Meeting Minutes of April 7, 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**
Oracle: **Will Lyons**, **Dmitry Kornilov, Bill Shannon, Ed Bratt**
Payara: **Steve Millidge**
Red Hat: **Mark Little, John Clingan, Scott Stark**
Tomitribe: **David Blevins, Cesar Hernandez**
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 24 meeting were approved.

Minutes of the March 31 meeting will be reviewed next time.

Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls

- Update on Virtual CN4J day/JakartaOne Livestream Event
  - Moving to May 12 - all but 1 speakers have affirmed
  - Planning on distribution of content for social media promotion.
  - Kubecon rescheduled - day zero would be August 13th.
    - Exploring move of Day 0 sponsorship to NA event in November
- Discussion on "Driving people to spec project lists"
  - Marketing Committee has commented on branding concerns and a series of recommendations has been provided
    - Received and confirmed revision for sticker
    - Created version for virtual May Livestream
    - Advice on tagging forthcoming from Marketing Committee
  - Follow up from discussion last week
    - 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
  - Do not have the "unique count" at this time, but the following provides a measure of mailing list participants, and has been updated for March:
    - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1dkiob_WkIkGOclt7XWnL1uRNMReR8_fOo92Q5YrH40g/edit#gid=0
  - The intent is to measure and determine how we can increase the count
- Jakarta EE developer survey is out
  - https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Z9WBXSC
  - Collector links: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1--XAkXjT-ve-KbzzqzHF1ETQgnoP85rYEaHxRuZVeEs/edit#gid=213240262
  - Please support in social media channels
- The following items are carried over from prior meetings
  - Jakarta EE Update Calls
    - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SXWpaN3hf3wiTWQ/edit#
    - Call tomorrow - limited update (Ivar, Tanja, Shabnam) - Ivar - steps to help with delivery of Jakarta EE 9
    - For May need topics like TCK discussion, Technical directions, roadmap, etc. to be covered
  - Jakarta Tech Talks - Tanja is open for suggestions
    - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19AfvCUdScUHwJejMYg370tum5mi7zI4bvkZczcQXiUM/edit#gid=0
    - All topics for Cloud Native Java will be considered. Looking for more presentation referrals.
  - 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/1YDTAyynuhlNVBJK-Clb4XAW7gVw0TLu5R0uV3FUkW20/edit#gid=0
    - Need members that are engaged with JUGs to present to their local JUG communities - spark interest and then spread the knowledge and relationship further
  - 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/1Yn9EmzHlFIBwZKa8jDVQNWZXdtrxnDmX

  - 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](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNqGDYQp1etqHB4FqsgaHZA)

Jakarta EE 9

- ● From March 24 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.
- ● Update on April 7
  - ○ The Spec Committee agrees the June date is at risk, but felt this was not the proper forum for resolving the schedule issues.   Should be brought to Steering Committee and/or the Platform project.
  - ○ Kevin will update the document with Spec Committee comments and distribute to the Steering Committee and Platform project by end of week.
  - ○ Steve had also sent out a note summarizing dependencies on upstream projects to platform-dev list. Will send to Steering Committee as well.
  - ○ 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/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBilH qKGSOWrcEuc/edit?urp=gmail_link#gid=1810653774](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBilHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit?urp=gmail_link#gid=1810653774)
  - David did an initial (not complete) scan/analysis of Spring jars in Maven Central for Java EE/Jakarta EE dependencies which suggests the potential impact of the API changes. See below.
    - [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NOVFZhra4sRHsI1QMLVmCc D58RMD87RfP0WhVQg-PsM/edit#gid=1022962872](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NOVFZhra4sRHsI1QMLVmCcD58RMD87RfP0WhVQg-PsM/edit#gid=1022962872)

Jakarta EE and MicroProfile

- Would like to leave an opportunity for discussion on the "Fork Eclipse MicroProfile Configuration as Jakarta Configuration" discussion.
  - A future action for the Spec Committee could be structuring a discussion on how MP specs may be consumed for Jakarta EE.

- Mike Milinkovich had proposed the following resolution, and requested a vote by the Steering Committee:

  > Resolved, that the Jakarta EE Working Group Steering Committee agrees in principle with the proposal to create a Cloud Native for Java Umbrella Working Group.

  The proposal being referenced is the following:
  [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pV2n0iZkgdaIOaaZMZuTmSPDyjVKZBS5 gg7Y1-P_RHU/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pV2n0iZkgdaIOaaZMZuTmSPDyjVKZBS5gg7Y1-P_RHU/edit)

  Mike had also requested that the MP team put together a standalone WG proposal. As of April 6 delivery of that proposal was imminent.

  There was significant discussion about the content of the proposal, and the position of various members of the Working Group on the proposal.   Without attempting to characterize all of the comments made by all of the individual members, some members supported the proposal in principle, some members felt there were too many open comments to endorse the proposal, some members felt that the timing of the proposal was too early relative to the MicroProfile Working Group proposal, some members believe Jakarta EE 9 delivery should be our primary focus.

  The conclusion of the discussion was the vote would be deferred until next week, at which time members should be prepared to vote and provide a 1-2 line summary of their comments.

Operationalizing Jakarta EE Program Plan (not discussed)

- Scheduling the Jakarta EE Program Plan review
- 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/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