

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 scenarios 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 months 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)