Spec Committee meeting min July 12, 2018

Attendees (present in bold):
Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu, Michael DeNicola
Dan Bandera - IBM, Kevin Sutter
Bill Shannon - Oracle, Ed Bratt
Steve Millidge - Payara, Arjan Tijms
Scott Stark - Red Hat, Mark Little
David Blevins - Tomitribe, Richard Monson-Haefel
Ivar Grimstad - PMC Representative
Mike Milinkovich - Eclipse Foundation Paul White, Wayne Beaton, Tanja Obradovic

Actions are marked in red with individuals or companies

Review of the actions from the previous calls
New time slot confirmed Doodle poll - Wednesdays 12:00 PM EST / 9:00 AM PST
Mike Milinkovich will make the document final by updating the Requirements and Goals document with comments. TBC by next week’s call July 18th.

Goals for this call - we should set up front key items we want to close or make decision on; e.g.
Decide on TCK (Technology Compatibility Kit) process document and timelines
Decide on the approach for Jakarta EE specification documents

Agenda
Patent Policy document - Mike Milinkovich shared the doc with the spec committee
There is an open discussion on whether the policy should lean towards:
- focusing on compatibility (e.g. tie patent licenses to passing TCKs)
- focusing on innovation (e.g. patent licenses are available to all implementers)
Many provided feedback that compatibility is very important
Oracle’s input is to support both scenations and each project defines its own priority
Eclipse Foundation (Mike / Tanja) to set up a joint meeting IP Advisory and Spec Committee
- Richard Monson-Haefel to send doc with with questions for IP Advisory prior this meeting
How does compatibility prevent innovation?
Tanja Obradovic to ensure Mark Little or Scot Stark to attend the next call and answer if compatibility is paramount
It should be noted that innovation vs. compatibility is not an either/or equation. The two approaches are slight nudges in a certain direction, but tying patent licenses to passing TCKs does not preclude innovation, nor vice versa.

Writing Jakarta EE specification documents
- Current Oracle specification docs - huge documents, not realistic to rewrite all for the goal to have Jakarta EE 8 released this year
- Can we reference specs instead of redefining / rewriting them?
- What is IP flow structure?? will this allow specs to co-exist
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 mostly Oracle, but also IBM + RedHat + PMC (Ivar)

To engage Oracle legal will take moths which impacts
- Jakarta EE 8 is the same as Java EE 8 - which does not require delta documents (will have spec project and spec committee; Jakarta EE 8 will need open source tck to pass certification);
- Having a decision from Oracle Legal on Specs is mandatory for any future Jakarta EE release

What other app servers, beside GlassFish can we expect on Jakarta EE 8 (Java EE 8) - to be asked at the steering committee
- Wildfly - name clarification needed, RedHat?
- IBM Liberty
- Fujitsu
- Payara - ?
- Weblogic - ?
- TomiTribe - ?

Release Plans for Eclipse GlassFish 5.1 and Jakarta EE 8
- Release plan in works for release of Eclipse GlassFish 5.1 on Java EE 8 in September 2018, Wayne Beaton will present to PMC
- Release plan needed for Jakarta EE 8 by end of the year 2018

Was not discussed at this call

TCK (Technology Compatibility Kit) process - who is writing a draft? (David or Richard??)
- Draft due date?
- Is a week for review and approval enough?
- Final version of the TCK process may take 2-3 weeks. Can we complete by end of July?

TCK challenge process
TCK releases
- version management process
  - What should be our approach? How frequent our release need to be? stability vs aggressive releases
- Who calls for a new version?
  - Spec committee needs to approve a new version; a new version would be suggested /recommend it by spec project
  - recommendation from the project and committee to be used as escalation path (PMC, EMO)