# Best use of Software Tags - Contest Rules

## Description of Contest

This contest is being sponsored by The ITAM Review and TagVault.org. The purpose of the contest is to identify those SAM tool vendors who have recognized the necessity of using software identification (SWID) tags already [deployed by Adobe Systems Inc.](http://blogs.adobe.com/OOBE/2009/11/) as well as tags that fully conform to the ISO/IEC 19770-2:2009 standard

This contest is designed to highlight ways in which SWID tags can improve reporting and other facilities in the inventory, discovery and SAM markets. However, the contest has implications for the wider IT community as well due to the fact that authoritative software identification has a positive impact on desktop management, patch management, security policies, help desk procedures, and more. In fact, accurate, consistent and authoritative software identification is required for most IT operations to work effectively.

Software and tool purchasing organizations constantly use checklists to validate and compare the capabilities of various tools available for purchase. This contest provides a third party review of the capabilities of the various tool vendors to use the next generation of software identification procedures to help purchasing organizations understand which tool vendors are committed to accurate and authoritative software identification procedures. Due to the nature of SWID tags, they can be provided by the publisher, or by software purchasing organizations meaning that every single software product regardless of publisher, platform or release date can utilize tags immediately. The value to software purchasing organizations is clear – using a standardized identification method allows consistency between all tools used in the organization regardless of platform or any organizational structure/process issues.

SWID tags are already starting to be required of software vendors by governmental organizations such as the US Air Force ([requirements included the NetCents 2 RFP](http://www.herbb.hanscom.af.mil/esc_opps.asp?rfp=R1613)) and the GSA ([with new draft language added to the SmartBuy program](http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/103237)). Due to the concerns software purchasing organizations have about accuracy of software identification information and frankly the fact that the software purchasing organizations end up being liable for any inaccuracies, we’ll be seeing larger enterprises requiring SWID tags as well. Adobe, Symantec and CA have all made commitments in support of SWID tags as well either through product releases (of which Adobe is now on their second major release cycle with tags), or through the development of the non-profit program to create registration and certification procedures for SWID tags.

## Contest Dates

**Contest submission deadline:** February 25, 2011

**Sample Tags provided:** February 28, 2011

**Final Tags provided:** April 11, 2011

**Contest presentation:** April 18 – April 21, 2011

**Announcement of winner:** May 4, 2011

## Rules of the Contest

1. All tags will conform to the ISO/IEC 19770-2:2009 specification.
2. Product demonstrations must include the use of all tags created for the contest by TagVault.org. These tags will include:
	1. Adobe CS5 tags
	2. Symantec Certified Tags
	3. Sample tags created byTagVault.org which will include the use of multiple optional elements in the tag structure including, but not limited to:
		1. Suite tags that include the suites and the relationships with software products included as part of the suite.
		2. Patch tags that identify their relationship with installed software products and/or suites.
		3. Digital signatures that can be used to validate the integrity of data provided in the SWID tags.
3. Presentations will be 1.5 hour in length
	1. Presentation will consist of at most 15 minutes of slide material
	2. Remaining time should be used to demonstrate how your product utilizes the information in the various SWID tags.
	3. Contestants should highlight the architecture and details of how the system collects, stores and uses SWID tags.
	4. Contestants should also highlight the various areas of their product set that utilize SWID tags (i.e. is the tag in a database for an user to find, or is it actively used as part of the reporting process).
4. Tag collection and use features do not need to be available in shipping product – alpha, beta or field developed components will be allowed as part of the demonstration.
5. Details of when SWID tag collection capabilities will be provided to market must be specified along with the delivery approach (patch, field add-on, separate utility, etc).
6. No presentation information or release details may be considered confidential information unless separately arranged
7. Architecture details may be kept confidential as required and/or requested by the tool provider
8. The winners of the contest will be determined by a panel of judges that include end-users as well as Martin Thompson and Steve Klos.
	1. All end-user judges will be reviewed to ensure there is no conflict of interest.
	2. Any end-user who has worked for a tool company in the last 3 years will not be allowed to participate as a judge.
9. Note that Martin and Steve will have the final say on the judging process. If a judge is determined to be biased in their scoring, the scores may be removed from the tally. If a contestant repudiates a judge, Martin and Steve will determine how to handle the situation and may remove the judge from the judging panel
10. Judges will score the contestants and provide comments for the tool vendors. Each tool vendor will receive all comments provided by all judges.
11. Webcasts of the various tools will be provided to the market. Every contest participant will have the right of refusal for the presentation of any material that shows demonstrations or screenshots of their products.

## Eligible companies

Companies providing tools to manage discovery, inventory or SAM processes may enter the contest. There is no requirement that the company be a member of TagVault.org to enter the contest.

## Judging Criteria

The following criteria will be used in the judging:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** (score - 1 - 5 with 5 being the best) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Tags stored so no data is lost**(i.e. can a user export the tag from the server side and validate that the digital signature is still valid) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Tags are used throughout the tool**(i.e. the tags are not simply used to store ID information in a database, but that ID information is used for reports, license compliance and other processing) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Tag software title is used as the discovered SW name**(as opposed to a proprietary name being used) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports show relationships between tags**(such as a suite tag with the various products that make up that suite) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports allow drill down functions to discover more information about a product** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are able to show all data provided in a SWID Tag** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Tool identifies if signed data has been tampered with** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are clear and useful to SAM practitioners** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Multiple views of the tag data are available**(reports might include:* count of devices with a specified suite installed
* count of products from the suite that are installed
* which devices have the suite installed
* all installations of a specified product regardless if it is installed as a suite or stand-alone product
* count and report of all installations of a suite that do not have a specified part of the suite installed
* etc)
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports include grouping capabilities** (i.e. Publisher, platform, product, version, etc) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are useful to SAM practitioner** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are useful to compliance manager** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are useful to patch manager** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are useful to desktop manager** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reports are useful to corporate policy compliance (**Reports might include:* software that is not part of an approved list
* specific categories of software – i.e. 43232000  computer game or entertainment software, 43232104 word processing software
* software tags with “entitlement\_required\_indicator” set to false – typical of open source software
* other data identified in the SWID tags that have a potential to be problematic for the purchasing organization.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Where available, tool provides platform details as well** (Windows, Windows, Macintosh, HP-UX, RedHat, Windows Phone, Android, Blackberry, etc) |  |  |  |  |  |

### Judges’ Comments based on the web demonstration

We encourage judges to provide additional feedback to the product teams, The ITAM Review and TagVault.org. These comments are particularly valuable to the product teams for them to know what was good, bad, or less relevant during the demonstration presentation.

## Winners of the contest will receive:

* A write up in The ITAM Review newsletter describing the SAM tool and the reason it won the contest
* Highlighted presentation in the contest video (available from the TagVault.org and The ITAM Review websites).
* A joint press release from The ITAM Review and TagVault.org
* The ability to use the appropriate logo on their website, marketing literature, product and other electronic and physical materials

## Contest process

Organizations interested in submitting an entry will fill out the entry form and e-mail it to Martin Thompson and Steve Klos. Submissions are due by February 25, 2011. Sample Tags will be provided to all registered companies on Feb 28, 2011 with final tags provided on April 11, 2011. Martin and Steve will setup time with your organization between April 18 and April 21, 2011 to view a webcast of your solution and review how effective it is at collecting and using the information provided in SWID tags.

All tags will conform to the ISO/IEC 19770-2 standard and may contain any elements specified in the standard.

All presentations will be recorded for review by additional judges as well as creation of the final webcast showing the benefits of the various tools. All materials for a specified tool or vendor that will be presented as part of the webcast for this contest will be provided to the contact named on the contest entry for review and approval for publication. No materials will be presented publically unless authorized by the vendor contact.