**October 2, 2014 OpenID Executive Committee Call Minutes**

**Present:**

Don Thibeau, Executive Director

Mike Jones

Nat Sakimura

John Bradley

Adam Dawes

**Visitors:**

John Ehrig, Global Inventures

Tom Smedinghoff, Edwards Wildman Palmer LLP

**Absent:**

George Fletcher

1. **Local Chapters Policy Proposal**

We reviewed the local chapters policy document that was circulated last year. Mike asked what classes of members it is intended to apply to. Nat said only sustaining members, but the document doesn’t say that. Mike asked why the revenue share number might be as high as 80%. John (as treasurer) suggested that he likes 50% better. Mike said that he could imagine going as high as 60%. John said that 50-50 sounds fair, especially since they’re getting a board seat. Tom also said that the language does not appear to give the OIDF clear rights to terminate the relationship. Nat will change “mutual termination” to “termination by either party”. Nat will revise the document accordingly and recirculate it.

1. **Liaison Statement**

We need to send the liaison statement to ISO prior to their meeting next week. Tony had OK’ed the statement on the thread. Nat will fill in the “Future Meetings” section with dates of the workshops before the IIWs. After that, Nat will ask Tony to send it.

1. **IPR Update**

There is an IPR dialog between the foundation and MIT. Microsoft lawyers who are experts in our IPR Policy are in conversation with Tom and Don on this. MIT has suggested IPR policy changes. Tom will be sending a response to MIT this week.

We will talk more about the IPR status in an upcoming executive committee or board meeting. Don and Tom are meeting with Mike, Tony, and Microsoft Standards IPR lawyers the week after next to discuss our current status and possible options.

[ Adam Dawes joined the call at this point ]

1. **OpenID Connect Self-Certification**

Don has created a draft workflow for self-certification and a proposed term sheet with Roland Hedberg and his university to create and deploy the conformance testing software. Don will also be visiting Microsoft, Google, and Symantec in the next few weeks and among other topics, will discuss certification with each of them. He has also already discussed it with John Bradley of Ping Identity.

We discussed the term sheet. The executive committee authorized Don to negotiate a contract on that basis.

Adam asked what will happen after the contract expires in late 2015 – particularly, who will run the conformance testing site. We agreed that we will want a new contract to continue running the site, but will work on that after the site is already working and in use.

1. **Voting Schedules, Tooling and Course of Action**

Don, John Ehrig, Mike, and Darin Richardson talked this week about ensuring that the membership databases are in sync and ready for the upcoming membership votes and election. John Ehrig has contacted all the corporate and sustaining representatives asking them to confirm that their contact data is correct. We will review the Web site support plan at the board meeting next month. Mike will prepare a report about the board election to occur in January for the upcoming board meeting.

1. **Working Group Status**

All the active working groups will be represented at the upcoming October 27th OpenID Workshop. Eve Maler of ForgeRock, Debbie Bucci, and others are also working on a charter for the proposed Health Information Exchange Profile working group, and are planning to complete chartering in time for the workshop.

1. **OpenID Connect Working Group**

Votes for the OpenID Connect errata and the OpenID 2.0 migration specification are scheduled to start on Friday, October 17th. The working group is working on preparing for self-certification.

1. **Account Chooser Working Group**

The Account Chooser working group is working on getting to an Implementer’s Draft. Terms used are being clarified. The working group may use .docx or another format supporting WYSIWYG editing and rich images as the authoritative specification format, rather than using xml2rfc, because of the need for graphical images in the specification.

1. **Native Applications Working Group**

There is increasing interest in the working group. Google is participating. The custom URL scheme communication methods have known downsides and alternatives are being considered.