Open Regulatory Compliance Working Group Steering Committee Meeting

Steering Committee | Minutes

Deliverable:	2026-07-02
Category:	Meeting Minutes
Owner:	Steering Committee
Status:	Yes Approved
License:	CC-BY-SA 4.0
Date:	2026-07-02

Open Regulatory Compliance Working Group Steering Committee Meeting

###

2 July, 2026

Agenda Topics	Moderator	Minutes
Approval of the minutes of the previous ORC Steering Committee call	Juan	2
ORC SC feedback document	Juan	30
Code and Compliance Fall 2026	Juan	10
CRA implementation status (Expert Group + Standardisation)	Juan & Dirk-Willem	10
AI Policy and Compliance SIG	Ciaran	5
AOB	Juan	3

Quorum - 50% of Representatives / >50% of Quorum Present for simple majority vote Quorum is 4 with 3 votes affirmative for simple majority

ATTENDEES

Steering Committee Members

- No Nokia: Timo Perala (Primary), Jonne Soininen (Alternate)
- No Huawei: Adrian O'Sullivan (Primary)
- No Red Hat: Roman Zhukov (Primary), Dave Russo (Alternate)
- [ ] Victor Roland, OBEO (Elected Participant)
- No Dirk-Willem van Gulik, Apache Software Foundation (Elected Foundation)
- [ ] Olle E. Johansson, OWASP Foundation (Elected Foundation) (Excused)

Eclipse Foundation Staff

- [ ] Sharon Corbett
- No Juan Rico
- No Gael Blondelle
- No Ciarán O'Riordan

MINUTES

Meeting Chair: Timo Perälä

Quorum:

Quorum reached at 16:02

Notes:

Approval of the minutes of the previous ORC Steering Committee call

- Minutes of the previous meeting are approved by the Steering Committee and will be made available in the public repository.

ORC SC feedback document

- The Eclipse Foundation thank the Steering Committee for the feedback document. To drive the discussion slides (attached below) were presented covering three main areas:
  - Strategic membership value and financial sustainability
    - Governance: Strategic members are provided with active roles on the Steering and Specification Committees. This includes the ability to align Working Group priorities with the Program Plan, define overall topic strategy.
    - Member Meetings: Following the commencement of structured H1 update meetings, the committee discussed the importance of these sessions.
    - Marketing and Events: The Foundation continues to support collaborative frameworks through contributed articles and communication activities. Strategic members also receive event tickets and retain influence over the events program.
    - Financial structure will improve by the addition of 2 new strategic members and the opportunities generated by the newly created AI Policy and Compliance SIG.

    - Also the Foundation is checking sponsorship opportunities and public funding available to support the development of WG activities.
- Planning
    - The EF has planned the staff according to the objectives set in the program plan and the availability of internal resources that can develop according to those objectives.
- Program plan
    - Institutional Engagement: While connection building is relatively fast, establishing deep trust with institutions remains a longer-term effort. Current status: The ADCO group is in its early stages; relationships with ENISA are focused on attestations and SBOMs (with discussions regarding their role in Code and Compliance); and vertical engagement is being utilized as a high-impact, low-resource communication tactic for partner recruitment.
    - Community Representation: The project continues to drive its pipeline through inbound website inquiries and established connections made at events.
    - Regulations & New Markets: There is a strategic priority to develop local chapters, which will help cultivate regional communities and better disseminate lessons learned.
    - FAQ Promotion: FAQ promotion resulted in over 23,000 visitors to date, it is planned to continue this work to promote also the ORC Learning Hub.

After the presentation the group discussed about several aspects listed below:

- The value perceived by strategic members is still very intangible and that is something that demands considerable efforts to be sold internally in their organisations.
- It was discussed the possibility of organising specific trainings as part of the value, this is very well aligned with the regular meetings implemented to support the strategic membership.
- It was proposed to create an asset to highlight the value generated by the ORC WG by its activities and impact generated, presenting the influential ability as a value of being a strategi member.
- It was discussed also the access to the institutions the Eclipse Foundation is in touch with, as well as early access to information.
- As Program Plan priorities it was discussed the contribution the WG should make to Standardisation activities, deprioritised during 2026 that should be discussed in the next weeks.
- As part of the discussion it was highlighted that the Program Plan is a living resource that the Steering Committee can modify and update.
- It was discussed the role of the FAQ and its maturity, as one of the key assets that can be used to increase the working group visibility.

During the Q2 review these topics will be revisited and analysed.

Code and Compliance Fall 2026

After evaluating the multiple events that are happening in the last part of the year it was presented that Code and Compliance will be happening on October 27th in Brussels. To make the Fall edition useful it was proposed to focus on industries that are using open source, but are not part of our communities. This target group is the type of organisation that can benefit the most from the work we are doing in ORC. FOSDEM edition will happen as well, and the focus will be the open source community. The Eclipse Foundation is reaching out to associations and institutions to start defining the program, with the support of the Steering Committee. The initial proposal includes four slots:

- Institutional presentations - sharing a view of the current state of play and regulatory challenges ahead of us.
- CRA oriented session, where we mainly focus on presenting the assets we have created and explain them to the participants.
- AI Act, the role of AI in demonstrating compliance, tooling and implications of integration of AI solutions.
- Open Cooperation, helps the target groups understand the way open source communities work and make an invitation to join us.

The proposal was well received by the Steering Committee.

CRA implementation status (Expert Group + Standardisation)

- Moved to email discussion

AI Policy and Compliance SIG

- Not covered

AOB

None

Adjournment

The meeting was closed at 17:07

Resolutions

- none

Supporting materials

Meeting presentation (attached below)

Eclipse ORC WG Steering Committee F2F feedback document (attached below)

Next Meeting

August 20th - 16.00 CEST ___________________________________

Eclipse ORC WG Steering Committee F2F

Brussels, 21 April 2026

Participants: Roman Zhukov, Dirk-Willem van Gulik, Dave Russo, Adrian O'Sullivan, Timo Perälä

We wanted to use the opportunity to meet F2F between the steering group members attending OCX. The idea was to discuss 2026 ORC Program and discuss what works well and what are the challenges the members observe. We hope this facilitates steering committee discussion to conclude on 2026 ORC Program review.

For reference, latest SC call presentation (Q1 2026 report): 2026-04-16-orcwg-sc-presentation.pdf and Notes.

1. Discussion on the value of Strategic Membership

- The membership base has grown, but the number of strategic members is not. This is seen as an issue, especially if ORC WG should become self-sustainable in 2027, or at least less dependent on Eclipse funding. Not reaching the level of self-sustainability (what is this, 100% or >50% of ORC funding from membership fees, or something else?) could jeopardize the ability of ORC to deliver according to membership's hopes and plans. We need discussion with Eclipse staff regarding the expectations and timeline for ORC self-sustainability.
- The value of strategic membership is questioned. We see many intangible benefits – awareness, showing thought leadership, etc. There's a sentiment we do not see enough tangible benefits, and this makes it a hard sell with the current strategic members to internally justify continuation on that membership level. We're worried about the potential domino effect should companies like Mercedes decide to quit as strategic member. Also, without proper tangible benefits it is harder to secure new strategic members.
- An example of a strategic member benefits an idea of a training program was brought up, training with an expanded experience to the strategic member companies (in-person, AMA, etc.) besides just publicly available.
- Another benefit could be strategic members getting x amount of tickets for free to the events (C&C, OCX) as part of membership.
- Expanding the scope of ORC WG beyond the CRA would show continued value of the WG. Being agile and tap on next things coming. NB, this is being addressed with establishing AI Policy and Compliance SIG. We need to closely follow other emerging topics (e.g, Sovereignty, DORA/NIS2 harmonization, Digital Omnibus, CAIDA, AI Standards, etc.) to make sure the scope of the ORC is current and compelling for members and community to keep supporting it.

2. Planning is challenging without visibility to resources

- ORC WG is quite dependent on Eclipse staff engagement and contribution. This is especially true in context of EC Expert Group and engagement with ESOs. However, visibility to the availability of and duration of the engagement of the staff members is not very clear to the members. Hence e.g. a question "Where's Marta and Mika?", as both had been visible and active in CRA standardisation but don't seem to be anymore. On the same token, clarification of the role of staff members is needed to make sure we understand covering policy things doesn't affect other priority topics. Overall, better visibility to allocation of staff resources would be good.

3. Comments on ORC Program Plan 2026 review

- Standardisation work: Strong sentiment that standardisation work shall be prioritised. Eclipse should establish good level of engagement with CEN/CLC to make sure they have a strong voice there. Overall, Eclipse should establish itself as an active player in standardisation as FOSS industry will be more and more regulated (specifically, in the AI era), whereby this engagement will need to happen somewhere anyway. Emphasising standardisation could lead to prioritization discussion - drop some activities if we feel there is no capacity to carry out what we have started or planned.
- Institutional engagement: Contributing to consultations and future regulations is valuable and very well perceived by the Commission. ORC is visible to the Commission and ENISA already (though we still don't have an early access to ENISA SRP which would be a good example of tangible benefits for strategic members), but not to national level agencies. Engaging with those bodies long-term is valuable. Can we expect Eclipse is a trusted proxy for members to get connected with MSAs, CSIRTs etc. We see no traction yet. Who is doing it, what is the plan? Policy Engagement Forum - give us more details, maybe we can postpone? Scoping question is here as well, can we keep up with all the initiatives in the program?
- Attestation and Due Diligence: We felt due diligence is not doing that great (not really green) yet, we are not at tipping point to see proper progress (white page syndrome still). Attestations and due diligence are market trend setters, to allow consultants and others to use it, but IT-industry is not clear yet how to apply or use it.
- ORC Community Representation (slide 9): What's the pipeline and how can members help/advocate to engage with new members? If prioritization is needed, emphasis shall be on growing membership base rather than putting effort in cooperating with other foundations. Related to prioritization and resourcing, working with verticals and industries - how much time/effort does it take?
- Role Matrix (slide 10): How to make sure we (members) contribute actual engineering work? We're suggesting doing more workshops on priority areas. It will also help to attract more community members to participate, once they see clear benefits in the planned outcomes (communicate the user story: "as a manufacturer who employs FOSS maintainers I'd like to reduce work duplications and make sure due diligence is simplified...") and "lead by example".
- Outside of program plan: Should we start preparing for CRA-2, i.e. an update of the CRA, for which there are rumors? Should we expand our radar screen to cover policy actions outside of EU, in USA, China, India, etc. so that we emerge into true international collaboration with extended value for participants across the globe ?
- Last comment, to end with positive note: FAQ is visible and potentially beneficial reference to our members/customers. Everyone agrees it's awesome. We just need to make sure we have a solid promotion plan for it (more references from the EU Commission, campaign, workshops/webinars how to use it, etc.).