# Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Topics</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Signal Fire (Justin Brzozoski)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Event with IIoT World (guest: Lucian Fogoros)</td>
<td>Lucian</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkplug specification project update</td>
<td>Wes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO/IEC IPR Policies — Way forward</td>
<td>Frédéric</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attendees:

Frederic Desbiens (Eclipse Foundation)  
Benson Houghland (Opto22)  
Arlen Nipper (Cirrus Link)  
Ian Skerrett (HiveMQ)  
Jeff Knepper (Canary Labs)  
Hassan Jaber (Eclipse Foundation)  
Jackie Eldridge (Inductive Automation)  
Kristine Zukose (Inductive Automation)  
Wes Johnson (Cirrus Link)  
Don Pearson (Inductive Automation)  
Chris Houghton (Cirrus Link)  
David Grussenmeyer (Inductive Automation)  
Justin Brzozoski  
Lucian Fogoros (IIoT World)

Absent:  
Todd Anslinger (Chevron)
IoT World Discussion

Lucian Fogoros joined the meeting to discuss the possibility of doing an event with the Sparkplug Working Group later this year. He gave some background on IoT World and their following so the members could get an idea of what type of attendees would be included. The members need to decide if they’d like to move forward with booking and planning the next steps. The members could choose to be speakers or sponsor the event, or both. It would be a virtual event with about 3-5 sessions. The members need to decide their interest and the best timeframe for the event and get back to Lucian.

Spec update

Wes joined the call to update the members on the spec project. Before the next meeting specification will be near the final draft. He will post it to the sparkplug slack channel for final review.

ISO/IEC IPR Policies- Way Forward

Wes met with past mentor David Filipe on the subject of if we were to take the option of submitting the tck as an electronic attachment, what would be the expectations in terms of documentation. Wes found out you can't attach code to a specification and require that implementations pass that tck. His hope was that because we do have annotations and the specification itself which tied directly to the tck which then enforce conformance, that all of that relatively strong binding would make this okay. It didn’t work out, so if we require passing a tck to be considered conformance then a specification for the tck itself must exist. This was probably the most ideal solution in terms of what ISO and all of the people there would like to see. It's a huge amount of work to actually write a specification for the tck itself. It would be equal in scope, if not, maybe a bit larger to writing a sparkplug specification itself.

In order to meet the deadline, because we passed the initial review in May, we would need to start the process of transposition by November and need to be complete with that process by May of 2023. Wes mentioned this is a lofty goal and without additional help he doesn’t think it's possible.

Frederic mentioned that given all this, there are two main options as we advance:

1. Each participant and strategic working group member needs to confirm that they will be willing to provide royalty-free patent licenses to all Sparkplug implementers working with the ISO/IEC version of the specification under the Eclipse Foundation Compatible Patent license. This license requires passing the TCK as the condition for receiving the royalty-free patent licenses. This would ensure all implementers would be compatible whether they implement the Eclipse or the ISO/IEC version of the specification. This approach would require the Foundation to submit the TCK binary to ISO/IEC as a binary file attachment and to document the inner workings of the TCK as a specification. In particular, we would have to provide details about each test performed and write step-by-step instructions to run each of them. This is no small effort and not something currently in the project plan.

OR

2. We change the patent license for the working group from the Compatible Patent
License to the Implementation Patent License. It is still possible for us to do so since there were no reviews in the lifecycle of the Sparkplug specification yet. In that case, you would not have to negotiate because we could point to the blanket patent license provided by the Eclipse Foundation's Implementation Patent license. We would not have to submit the TCK as an attachment.

Frederic sent an email to the steering committee laying all this information out as well. The members will need to decide in the next few weeks before we hold a review or vote to ratify the specification.