

Java Community Process Executive Committees Meeting

Meeting Summary

February 16 & 17, 2005
Face-to-face Meeting
IBM Offices, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Attendance

PMO

Aaron Williams
Onno Kluyt
Harold Ogle
Liz Cadd

ME

Ericsson Mobile Platforms - Angana Ghosh
IBM - David Girle
Intel - Eric Dittert
Matsushita - John Buford
Motorola - James Warden
Nokia - Pentti Savolainen, Dietmar Tallroth, Asko Komsu
NTT DoCoMo: Kazuhiro Yamada
Orange France: Paul Amery, Thomas Vergouwen
Philips - not present
RIM - Anthony Scian
Samsung: Ho An
Siemens: Birgit Kreller
Sony-Ericsson - Hanz Hager
Sun - Danny Coward, Tim Lindholm
Symbian - not present
Vodafone - Unai Labirua

SE/EE

Apache - Geir Magnusson

Apple - not present
BEA - Ed Cobb
Borland - not present
Fujitsu - Mike DeNicola
Google: Bob Lee
HP - Scott Jameson
IBM - Steve Wolfe, Mark Thomas
IONA - Rebecca Bergersen
Intel: Wayne Carr, Tony Baker
JBoss: Sascha Labourey
Doug Lea - Doug Lea
Nortel Networks - Bill Bourne
Oracle - Mark Hornick
SAP - Not present
Sun - Graham Hamilton

Agenda

- PMO Report
- Individuals and the JSPA
- IEPA
- EC Member Guide 1.1
- JSRs Changing Scope
- JSRs 235-237
- EC & Community Communications
- PMO Response to Sony-Ericsson Motion from January Meeting

PMO Report

The PMO announced an update to the usual stats slides that are shared with the EC Members at each month's meeting. The update included slides highlighting changes in Spec Leadership for JSRs, as well as a look at the up coming JSR stage changes that the PMO is aware of. The PMO intends to make these new slides available each month.

Individuals and the JSPA

At the EC Meeting in December, the ECs started a conversation on individuals and their role in the JCP. The PMO presented a few concerns that they had heard from EC Members and community members about individuals. First and foremost was the concern of an employed individual giving away (either by accident or on purpose) their employer's IP to a JSR. This could potentially result in the employer suing the Spec Lead and all implementers of the JSR for using their IP without permission.

The PMO explained the current practice of requiring all individuals to submit a completed Exhibit B from the IEPA when they sign up using the JSPA. The Exhibit B is a statement from the employer saying that they are aware that the employee is participating in the JCP, and it does not deal with any IP rights the employer has.

Some EC Members saw this as a spectrum of risk – with some individuals being riskier than others. The PMO agreed that one way to help mitigate the issue, but not solve it, might be to give Spec Leads more information about the individuals who ask to be on their EG.

Some other ideas were discussed, but there was not a clear consensus

on how or if this problem could be solved. The PMO agreed to continue the conversation and look for ways to take steps toward providing a less risky environment. The ECs were clearly in favor of individual participation, and were interested in finding ways to ensure individuals with employers were backed by their employer to participate in a more substantial way.

The IEPA

In conjunction with the conversation about the JSPA and individuals, the PMO presented slides on the use of the IEPA. In general, the PMO does not find people using the IEPA because of the differences between it and the JSPA for individuals, and recommended to the ECs that the IEPA be taken out of use. EC Members agreed with the general notion that the IEPA had out-lived its usefulness and should be eliminated. The PMO made it clear that this would not effect any IEPA signer currently active in the JCP, it would just remove the IEPA as an option for any future individuals who wanted to join. (To be clear, individuals would still be able to join the JCP using the JSPA.)

EC Member Guide 1.1

The PMO presented some suggested changes to the EC Member Guide. The EC Member Guide was created in May of 2004 to guide EC Members as to how the ECs conduct business, and how they carry out their responsibilities. The PMO was interested in specifically updating the time constraints for when agendas and materials needed to be sent to the ECs before meetings, because the times in the 1.0 version of the EC Member Guide were not very realistic. EC Members pushed back, asking the PMO to be more diligent in getting the materials and agendas out on time, even if that meant that some agenda items would not make it onto the agenda until the following meeting. The PMO agreed to be more diligent between now and the next face-to-face meeting in May, when the EC Member Guide would be more generally and completely reviewed and discussed.

JSRs Changing Scope

An EC Member suggested that there were some recent cases where JSRs had changed scope in the middle of the JSR, and wondered how the ECs could get more visibility into those changes. The PMO told EC Members that it does allow Spec Leads to change information submitted after the original JSR submission, and that the new information is included on the JSR detail page on jcp.org (in a section called "Updates to the Original JSR"). Some EC Members also felt that the changes made with JCP 2.6, specifically changing the second ballot

to be later in the process, may have actually given the ECs less opportunity to review and vote down any potentially problematic scope changes before the JSR gets too far into the process. The PMO reminded EC Members that they are supposed to be carefully reviewing all JSRs at Early Draft Review, and providing comments to the Spec Lead when they feel something has changed that would prevent the EC Member from voting for the JSR at the Public Review Ballot.

JSRs 235-237

An EC Member asked about the status of these JSRs, which had been discussed at previous EC Meetings because of the Spec Leads' intention to require EG Members to sign a side letter in order to participate. The PMO reiterated its position that side letters which alter the IP rules of the JCP are not allowed, and its legal position that the agreements that the Spec Leads are asking for with these JSRs does do that. Other EC Members disagreed, saying that their legal opinion was that these agreements were speaking to legal issues that the JSPA is silent on. All EC Members that spoke, along with the PMO, expressed interest in finding a solution to enable these JSRs to make progress. An EC Member agreed to begin Ad Hoc EC Meetings to try and address the issue.

EC & Community Communications

The PMO reviewed the communications plan with the ECs from two perspectives: how the PMO communicates with the community to inform their decisions, and the programs the PMO has put in place to enable the ECs to communicate more with the community.

On the topic of how the PMO communicates with the community, the PMO presented results from a recent survey of the community. The PMO has conducted surveys of the community for the past three years running, to get more information about what is working, what is not, and what is important to the community. The PMO stressed its desire to find the principles of the community, the things that have enable our success over the past 6 years, and then use those principles to guide our execution of the process.

The PMO then presented the current plan for enabling communication between the ECs and the community – including Spec Lead talks at EC Meetings, gatherings and events at conferences, and these community summaries from EC Meetings. EC Members were encouraged to provide input into other means of fostering further communication

between the ECs and the community.

PMO Response to Sony-Ericsson Motion from January Meeting

At the January EC Meeting, Sony-Ericsson made a motion asking the PMO to publish the text of the Intel motions from the December EC Meeting and conduct a poll of the community regarding whether they agree or disagree with the motion. The Sony-Ericsson motion was passed by the ECs in January. The PMO responded at this meeting by saying it had no intention of following up on the Sony-Ericsson motion because it did not agree that a poll like this would provide any further closure on the Intel motions than we already had.