Excerpts

Minutes of the: *meeting of the Co-ordinating Committee*

held in: *Geneva*

on: *10 – 11 April 2014*

Chairman: Ms J. Auber (HP)

Secretary: Mr. I. Sebestyen (SG Ecma)

Attending: Mr. O. Elzinga (Ecma), Dr. J. Friedrich (IBM), Mr. D. McAllister (Adobe), Ms I. Valet-Harper (Microsoft, part-time, via teleconference), Mr. K. Yamashita (Hitachi).

0   Approval of the agenda

The draft agenda of the meeting was approved (CC/14/007-Rev1) with minor additions.

1   Review of TC Activity reports

The following TC Chairmen's reports were presented:

TC12	Mr. Elzinga
TC20	Mr. Elzinga
TC26	Mr. Sebestyen
TC31	Mr. Yamashita
TC32	Mr. Elzinga
TC38	Mr. Elzinga
TC39	Mr. Sebestyen
TC43	Mr. Sebestyen
TC45	Ms Valet-Harper
TC46	Ms Valet-Harper
TC47	Mr. Elzinga
TC48	Mr. Elzinga
TC49	Mr. Sebestyen
TC50	Mr. Elzinga
TC51	Mr. Yamashita
TC52	Mr. Sebestyen

1.7   TC39 - ECMAScript

Activity report: TC39/14/011.

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

Mr. Sebestyen gave a verbal activity report.

This is the largest Ecma TC with over 30 participants at each face to face meeting. The rate of 6 face to face meetings per year continues.

Nothing for approval at the June 2014 GA.

Work on the new Edition of ECMAScript (ES6) continues with a new target date of December 2014 for GA Approval. A new Edition of ECMA-402 is also in progress now with expected completion in December 2014. Further work on JSON is under consideration but not concretely planned.

RFTG transition went smoothly at the January 2014 meeting. The TC39 RFTG became operational at the January 2014 TC39 meeting. Deadline to register with the TC39 RFTG by all TC39 members has been set until the April 2014 TC39 meeting.

The May 2014 ES6 draft will be defined as "opt-out" version. Then TC39 RFTG members can decide within the following 60 days if they want to opt-out from the RF mode for any material in this draft.

Work will continue on the Test system known as TEST 262 which is a Technical Report. This will also include the ECMA-402 tests. TC39 is happy to note that a policy allowing 3rd party text and software contributions developed by the IPR Group is under Ecma GA

approval by postal ballot. There is urgency for the final approval of the new policy because of the TEST 262 of ES6.

JSON fast-track submission to JTC 1 is currently on hold, and is not expected to happen. IETF (IAB) is intending to formalize its liaison status with Ecma TC39. So far the liaison was informal, via joint meeting participants and did not work too well.

TC39 is considering having one update of the ECMAScript standard per year, instead the current longer periods.

Mr. Brendan Eich has suddenly left Mozilla. The CC noted the request of TC39 to treat **Mr. Eich** as invited expert and supports that **Mr. Eich** can continue to be part of the TC39 work. In the fall meeting of the CC we will look again at the situation.

3 Ecma policy matters

3.1 Ecma RF IPR Policy extension to TC39 and TC52 – status of implementation – Harmonization?

Mr. Sebestyen reported that both TC39 and TC52 have now implemented the RF policy. In TC39 all key players have already registered for the RF TG, in TC52 so far only Google. The deadline for registration is the next meeting of both organizations. **Ms. Auber** has requested that after the next meeting of TC39 and TC52 a list of registrants should be published for information.

Regarding the "opt out" possibilities TC39 has informed the SG that the next May 2014 draft version of ES6 will be the "opt-out" version (duration of the opt-out is at least 60 days). The CC noted that, as the policy mandates at least one "opt-out" window/review before final approval, "opt-out" has to be applied also for the TC52 draft Dart standard to be approved by the June 2014 GA. So far TC52 has not done an opt-out yet (also at least 60 days).

The question of "harmonization" came up as a question at the last meeting, because both policies are exactly the same (except one is for TC39 and one for TC52). **The CC suggested that for the time being the two experimental policies should not be harmonized, let us wait until the end of the trial implementation of both policies.**

3.2 Ecma TC39 Software Copyright Policy extension to 3rd Party contributors (CC/14/002-Rev3)

Mr. Sebestyen reported that the IPR Group and the CC have finished the combined 3rd party "text and software" contribution policy and this is now under GA ballot. TC39 is happy about this and it is said that some external contributors are lining up to submit their test software for ES6.

Ms. Auber said that one item on the form is unclear and may confuse people, namely that one form has to be filled in for any **new subject** and not one form for one contributor (company) "forever". This is a proposed editorial change.

Mr. Elzinga noted that now for TC32 we will also get software based contributions (like for the multimedia test sequences of Qualinet) and that is not covered yet by the Ecma policy, which is only valid for TC39. **Mr. Sebestyen** agreed and added that this is also missing in TC52 at present. So later maybe such an Ecma-wide policy will be needed.

3.3 Extension of Ecma Text Copyright License (for TC39 only?)

Draft Ecma Text Copyright FAQ (CC/14/003-Rev2)

Mr. Sebestyen reported that on the request by some members of TC39 we looked at the text copyright question. They felt that the current text was too restrictive. The IPR Group looked at this and suggested not change the copyright policy and text but that an FAQ should be written and published on the Ecma website, explaining how Ecma interprets "fair use" of its text copyright. This FAQ has been prepared and published. Since this is a living document everybody is invited to read it, to comment it, to add to it.

The IPR group has not finished yet all the points that TC39 members wanted to address. One issue still under discussion: if a new language wants to use part of an old language where Ecma has copyrights (a normal process in the development of languages), what should Ecma say about this ?

Ms. Auber said that she had some editorial comments to the text and she will send it to the Secretariat for update. Everybody (also in the CC) is invited to read the FAQ and to comment it.

3.4   Review of the NFP membership rules (CC/14/008, CC/14/009)

This was a task from the last CC meeting on October 2013 that this CC meeting should pick up the subject. **Mr. Sebestyen** has republished the CC document from 2009, when this topic was discussed. At that time we did not change the policy but introduced a few measures that have proved to be successful. For example the yearly renewal has been implemented. We also allow large universities to participate in more than one TC if they and Ecma want. We did not change anything for governmental agencies. We also did not do anything for those NFPs, who had members who themselves could become Ecma members.

The second document is the current list of the Ecma NFP membership. April 1 2014 was the deadline for final renewal for 2014. Some organizations who have not answered will be removed from the Ecma membership (6 were not renewed). We carry on with everybody who positively responded.

Then the CC looked at it which of those NFPs are active and which are not. It has been observed that the majority of NFPs are active contributors. There are also NFPs who just monitor, or for whom Ecma membership is important for whatever reasons (e.g. prestige) but hardly contribute. This has been acknowledged by the CC.

In terms of possible additional income there are only a few prospects and their legal status is sometimes "tricky". E.g. there is an "XXX foundation" that is not-for-profit and is Ecma member, then there is a "XXX corporation" that runs and finances the foundation and it is for profit, but who is not the member of Ecma. Others foundations have only "individual members" who do not have much money.

Currently we do not have governmental organizations. We have "government owned" service providers, like France Televisions, or research organizations.

And we still have several universities as NFPs.

After having reviewed the NFP situation, the summary is, we keep the status quo, but the CC observes that some of the changes introduced in 2009 regarding NFPs are working well. So the situation of NFPs is different from that of 2009.

Ms Valet-Harper noted that sometimes there is only one person behind an NFP membership. We could leave the NFP status as it is, but we may look also at an individual membership category. The CC reviewed again the list of NFP list and agreed that there are indeed such NFP categories where it is only one person behind it. It was also noted that some of those persons are important, e.g. doing editor jobs. Often the one person represents the member but often they only represent themselves and the member is just used as a vehicle for working with Ecma, and this is often how retired experts continue to work with Ecma. Maybe an "Ecma Fellow" type of category could be used for that, but that discussion is a different- and long discussion. So we should think how to treat individuals as permanent experts and not as invitees.

3.5   Creation of a Maintenance TC?

This idea was brought up in the discussions of the Las Vegas General Assembly. Ecma as an SDO has the responsibility to provide for maintenance of its "active" standards, even when the TC that has created it is not active anymore. The original idea was to create a "Maintenance TC" and to put under this TC the selected not-active TCs as TGs. In our case these TCs are TCs with no chairman, no reports.