

Minutes of the August 3, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura

IBM: Dan Bandera, Kevin Sutter

Oracle: Ed Bratt, Will Lyons

Payara: Eliot Martin

Red Hat: Scott Stark, Mark Little

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez

Enterprise Member representative: Not present

Participant member representative: Martijn Verburg

Committer member representative: Arjan Tijms

(Quorum is 5 -- simple-majority or one-half of the members (if even number) must be present)

Eclipse: Not present

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the July 6 meeting were approved.

Minutes of the July 20 meeting will be reviewed next time.

Objectives Review - Reminder of action items, please review spreadsheet for your items

- Review, adjust and redefine Q3 objectives that we set out early this year.
 - The [2021 Jakarta EE Program Plan - by quarter](#) presentation and
 - The [corresponding Q3 2021](#) tab in the spreadsheet
- Follow-up items from last time:
 - Cesar Hernandez to check in w/ David progress and expectations regarding “Advance Implementation Neutrality” objectives - no update
 - Paul Buck has followed up w/ Neil and Karen to request updates to the “Drive Jakarta EE Brand, Awareness and Adoption” objectives
 - Is “Content for Jakarta EE as a reliable, trusted platform for End-User Innovation” a Q3 objective - no update
 - Paul Buck has followed up with Martijn on “Enable Ecosystem Transition to jakarta namespace” objectives
 - There are a number of objectives listed as dependent on a “lead” (see xls) - these are being pursued

- Will Lyons/John Clingan to define a specific goal for Technical Jakarta EE/MicroProfile alignment forum and plan (e.g. Core Profile, Config) - John has called a meeting for this time next week (August 10).
- Will Lyons to prepare a specific proposal for a meeting of all Working Group members in September.

Jakarta EE 2021 Developer Survey Update - FYI

- [Initial Jakarta EE 2021 Developer Survey findings:](#)
- The Marketing Committee will be looking for quotes to send out with a press release.
 - These are due in two weeks
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LV-_U5KEOq6M5T28wEj_Dd2ZmUcnsLWvQv0jIDeJDHg/edit#gid=599163621
 - Has the request for quotes gone out
 - IBMers please ping Neil and ask for a request if appropriate
 - Will to follow up with Ed and Melissa from Oracle

Jakarta EE 10 (9.1+) - Reminder of Action Item

- Plan reviews
 - <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/labels/plan%20review>
 - Had reached out to component spec teams whether a release review date of Oct 15 would be achievable.
- Jakarta EE Core Profile Creation and Plan review
 - <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pull/349>
 - This (and relationship to Platform release) was a significant topic of review at Platform team and will continue to be.
- In response to Paul Buck's suggestion, in a prior meeting the Steering Committee requested that the Platform Project provide a date, or a date for a date, when the Jakarta EE 10 Plan Review will be initiated for the Platform and Web Profile specifications.
- The Platform team is pursuing this (in process)
 - Waiting on input for two particular development items
 - Expect to create PRs next week
 - Red Hat will drive the EE 10 release (details to be provided)

Proposal on [Developer badging / certification](#) - Neil Patterson - no update

- See minutes from June 8 meeting on this topic:
 - <https://docs.google.com/document/d/16AwgivXpavMhc8wF2iEFDjGMSD-zyvnJO6mrVDH2pQQ/edit>
- Question was raised regarding who would do the creation of the tests and content - e.g. by volunteers or by existing committees or spec project teams?

- Neil: Assume there would need to be contributions on a volunteer basis (but cannot be a public project)
- Next steps from last meeting - there was no update:
 - Define and scope a MVP (Neil will set up a call on this topic next week during normal marketing time to explore technical aspects)
 - Define success criteria (Paul W will define next steps for this)
 - Paul W will prepare a program proposal for next SC meeting

Patent License Option

- Frederic Desbiens from the Eclipse Foundation presented on the topic of Patent Licenses in the Context of the EFSP
- See minutes from June 8 meeting on this topic:
 - <https://docs.google.com/document/d/16AwgivXpavMhc8wF2iEFDjGMSD-zyvnJO6mrVDH2pQQ/edit>
- The Eclipse Foundation has sent out an email “Summary on patent policy”
 - This addresses the question of “mixing” specification licenses
- On June 16 Wayne Beaton sent an email which was discussed per the minutes last meeting
- The EF is updating the EFSP to define the process for override.
- Per discussion last time Will agreed to draft a proposed resolution and sent it in email, for vote at this meeting:
 - Resolved, that the Jakarta EE Working Group Steering Committee has selected the “Compatible Patent License”, as defined in the Eclipse IP policy, as the default Patent License option to be used in Jakarta EE specifications created using the Jakarta EE Specification Process.
- There had been active discussion of this topic in mail. Each member was given the opportunity to comment prior to voting.
 - Will from Oracle reiterated support for the Compatibility Patent License for reasons as summarized in emails
 - Dan from IBM commented that IBM prefers compatible implementations, but not using patents
 - Kenji from Fujitsu said Fujitsu would like to encourage compatibility
 - Eliot from Payara said Payara prefers to encourage compatibility but patents are not the way to achieve it
 - Scott from Red Hat reiterated support for the Implementation Patent License as summarized in emails
 - Cesar reiterated Tomitribe support for the Implementation Patent License as summarized in David Blevins’ email
 - Martijn in reflecting the views of the LJC expressed concerns about the emergence of incompatible cloud implementations, but also concerns about use of patents

- Arjan expressed his desire to encourage compatible implementations
- Oracle moved for a vote on the resolution which was seconded by Red Hat. The vote was as follows:

Fujitsu: Yes +1

IBM: No, -1

Oracle: Yes, +1

Payara: Abstain (with statement that we want to encourage compatibility but patents are not the way to achieve it)

Red Hat: No, -1

Tomitribe: No, -1

Enterprise Member representative: Not present

Participant member representative (Martijn Verburg): Abstain (with statement that we want to encourage compatibility but patents are not the way to achieve it)

Committer member representative (Arjan Tijms): Yes +1

The vote was a tie, the resolution did not pass.

Will agreed to contact the Eclipse Foundation for suggestions on how to proceed and will do this in the Steering Committee alias.

It would be helpful to have concrete alternative mechanisms to incent or encourage the delivery of compatible implementations.

Acquire New Working Group Members

- A Q2 objective is to "Identify ways to find potential new members".
- Paul reviewed a short [presentation](#) on June 22
- Kevin expressed interest in seeing pipelines.
- Questions were raised about whether we could do more for JUGs and cloud providers.
- A/I: Will volunteered to draft specific suggestions for group review
 - Will will do so for next meeting.

Jakarta EE Presence in Asia

- See the [short report](#) we discussed on the Steering Committee call on June 8.
- A/I: Committee members were requested to propose someone from their organizations, or from external organizations, who can help organize Jakarta EE activities and:
 - Speaks Chinese and English
 - Is local to the China timezone

- A/I: It was agreed we should hold a meeting with Chinese members to hear directly from them what would be most helpful to them in promoting Jakarta EE in China. Such a meeting would need to be moderated by someone who is bilingual.
 - No member has identified such a contact

Elections are coming up

- Chair, committer members representative and participant member representative