

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
highlights general information about LF Edge Foundation. Such as: hosted projects, membership structure, governance structure	0 - About LF Edge Foundation					
Contains themes of core values, mission, vision, goal, membership structure of the LF Edge Foundation	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information				
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	core value	an umbrella of very diverse use cases		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	core value	looking at differences and sorting it out		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	establishment - january 2019			
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	focus			
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Founding members - count			
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Founding members - name	IBM		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Founding members - name	Intel		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Goal	consider projects which will fill the gaps in the landscape		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Goal	create a single framework for edge computing		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Goal of LF Edge (based on TAC members views)	build better together edge solutions of well integrated OS edge		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Goal of LF Edge (based on TAC members views)	Help market the importance of OS edge projects		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	Goal of LF Edge (based on TAC members views)	incubate open source edge technology		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	membership structure	associate members		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	membership structure	rights of general members		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	membership structure	rights of premium members		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	create a unified community for OS Edge	accelerate adoption and innovation	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	create a unified community for OS Edge	deliver value to end users by providing a hub	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	create a unified community for OS Edge	facilitate harmonization across Edge projects	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	create a unified community for OS Edge	foster cross-industry collaboration	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	create a unified community for OS Edge	unified community / cross industry collaboration	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	encourage open standards for industry		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	raise funds		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	mission	spend funds on OSS projects related to edge		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	markets / industries to reach	automotive	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	markets / industries to reach	commerce	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	markets / industries to reach	energy (oil and gas)	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	markets / industries to reach	fleet / transportation	

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	markets / industries to reach	homes	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	markets / industries to reach	Industrial manufacturing	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Background Information	vision	supply necessary building blocks for Edge platforms		
Contains themes of governing board, overview of committees	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance				
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	members		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	adopt and maintain rules and procedures	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	approving projects	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	budget approval	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	establish ad-hoc committees when necessary	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	nominate and elect officers	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	oversee of the business and outreach matters	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	governing board	responsibilities	promote the projects and foundation	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	LF Edge Marketing	raise the visibility of the LF Edge mission statement		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	other committees	budget committee		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	other committees	legal committee		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	other committees	outreach committee		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	other committees	TAC		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	Project development	development process of projects	developers	on payroll of member companies
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	Project development	development process of projects	role of Linux Foundation	doesn't involve in code development process
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	Project development	development process of projects	role of Linux Foundation	involves in roadmap synronisation
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	Project development	development process of projects	tools	Github
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	Project development	development process of projects	tools	Slack
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Governance	Project development	Project lifecycle - maturity levels		
Contains subthemes of project development process, background of grounding projects, project stages	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects				
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	5 founding projects	Akraino Edge Stack		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	5 founding projects	EdgeX Foundry		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	5 founding projects	HomeEdge - Samsung		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	5 founding projects	Open Glossary of Edge Computing		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	5 founding projects	Project EVE		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	access to resources	stage 1	less budget allocation	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	access to resources	stage 2	secondary importance	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	access to resources	stage 3	in focus of LF Edge Marketing	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	access to resources	stage 3	more access to resources	

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	general structure	have their own governance - autonomy		
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	general structure	Project Technical Charters	approved by project TSCs	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	general structure	Project Technical Charters	empower the TSCs for project decisions	
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	general structure	steering committee of projects	roles	technical oversight of each technical project
	0 - About LF Edge Foundation	Projects	general structure	transparency		
highlights information about the background of the interviewees	Interviewee Info					
	Interviewee Info	previous experience	DELL	Open Daylight		
	Interviewee Info	responsibility	LF Edge - TAC			
	Interviewee Info	responsibility	running documentation working group			
	Interviewee Info	responsibility	software networking			
	Interviewee Info	tenure	6 years			
	Interviewee Info	work place	IBM			
	Interviewee Info	work place	Linux Foundation			
Highlights the reasons for collaboration considering with subthemes of: competition, productivity and innovation, reputation and revenue	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium					
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Competition	Getting competitive advantage	being the leader in the market		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Competition	Getting competitive advantage	creating - influencing the market		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Competition	peer pressure - other companies engagement			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Competition	setting open standards across the industry			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	be part of the innovation - dont miss the opportunity			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	getting the support of a community			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	having more secure code			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	increasing speed of innovation	low speed of innovation of proprietary software developers		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	increasing speed of innovation	using generic features in software base		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	increasing speed of innovation	using open governance, open standards, open source		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	increasing speed of innovation	using the same framework for interoperate and test		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	increasing speed of innovation			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	reaching diversity of adopters and viewpoints	diversity of organizations		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	reaching talent globally			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	solve common problems	saving by working together on undifferentiated software		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	solve common problems	work on generic features		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Productivity and Innovation	solve common problems			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Reputation	getting recognition from other companies working in the foundat			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Revenue	cost efficiency - economic advantage of OS			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Revenue	having more options - control over the software	preventing vendor lock-in		
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Revenue	having more options - control over the software			
	1 - Reasons for collaboration - involvement in consortium	Revenue	using open source as on-ramp for their products			
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	benefits of being LF members	event benefits			
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	benefits of being LF members	legal mentorship			
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	benefits of being LF members	marketing benefits			
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	benefits of being LF members	training			
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	have sub-foundations - directed funds	have projects	has a community of developers		
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	have sub-foundations - directed funds	operate independently			
	2 - reasons for joining an umbrella foundation	sharing the same goal with the foundation and other members				
highlights problems and and their solutions experienced in the LF Edge Foundation	3 - problems & solutions					
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-1 - sustaining financial continuity	Sub-Prob: funding depends on membership fees		
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-1 - sustaining financial continuity	Sub-Prob: need for new projects to increase funding	plug the gaps in the market	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-1 - sustaining financial continuity	Sub-Prob: need for new projects to increase funding		
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-1 - sustaining financial continuity	Sol S-1.1 - convince companies to get more involved		
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-1 - sustaining financial continuity	Sol S-1.1 - convince companies to get more involved		
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-1 - sustaining financial continuity	Sol S-1.2 - attracting more members to share the load		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage			
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.1 - Explaining the benefits of involvement	saves time to develop common non-differentiating software	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.1 - Explaining the benefits of involvement	cost saving	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.1 - Explaining the benefits of involvement	showing them working examples	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.1 - Explaining the benefits of involvement	innovation bring value	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.2 - Training	legal courses	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.2 - Training	about open source	
	3 - problems & solutions	S - Sustainability	Pr S-2 - Persuading decision makers to engage	Sol S-2.3 - peer presure		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem			
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sub-Prob: inefficient use of resources		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sub-Prob: computing each other		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.1 - collaborate with each other		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.1 - changing mindset, promoting collaboration		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.2 - focus on distinctive solutions different from other projec		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.2 - try to harmonize potential areas		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.2 - TAC / Subgroup - find overlaps between projects		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.2 - TAC / Subgroup - find overlaps between projects	overlaps in Foglamp and EdgeX Foundry	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-1 - overlapping projects - offering for the same problem	Sol P-1.2 - TAC / Subgroup - find overlaps between projects	sub group evaluation	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-2 - absence of end-user insights in the foundation			
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-2 - absence of end-user insights in the foundation	Sol P-2.1 - talking with end users		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-2 - absence of end-user insights in the foundation	Sol P-2.2 - going to where end customers are (user-led OS consortia)		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-2 - absence of end-user insights in the foundation	Sol P-2.1 - Launch of End User Solution Group		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-2 - absence of end-user insights in the foundation	Sol P-2.1 - Launch of End User Solution Group	first priority identifying verticals to create groups around	

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sub-Prob: being too diverse		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sol P-3.2 - Cross-Project white paper	define similarities and differences between projects	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sol P-3.2 - Cross-Project white paper	what is the value of participating in WG	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sol P-3.2 - Cross-Project white paper	mapping projects with use cases	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sol P-3.1 - TAC Architecture Working Group	harmonizing and evangelising across projects	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sol P-3.3 - Open Edge Services Catalog	creation and cross-project support	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-3 - absence of commonality between projects	Sol P-3.3 - catalog of edge based services	create something of value across all the projects	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers			
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.1 - looking enterprise developer market		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.2 - targeting developers who create their own projects		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.3 - creating mentorship and internship opportunities		
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.3 - LF Expanded Mentorship Program	timeline: July 2020 - June 2021	
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.3 - LF Expanded Mentorship Program	goal: helping developers new to open source	connect with experts and employers
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.3 - LF Expanded Mentorship Program	goal: helping developers new to open source	experiment, learn, and contribute to open source communities
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.3 - LF Expanded Mentorship Program	goal: helping developers new to open source	Open Horizon - Mentorship program
	3 - problems & solutions	P - Efficiency and productivity	Pr P-4 - reaching (having) a diversity of developers	Sol P-4.4 - Hackathon Events [EdgeX Foundry]		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-1 - concerns about political influence on stage upgrades			
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-1 - concerns about political influence on stage upgrades	Sol G-1.1 - use the same criteria to evaluate projects		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-1 - concerns about political influence on stage upgrades	Sol G-1.2 - discuss it with other community members		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-2 - disagreement about voting rights of organizations			
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-2 - disagreement about voting rights of organizations	Sol G-2.2 - agreement on new rules		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-2 - disagreement about voting rights of organizations	Sol G-2.1 - compromise by giving up some privileges		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sub-Prob: difficult to apply stage 3 criteria to an umbrella projec		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sub-Prob: Having vague criteria for Stage 3		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sol G-3.2 - having a shared understanding of the processes		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sol G-3.2 - revisit the set criteria based on feedback - discussions		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sol G-3.2 - needs to be updates with lessons learned		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sol G-3.1 - Create a volunteer team to develop the PLD		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sol G-3.1 - Decide about the criteria to measure potential projects		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sub-Prob: how to apply overall rules to unique project settings?		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-3 - Disagreement about project lifecycle criteria	Sub-Prob: ambiguous information		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sub-Prob: not focusing on the same conferences		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sub-Prob: Unbalanced size of companies - need more startup		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sub-Prob: Unbalanced size of companies - need more startup	prob: budget allocation was not good enough	
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sol G-4.4 - Balancing startups and big players - having 50-50.		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sol G-4.4 - Balancing startups and big players - having 50-50.	big companies: put more reseources	
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sol G-4.4 - Balancing startups and big players - having 50-50.	startups: move faster	
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sol G-4.3 - relationship building, alignment, promoting collaboration		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sol G-4.2 - Convince other members about the benefits of changes		
	3 - problems & solutions	G - Governance	Pr G-4 - imbalance among expectations of members	Sol G-4.1 - being transparent about reasonings		
highlights information about the best practices applied in LF Edge Foundation. This contains subthemes of empowering governance, increasing efficiency and productivity, and ensuring sustainability	4 - Good practice					
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-2 - mitigating legal conflict	G-2.1 - following anti-trust policies	not to talk about market differentiation	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-2 - mitigating legal conflict	G-2.1 - following anti-trust policies	not to talk about pricing	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-2 - mitigating legal conflict	G-2.1 - following anti-trust policies	not to talk about products	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-3 - empowering dialog among members	G-3.1 - allow people to discuss issues and understand the root of it		
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-3 - empowering dialog among members	G-3.2 - Organizing face-to-face meetings	let people know each other	

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-3 - empowering dialog among members	G-3.2 - Organizing face-to-face meetings	[Akraio Team - EdgeX]	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.1 - having set governance documents	having a bounding charter - bylaws	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.1 - having set governance documents	having the membership conditions explained on the charter	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.3 - managing community meetings professionally	documentation (recording -meeting minutes)	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.3 - managing community meetings professionally	focus on solutions rather than people	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.3 - managing community meetings professionally	having professional program managers	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.3 - managing community meetings professionally	leading the meetings in a professional manner	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.2 - seperating responsibilities of board from the tech. community	Organizational level : Governing Board	gives the final decision
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.2 - seperating responsibilities of board from the tech. community	Organizational level : Governing Board	have representatives from majority of members
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-1- mitigating management conflicts	G-1.2 - seperating responsibilities of board from the tech. community	Technical Level: Technical Steering Committee	The board of directors
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-4 - guiding members	G-4.1 - creating guidelines		
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	G-4 - guiding members	G-4.2 - revisit the set criteria periodically (e.g. once a year)		
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	P-4 - focusing specific topics in depth	P-4.2 - reviewing processes - continuously improving	asking community (via survey) to improve LF Edge	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	P-4 - focusing specific topics in depth	P-4.1 - establishing subgroups	subgroup formed to review proposal	
	4 - Good practice	G-Empowering governance	P-4 - focusing specific topics in depth	P-4.1 - establishing subgroups	subgroup formed to draft Annual Review Process	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-1- enhancing cross-project collaboration	P-1.1 - LF to initiate a subgroup to clarify integration process		
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-1- enhancing cross-project collaboration	P-1.2 - Cross-Project demo(s)	show how projects fit together	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-2 - align joint efforts with other foundations	P-2.1 - assigning rep. to represent the group in other LF units	represent LF Edge TAC	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-2 - align joint efforts with other foundations	P-2.2 - inviting rep. from other groups		
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-2 - align joint efforts with other foundations	P-2.1 - assigning rep. to represent the group in other LF units	starting with LF AI meetings	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-3 - sharing knowledge and experience	P-3.1 - experience sharing between projects	rules and governance structure	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-3 - sharing knowledge and experience	P-3.1 - experience sharing between projects	what worked and didn't work - reasons	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-3 - sharing knowledge and experience	P-3.1 - experience sharing between projects		
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-3 - sharing knowledge and experience	P-3.3 - Mentoring candidate projects		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-3 - sharing knowledge and experience	P-3.2 - Mentoring current projects as TAC members		
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-5 - sharing resources	P-5.1 - shared community lab	open to donations from community-participants	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-5 - sharing resources	P-5.1 - shared community lab	processes	request process
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-5 - sharing resources	P-5.1 - shared community lab	processes	request review
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-5 - sharing resources	P-5.1 - shared community lab	provides hardware resources to the Akraino	
	4 - Good practice	P-Increasing Efficiency and Productivity	P-5 - sharing resources	P-5.1 - shared community lab	transferred from Akraino project to LF Edge	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.1 - creating a project taxonomy	developing an overview about the projects	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.1 - creating a project taxonomy	show candidate projects the gaps and opportunities	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.1 - creating a project taxonomy	show the overlapping areas of existing projects	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	collected market's pain points - work with industry associatons	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	generated additional contributors	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	in numbers	100 days
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	in numbers	173K voters
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	in numbers	2 Solution tracks: Commerce and Industrial
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	in numbers	40 Teams
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	keep the community warm with training and Q&A sessions	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	match-making sessions	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	partner with influential partners & communities	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.4 - EdgeX Challenge - Event Contributions	use of social media to get attention	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.2 - LF Edge publications	Akraino Edge Stack APIs	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.3 - Annual report	Sharpening the Edge: Overview of the LF Edge Taxonomy...	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-2 - expanding outreach	S-2.2 - LF Edge publications	Presenting LF Edge projects and vision - white paper	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.4 - ensuring independence of projects (avoid domination of one or two org)		
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.1 - checklist for self evaluation	best practice guide	for new and existing LF Edge Projects

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.1 - checklist for self evaluation	best practice guide	need for community support
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.1 - checklist for self evaluation	best practice guide	to define/refine/enhance their Project Management
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.1 - checklist for self evaluation	best practice guide	updates
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.1 - checklist for self evaluation	Getting started checklist	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	automated vulnerability scanning & PEN testing	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	Complete the CII Best Practices security panel questions	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	generate reports regularly	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	having a security subcommittee	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	having a threat model	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	Identify SIR team to read and act on reported vulnerabilities	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	provide an email address for public reports about vulnerabiliti	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.3 - facilitating projects to address security issues	providing a security guidance	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.2 - having annual project review cycles	ensure that projects are on track	
	4 - Good practice	S-Ensuring Sustainability	S-1- improving projects' health	S-1.2 - having annual project review cycles	once a year	
	Governance actors					
Highlights information about Technical Advisory Council of LF Edge Foundation. It contains subthemes of chair election, charter principles, structure, responsibilities, focus areas	About TAC					
	5 - About TAC	chair election	chair role	enable a smoth running TAC		
	5 - About TAC	chair election	chair role	meeting planning, prep, execution		
	5 - About TAC	chair election	chair role	provides updates to the Board		
	5 - About TAC	chair election	for 2020	process		
	5 - About TAC	chair election	for 2021	process		
	5 - About TAC	chair election	for 2022	process		
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	being an open and welcoming community			
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	Being project-centric			
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	goal is helping projects			
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	No Kingmakers			
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	Not a standards body			
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	Projects are self-governing			

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	5 - About TAC	Charter - Principles	Projects increase the value to the community			
	5 - About TAC	creating a vice-chair role - 2021	process			
	5 - About TAC	creating a vice-chair role - 2021	reason	back up		
	5 - About TAC	creating a vice-chair role - 2021	reason	useful for two people discussing issues		
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	APIs			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	Architecture	Expected Output: White paper	create a sub-group with cross project coll	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	Architecture	Expected Output: White paper	discussion about what expected to achieve with the white paper	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	Consortiums expansion			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	cross project collaboration	Collaboration in Edge market		
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	cross project collaboration	create a Sub-group	set up a mail list, ask for volunteers, set kick-off w. doodle	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	cross project collaboration	discussion about how to start		
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	cross project collaboration	need for harmonization		
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	cross project collaboration	overlapping projects	EdgeX and Fledge	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	cross project collaboration			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	forcing function - use case and deployment	demo across all projects	start with a deadline, call for participants	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	IT efficiencies			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	PLD Project Review			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2020 - areas to direct funds	technical overlap / unification			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	first gathering feedback for the v1	unsuccessful about gathering feedback
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	include outreach committee to the discussion	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	questions about goal	audience?
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	questions about goal	general or specific?
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	questions about goal	LF Edge level or project level?
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	questions about goal	post publishing - success metrixs
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	questions about goal	post publishing - vehicle for feedback?
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	they have cross-cutting concerns	API white paper
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	they have cross-cutting concerns	security white paper
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	content suggestion	vertical use case stories	

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Cross-project white paper v2	if goal: create something of value across all the projects	catalog of edge based services	
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Document APIs for all the projects			
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Open Edge Services Catalog	creation and cross-project support		
	5 - About TAC	focus areas - 2021	Use Cases and Deployments	require commitment from the TAC		
	5 - About TAC	out of scope for TAC - 2020	vertical solutions			
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	creating project lifecycle document			
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	decide about the acceptance of new projects			
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	discuss project status			
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	facilitate communication and collaboration	forum for communication and transparency		
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	inform the board about potential overlap			
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	propose changes (regarding to Charter) to the Governing board			
	5 - About TAC	responsibility	relates budget requests from Projects			
	5 - About TAC	structure	meeting frequency	bi-weekly starting from 18 December 2019		
	5 - About TAC	structure	meeting frequency	weekly until December 2019		
	5 - About TAC	structure	need to work as a cohesive team			
	5 - About TAC	structure	participants	LF Edge Developer Advocate		
highlights information about the subgroups or working groups of LF Edge Foundation	Subgroups - Working groups					
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Southbound Device Connectivity - Subgroup	concern: a few of the Projects have different implementations			
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Southbound Device Connectivity - Subgroup	discussion about collaboration - how to do it			
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Southbound Device Connectivity - Subgroup	no agreement about collaboration areas			
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Southbound Device Connectivity - Subgroup				
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	Annual Review process for PLD		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	develop initial draft of the changes/updates to present in TAC		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	PLD - process updates to consider for refinement		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	PLD - Stage 3 Criteria review - refinement	criteria are vague	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	PLD - Stage 3 Criteria review - refinement	Sug: a survey to TAC members to better understand their expectations	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	PLD - Stage 3 Criteria review - refinement		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	PLD clarification		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	Project Review - Due Dilligence Guidelines		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	proposing changes	on project taxonomy	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	focus	review new project proposals before TAC		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	structure	have a member from each LF Edge projects		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	structure	mail list for interested participants		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC - sub-group	volunteer project representatives			
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	0 - Goal	Architecture - White paper		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	0 - Goal	Cross project collaboration	harmonizing and evangelising across projects	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	need a WG chair to drive work	Working group chair election	elected chair
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	participants	need representatives from each projects	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	participants	representatives should have technical knowledge	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	projects involvement	all projects are requested to be present on upcoming meeting	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	projects involvement	representations of projects	Akraino
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	projects involvement	representations of projects	Baetyl
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	projects involvement	representations of projects	Fledge
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	1 - Structure	projects involvement	representations of projects	Project EVE
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	2 - Administrative	decision about upcoming meetings	through doodle poll	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	2 - Administrative	kick off meeting date: 26 november 2019		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	2 - Administrative	participation	through email list	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	Akraino BP	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	EdgeX + EVE	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	EdgeX + Home Edge	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	every TAC member should explain the differences between project	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	Fledge + EVE	Industrial use case - FLIR Camera demo
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	Mobiledgex + Futurewei	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	Mobiledgex + Redisedge	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	Open Horizon + Home Edge	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project demo(s) for ONES in Los Angeles - April 2020	show how projects fit together	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	achievements	edge definitions

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	achievements	harmonized taxonomy - contribution projects
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	achievements	market verticals defined
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	achievements	service provider edge and user edge
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	achievements	wiki links with cross project collaboration
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	administrative	process: technical writer -- creative services -- publishing
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	administrative	targeted deadline - ONES - 20 April
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	goal	define similarities and differences between projects
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	goal	what is the value of participating in WG
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	mapping projects with use cases	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	more targeted to a technical director	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	Cross-Project white paper	publication link	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	3 - Action items	LF Edge API - white paper	administrative	targeted deadline - end of 2020
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	TAC Architecture Working Group	4 - reporting to TAC	report out results to TAC weekly		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	Charter		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	expected result: provide value to Project roadmaps - features		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	focus: End users of LF Edge projects		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	goal: gather common understanding of User requirements	provide end user perspective on value and usability	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	goal: gather common understanding of User requirements	understand areas of concern	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	goal: gather common understanding of User requirements		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	participants - members	individuals at end-user organizations	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	participants - members	members: 2 from End user company or 1 from industry expert comp	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	End User Solution Groups	participants - members	technical representatives from LF Edge projects	
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	kick off event	goal: educate LF Edge community to meet end user needs		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	kick off event	launching LF Edge End user community		
	6 - Subgroups - Working groups	Vertical Solutions - End User Community	providing a platform for end users of LF Edge Projects			
Highlights information about the activities of LF Edge Outreach Committee	Outreach committee					
	7 - Outreach committee	digital media	LF Edge YouTube channel			

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	7 - Outreach committee	digital media	LF edX Course - Edge computing			
	7 - Outreach committee	digital media				
	7 - Outreach committee	Events				
	7 - Outreach committee	marketing discussions				
	7 - Outreach committee	Webinar series	LF Edge Webinar series			
	7 - Outreach committee	white papers				
highlights information about the Strategic Planning Committee of LF Edge Foundation	Strategic planning committee (SPC)					
	8 - Strategic planning committee (SPC)	have an attachment to projects				
	8 - Strategic planning committee (SPC)	have some level of commitment				
	8 - Strategic planning committee (SPC)	prioritize potential projects				
	8 - Strategic planning committee (SPC)	Special projects				
	8 - Strategic planning committee (SPC)	Stage 1 project final approval				
highlights structure and processes of Community Lab of LF Edge Foundation	Community Lab - LF Edge Lab					
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	Acceptable Usage Policy				
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	budget approval request				
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	equipment purchase request				
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	hardware request of Projekt EVE - FLEDGE	discussion			
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	hardware request of Projekt EVE - FLEDGE	voting process			
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	Preparing - Subcommittee Charter				
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	Subcommittee of TAC	Oversee operation of LF Edge Shared Community Lab			
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab	Subcommittee of TAC	processes			
	9 - Community Lab - LF Edge Lab					
highlights information about the discussed events during TAC calls	Event news					
	Event news	CFP Panel				
	Event news	Decision Board Meeting	2019 - April			
	Event news	EdgeX Meetup - 2019				
	Event news	Embedded Linux Conference 2019				
	Event news	Gitee - China	large LF Edge developer community in China			
	Event news	Gitee - China	Lessons Learned			
	Event news	Gitee - China	they use Gitee instead of Github			
	Event news	Gitee - China	updates in Github mirrored to Gitee			
	Event news	Hannover Messe				
	Event news	IoT Evolution Expo - 2019				
	Event news	IoT Meetup Shanghai - 2019				

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Event news	IoT Tech Expo				
	Event news	IoT Tech Expo Europe 2019				
	Event news	IoT World Santa Clara				
	Event news	KubeCon + CloudNativeCon				
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Administrative	date: 20 - 21 April 2020		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Administrative	Need for a Planning Team (Volunteers)		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Administrative	Projects need to decide whether to be present or not		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Administrative	sponsorship?		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Goal of the event	Awareness?		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Goal of the event	Education?		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Goal of the event	Plugfest?		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Target audience	developers engaged in LF Edge Projects?		
	Event news	LF - ONES Developer Event	Target audience	Internal or open to everybody?		
	Event news	LF Edge mini summit at OSSEU				
	Event news	LF Edge mini summit at OSSNA				
	Event news	Meetup Program	structure			
	Event news	ONS				
	Event news	Open Networking Summit Europe - 2019				
	Event news	Open Networking Summit Europe - 2019				
	Event news	Open Source Community Event - 2019				
	Event news	Open Source Summit China - 2019				
	Event news	Open Source Summit Europe - 2019				
	Event news	Open Source Summit Japan - 2019				
	Event news	OSSNA				
highlights information about services of Linux Foundation discussed during TAC meetings	Linux Foundation					
	Linux Foundation	CII Best practices badge	benefits			
	Linux Foundation	CII Best practices badge	identifies a set of best practices for OSS projects			
	Linux Foundation	CII Best practices badge	structure			
	Linux Foundation	Inclusive Language Initiative	goal	define processes to move harmful language from projects		
	Linux Foundation	Inclusive Language Initiative	members	IBM		
	Linux Foundation	Inclusive Language Initiative	members	Kubernetes Naming WG		
	Linux Foundation	Inclusive Language Initiative	members	LF Networking		
	Linux Foundation	Inclusive Language Initiative	members	RedHat		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Linux Foundation	Inclusive Language Initiative	mission	remove harmful and unclear language from projects		
	Linux Foundation	LF Community Bridge Insights				
	Linux Foundation	LF IT support summaries				
Highlights information about project events discussed during the TAC meetings	Project Events					
	Project Events	Akraino Edge Stack New York City Event				
	Project Events	Akraino MEC Hackathon				
	Project Events	Akraino Release 1 Celebration				
	Project Events	Akraino Summit				
	Project Events	Akraino technical meetings				
	Project Events	Akraino Technical Mini-Summit				
	Project Events	EdgeX Phoenix Technical Meeting				
highlights information about the general project lifecycle processes for projects	Project lifecycle					
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	determine whether projects are in accurate lifecycle		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	evaluation against the stage criteria		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	if they are out of place --> TAC shall provide guidance		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	opportunities around complimentary synergy		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	provide a Project Health Assessment	a quantifiable review against their current Stage expectations	
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	recommendations to address project stage level expectations		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	set actions for projects to be moved to Emeritus status		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	goal	understand project roadmap and provide required resources		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	proposed annual review process			
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	review schedule - frequency	12 months from the last TAC review date		
	Project lifecycle	annual review process	subgroup formed to draft Annual Review Process	volunteers		
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2020	Akraino			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2020	Baetyl			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2020	EdgeX foundry			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2020	Home Edge			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2020	Project EVE			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2020	State of the Edge (SOTE)			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2021	Akraino R5			

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation						
Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2021	Fledge			
	Project lifecycle	Annual reviews - 2021	SDO			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	Akraino			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	Baetly			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	EdgeX Foundry			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	EVE			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	Fledge			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	Kuiper			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	Open horizon			
	Project lifecycle	annual reviews - 2022	SDO			
	Project lifecycle	Documentation process	being approved by TAC			
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	Create a volunteer team to develop the PLD			
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	Decide about the criteria to measure potential projects			
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	documentation of PLD			
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	documentation of PLD			
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	documentation of PLD			
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	needs to be updates with lessons learned	update request is rejected by TAC in 2019		
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	project induction guidelines	ecosystem and LF Edge impact		
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	project induction guidelines	Perception and positioning		
	Project lifecycle document	Documentation process	project induction guidelines	Project value proposition		
	Project lifecycle document	evaluation criteria	evaluate the overlap			
	Project lifecycle document	evaluation criteria	evaluation of mission fit with the LF Edge			
	Project lifecycle document	evaluation criteria	functionality mapping			
	Project lifecycle document	evaluation criteria	incubation and demo review			
	Project lifecycle document	new project proposals	1 - considered under stage 1			
	Project lifecycle document	new project proposals	2- a new TAC subgroup will review proposals			
	Project lifecycle document	new project proposals	3- the recommendation of sub group, TAC consider the project			
	Project lifecycle document	new project proposals	4- decision process for TAC review - 4 weeks			
	Project lifecycle document	new project proposals	5 - two members of TAC should second the project for voting			
	Project lifecycle document	new project proposals	invitation for 2, time for presentation for 1			
	Project lifecycle document	voting process	in case of decline	work on next steps		
highlights information about candidate and hosted projects in the LF Edge foundation	Projects					

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Akraino	alignment with LF Edge Goals	cannot mandate Akraino to any LF Edge project		
	Projects	Akraino	alignment with LF Edge Goals	charter approved by LF Edge Board		
	Projects	Akraino	alignment with LF Edge Goals	encourage LF Edge projects to participate with Akraino Projects		
	Projects	Akraino	allow multiple blueprints for the same use case	doesn't have one code core base - it is use case driven		
	Projects	Akraino	allow multiple blueprints for the same use case	offers a platform - multiple vendors build together solutions		
	Projects	Akraino	allow multiple blueprints for the same use case	since one solution does not fit all edge use cases		
	Projects	Akraino	allow multiple blueprints for the same use case			
	Projects	Akraino	being an umbrella project			
	Projects	Akraino	community	100 committers		
	Projects	Akraino	community	20 companies		
	Projects	Akraino	community	65% of LF Edge members		
	Projects	Akraino	discussion about not filling the criteria	concern about publicly known end-user deployments		
	Projects	Akraino	discussion about not filling the criteria	concerns about integration		
	Projects	Akraino	discussion about not filling the criteria	concerns about interoperability		
	Projects	Akraino	discussion about not filling the criteria	concerns about release policy		
	Projects	Akraino	discussion about not filling the criteria	concerns about stages of blueprints		
	Projects	Akraino	ensuring quality of the blueprint			
	Projects	Akraino	its usefulness to other LF Edge projects	can integrate other projects		
	Projects	Akraino	its usefulness to other LF Edge projects	cannot mandate Akraino to any LF Edge Projects		
	Projects	Akraino	its usefulness to other LF Edge projects	complementary to other LF Edge and OS projects		
	Projects	Akraino	its usefulness to other LF Edge projects	delivery of Edge Stack		
	Projects	Akraino	its usefulness to other LF Edge projects	LF Edge projects can use blueprints or submit new blueprints		
	Projects	Akraino	its usefulness to other LF Edge projects	multiple layers to an Edge Stack		
	Projects	Akraino	mission	create end to end configuration for particular Edge Use case		
	Projects	Akraino	mission	develop projects to support such end to end configuration		
	Projects	Akraino	mission	encourage vendors and other communities to validate Edge app		
	Projects	Akraino	mission	standardize edge APIs		
	Projects	Akraino	motion to promote project to stage 3	accepted by Governing Board		
	Projects	Akraino	motion to promote project to stage 3	accepted by TAC- 30 Oct 2019 - due to voting rights change		
	Projects	Akraino	motion to promote project to stage 3	denied by TAC - 23 Oct 2019		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Akraino	no duplication with other LF edge projects			
	Projects	Akraino	projects graduation in Akraino			
	Projects	Akraino	publicly documented release cycle	project metrics		
	Projects	Akraino	publicly documented release cycle	six-month release cycle - open to all members to see		
	Projects	Akraino	Stage 3 consideration			
	Projects	Akraino	targeted to address	Enterprise		
	Projects	Akraino	targeted to address	Industrial IoT use cases		
	Projects	Akraino	targeted to address	Telco		
	Projects	Akraino	targeted to address			
	Projects	Akraino	Vote accepted to consider to move Akraino Stage3			
	Projects	Akraino				
	Projects	API Mapping Tool	Akraino uses Mindmanager			
	Projects	API Mapping Tool	can help minimize duplication of functionality			
	Projects	API Mapping Tool	opportunity for usage in LF Edge Projects			
	Projects	API Mapping Tool	provide semantics			
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	accepted: stage 1		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	commercial support	AI and Data Analysis	
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	contributors	Baidu	
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	function		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	decision will be TACs	subgroup review
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	decision will be TACs	voting process
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	differences between EdgeX	focus on industrial markets
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	differences between EdgeX	FogLAMP has a control function
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	discussion about being in stage 2	does it fill the criteria for stage 1
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	discussion about being in stage 2	potential overlap with EdgeX foundry
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested	discussion about being in stage 2	unease between TAC members about the stage of the project
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	initially stage 2 requested		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	open source code	infrastructure	
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	Baidu Open Edge	open source code	OS layer and orchestration and remote management	
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	combination of Edge and Cloud Native	Application with multiple services		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	combination of Edge and Cloud Native	support edge cluster		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	combination of Edge and Cloud Native	unify management		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	integration with EdgeX			
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	parts and use cases	cloud-edge sync protocol		
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	parts and use cases	self-updatable model		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Baetyl 2.0	parts and use cases	use case: a remote management system		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	goal	increase contributors		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	goal	increase user base		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Jakarta - release 2.1. planning	emphasis on expanded testing		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Jakarta - release 2.1. planning	long term support release		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Jakarta - release 2.1. planning	semi-annual roadmap		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Jakarta - release 2.1. planning	stabilization release		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Needs Lf help for Arm64 builds	Asked help from Akraino	Akraino need the approval of Akraino TSC	
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Release version 1.0	highlights		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Release version 1.0	key features		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Release version 2.0 (Ireland)	significant new features		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	roadmap			
	Projects	Edge X foundry	Stage 3			
	Projects	Edge X foundry	TSC members	Beechwoods		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	TSC members	Canonical		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	TSC members	Dell		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	TSC members	IBM		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	TSC members	IOTech		
	Projects	Edge X foundry	TSC members	VMWare		
	Projects	Edge X foundry				
	Projects	ETSI-MEC	state			
	Projects	EVE - Edge Virtualization Engine	Project EVE			
	Projects	Project E	deploys containers, virtual machines, bear applications			
	Projects	Fledge	contributor companies	Google		
	Projects	Fledge	contributor companies	HarperDB		
	Projects	Fledge	contributor companies	Industrial systems integrator		
	Projects	Fledge	contributor companies	Nexcomm		
	Projects	Fledge	contributor companies	Others		
	Projects	Fledge	FogLAMP	stage 2 requested	a subgroup reviewed the project	
	Projects	Fledge	FogLAMP	stage 2 requested	officially accepted as Stage 1 Project	
	Projects	Fledge	FogLAMP	stage 2 requested	voting progress begin	
	Projects	Fledge	Stage 3 proposal			
	Projects	Fledge	Stage 3 proposal			
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	advancements after recommendation meeting	attended EdgeX foundry meeting to discuss collaboration options	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	advancements after recommendation meeting	gained new contributors	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	advancements after recommendation meeting	started regular TSC calls	

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	advancements after recommendation meeting	updated wiki page	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	competing project: EdgeX Foundry		
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	complementary projects	Intel SDO	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	complementary projects	Open Horizon	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	complementary projects	Project EVE	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	recommendation: defer to advance Fledge to Stage2	areas of concern - not run periodic TSCs	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	recommendation: defer to advance Fledge to Stage2	not a true OS community in the spirit of LF Edge mission
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	recommendation: defer to advance Fledge to Stage2	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	recommendation: submit later again for stage 2 with improvement	collaborate with overlapping projects to show harmonization
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	recommendation: submit later again for stage 2 with improvement	create a community beside the participating companies
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	recommendation: submit later again for stage 2 with improvement	regular, open TSC meetings
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	recommendation: submit later again for stage 2 with improvement	transparency
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	decision process	TAC vote: approved - 9 July, 2020	
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	proposal discussion		
	Projects	Fledge	stage2 proposal	proposal process		
	Projects	Home Edge				
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Arrow Connect	invited to submit for Stage 1 consideration		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Coaty.io	invited to submit to Stage 1 consideration		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Coaty.io			
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Digital Rebar			
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Edge Gallery	concern: EG governance structure		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Edge Gallery	concern: EG members		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Edge Gallery	concern: having an app store		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Edge Gallery	concern: relationship with other org - IP or legal obligations		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	Edge Gallery	meets the basic requirements for a Stage 1 project		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	FIWARE	invited to submit Stage 1 consideration		
	Projects	Invitated Projects (no participation - not worked out)	FIWARE	removed from list		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Kuiper	collaboration with EdgeX			
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	1- review period		
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	2- voting process	acceptance criteria: 2/3 vote of all TAC representatives	
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	2- voting process		
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	3- if declined - first time - work with the subgroup & re-submi		
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	4- if declined - 2nd time - wait 12 months to re-apply		
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	5- if approved by the TAC --> voting of the Board		
	Projects	Kuiper	Proposal	6- if approved by the Board --> officially Stage 1 project		
	Projects	LF Edge Landscape Project				
	Projects	Open Glossary	content of glossary	dictionary		
	Projects	Open Glossary	content of glossary	harmonize architectural patterns		
	Projects	Open Glossary	goal	creating graphical industry landscape map		
	Projects	Open Glossary	landscape link			
	Projects	Open Glossary	weekly meetings			
	Projects	Open Horizon	about deploying application containers			
	Projects	Open Horizon	community structuring	voting		
	Projects	Open Horizon	Open Governance			
	Projects	Open Horizon	starting point			
	Projects	Open Horizon	Working groups			
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	complementary and supportive to other LF Edge projects	demonstrated in a prototype with EdgeX Foundry
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	complementary and supportive to other LF Edge projects	other projects can benefit from OH
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	fills a requirement gap not currently provided by LF Edge	
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	has 2 TAC sponsors
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	has presented the project at the TAC meeting
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	intention to list their status on a website
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	license criteria: Apache 2
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	might be a sample project for other new project initiations	
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	candidated for Stage 1	worked under EdgeX foundry - gain insights of LF Edge	
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	Proposal		
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 1	vote initiated over email - March 25, 2020		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook

Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 2	concern	need to show that OH is not strictly tied to one company (IBM)	
	Projects	Open Horizon	process - stage 2	subgroup formed to review proposal		
	Projects	Open Horizon	Proposal emailed to TAC - March 2, 2020			
	Projects	Project Alvarium	Advocates from	Aveva		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	Advocates from	HP		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	Advocates from	IBM		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	Advocates from	IOTA		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	Advocates from	IOTech		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	Advocates from	Open Horizon		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	approval for stage 1 - at large project			
	Projects	Project Alvarium	IP Policy	Apache 2.0 for code contributions		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	IP Policy	CC 4.0 for documentation		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	IP Policy	DCO for inbound contributions		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	things to be fulfilled	code of conduct document		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	things to be fulfilled	transparence wiki content		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	things to be fulfilled	website with LF Edge presence		
	Projects	Project Alvarium	voting process			
	Projects	projects - induction	Baidu OpenEdge			
	Projects	projects - induction	digital rebar			
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP	Concern: Does it overlap with existing projects?		
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP	Concern: how does it fit into the Edge Foundation		
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP	contributors	Avanteq	
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP	contributors	dianomic	
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP	contributors	Nokia	
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP	contributors	OSIssoft	
	Projects	projects - induction	FogLAMP			
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	compliment EVE		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	compliment LF Edge projects		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	created and open sourced by INTEL		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	has 2 TAC sponsors	
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	has presented the project at the TAC meeting	
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	intention to list their status on a website	
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill acceptance criteria	license criteria: Apache 2	
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	fulfill not addressed parts of existing LF Edge Projects		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	integration with FLEDGE		

Why Do Companies Create and How Do They Succeed with a Vendor-Led Open Source Foundation

Appendix C - Codebook						
Explanation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	use case	automate large scale deployment of IoT devices	
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	candidated for Stage 1	use case	Zero-touch onboarding service	
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	proposal	proposal emailed to TAC - May 6, 2020		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	reasons for open sourcing	drive an industry standard		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	reasons for open sourcing	influencing the market		
	Projects	Secure Device Onboard (SDO)	reasons for open sourcing	resolve key industry friction points		
	Projects	SOTE: Landscape Working Group	administrative	bi-weekly calls		
	Projects	SOTE: Landscape Working Group	administrative	other organizational links		
	Projects	SOTE: Landscape Working Group	goal	leverage cross-project initiatives to drive awareness	Content creation - white paper, blog	
	Projects	SOTE: Landscape Working Group	goal	leverage cross-project initiatives to drive awareness	PR - Media	
	Projects	SOTE: Landscape Working Group	goal	leverage cross-project initiatives to drive awareness	State of Edge Report - 2021	