

# Minutes of March 31, 2020 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

The Zoom ID is:

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

Attendees:

Fujitsu: **Kenji Kazumura**

IBM: **Daniel Bandera, Kevin Sutter, Neil Patterson, Ian Robinson**

Oracle: **Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov, Bill Shannon, Ed Bratt**

Payara: **Steve Millidge**

Red Hat: **John Clingan, Scott Stark**

Tomitribe: **David Blevins**

Participant member representative: **Martijn Verburg** (LJC)

Committer member representative: **Arjan Tjims**

(Quorum is 4 -- simple-majority or one-half of the members (if even number) must be present)

Eclipse: **Paul Buck, Tanja Obradovic, Paul White, Ivar Grimstad, Mike Milinkovich, Shabnam Mayel**

## Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the March 17 meeting were approved.

Minutes of the March 24 meeting will be reviewed next time.

## Topic from Mike Milinkovich

"I would like to discuss why some of our largest members are not helping promote the Jakarta EE brand.".... "I am not trying to pick on anyone here, but it is clear that we collectively need to engage our member's product marketing resources to help educate the market about the transition from Java EE to Jakarta EE. Please consider this a cry for help."

"Specifically":

- "The Red Hat JBoss product page makes exactly zero mention of Jakarta EE, despite the fact that it is listed as a compatible product."
  - **Update from meeting - Red Hat will add.**
- "Oracle just shipped WebLogic 14.1.1, but according to Will's blog has not completed testing for Jakarta EE compatibility."

- Update from meeting - Compatibility tests are passing and will be submitted in mid-April
- It is OK to use the Jakarta EE logo without claiming compatibility (if you do not have a compatible implementation). Can also use the Jakarta EE member logo.
- Update from Meeting. It was requested that the platform team review the question of whether to modify the Jakarta EE 8 TCK to run on JDK 11. This is a desirable, but not an urgent requirement from the POV of the Steering Committee.

## Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls

- Update on Virtual CN4J day/JakartaOne Livestream Event
  - After further discussion, planning to move to May, Polling speakers to determine which day in May would work best.
  - Planning on distribution of content for social media promotion.
  - Kubecon rescheduled - day zero would be August 13th.
  - Hope for more information next week.
- Discussion on “Driving people to spec project lists”
  - Marketing Committee has commented on branding concerns and a series of recommendations has been provided
    - Expecting revisions for sticker to review
    - Expect to have available by May Livestream
    - Advice on tagging forthcoming from Marketing Committee
  - Follow up from discussion last week - any update on the following
    - Is it possible to get a “unique people” count of spec list participants
      - Each individual counts as 1 if participating across multiple specs
      - Tanja had initiated a similar request (bug open), and created a new bug reflecting request above:
      - [https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show\\_bug.cgi?id=558926](https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show_bug.cgi?id=558926)
      - Do not have the “unique count” at this time, but see the following:
      - [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1dkiob\\_WklkGOclt7XWnL1uRNMRer8\\_fOo92Q5YrH40g/edit#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1dkiob_WklkGOclt7XWnL1uRNMRer8_fOo92Q5YrH40g/edit#gid=0)
  - The intent is to measure and determine how we can increase the count
- The following are listed from prior meetings - updates in **bold**
  - Jakarta EE Update Calls
    - [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F\\_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SXWpaN3hf3wiTWQ/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SXWpaN3hf3wiTWQ/edit#)
    - Call last week. Next call to be scheduled in April
  - Jakarta Tech Talks - Tanja is open for suggestions
    - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19AfvCUdScUHwJeiMYg370tum5mi7zl4bvkZczcQXiUM/edit#gid=0>

- All topics for Cloud Native Java will be considered. Looking for more presentation referrals.
- Jakarta EE developer survey coming up next quarter
  - Will be launched April 6, with feedback incorporated
  - Results to be published on June 16
  - [Draft](#) has been closed
- Foundation has created a list of enabling JUGs. Looking for members to sign up and present on Jakarta EE at JUGs.
  - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YDTAaynuhlNVBJK-CIb4XAW7gVw0TLu5R0uV3FUKW20/edit#gid=0>
- Crowdcast for JUGs. Was discussed last time and has been completed and already available for JUGs to use. Good response so far:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1Yn9EmzHIFIBwZKa8jDVQNWZXdtrxnDmX>

- JakartaOne Livestream Brazil
  - August 29th - tentative - working with SouJava team
  - **Expect communication requesting Portugese speaker participation. Anyone interested in serving on the program committee, contact Ottavio Otávio Gonçalves de Santana <otaviopolianasantana@gmail.com>).**
  - (Marketing Plan had planned for sponsorship for [JakartaOne Livestream](#) also see [planned budget](#))
- RACI for website ownership - please review and volunteer for “columns”. No feedback on this so far.
  - [Maintainers document](#)
  - [RACI spreadsheet](#)
- Studio Jakarta EE
  - <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNqGDYQp1etqHB4FqsgaHZ>  
[A](#)

## Jakarta EE and MicroProfile

Mike Milinkovich distributed the umbrella working group proposal for feedback:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pV2n0iZkgdalOaaZMZuTmSPDyjVKZBS5gg7Y1-P\\_RHU/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pV2n0iZkgdalOaaZMZuTmSPDyjVKZBS5gg7Y1-P_RHU/edit)

- Last meeting Mike requested feedback on this doc. Some feedback has been provided.
- Mike will update based on feedback and request a Jakarta EE Steering Committee vote on whether this approach is endorsed. MicroProfile would need to vote separately.

- Mike has also requested that the MP team put together a standalone WG proposal.

## Jakarta EE 9

- From last meeting:
  - <https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/17>
  - As of Mar 17, had an RC1 for Jakarta EE 9 Full Platform and Web Profile.
  - Several spec projects making progress.
  - Are not seeing PRs for final versions. Not seeing significant progress in the past several weeks. Related to dependency on compatible implementations and difficulty implementing updates to GF implementation.
  - June delivery date at risk.
  - Kevin indicated he would initiate a Jakarta EE 9 review at the Spec Committee. Paul and Kevin will prepare “homework” for Spec Committee members.
- Update on March 31
  - Paul and Kevin have discussed a document capturing overall project status, ownership, tracking and review will distribute to Spec Committee for action to remedy the situation. It was noted there is impact from the coronavirus situation.
  - Discussion on backwards compatibility:
    - This is not part of the current Jakarta EE 9 plan
    - David recommended that we need an agreed message on this topic
    - There is a Transformer project proposal on the Eclipse web site
      - <https://projects.eclipse.org/proposals/eclipse-transformer>
- Update on tooling:
  - Ownership for tooling vendors being tracked below:
  - [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBiHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit?urp=gmail\\_link#gid=1810653774](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBiHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit?urp=gmail_link#gid=1810653774)

## Cloud Native for Java Message Architecture

- See email for Tanja requesting feedback
  - [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UvQh9pHERspSIFismAXbDqVOvhD2Q-s8K5GoYh6Lm\\_Q/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UvQh9pHERspSIFismAXbDqVOvhD2Q-s8K5GoYh6Lm_Q/edit)
- Tanja has received feedback, thanks. Will take to Marketing Committee

## Operationalizing Jakarta EE Program Plan

- Tanja and Will have drafted a document that translates the goals of the 2020 plan:
  - <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1S053agg7BeBM4wSaGhtbANE6tlFBc3Ap0Z-e-xdEOnM>
- We will review status of the tracking spreadsheet.

- [https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19du8Ccxf4aYc-q5aNnuglYR1nl00ZPUcgPeZU9uW8NE/edit#slide=id.g7b69340134\\_0\\_132](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19du8Ccxf4aYc-q5aNnuglYR1nl00ZPUcgPeZU9uW8NE/edit#slide=id.g7b69340134_0_132)
- <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBilHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit#gid=0>
  - It was recommended we defer the goal related to innovation in new specifications until after the Jakarta EE 9 release.
  - We will schedule a separate meeting within the next two weeks, to review Jakarta EE progress/actual vs goals in Q1.
- All docs are in the Steering Committee folder, program plans. Q1 goal suggestions were reviewed and feedback was requested.
- Dan and Will meet to discuss backward compatibility goal

### **Jakarta EE 8 Follow-Up [not discussed]**

- Any update from last week.

### **Release Cadence discussion [not discussed]**

- Discussion about cadence of releases from Jan 14 (John C provided the following summary).
  - Spec projects can release at any cadence they can implement to.
  - John C. suggests that slower does not equate to a negative. Stability is also of concern - what cadence do Jakarta EE users want to absorb (based on how they have been deploying Java EE up to this point)?
  - TCK compatibility requirements also have details about how independent releases can be absorbed. We may need to change these requirements, to support flexibility that we want to achieve.
  - The committee would like to identify barriers to complete independence with respect to release schedules. Jakarta may provide opportunities for expanding this flexibility.
  - We could include questions about this in a survey to help refine the community input. There are many possibilities for accomplishing this.
  - Suggested that the committee adopt a statement (or resolution) recommending improvement in the frequency of releases and that we work to identify and perhaps relax requirements that make releases take longer. Then the subcommittees and committer working groups could be asked to provide feedback about their processes and requirements that could be changed to meet this goal.
- Discussion from Feb 25 meeting
  - A plan for defining a release cadence should be informed by vendor requirements for releases
  - A release cadence plan should consider both a cadence for the Platform and a cadence for individual APIs

- We need to define a relationship to compatibility requirements
- It is difficult to define a release cadence plan without having completed a first release with changes (i.e. Jakarta EE 9)
- We do not have a strawman/guideline for this to guide the discussion
- Defining a release cadence/plan should be a Q2 goal