

Report to TC39 from: *meeting of the Co-ordinating Committee*
held in: *Geneva*
on: *15 – 16 October 2013*

Source: Ecma Secretariat

In the following we have taken out those parts from the CC minutes that were particularly relevant to TC39.

1.4 TC39 - ECMAScript

Activity report: [TC39/13/061](#).

Chairman: **Mr. John Neumann** (Microsoft, Yahoo, Mozilla, Google), Vice Chair: Vacant.

Mr. Sebestyen gave a verbal activity report: well attended meetings in Redmond, Microsoft (see [GA/13/082](#)) and in Boston (see [GA/13/114](#)) with over 30 participants each. Facebook were invited and they attended with an indication that they would like to apply for Ecma membership (which they did see in [GA/13/111](#)). Several other experts were invited as well, Lab49 is the first to use the 3rd party contribution policy.

Philippe Le Hégarret, who is Internet Domain Leader of W3C, also attended the September meeting; W3C intend to intensify liaison on HTML5, CSS3 and Real Time Web. A joint meeting with them in the fall of 2014 is possible. TC39 appointed already in July 2013 **Alex Russell** as Liaison officer to the W3C.

Finishing ES6 is scheduled for December 2014. There is still a lot of work to do also for ES7 but nothing to be approved at the December 2013 General Assembly.

More test modules are added to Test262 and ECMA-402 without seeking GA approval this time. It is not decided if the ECMA-402 tests will be included in Test262 or they remain separate.

Mr. Sebestyen introduced a new discussion on the TC39 mailing list: Some in TC39 are questioning the suitability of the Ecma text copyright policy for ECMAScript, they claim:

- 1) copied parts of the text in the standard cannot be used as comment of software codes; and
- 2) development of another (forked or reused) language based upon ES could not be done.

The general question is: How should Ecma defend its role as ES developer?

After the introduction the more detailed discussion was carried out under paragraph 3 below.

So far only few members (mostly key TC39 members) submitted their registration to the experimental TC39 RF TG; the CC recommends that the GA instructs TC39 to take a final decision (min. 50% majority vote) on creating a RF TG no later than January 2014. If by then no RF TG is created and if the RF TG not launched the current, still RAND based policy for all TC39 standardization work remains.

TC39 and the GA approved (in October 2013) the JSON base grammar and interchange format as ECMA-404. Originally this was targeted as joint text with IETF, but according to **Doug Crockford**, the creator of JSON and Editor on both the Ecma and the IETF side, the IETF did not want to have the base JSON grammar and interchange format as its own standard. Mr. Crockford resigned as an editor of the IETF project. It is not decided yet by TC39 if they would like to fast-track ECMA-404 to JTC 1.

Regarding 3rd party software contributions to ECMAScript work the request is still there. The CC suggested planning a meeting with the Ecma IPR Group. **Mr. Sebestyen** said that the current text for Ecma members might also work for 3rd party contributions and the IPR Group has been requested some time ago to give their opinion on this.

TC39 is also discussing how to increase the frequency of new Editions of ES. One idea is to have yearly new releases for ES. At present there is no decision on that issue yet.

2 New work areas

2.1 DART workshop report, initiation of work item (CC/13/024, CC/13/025, CC/13/028)

Mr. Sebestyen reported about the Dart workshop on September 20, 2013 at Google, Boston that was suggested by the last GA in June. Time and location was selected in order that TC39 members who were potentially interested could also easily participate.

Location: Google Cambridge

In the workshop a short introduction to Dart was given, followed by a discussion on the direction for the possible future Dart work in Ecma and discuss potential new features in Dart.

Goals:

1. Brief introduction to Dart
2. Finalize “scope and programme of work” for submission to Ecma
(for review at the upcoming CC and GA Ecma meetings in October and December 2013, respectively),
3. Advance the current draft specification of Dart and
4. Work on future features of the language, such as, extending the utility/functionality of first class types, Enums, library composition and modularity extensions as well as language support for asynchrony.

Participation: 8 (Google, Intel, LG Korea, Ecma International)

Intel: interested in anything that might be useful for its processors. LG: interested generally in Web languages, maybe useful in TV-sets (which today are dedicated PCs). It was reported that several universities are interested in the subject (e.g. Aarhus University, perhaps MIT), but were not represented.

The workshop went through the agenda as presented above. Dart was presented by Gilad Bracha - Dart's “Chief Specification Officer. Many questions, also between Dart and present TC39 experts were answered. The specification is publicly available (we have distributed it). It was said that the spec was mature, but not yet finished for a first Edition (maybe 90% ready), for a 2nd edition there are also many new ideas. If a new Ecma TC established, the first meeting would be in February / March 2014 (calendars of people are getting full). Temporary Email reflector has been established and maintained by A. Sandholm (Google DK)).

The Scope and the work-program were reviewed.

It is suggested that if the project is approved the TC chair and the Editor should come from Google.

There was a strong request also to apply the experimental TC39 RF policy to the potential Ecma work on Dart as well.

Reasons: It is also a very open standardization process with open source, RF requirement. Also directed as a Web programming language.

The CC has discussed the outcome of the Dart workshop and the draft scope and work-plan approved by the workshop. The CC looked at the current supporters for the project and is suggesting the Ecma GA to approve and launch a new TC for Dart (TC52) and suggests that an experimental RF TC52 policy (similar to the experimental RF TC39 policy) should be applied. **Mr. Sebestyen** was asked to draft such experimental TC52 RF policy based on the TC39 RF policy (with the same conditions), which should be part for a GA approval package. The TC52 would start with the RF policy, so no RAND to RF transition will take place. The IPR group mailing list should check if the editorial changes introduced by **Mr. Sebestyen** in the experimental TC52 RF Policy are correct. The above suggestion should be included in the proposed scope and work-plan, which should be circulated to the CC.

3 Ecma policy matters

3.1 Ecma RF IPR Policy extension to TC39 – status of implementation

This has been discussed in the TC39 discussion. See above.

3.2 Ecma TC39 Software Copyright Policy extension to 3rd Party contributors

The CC looked at the current text of the TC39 External Software Copyright Policy. This is still relevant for TC39 work.

In June 2010 the Ecma General Assembly approved this experimental software copyright policy. This policy is being applied by Ecma TC39 but only to members. External “text” contributions have been solved at the June GA. **Mr. Sebestyen** said that for 3rd party Software the current software submitter contributions could be used:

<http://www.ecma-international.org/memento/TC39%20exhibit%20B.pdf>

Mr. Sebestyen said that the Exhibit B “Software Submitter Contribution Form” seems to be applicable also to 3rd parties. **Ms Auber** said that the paragraph F that refers to the Ecma Patent policy which should be checked because that addresses first of all Ecma members and how this can be applied also to non-members (because in such a case we need also to reach also non-members). There was a broad discussion on this in the meeting. In the end it has been agreed that in all cases this has to be consulted and checked by the IPR Committee. The proposal is that we would apply Exhibit B also for 3rd parties (non-members) if the IPR Group does not object to it.

The draft text should be reviewed again by the CC after the discussion within the IPR group.

3.3 Ecma By-laws and Rules – Participation of non-members in Ecma activities

Mr. Sebestyen presented CC document 22 with the results and feed-back from the TC26 meeting test “filling out” the form by the present non-members. He said that people were basically happy to use the form and did not find hard to fill it in.

Ms Auber said that we have different situations for invited experts. We should apply flexibility when filling in (or not) the form to be decided by the Ecma Secretariat. We should have the form as a flexible tool where we will decide on a case by case basis when to use. We should remind our members that, however, the use of the form helps to protect the interests of Ecma.

This was fully supported by the CC.

3.5 Refinement of Ecma Recognition Policy

Mr. Sebestyen reported about the current status of implementation. He said that the 1st generation of awards is practically distributed to those persons who were awarded at the last GA. These awards went to departing chairs who have served Ecma for a longer time and recent editors of finished standards.

In the category of “Special People” we have no policy yet, so none of the key-movers in an Ecma TC work got an award.

The CC has decided that for “Exceptional, Significant Contributions to Ecma” the TCs may submit nominations to the GA. Regarding Editors of standards the CC suggested that only significant new editorial work should be awarded. Regarding departing Ecma Leadership persons (TC Chairs, TG Chairs etc.) also only significant contributions should be awarded. So in all categories the principle of “Exceptional, Significant Contributions to Ecma” should be the guiding rule.

3.6 Extension of Ecma Text Copyright License

The introduction to the subject has been already given above under 1.4 “TC39 – ECMAScript”.

The CC has discussed the matter at length.

Regarding the two cases that were summarized by Mr. A. Wirfs-Brock the opinion of the CC was the following:

Case 1: To take out text from the ECMAScript standard and to put it in comments of a software implementation was regarded as “fair use”, and the feeling of the CC was that nothing has to be done.

Case 2: To reuse the concepts of ECMAScript in a completely new language (not called ECMAScript anymore) is not a copyright issue and should be possible.

The question of “forking” i.e. to create a new ECMAScript variant (that is also called ECMAScript) without the consent of Ecma would confuse the market and should not be permitted. So we should disallow derivatives that have the potential to represent the Ecma standard.

The CC has recognized that the ECMAScript Trademark – that is owned in many significant world markets by Ecma International – we have a suitable defense tool.

The CC feels that both above cases can be covered by the current copyright text and it does not need any modification. So no change to the text copyright license is suggested.

The CC has also recognized that a FAQ (to be published on the Ecma website) explaining how ECMAScript can be used and should be used would be useful (including illustrating the fair use cases).

The CC also recommended that the IPR group should review the policy and the correctness of the above CC recommendations and should help to create such FAQ.

5.3 EC Multi-Stakeholder Standardization Platform

Mr. Sebestyen gave an update of the status of the EU recognition: The EC has suggested “ECMAScript” as a test case for their new policy. They have suggested more the “technology” than the actual ECMA-262 or related standards. As a first task we had to identify which concrete standards and TRs can come into consideration. The main ECMA-262 is already an International Standard due to the fast-track to JTC 1, so it is not subject of recognition.

ECMA-402 and ECMA TR/104 were identified as potentials. The Platform evaluation team has selected ECMA-402 to move ahead. TR/104 (Test262) was found as useful TR but not

suitable for EU recognition. We still have to go into public consultation, etc... so the whole process will take about 2 years, which is in IT standardization too long.

The process seems far too heavy handed to be attractive; Ecma will suggest some efficiency improvements in the next meeting.