embedded software initiative in the past.
This could be of interest for ST (and others), based on Mind.

Note: for the website, HTML is generated from docbook files, with XSLT modifications.

EasyFlow

Discussion on competition.
Competition is accepted officially.
There should be no rivalry.

Reminder of the rules in http://www.ow2.org/view/Community/TCguidelines:
> *Competition We can/should accept some level of competition but we should also avoid damaging rivalry between projects. We must refuse to upgrade to mature a project that position itself as a rival to an existing OW2 project. While there may be some overlap, all mature projects must be clearly differentiated.*
>
> *Competition and differentiation A mature project must be able to make its differentiation clear. Such differentiation can be a question of:*
> *a) technology,*
> *b) range positioning (lightweight solution vs heavy-duty, stand-alone vs distributed, etc.),*
> *c) packaging (component, user-ready solution, OSGi, etc.)*

d) open source license

Incubator projects should answer these questions, and show some differentiator.
GB thinks that we should accept the project into the incubator, and review the project.

Decision to:
- review the EasyFlow position w.r.t. this policy (by analyzing the previous answers), using the TC mailing list
- depending on the result, possibly get back to EasyFlow that they answer the question
- propose a dedicated meeting between EasyFlow and OW2 competing projects if necessary

OW2 projects and infrastructure

Policy for OW2 projects and code hosting

We agreed that the minimum is that code source should be mirrored, or targz (we understand that SVN access without HTTP is sometimes impossible)

GB: What is an OW2 project?
Is it a project approved by the OW2 TC?
Is it a project hosted on the OW2 Forge?
What about projects going outside OW2 for their hosting?
What about projects accepted but which never provide source code at OW2 (either SVN or as downloads)?

CS: the process for Apache projects is very strong.
OW2 needs such a model.
Once we have rules, we have to enforce them, and be consistent.
The difficulty is to define rules that are acceptable by the community.

CT: in OW2 we have mature projects, and incubator projects.
For Mature projects, the rules MUST be obeyed.

GB: Bonita has the runtime (the historical OW2 project), which is hosted in OW2, and the "new Bonita" project, which is hosted at BonitaSoft.
Q: Is the entire code base considered open source and OW2 project?
CS: Yes, the entire solution can be considered as an OW2 project.

GB sees no personal problem to host the source code elsewhere.
What about mirroring the repository on the Forge somewhere?
GB thinks that OW2 should help you to do it (provide you with the right tools to mirror your source code).

CS does not think it would be a problem to mirror the source code repository.
Even though BonitaSoft has to manage their own repository.

CS: to be identified as an OW2 project, a project must :
- provide the source code on OW2
- share the consortium guidelines, share the vision, the values

CT: OW2 provides users with tools. OW2 cannot expect that all projects use all the OW2 tools.
The source code however must be available somehow on OW2.

RM: They have started the project in 2005, and have a long commit history.
Then they submit the project. They also want to import the history (or not).
OW2 should provide a way to import previous history (SVN should be able to do it).

GS: we have done it for the Shelbie project (imported an existing repository).
Action: AL to check with Jeremy Casery.

Update and discussion on technology tools offered to the projects

GS:
1- the "shopping list" itself (to be continued on the mailing list).
Note that Hudson will come with NovaForge.

2- which process to handle infrastructure, respond to support request
There is a definite lack of communication on infrastructure improvements.
Difficulty of announcing a roadmap with items which never come...
However, some items are announced and delivered (hardware migration).

CT: We have an infrastructure page, but its structure is not very good, maybe, and its content needs to be reviewed.

CS: We should push the information (like newsletter, or a dedicated mailing list) for this kind of information.
Communicate for every step.

GS: When XSalto is going to make some changes, we push it to the users.
We do it well for hardware, why not for software.

GB: AL is the right person to do it (availability problem, to be solved soon).

OW2 download statistics

CS: to be credible, this is a major issue.
We have to be careful.
For anything which is public, we have to be very careful, because this could be bad for OW2.
We have to be strict and clean, when people compare us to open source.
In open source, downloading projects is the "nerf de la guerre".

CT: some OW2 projects and members, as well as people from outside OW2, look at the stats closely.
If there is a problem with the stats, we are informed straight away.
We know that the stats are reliable.
GB: however, there is an issue: each time you release 1 file, you get a lot of downloads (about 700, maybe because of crawlers ??).

Reasons why stats need to be improved:

- extra 700 downloads for each file released
- people may want to cheat

<u>Action:</u>
- investigate the 700 downloads for a new release issue
- prevent possible cheats