

**OASIS MQTT Technical Committee**  
**Minutes for the meeting of Thursday, 05th June 2014**  
**Teleconference**

**Convener:** Richard Coppen (IBM)

**Attendance:**

Attendees:

- William Bathurst
- Geoff Brown
- Rick Bullota
- James Butler
- Marco Carrer
- Raphael Cohn
- Sarah Cooper
- Richard Coppen
- Paul Fremantle
- Rahul Gupta
- Steve Huston
- Denis Kemper
- Alex Kritikos
- Louis-P. Lamoureux
- Dave Locke
- Peter Niblett
- Julien Niset
- Nicholas O'Leary
- Andrew Schofield
- Allan Stockdill-Mander

We have quorum.

**Approve Agenda:**

Agenda:

- Roll Call
- Approve Agenda
- Approve minutes from last meeting
- Voting Rights update
- MQTT 3.1.1 Standardization update & COS ballot
- Approve Security SC Issue resolution log
- Review community feedback
- Next steps and actions
- Confirm date & time of next MQTT TC meeting
- Confirm date & time of next MQTT Security SC meeting
- AOB
- Call for late joiners
- Close

The agenda is approved.

### **Approve minutes form last meeting 29.05.2014:**

Minutes approved.

### **Voting rights update:**

- Mr. David Kemper group role has been changed to Voting Member
- Mr. Nicholas O'Leary group role has been changed to Voting Member

### **MQTT 3.1.1 Standardization update & COS ballot:**

There are still a few hours to vote for COS. R. Coppen encourages voting members that have not yet voted to do so.

### **Approve Security SC Issue resolution log:**

R. Coppen proposes that we approve the MQTT SC CNPRD Issue Resolution log.

Proposed R. Coppen, Seconded Louis Lamoureux.

No objections, TC approved.

### **Review community feedback:**

MQTT has received some focus this week following a blog entry by Clemens Vasters (<http://www.vasters.com/clemensv/>). C. Vasters claims to have implemented MQTT following the 3.1.1. specification, and the blog entry documents his experience of doing so. His conclusion is quite negative towards MQTT and the 3.1.1. spec.

R. Coppen suggests that TC members review the blog entry and decide how we would like to respond.

R. Bullotta suggests the TC reaches out with a call for participation.

R. Cohn supports Rick's suggestion. He clarifies that MQTT and AMQP are different protocols and possible not straightforward to compare. He suggests that we should encourage C. Vasters to participate and join the TC. We should accept the criticism and not make an aggressive response.

A. Kritikos agrees with the previous comments and suggestion for involvement. He agrees that we should not make an aggressive response.

P. Niblett: Responding point by point may be inefficient as it may distract from the bigger discussion. A lot of the comments align well with our ideas for future versions. Still, there are a couple of misconceptions that we need to take care of, for example there is no need to drop a connection on an Authorization error.

P. Freemantle: We have a very clear charter. Many of the comments fall outside of our current charter. We can't really go back fix that. In hindsight maybe we should have done less so that we could have moved forward faster. Moving forward we can have a very clear list of areas we'll focus on.

G. Brown suggests that we do not respond to C. Vasters at all. We should seek some clarification and contact the OASIS Microsoft contact. He states that we need an official

line from Microsoft and that we need to understand what is political and what is technical. He states that this is a political issue.

A. Kritikos: If we take that approach the TC should be in CC of the emails.

P. Freemantle: I agree with G. Brown's approach from the OASIS perspective. In addition we need to deal with the technical perspective. The blog makes it clear that it is a personal view and we should capture the points in JIRA and work them.

P. Niblett: The article clearly states that the comments are personal and not from Microsoft. However, people are reading the content and we need to respond. He sees no reason why we shouldn't reach out here.

R. Coppen: What are the next steps? 1) Reach out to OASIS and work the official channel? 2) Work back channels to understand what is Microsoft's position? 3) Answer the author.

G. Brown states again that he only recommends the official approach. No back channels and no direct answer to the author.

P. Niblett and D. Locke note that we should capture things we want to improve as JIRA's.

R. Cohn: A lack of response may look negative.

The discussion continues on next steps between G. Brown, A. Stockdill-Mander, N. O'Leary, R. Coppen, D. Locke and P. Niblett.

N. O'Leary: There are a lot of technical criticisms in the document and we should also address them.

R. Cohn: We should reach out via OASIS, but the technical community will read the doc.

A. Stockdill-Mander: We should reply on the OASIS webpage / news forum and not on personal blogs.

R. Bullota agrees on an official communication. Overall the objective should be to get the motivation behind this so using back channels to get information is also of value.

R. Coppen: We can formalize the next steps next week once we have received an answer from the OASIS investigation.

A. Kritikos: Once we have a response should we advertise it on social media?

R. Cohn: No reason why we shouldn't.

R. Coppen summarizes the actions:

- 1) Work with OASIS to get an official position on the article
- 2) Load up JIRA with issues (as part of our futures exercise)
- 3) Publish an acknowledgment on the OASIS TC page (or elsewhere with OASIS)
- 4) Bring the TC back together next week to review

A. Kritikos: We should ask OASIS to distribute our complete answer (whenever we have that) in the IOT newsletter.

**Confirm date & time of next TC meeting:**

Thursday 12th June 2014.

**Confirm date & time of SC next meeting:**

No meeting scheduled.

**Any Other business:** None.

**Call for late joiners:** None.

**Close.**