

Minutes of the COIN-OR Foundation, Inc.
Strategic Leadership Board Conference Call
Tuesday, 22 March 2005

1 Scheduled Agenda

The call was scheduled to begin at 3:00 PM Eastern Time.

1. Revise agenda or process, if desired.
2. Policy for contributions
 - (a) Decide which document to use as a starting point for discussion, the current draft in the repository or the revision by Ted that was emailed out yesterday.
 - (b) Determine which proposed changes have unanimous support, if any.
 - (c) Decide how to proceed. Logical options include: vote on the policy without discussing non-unanimous proposed changes, discuss some or all of the non-unanimous proposed changes prior to voting, or discuss the document but postpone the vote until next week.
3. Other business (if time)

A list of the proposed changes that was distributed to board members prior to the call is given at the end of this document.

2 Minutes of the Meeting

Present: Lou Hafer, Brady Hunsaker, Randy Kiefer, Bjarni Kristjansson, Laci Ladanyi, Robin Lougee-Heimer, Ted Ralphs, Matt Saltzman. A quorum was present. Matt Saltzman was facilitating.

The meeting was called to order by Matt at 3:07 PM.

Matt read the agenda as scheduled. No concerns were expressed about the agenda.

Bjarni and Laci joined the called at this point.

2.1 Policy for Contributions

2.1.1 Decide whether to start discussion with Ted's or Lou's draft

Motion by Matt to start discussion with Ted's draft. Lou seconded. Accepted without objection.

2.1.2 Determine which changes have unanimous support

Changes R, S, and T were considered. Minor change to S in wording: change "it for distribution and redistribution" to "the portion that I own". Unanimous support.

Change B unanimous support.

Change H unanimous support.

Change L unanimous support.

Change M slightly changed: Section 6. "The \tlc will also establish procedures for ensuring that projects adhere to these guidelines and for taking action when a project fails to meet established criteria." Unanimous support.

Change N: Review of projects will take place on a regular basis. Review may also be initiated by the SLB or the TLC at their discretion. Unanimous support.

2.1.3 Discussion of new proposed changes and additional concerns

Proposal by Robin to remove “specific” as the first word from the bullets in Section 3. Unanimous agreement. Discussion of “Additional concerns” from the preparatory email.

1. Should we remove the overlap between the Principles of Utility and Scope of Contributions section?

A suggestion to move the last sentence of Section 4 to Section 3 and remove the rest. [No consensus or vote taken on this change.]

2. Who should determine what is a nontrivial contribution? Who is responsible for determining when the sum total of a user’s “insignificant” contributions become significant?

Concern expressed that this is a legal issue and so should be determined by the SLB rather than the TLC. Other concerns that this will eventually be determined by project managers, so guidelines here may not be useful.

Suggestion made that this issue should be revisited later.

3. Who’s responsible for keeping track of the paperwork? Is this procedure or policy?

Several opinions expressed that this is procedure.

5. Should we specify the project managers are responsible for developing specific procedures for contributing to their project?

It was noted that such a statement is in the current document.

6. Should the Software Contributions and Non-software Contributions sections be left to the TLC to determine?

An concern was expressed that the current document comes close to giving procedures in this case; should that be the case? This issue may be revisited at a later meeting.

New question: do we need a section on existing projects? An opinion was expressed that this is covered in Section 5.1

7. Should the term “software project” be replaced with “mature software project” or something similar?

Proposal to replace “software project” with “production software project” throughout the document and “software development project” to “development software project” throughout the document. Unanimous support.

Proposal to change point 1 of 5.1 to “All contributions must be licensed under an open-source license approved by the Open Source Initiative. If a contributor feels that no approved license is appropriate, alternatives will be considered on a case-by-case basis.” Unanimous support.

Proposal to change Contributor’s Statement of Respect for Ownership points (b) and (c) to make them parallel wording. Specifically, “ (b) for any original contribution I make to the COF repository, I will make...

(c) for any other contributions I make, I will verify that they were obtained under an OS license certified by the OSI.”

Motion by Brady to accept the Policy starting from Ted’s revision and including all the changes agreed to unanimously today. Seconded by Ted. Vote taken: Unanimous passage.

2.2 Other business

Discussion of what to do for procedures document. Agreement to try to fix up the procedures so that they don’t contradict policy and then give the draft to the TLC as a starting point.

Action item: Brady will look at procedures document and make it consistent with the policy document.

Action item: Matt will prepare draft that meets the changes we discussed today. Brady will check-in Ted’s version of the LaTeX source.

Motion by Ted to adjourn the meeting. Brady seconded.

[Discussion of whether the Foundation owes INFORMS \$5 or \$1 for web hosting.]

Meeting adjourned 4:23 PM.

3 Summary of Resolutions

Motion by Brady to accept the Policy starting from Ted’s revision and including all the changes agreed to unanimously today. Seconded by Ted. Vote taken: Unanimous passage.

4 Summary of Action Items

Action item: Brady will look at procedures document and make it consistent with the policy document.

Action item: Matt will prepare draft that meets the changes we discussed today. Brady will check-in Ted's version of the LaTeX source.

5 Changes proposed prior to the meeting

These are labeled with letters and given in order of occurrence in the current draft of the document.

A. Recurring. Change Canadian English spelling to American English spelling.

B. Recurring. To improve readability for the uninitiated, put the titles of the names of the three forms in italics, quotes or something. The three forms are: “Statement of Respect for Ownership”, “Statement of Ownership and Licensing”, “Confirmation of Licensing”

C. Recurring. Remove the use of the term “operations researchers,” as it sounds a little colloquial (it sounds like people who research operations rather than people who use operations research techniques).

D. Section 1. Delete the word “Principles” from subsection titles to avoid being repetitive with section title.

E. Section 2. Change the section called “Delegation to the TLC” to a section called “Responsibilities” and expand it to summarize the responsibilities under this policy of all the main players: SLB, TLC, and project managers. There are a few reasons for this. First, this section currently contains a statement about responsibilities of the SLB as well, so the title wasn't really broad enough to begin with. I also felt this section was needed because the responsibilities of the TLC are spread throughout the document and were not easy to pick out. Having one place to refer to for a list is convenient. Also, project managers have specific responsibilities under this policy and I wanted to bring that out as well. [Note: see Section 3 of Ted's revision.]

F. Section 3. Change to the following:

\coinwelcomes a broad range of contributions, including software, standards specifications, interfaces, benchmark problem sets, tutorial materials, models, and documentation. Any contribution related to computational operations research that is of use to an operations researcher and is not better suited to another open-source community is a candidate for inclusion in the \coinrepository. The acceptance criteria for contributions is specified by the \tlc. If the \tlcis unable to reach a decision, the question is referred to the \slb.

G. Section 4. Delete this section. This section on “Initiating the Contribution Process” seems a little vacuous, especially in light of the expanded Responsibilities section I'm proposing. All it really says is how someone should go about contributing a project, which is really procedure. There doesn't seem to be any policy here.

H. Section 5. Add a reference to the first time “Confirmation of Licensing” is mentioned – so the reader knows it's a form.

When a new project is accepted into the repository, the contributor must complete a Statement of Ownership and Licensing (\ref{app:miniC00}). All owners of the contribution must provide Confirmation of Licensing (\ref{app:miniC00}). Equivalent documentation will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

I. Section 5. Change bullet 1 of the Legal Requirements section to not require non-software contributions to be under an OSI-certified license. I don't think there are many OSI licenses that are appropriate for non-software projects and so I prefer the language of “licenses generally compatible with OSI licenses,” as I think we had before, but I'd welcome comments from other.

J. Section 5. Move the description of what is considered a “significant” contribution to bullet 2 of the Legal Requirements section. This description only affects bullet 2 anyway, so I think it reads better there.

K. Sections 5, 7, and 8. Combine these sections into a single section called “Contribution Requirements,” since these sections all discuss things that are required of a contributor to have a contribution accepted into the repository.

[See Section 5 of Ted's revision for the proposed replacement section.]

L. Section 6. Nix the “expectations” and put in “will”, i.e., “The project manager will be expected to observe \coinpolicy and procedure for maintaining the project and associated material in the repository.”

to “The project manager will follow \coinpolicy and procedure for maintaining the project and associated material in the repository.”

[This may have been intended to be a recurring change in other parts of the document. We need to specifically identify those if we wish to change them.]

M. Section 6. English – the “to ensure” and “for taking” isn’t balanced in... “The \tlcwill also establish procedures to ensure that projects adhere to these guidelines and for taking action when a project fails to meet established criteria.”

Proposal A. “The \tlcwill establish guidelines - for ensuring projects in the repository remain relevant and are actively maintained, - for ensuring that projects adhere to these guidelines, and - for taking action when a project fails to meet established criteria.”

Proposal B. The \tlcwill establish guidelines to ensure that projects in the repository remain relevant and are actively maintained. The \tlcwill also establish procedures to ensure that projects adhere to these guidelines, and to ensure that action is taken when a project fails to meet them. Review of projects will take place on a periodic basis or may be initiated by either the \tlcor \slbat its discretion.

N. Section 6. Change the “or” to an “and” in the sentence: “Review of projects will take place on a regular basis or may be initiated by either the \tlcor \slbat its discretion.”

O. Section 7. I still stumble when I read the sentence... “A software contribution to an existing project must include the source code for the software.” I think it’s because you use “software” as an adjective (e.g., software contribution) and then as a noun (for the software) in the same sentence. To improve the readability, consider the following instead. “A software contribution to an existing project must include the all the source code for the contribution.”

P. Section 7. Delete the sentence that says that software contributions to existing projects must include source code, since we are already requiring all contributions to be under an open source license and this is redundant.

Q. Section 9. Delete this section. I’d like to suggest we delete the section on COIN-OR infrastructure because I’m not sure why it’s there, but this is not a big deal.

R. Appendix A. In the statement: “for any contribution I make to the \cofi* repository, I will make all reasonable and prudent efforts to determine the legal owners of the contribution, and I will obtain the permission of the owners of the contribution to make the contribution available for distribution and redistribution;”

remove the “available for distribution and redistribution” part..., as follows:

“for any contribution I make to the \cofi* repository, I will make all reasonable and prudent efforts to determine the legal owners of the contribution, and I will obtain the permission of the owners to license the contribution under an OSI-certified open-source license;”

S. Appendix B. Change the word “it” in “I, _____, am an owner of the contribution _____, and I agree to license it for distribution and redistribution under the terms of the _____, an open source license certified by the Open Source Initiative.” to “my portion”.

T. Appendix B. In the statement “I, _____, am an owner of the contribution _____, and I agree to license it for distribution and redistribution under the terms of the _____, an open source license certified by the Open Source Initiative.”

remove the qualifies “for distribution and redistribution” so it reads

“I, _____, am an owner of the contribution _____, and I agree to license my portions under the terms of the _____, an open source license certified by the Open Source Initiative.”

U. New section. Add a section for definition of terms that are used in the document. I think this is nice to have for reference and so we all talk the same language. Some terms were not really clearly defined currently. [Note: see Section 2 of Ted’s revision.]

Additional concerns submitted prior to meeting

1. Should we remove the overlap between the Principles of Utility and Scope of Contributions section.
2. Who should determine what is a nontrivial contribution? Who is responsible for determining when the sum total of a user’s “insignificant” contributions become significant?

3. Who's responsible for keeping track of the paperwork? Is this procedure or policy?
5. Should we specify the project managers are responsible for developing specific procedures for contributing to their project?
6. Should the Software Contributions and Non-software Contributions sections be left to the TLC to determine?
7. Should the term "software project" be replaced with "mature software project" or something similar?