

Java Community Process Executive Committees Meeting

Meeting Summary

November 9 & 10, 2004
Santa Clara, California

Attendance

JCP PMO - Harold Ogle, Onno Kluyt, Aaron Williams

ME EC

Ericsson Mobile Platforms: Magnus Olsson

IBM: Mark Vandenbrink

Insignia: not present

Intel: Tony Baker, Wayne Carr

Matsushita: Deanna Wilkes-Gibbs

Motorola: James Warden, Sanjay Gupta

Nokia: Pentti Savolainen

Philips: not present

RIM: Nobuhisa Yoda

Siemens: Birgit Keller

Sony: not present

Sony-Ericsson: Hanz Hager

Sun: Tim Lindholm, Danny Coward

Symbian: not present

TI: Marion Lineberry

Vodafone: Andreas Binder, Unai Labirua

SE/EE EC

Apache: Geir Magnusson

Apple: Dave Michael

BEA: Ed Cobb

Borland: Axel Kratel

Fujitsu: Mike DeNicola

HP: Scott Jameson

IBM: Mark Thomas, Steve Wolfe

Intel: Wayne Carr

IONA: Rebecca Bergeson

Doug Lea: not present

Macromedia: not present

Nokia: Dietmar Tallroth, Asko Komsu
Oracle: Glen Foster
SAP: Michael Bechauf
SCO: not present
Sun: Graham Hamilton, Peter Walker

Agenda

- PMO Report
- Anti-trust Discussion
- EC Elections
- Planning for 2005 EC Meetings
- JCP Community Stats Review
- Evaluation of JSR Drafts
- JSR Review Comments
- Early TCK Info Proposal
- JSPA 2.0.1
- JSPA 2.1
- Gold Rush Ad Hoc Update
- Spec Lead Presentation (Bill Shannon, J2EE 5)

PMO Report

The PMO presented its usual set of EC stats, including voting records and JSR updates. The PMO also reviewed the process for handling web outages for EC Member voting.

Anti-trust Discussion

The PMO invited Mark Ostrau from Fenwick & West LLP to join us at the EC Meeting. He talked with the EC Members about anti-trust concerns, and some of the gray areas involved. Mark reminded the ECs that they are designed to be pro-competitive, and that the JCP processes are also designed encourage multi-vendor, compatible implementations. Mark also helped the EC Members better understand how they can work together to make Java a stronger platform.

EC Elections

The PMO presented the final results of the ratification election and the nominees for the open election. That information can be found online at jcpelection2004.org.

Planning for 2005 EC Meetings

The PMO presented an almost complete and final set of dates and times for EC Meetings for 2005. All of the meeting locations and times are setup in conjunction with other events, to give the ECs more opportunity to talk with the community. The February face-to-face is scheduled in conjunction with Web Services Edge East, and the May face-to-face is in conjunction with Telemetrics Conference in France.

EC Members were encouraged to help out and host one of the upcoming meetings.

JCP Community Stats Review

The PMO presented stats to the ECs regarding the state of the community. The PMO presents stats like this roughly each 6 months. The stats show a picture of a healthy and vibrant community, with membership up 6% in the past 6 months, JSRs continuing to be started and finished at an increasing pace, and more community members stepping up and becoming Spec Leads.

Independent Implementation of Drafts for Evaluation

Intel presented a proposal to provide additional licensing grants from JCP draft contributors to independent implementers of non-final drafts when the implementations are created for the purpose of evaluation of the emerging drafts. There was discussion among the EC Members about notification of JCP related grants to downstream users of evaluation implementations since the Intel proposal specifically allowed implementers to distribute under common open source licenses that would not carry JCP specific notifications. There was also a discussion regarding the current inbound grants of the JSPA and if this proposal would also need to change those grants. Since this proposal has been under discussion in one form or another for an extended time and was not reaching consensus, Intel withdrew the proposal.

JSR Public Draft Review Comments

Intel proposed that public comments submitted to the Expert Group in response to the Public Review Draft be made available to EC Members before the EC votes on the Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot. The PMO and several other EC Members objected, some EC Members also supported it. In the end, there was not enough support from other members and the proposal was withdrawn.

Early TCK Info Proposal

Intel presented a proposal to modify the Spec Lead Guide to provide specific guidance to Spec Leads about their TCK licensing. This guidance required Spec Leads to provide more information at the time the JSR is submitted, and it also required TCK licenses to be offered without any restrictions on the code that the TCK tested. The PMO expressed reservations about this proposal, because using the TCK license as a means to ensure compatibility was compelling. A straw poll was taken and there was support from the EC Members for this proposal.

JSPA 2.0.1

The PMO presented a revised version of the JSPA, and suggested that a maintenance review be held on JSPA 2.0. The goal of this new JSPA would be to increase the likelihood that the JSPA would be submitted correctly the first time, reducing the time the PMO spends getting the JSPA correctly submitted. EC Members raised concerns about the changes the PMO was suggesting, especially with regards to how individual members were handled and what they needed to have signed by their employer in order to participate. The PMO agreed to look into that, but wanted to move forward with the proposal because it was not proposing any change to the current process. A straw poll of the EC Members showed there was not support for going forward with the proposal as it was, but many EC Members abstained from the poll. The PMO appreciated the input and agreed to get back to the ECs.

JSPA 2.1

The PMO also presented ideas for updating the JSPA to make it more manageable and more understandable. The PMO proposed the creation of a new JSR to update the JSPA with these goals in mind. EC Members supported the idea of making the JSPA easier to understand, but when it came to specifically breaking the JSPA into smaller pieces, there was little support for that proposal. EC Members were in favor of investigating ways to make the JSPA submissible through the web (as opposed to requiring it to be faxed into the PMO). The issue of individual members was raised again and the PMO suggested this be further discussed in the sub-group meetings.

Gold Rush Ad Hoc Update

Motorola presented a problem statement that had been discussed in the ad hoc group they are leading. The problem statement was generally well received. One specific issue that was discussed involved JSRs that show little or no progress. The PMO expressed interest in investigating ways to require JSRs to either make progress, or get out of the way so that others can make progress. Motorola agreed to continue working on this issue in the ad hoc group.

Spec Lead Presentation

The ECs were fortunate to have a Spec Lead join the meeting to share his perspective on the JCP. Bill Shannon, Spec Lead for JSR 244, J2EE 5.0 shared the status of his JSR with the ECs, and gave some particular insight into the struggles of being a Spec Lead. His EG has

to balance many competing interests. Bill shared with the ECs some of his goals for the next version of J2EE. Bill also shared his perspectives on the process and some of the improvements he would like to see made in that respect. This included cleaning up the EG nomination and management process. The PMO and the ECs very much appreciated Bill taking time to join us.