

Project	OW2
Subject	TC
Type of meeting	Audioconf
Date	09/12/09
Attendees	Gaël Blondelle, TC chair (GB) Cédric Thomas, CEO (CT) ang Yang (CSTC) Cherry Bian (CVIC SE) WANG Wei, ISCAS Ye Shiyang, ICSAS Zhou Minghui, PKU (ZM) Rafaël Marin, Neociclo (RM) YIN Gang, NUDT François Exertier, Bull (FE) Alexandre Lefebvre, CTO (AL) (sorry if I missed other participants)

Next TC meeting

By phone 13 January 2010, 9am Paris time.

Action: AL to circulate best practices (use a headset, avoid heavy breathing into the microphone, keep microphone on mute when not speaking, do not use loudspeakers, avoid background noise, introduce yourself when joining and when speaking).

Note: Chinese new year holiday will be Feb 14 to 21, 2010

OnceSS technical presentation by Ye Shiyang

OnceSS is a newly accepted project from Trustie.

See <http://forge.ow2.org/projects/oncess/> and
<http://www.trustie.com/projects/project/show/OnceSS>

CSTC proposal for OW2 by Yang Yang

We should begin cooperation with 2 projects: one from Trustie Forge and one from OW2 Forge.

A discussion will start with JOnAS for performance testing.
Meeting between PKU and CSTC, Thursday, December, 10.

Competing projects

Follow-up to the discussion about competing projects (in link with the EasyFlow submission)

Discussion around the TC guidelines draft:

<http://www.ow2.org/view/Community/TCguidelines>

Competition is good, and openness is one important aspect.

Decision: The TC agreed that it is important to allow competition.

Discussion about what we mean with openness.

We need to draw the line clearly between acceptable projects and the ones we would reject.

We need a set of clear principles.

Extract from the current TCguidelines document:

gael.blondelle@ow2.org / alexandre.lefebvre@ow2.org

2009-09-15

1 of 4

***Leverage** Submitted projects must leverage the OW2 code base. Submitted project must describe how it intends to works with / integrates / assembles with existing projects for their common benefits. TC must be able to understand what is the project contribution to the code base and how it re-uses existing code.*

Leverage thus means assembling with other projects, integrating seamlessly with other projects, contributing to other projects. Leverage is an important notion, it means both how the project "Contribute" to the code base and how it "Increase the value" of the code base.

Action: TC should decide and freeze the notion of **Leverage** in the TCGuidelines document.

Status on submitted projects

3 projects currently under vote at the TC.

TESS+CRS

10 votes, all positive.

Comments provided:

- Integration as a service engine within PEtALS would be interesting.
- quite good to have an alternative to esper with a LGPL license ... what could benefit to the Wilcat project (<http://wildcat.ow2.org/>)

Decision to accept the TESS+CRS project, including the comments.

Accord

9 votes, all positive, RM already answered questions on the TC mailing list.

Discussion about the Affero GPL license.

Decision to accept the Accord project.

EasyFlow

8 votes: 4 positive, 3 negative, 1 neutral.

Comments and questions during the vote about:

- Bonita differentiation and synergies to be better identified
- Possible position wrt Shark
- Roadmap
- They mention J2ME: are mobile applications a differentiator wrt Bonita?

Discussion at the TC due to the competing project issue, and to the currently insufficient position w.r.t. other OW2 projects.

Insist on Leverage = integration, cooperation, differentiation.

Decision: get back to them with the comments and questions raised during the TC vote for clarification before accepting the project.

Licenses

Discussion following a recent C-JDBC request to change their license from LGPL to Apache.

There are two points behind the discussion:

1. enter OW2 with one license
2. "change" the license during the life of the project

CT summarizes the situation:

The current OW2 IP policy is very loose: we accept any OSI-approved license.

Despite being so liberal, we currently only have 5 licenses in the OW2 code base.

OW2 has decided to move in a more proactive way in order to provide guidance to new projects, in order to help them choose a license, and tell them which licenses OW2 recommends.

This choice depends on the ambition of the project. We have identified three project scenarios. For each project scenario, we think that there is a license better adapted.

The 3 scenarios are:

1. community driven, academic work BSD (do we include Apache in this category?)
2. market driven, business-oriented projects, partially closed LGPL, CDDL
3. dual licensing, business-oriented projects, fully reciprocal GPL, Affero GPL

OW2 strongly recommends a subset of licenses.

Problem of the Apache license, which gives intellectual property to Apache: is this a problem for OW2?

OW2 can recommend a subset of licenses, but can we "reject" projects on the basis of their choice of license?

We all agreed that, wrt the openness principle, we cannot reject projects on this criteria.

The key point is the interoperability between projects: on one hand we encourage interoperability but on the other hand different licenses complicate this (compatibility between licences).

RM point of current C-JDBC release with LGPL which does not pose problem, and the problem would be for future version.

Decision for C-JDBC, which would like to change their license:

→ AL to ask C-JDBC what is the consequence of JOnAS+C-JDBC bundle for OW2 and for end-users.

Incubation to Mature upgrade process

We already have a number of criteria which we used to tag projects (incubation, mature, archive).

To move a project from incubation to mature, projects must demonstrate their Leverage of the OW2 code base, and the TC must verify that claim.

Decision: this criteria should be added when deciding to move a project from incubator → mature.

Vision document

Goal is to continue with the OW2 technology vision document <http://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXH0rX-FCD5HZGcyd3ZjamtfMTZ2Z3pjN3gz&hl=en>

Decision: Technical vision document should be updated by everybody by e-mail and online with the document, until the next conference call.

Project hosting and membership

Should only OW2 members be eligible for project hosting?

Note that, at the moment, anybody can submit a project, whether they are a member or not.

CT: if we accept projects from non-members, we accept free riders, it consumes some resources and costs money for OW2 which has limited resources.

AL: what of community project, with no clearly identified member/leader (like ASM) ?

GB: we should find an existing OW2 member who agrees to sponsor the project.

FE: you need to pay some fees to be hosted. What about Apache ?

CT: if you want free hosting you can go to Sourceforge. As for Apache, their economic model is different, since they have a higher level of volunteer work and donation in terms of machines for instance.

Our decision is driven by our willingness to build a community, and by our economic constraints.

Decision to enforce that the project be backed up by an OW2 member for hosting.

Free riders and OW2 infrastructure

Problem of projects hosted for which members have stopped paying their fees and which use a large bandwidth and disk space.

The problem comes from projects pushed by companies who want to be free riders, and this is not an appropriate behaviour.

Suggestion to shift these projects from non members to archive with a degraded, low-cost service.

RM suggestion to establish a partnership with Sourceforge to migrate such projects.

Current free riders include e.g. Enhydra (TogetherTeamlösungen), Lomboz (Eteration), eXo, Cardamom (Thales).

These companies cost us money and don't participate.

Decision: TC agrees to move some projects to low cost infrastructure.

Action: CT to prepare the low cost infrastructure and send notice to the projects concerned.

Archive projects should also be moved to the low cost infrastructure.

Discussion on the space used by obsolete download files and the possibility to move them to a low cost infrastructure.

Other issues

Action: AL to update the TC participant list on the TC page.