

# Java Community Process Executive Committee Meeting

## Meeting Summary

December 3, 2002  
8:30 – 5:30 PDT  
Santa Clara, California  
Face-to-Face Only

### Attendance

**JCP PMO** - Onno Kluyt, Harold Ogle, Aaron Williams, Rob Gingell

### **ME EC**

BEA- Bill Cox  
IBM – Paul Buck, Jim Mickelson  
Matsushita – Deanna Wilkes-Gibbs  
Motorola – Sanjay Gupta  
Nokia – Dietmar Tallroth  
RIM - Anthony Scian  
Siemens - Michael Becker  
Sony-Ericsson – Hanz Hager  
Sun - Tim Lindholm  
Symbian – Peter Wikstrom  
TI - Marion Lineberry

### **SE/EE EC**

Apple - Dave Michael  
BEA - Ed Cobb, Scott Dietzen  
Borland - Shobana Narasimhan, Bill Patteke  
Cisco – Krishna Sankar  
Fujitsu - Michael DeNicola  
HP - Scott Jameson, DJ Powers  
IBM - Steve Wolfe, Graham Barber, Mark Thomas  
IONA - Simon Pepper  
Nokia – Dietmar Tallroth  
Oracle – Glen Foster  
SAP – Michael Bechauf  
Sun - Graham Hamilton

## Agenda

JCP PMO Report  
Action Item Update  
PMO Stats  
Proposed Meeting Schedule  
JCP.next  
Strengthening Java Through Metrics  
OMA

### **JCP PMO Report**

The PMO presented the usual statistics regarding EC member voting and the JSR pipeline.

New members were introduced from SAP, Sony-Ericsson and Symbian and new reps were introduced from IBM and Caldera.

### **Action Item Update**

The PMO updated the members on the status of the new server for JCP.org and the work that is going on there to make the web site easier to use and more stable.

### **PMO Stats**

The PMO presented stats to highlight the participation of EC and non-EC companies in the JCP. These stats were suggested to be included in future stats packages and to be reviewed at the quarterly face-to-face meetings.

### **Proposed Meeting Schedule**

Meeting dates and times for 2003 were agreed to by the ECs. There will be 7 conference calls and 4 face-to-face meetings of the ECs in 2003, same as in 2002. The face-to-face meetings have been extended to 2-day meetings to incorporate more opportunity address the important issues of JCP.next.

### **JCP.next**

The process and work done for JCP 2.5 was reviewed and some of the issues around how that process was handled were raised. The PMO encouraged EC members to look for common ground and address issues that are facing the community.

It was suggested that the JCP should encourage more JSRs to be

formed after a feature has been added to a product rather than before. There was discussion about the benefits and drawbacks to that approach, and the PMO reminded EC members that this is possible in today's process.

The PMO had asked for ideas from the EC members before the meeting and those results were presented. Only 30% of the EC members participated in this exercise. The companies that responded were given the chance to expound on their ideas.

A few of the ideas from the list were explored further by the EC. The stewardship of Java, and Sun's unique role in the community, was discussed. Compatibility and interoperability were also discussed. The EC also looked at participation and investment.

The ownership of the Java brand was reviewed and EC members discussed its use and licensing. The JSR naming program was also discussed. Final topics including umbrella JSRs and JSRs that span ECs and editions were also raised and discussed before lunch.

### **JCP.next Common Ground**

The EC members looked more closely at the issues that were raised before lunch, looking for common ground and issues that were important enough to address in the next version of the process.

Three high-level groups of issues were identified – pace of innovation, cost of participation, and the openness and transparency of the process. Three ad hoc groups were setup with EC members leading them to address each of these issues and report back to the EC at the next face-to-face in March. Another set of issues, labeled "Low Hanging Fruit" were also addressed and the PMO agreed to address those issues as soon as possible.

### **Strengthening Java Through Metrics**

The PMO suggested that it would be a good idea for the ECs to identify valuable statistics and metrics for monitoring. The EC members agreed that it would be valuable to have more metrics and the PMO agreed to look into which metrics made sense and where that data could be found.

### **OMA**

The PMO gave a brief update on liaisons with OMA. Little progress had

been made, but the PMO was working to have an understanding of the steps required after the next OMA plenary in Long Beach in February. The EC members were very interested in seeing this agreement made, and the PMO agreed to work harder at getting it wrapped up.