



# Pain Points of the IP Policy

from the Planning Council

August 15, 2007



## Timeliness

- Eclipse Legal needs to provide an ETA
- Saying “I can’t give you a date” is not acceptable
- The projects have to provide estimates (project plans) and to meet those dates (June 28<sup>th</sup>, every year) – basing our work on “I can’t give you a date” is unreasonable and impossible.
- There are many project management techniques for providing dates including estimates using historical trends, the characteristics of the request, and the current backlog.
  
- Related: the lack of scheduling transparency makes it near impossible to properly do our project management.
  
- Related: IP review takes too long.
- For simple dot releases and service packs of already approved libraries, we expect no more than 1-2 weeks for approval.

# Unclear Rules and Requirements



- The documentation is currently written from the point of view of lawyers, not of developers who are trying to implement this stuff – we need documentation and examples tailored toward implementation.
- We can help and want to help with reviews if we (a) understand what is expected of us and (b) can be given access to the tools (like Black Duck).
  - We are willing to trade more work on our part (we will run Black Duck against our code base regularly) in return for better responsiveness from Legal.
- We need to reduce the number of places license text appears in the various legal files for a plug-in.

# Level of Trust



- We want to use the Parallel IP process for all projects.
- Example: DTP's 1.5 NEC contribution occurred late in the cycle but because we couldn't check it in until even later in the cycle, we were unable to develop it properly and it went out with some poor APIs and bugs. With Parallel IP, we could have checked it in, done the development, and still released with IP reviewed code.
- Example: Modeling M2M: the QVT contribution used the University of Kent OCL library contribution. The project wanted to release something immediately and then rewrite. The IP review took so long (it was submitted during Europa), that the rewrite completed before the review completed.
- Desirable: a "holding pen" for not-completely-reviewed libraries and code

# Milestones of Third-Party Libraries



- Keeping up with external run-times is a on-going problem for STP and is made near impossible by Eclipse Legal.
- Example: Apache CXF 1.0 was no good; project is moving towards 2.0, but their timing is outside of Europa window. Hence STP needs to use a milestone build of CXF. That's currently not allowed by Legal.
- We don't want to force the external world to adapt to the Eclipse process – for example, providing us bundles from their sites and/or changing their schedules to match Eclipse Legal's deadlines – that's just not good community citizenship.
- Some projects rely on libraries that are GPL. We need a way to provide 1-click download of Eclipse projects and dependent GPL code in order to remove the burden from our User Community.