Wasm Tools and the CG

Current State of Wasm tools (maintained by "us")

Some tools (Binaryen, WABT, compressor) live in the WebAssembly GitHub repository, and require CG membership to contribute

Preexisting or multi-target tools (LLVM, emscripten) have their own repo and license

CG membership (and its IP agreement) is a [hurdle](#) for contributors (not a license/agreement "known" to company lawyers)

Why did it get this way?

WebAssembly GitHub repo was a convenient place for new tools projects developed just for wasm

The CG IP agreement is supposed to [apply](#) to all contributions to CG deliverables

Tools are an integral component of wasm, experience with tool implementation informs wasm's design

The lawyers and standards folks recommended it

It doesn't have to be this way

Browser implementation also informs wasm's design, but browsers aren't covered by the CG

In practice, wasm design discussion has always been moved from tools repos to CG-covered forums (e.g. wasm design repo) for broader visibility

Some important tools are already definitely not covered by the CG (LLVM) and most future tools won't be

Tools (and all other non-test software products) are not actually part of the CG's chartered [deliverables](#)

Option 1: Keep the Status Quo

Declare that Binaryen and WABT are unique because they are special-purpose tools for wasm, are "owned" by the major CG participants (browser vendors), they get new proposals first, and therefore have extra influence

Pros: Most conservative in terms of legal coverage?

Cons:

    More difficult for outsiders to contribute

    Inconsistent (practically speaking, LLVM and emscripten have been just as important)

Option 2:

The CG declares/acknowledges that tools are not part of its deliverables and CG membership isn't necessary to contribute (but keep Apache2 where it exists already)

Continue to push all design-related discussion to CG-covered forums

More explicitly clarify which products are covered

We still want a convenient way to collaboratively produce tools and other non-deliverables:

 2a: Split the tools repositories into a new GH organization

 2b: Keep the single GH organization but be explicit about which repositories are covered

Possible actions/discussions

Vote: Should the CG explicitly acknowledge that tools are not covered by its charter and policies?

Possible edge cases: reference interpreter, tool-conventions

Does the charter need to be amended to clarify?

Does it matter that we privilege certain tools by featuring them in our org?