

## Minutes of June 18 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

The Zoom ID is:

<https://eclipse.zoom.us/j/499849869>

### Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura, **Mike Denicola**

IBM: Dan Bandera, **Kevin Sutter**, **Ian Robinson**

Oracle: Will Lyons (**Ed Bratt**)

Payara: **Steve Millidge**

Red Hat: Mark Little, **Scott Stark**

Tomitribe: **David Blevins**, **Richard Monson-Haefel**

**Martijn Verburg**

**Ivar Grimstad**

Eclipse: **Paul Buck**, Paul White, and team

### Review of Minutes from Prior Meeting

Reviewed draft minutes of the June 4 meeting. David proposed we approve as amended. Mike DeNicola and Kevin seconded. Meeting minutes were approved.

Draft minutes of the June 11 meeting will be reviewed next time.

### Jakarta EE 8 Release

#### *References*

1) The scope of the release has been agreed to as described in the following document:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/15rsZ5e3ONjsJjP635yev3dVjV5ZiKdlvRuHXQXpwQus/edit>

2) The “Next Steps” document provides an overview of the current plan:

[https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1VFaaE5-HaDIdm4c-IdJTcyO0sGoYcumGchq\\_aoNUq2M/edit#slide=id.g4d87466c3c\\_0\\_0](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1VFaaE5-HaDIdm4c-IdJTcyO0sGoYcumGchq_aoNUq2M/edit#slide=id.g4d87466c3c_0_0)

3) The following Google doc is being updated:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15HdTmptvIWIW53zm6wGwZoli5c1kRzM79G-ZDHe4FVMs/edit#gid=503170349>

4) Ed has drafted the following which was referenced in the May 7 and 14 meeting:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZtVZBLY2Q-zze0ftF0T0\\_7i0OlvhOVEkDTcBml2mG3E/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZtVZBLY2Q-zze0ftF0T0_7i0OlvhOVEkDTcBml2mG3E/edit?usp=sharing)

*Review of required Steering Committee decisions and guidance, including a weekly update on the status of the TCK (Scott), PMC (Ivar) and Spec Committee (Scott) process was requested.*

- PMC update on the progress of spec project renaming and creation of scope statements? (Ivar)
- Discussion: Still honing in on complete list of Scope Statements. Most are in good shape. Second batch for approval has been circulated to Committee. Final batch to be circulated by this time next week.

Links to GitHub projects below:

- Scope statements tracking: <https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/10>
- Project renaming tracking: <https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/11>
- Spec project creation tracking: <https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/13>
- Jakarta EE 8 TCK jobs tracking: <https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/14>

- The scope statement deadline was June 7, after June 7 PMC was to create them. As of the June 11 meeting, 9 scope statements were ready, 6 were in progress, 10 were in a “to do” state, but there was no firm date for completion of all scope statements. We were hoping for completion by the end of the month, depending on the Spec Committee review. Is that still the target?
  - Names and scope-statements to be completed by the end of the month.
- Other tasks (project renaming, spec project creation, TCK jobs) will align with the creation review process. As of the June 11 meeting, 5 projects ready for approval at the Spec Committee. Is there an update on the status of the creation review process?
  - TCK Jobs -- one is created for JAX-RS. A few more will be up, next week. Some discussion about approach at PMC. Meeting set up for Thursday to discuss further. Need resources to begin working to set these up for all projects. 34 APIs, each needing to set up a compatibility verification CI job. Proposed time is Thursday 5 PM CET (8 AM PDT). Dmitry to send details once presenters are. Dmitry to notify PMC list to reach project leads.
- Wayne was to research prior consideration by Eclipse Foundation on acquiring NexusPro for the purposes of holding TCK binaries being proposed while in use by compatible implementations. As of 6/11 there was no update. Any update on this?
  - Tracking issue: [https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show\\_bug.cgi?id=543462](https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show_bug.cgi?id=543462)
  - Wayne suggests that history of this be reviewed in the bug. Wayne reports this cannot be completed on the current schedule.
  - The committee would like to request work on this to complete a proposed plant resources to include Nexus Pro.
  - Implementation teams will investigate an interim solution for Jakarta EE 8.

- Additional discussion regarding alternative locations (e.g. download.eclipse.org). Some discussion about access restrictions. Private download (restricted access) is not a requirement. Fred will discuss some of this at Spec. committee tomorrow.
- Update from Scott on TCK and Spec Process progress

As of June 11, the TCK Process Guide Document was close to closure. It needed to be scrubbed and voted on. Is there an expected completion date for this document?

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eg7nqACM59Ptn6ph20WVifvjkadsl-yfpe5TPUiscx8/edit#heading=h.c86x9rk7bay9>

Oracle provided converted Specifications last week. Is there any general update on Spec Process? Is the following “Steps to Complete JESP for Jakarta EE 8” the document of record? Is there an expected completion date for this document?

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/12DsBDdDVO-jnOrrZYnOjx0tuAzZcoTumO6GvyS5c\\_DY/edit#heading=h.46tuhwbnexr3](https://docs.google.com/document/d/12DsBDdDVO-jnOrrZYnOjx0tuAzZcoTumO6GvyS5c_DY/edit#heading=h.46tuhwbnexr3)

Discussion: close to final text of TCK Process Guide. Paul Buck to add link to <sup>TM</sup> guidelines to this guide. Will review remaining issues w/Spec. Committee tomorrow. Vote either tomorrow, or Thursday next week

- Release timing

The goal is a target date of August (prior to Code One start date of Sept 16 and JakartaOne Livestream date of Sept 10).

Review of Ed’s schedule spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/14zRq36PiAmsNQuVB6t3ligCXIP3TGRCGqgDmIGnAPyc/edit#gid=297538807>

- Was EFSP 1.2 and the JESP update voted on in Spec Committee?
- Discussion: Not yet. Wayne intends to bring that to vote of Specification Committee this week (hopefully, today). Notes that JESP must be updated as well. Incorporate EFSP 1.2. Perhaps adopt ballot duration updates. Wayne will update and circulate a draft.
- The release must be ready for review by July 22. There is a 30-day ballot period defined in the JESP.
  - Paul White was to draft potential language to modify the ballot period. Is there an update on this?
  - Reassign to Wayne.

- The EFSP, JESP, TCK and Spec Process documents must all be approved by July 22 given the current review period. Are we on target for this?
- Is the Platform spec scope statement up for review at Spec Committee? Is the spec project team organized?
- Discussion: Wayne reports that the Scope statement is submitted for approval and project converted to Spec. project Tuesday next week. Wayne will enable contribution the Spec. text shortly following conversion. (First to IPZilla, then commit to the Spec. project repository.)
- Proposal to split specification repositories

Last week, the Steering committee voted to approve, in principle, separating Specification projects from implementation projects. Action to make this split has been discussed. Eclipse and Oracle implementation representatives have urged deferral until after Jakarta EE 8 is completed. Discussion.

- Progress on the discussion on the use of acronyms:

Oracle created a document for "Oracle Requirements and Guidance on the use of Oracle/JCP marks and acronyms in Jakarta EE specifications":

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1r44eNqn361ORIjXRkS36cKz3OkBSfwxE8ZXi5\\_uRPQ/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1r44eNqn361ORIjXRkS36cKz3OkBSfwxE8ZXi5_uRPQ/edit?usp=sharing)

Oracle will update the guidance consistent with the following:

The goal of these recommendations is to avoid confusion and ensure that the developer community can easily identify whether a project originates from Oracle/JCP or from Eclipse.

The **full project name/title** and any **scope statement** should not incorporate the acronym.

OK: "Jakarta Message Service Specification"

Not OK: "JMS Specification"

Not OK: "Jakarta Message Service (JMS) Specification"

The current **short names** (or id) for Jakarta EE projects are sometimes derived from Oracle/JCP acronyms (for example jaxrs-api, jaf and jpa-api). For **repositories** created for these projects, use of the current short names for these projects, within the following Github organization names, continues to be acceptable:

- eclipse (e.g. <https://github.com/eclipse/>[current short names])

- eclipse-ee4j
- jakartaee
- eclipse-jakartaee

For projects created at Eclipse, use of the current short names for these projects in URLs with the following form continues to be acceptable:

eclipse.org/projects/[current short name]

For maximum flexibility and clarity, we encourage projects to change their short names to more closely correspond to the new specification names, if applicable, and avoid the Oracle/JCP acronyms where possible.

If the project contains **references** to the acronym, include a sentence such as the following: "References in this document to JMS refer to the Jakarta Message Service unless otherwise noted." The sentence needs to be a legible size and should be in the project description, not in an illegibly small footnote. A reader should not have to scroll, turn a page, or click a link to get to the sentence.

A **URL, repository name, or package name** may include the acronym to the right of a string identifying Eclipse or Jakarta as the origin.

OK: [github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jms](https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jms)

OK: [eclipse.org/projects/ee4j/jms](https://eclipse.org/projects/ee4j/jms)

OK: jakarta.jms.JMSContext

Discussion: Oracle will update the Google Doc. that we have already started (Add link). That guidance will reflect what is written above. Wayne requests this be pushed as a web-page.

Ian: Could guidance explicitly include API names and paths

- Update on obtaining clearance for copyrights to Java EE 8 specifications (esp the Platform specification)?
- Bill Shannon has created a "specification template" project for creating boilerplate specifications. We should review this.

## Jakarta EE Next and Evolving the javax namespace

- Status of the discussion on evolving the javax namespace to the jakarta namespace. May 6 document referenced below:  
<https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakartaee-platform-dev/msg00029.html>

What is the status of this discussion, for example, something that outlines the current primary options that are under discussion, and the process we will use to select a direction. Variables under discussion that we are aware of are:

- Will Jakarta EE 9 focus on renaming only, with no new “functionality”
- Which packages will be renamed:
  - All
  - A designated subset (which subset)
- How deep will the renaming go (javax to jakarta only, or down to lower layers)
- Will we seek to implement all renaming in Jakarta EE 9 or will we allow for future renaming
- Approaches for implementing compatibility in the context of renaming

### **Paul White requested approval of Marketing Committee revision to Trade Mark Guidelines**

Discussion: Mike DeNicola reported these revisions were approved by the Marketing Committee and requested Steering Committee approve [draft 1.1](#)

The motion for unanimous approval was made and seconded. There were no objections raised.

The revised Trademark Guidelines v. 1.1

[“Jakarta EE Trademark Guidelines](#)

[Supplement to the Eclipse Foundation Guidelines for Eclipse Logos & Trademarks](#)

[Policy for Jakarta EE Marks](#)

[Version 1.1 - June 13, 2019”](#)

Are approved ([named version link](#)).

### **Other Agreements Between Working Group Members and the Eclipse Foundation**

- Participation Agreement signed by Tomitribe. Thank you

### **Marketing Committee Update**

- Any update

### **Jakarta EE committee elections**

- Any Update

### **Jakarta “Summit”**

Consensus has been to work on defining an agenda when there is more clarity on the resolution of legal issues.

Tomitribe does not intend to join

Payara has other commitments.

Oracle continues to be interested. IBM is supportive (Kevin continues to be supportive).

Paul will inquire about the possibility of keeping this on the calendar. Suggests 20-30 attendees is minimum for viability. Still working on Ottawa as the location.