Spec Committee Meeting Minutes August 15, 2018

Attendees (present in **bold**):
Kenji Kazumura - <u>Fujitsu</u>, **Michael DeNicola**
Dan Bandera - <u>IBM</u>, Kevin Sutter, **Alasdair Nottingham**
Bill Shannon - <u>Oracle</u>, **Ed Bratt**, Dmitry Kornilov
Steve Millidge - <u>Payara</u>, Arjan Tijms
Scott Stark - <u>Red Hat</u>, Mark Little
David Blevins - <u>Tomitribe</u>, **Richard Monson-Haefel**
Ivar Grimstad - <u>PMC </u>Representative
Alex Theedom - Participant Member
Werner Keil - Committer Member

Mike Milinkovich - <u>Eclipse Foundation</u> Paul White, **Wayne Beaton, Tanja Obradovic**

Actions marked in red with names of individuals or companies

Goals for this call
Approval of the past mtg min
Review actions from the previous call
Review of the [TCK Process document](#)
Review of the Eclipse Specification Process document

Review of the actions from the previous calls / Agenda
Is this fixed now? Issues with invites and Google doc for mtg agenda, Steve Millidge reported a problem - Tanja to follow up.

Approval of the past mtg min August 8th, approved
All participants please review and be ready to approve on the next call
  <u>Fujitsu</u> +1
  <u>IBM</u>
  <u>Oracle</u> +1
  <u>Payara</u> +1
  <u>Red Hat</u> +1
  <u>Tomitribe</u> +1
  <u>PMC</u> +1
  <u>Participant Member</u> +1
  <u>Committer Member </u> +1

Once meeting minutes are approved we'll publish them at https://jakarta.ee/meeting_minutes as pdf files.

Namespace discussion - moved for discussion on the next meeting
David Blevins to document and invite others to provide feedback.

Quick look at the [EE4J Project Status page](#)

- The goal is still to have all code submitted by Oracle by August 31st, 2018

TCK (Technology Compatibility Kit) process, continue reviewing/discussing
- [TCK process document](#) - Richard Monson-Haefel
- Please review and comment, discussion on the next week
- Great and long discussion on submission of the TCK results
- We need to be making more progress on the document
  - If a specific topic needs additional time - document the issue and organize additional meeting
  - We may need to time box this item to ensure other agenda items get discussed also

Eclipse Foundation Specification Process document - not discussed

Tanja / Wayne working on a draft document

OASIS Open Project
- OASIS Open Project Rules

https://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/open-projects-process
- "who can do what" matrix for open projects is in a different OASIS document. You can find it in section 1.3.2 of

https://www.oasis-open.org/policies-guidelines/oasis-committee-operations-process-2018-05-22
- OASIS Open Projects website

https://oasis-open-projects.org/

List of documents that need to be written - do we need to define ownership and timeline for this?
- Revisions to existing documents
  - Eclipse Contributor Agreement
  - Individual Committer Agreement
  - Member Committer Agreement
  - Terms of Use
  - Eclipse Development Process [*]
  - Eclipse Foundation Intellectual Property Policy [*]
- New Documents or Agreements In Process
  - TCK License + Java EE Trademark Agreement
  - Java Trademark License (right to use javax, etc.)
  - License to Existing Specifications
  - Jakarta EE Participation Agreement
  - Eclipse Specification License [*]
  - Eclipse TCK License [*]
  - Jakarta EE Trademark License [*]

    [*] Eclipse Foundation Board approval required

Discussion on specification development approaches: Can we have new Jakarta EE spec docs created this way: reference old Java EE spec + additional new specs updates - need definitive answer from Oracle (primarily, but also) + IBM + Red Hat + Ivar

- As temporary solution we can maybe start by referencing existing Java EE spec (is this valid even?), but long term we need our own Jakarta EE spec.Concern with this approach is licensing is still an issue and hearing from Oracle legal is necessary.
- The committee expressed great concern over lack of progress from Oracle legal again.
- Rewriting specs seems to be the only option right now, which is not favorable due to amount of time this will take
- The **best option** is to have the specs transferred to Eclipse Foundation and work from there with Eclipse Foundation licensing model (this requires Oracle legal approvals)

IP Advisory and Spec Committee call for questions on compatibility / innovation - the second call is postponed for the time being

- [IP Advisory questions](#) - Mike's email and Richard Monson-Haefel's
- [Patent Policy document](#) - part of IP Advisory discussion
- The above does not impact Green field specifications - brand new specifications owned by Eclipse Foundation in new namespace that will be part of the Jakarta EE and ee4j project.