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Background

After discussing the “Oracle Proposals” at the Zurich f2f meeting we agreed:

- To report EC members’ responses back to Oracle.
- To re-start the IP Working Group.

This presentation will report our progress in both of these areas.
EC members’ responses to Oracle’s proposals

• EC members’ responses are documented in the following slides (all have been reported back to Oracle.)
• Those listed in red have not yet been resolved. A summary of each of these has been incorporated into an updated version of the proposal presentation.
• The others have been incorporated into the updated presentation.
EC members’ responses to Oracle’s proposals

- Oracle’s determination that Field of Use clauses be permitted should be explicitly called out in the proposals.
- The IP-flow we adopt should be “flat” rather than based on a “hub-and-spoke” model. (That is, contributors should make grants directly to implementers and users rather than IP flowing via the Spec Lead.)
- A Contributor Agreement may be unnecessary for projects hosted at well-regulated institutions such as Eclipse and Apache.
- Any Contributor Agreement we approve must be symmetric (not granting special rights to any institution) and must not grant joint ownership to Oracle.
EC members’ responses (2)

• Define a Standard Commercial RI License for use when this is the only RI license offered (when Oracle takes advantage of the *Umbrella JSR exemption*).

• Permit the Spec Lead to offer additional open-source and commercial TCK licenses, which need not be disclosed, as proposed for the RI license.

• Insisting that the Community TCK License be available only through the RI open-source project discriminates against alternative FOSS implementations (e.g. JBOSS).

• Commit to community TCK licenses for Java SE and EE.

• Document Oracle’s commitment to waive the *Umbrella JSR exemption* for Java SE and EE.
Progress in the IP Working Group

• The group is now meeting again weekly.
• We started with a more detailed discussion of what a “flat” (as opposed to “hub-and-spoke”) IPR policy would look like.
• See the meeting minutes in our Document Archive for details.
• At the last meeting we thought we were ready to draft a Term Sheet on Spec licensing for Oracle Legal.
• On further investigation this is not quite ready for prime-time (while trying to draft it I found myself in a maze of twisty little passages). The EG has more work to do.
• However, the topic has been discussed with Oracle Legal.
Discussions with Oracle Legal

- We have had preliminary discussions with Oracle Legal about:
  - A flat IPR policy.
  - Contributor Agreements.
A flat IPR policy

• Oracle’s lawyers are sympathetic to “flattening” the IPR policy.
• The *devil is in the details* however, and further discussions will be necessary.
• Oracle’s lawyers and Oracle’s newly-appointed *Open Source Policy and Strategy Officer* believe that Oracle could not incorporate JSRs into the platform unless those who contributed to them had signed a suitable CLA.

• Even if this might be possible for projects hosted by some organizations or for code released under certain licenses we cannot vet all possible development platforms and hosting environments.
  • GitHub, for example, is definitely “unsafe.”

• Plus, we want to use the Contributor Agreement as a *JSPA-Lite* for Affiliate Members.

• However…
Contributor Agreements (2)

• Oracle’s lawyers believe they can draft a Contributor Agreement that:
  • Eliminates the joint-ownership language.
  • Is “symmetric” (doesn't grant special privileges to any particular organization).
  • Is "flat" as opposed to "hub and spoke“ (hopefully).
• So long as we have appropriate language in the JSPA only those who actually participate in RI-development projects (or who want Affiliate Membership status) would need to sign the CLA.
Next steps

• Continue our discussions with Oracle Legal and within the Working Group.
• Create *Term Sheets* to provide guidelines for Oracle Legal when we ask them to draft documents.
Thank You!

http://jcp.org