

# Spec Committee Meeting Minutes July 25, 2018

Attendees (present in **bold**):

**Kenji Kazumura** - Fujitsu, Michael DeNicola

**Dan Bandera** - IBM, Kevin Sutter

**Bill Shannon** - Oracle, **Ed Bratt**, **Dmitry Kornilov**

Steve Millidge - Payara, Arjan Tijms

**Scott Stark** - Red Hat, Mark Little

**David Blevins** - Tomitribe, **Richard Monson-Haefel**

Ivar Grimstad - PMC Representative

**Alex Theedom** - Participant Member

**Werner Keil** - Committer Member

**Mike Milinkovich** - Eclipse Foundation **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

Confirm all actions from previous call

Requirements and Goals marked final

Discussion on draft on TCK process document

## Review of the actions from the previous calls / Agenda

Approval of the past mtg min 28th, June 12th and June 18th and July 25th - not done, document was not made available

All participants please review and be ready to approve on the next call

Fujitsu

IBM

Oracle

Payara

Red Hat

Tomitribe

PMC

Participant Member

Committer Member

Eclipse Foundation

Note: once meeting minutes are approved we'll publish them [here](#) as pdf files (for each call, separately dated). This file is going to be our working document for the agenda and meeting notes of a current call as well as meeting minutes that need approval.

Confirm Requirements and Goals document is final - **Mike Milinkovich to complete by July 26th**

IP Advisory and Spec Committee July 25th call for questions on compatibility / innovation - **Mike Milinkovich**

- Another call needed, targeting Wed Aug 1st, 1pm EST (Jim Wright and Scott Peterson presence essential for the call) - **Tanja** to send out Doodle poll

- Refer to Mike's email and Richard Monson-Haefel's document with questions for IP Advisory board [Link to the document](#)
- Summary of the call (Scott Stark and Dan Bandera)
  - Key points:
    1. Scott Peterson(RH) argued, and Jeff Thompson(IBM) agreed that the worry about prototype/initial implementations that were happening concurrently with spec development should have no concerns with regard with when patent or other IP grants might occur as there was no incentive to challenge any violations at that stage. Their argument was mostly that there was no financial incentive.
    2. It was pointed out that attempting to use such IP grants as a way to control potentially unwanted development was a possibility, and this was acknowledged.
    3. It was made clear that the commitment for IP grants was given as soon as the spec was finalized. There was a discussion about whether such grants are tied to the passing of a spec TCK. A discussion about Oracle wanting this for at least the specs that deal with the java and javax namespaces ensued. It was suggested by Scott Peterson that some work had been done on updating the Eclipse patent policy to accommodate this view, but that new spec outside of this namespace would not make use of patents in this way as it was not the norm in spec development, at least in the software world. Bill mentioned that Jim Wright from Oracle had provided a potential counter example from the Bluetooth spec world, but there were no details.
    4. Scott Peterson was arguing that we should be moving away from patents, while at least Oracle was questioning whether weakened the ability to ensure compatibility.
    5. A discussion of what one wanted to avoid in terms of TCK evolution and the use of patents put forth an example of uncertainty with respect to the validity of a TCK test, and 1 holder of say the 100 essential patents required for the TCK, deciding to challenge the implementer who was questioning the TCK test ability to distribute their implementation, using the threat of pulling their patent grant as a leverage. It was pointed out that Eclipse had no role in this licensing of patents as it was now a many to many holder to implementor rights distribution model.

[Patent Policy document](#) - part of IP Advisory discussion, no additional discussion needed

Can we confirm? Other app servers, beside GlassFish can we expect on Jakarta EE 8

- Wildfly- yes
- IBM Open Liberty- yes
- Fujitsu- yes
- Payara - ?
- Weblogic - Oracle does not comment on future product plans
- Tomitribe - Apache TomEE (Apache project)- yes

*TCK (Technology Compatibility Kit) process*

- First draft due 25th - David Blevins and Richard Monson-Haefel
  - Will use notes from David to collect feedback and then write the document (google doc to be created, based on David's email)
- Review and feedback from others the following week
- Final version targeted mid August

Can we confirm this? Can we have new spec docs created by referencing old spec + additional new specs, seems to be approved from Oracle legal - need definitive answer from **Oracle (primarily, but also) + IBM + RedHat + PMS (Ivar)**

Writing Eclipse / Jakarta EE / Specification Process documents

**Tanja / Wayne** working on the document - aim to present on August 8th

List of documents that need to be written

- 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

Namespace discussion

- **David Blevins** to document and invite others to provide feedback.  
Suggested options
  - ee.jakarta
  - jakarta - may be questionable but preferred
  - jakartaee

Issues with the call Meeting invites and google documents with the agenda and previous meeting min-  
**Tanja**

- An Agenda to be sent via email a day prior each call
- Link for Google document with Meeting minutes for review to be sent in an email