Spec Committee meeting min July 12, 2018

Attendees (present in bold):
Kenji Kazumura - <u>Fujitsu</u>, Michael DeNicola
Dan Bandera - <u>IBM</u>, **Kevin Sutter**
Bill Shannon - <u>Oracle</u>, Ed Bratt
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
Mike Milinkovich - <u>Eclipse Foundation</u> **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)