Minutes of the April 11, 2023 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura IBM: Emily Jiang, Alasdair Oracle: Will Lyons, Ed Bratt Payara: not present Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): not present Enterprise Member Representative (Microsoft): Ed Burns (alternate) Participant member representative (LJC): Marcin Kruglik

We have quorum.

Eclipse: Tanja Obradovic, Shabnam Mayel

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

The <u>Draft Minutes of the March 14, 2023 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting</u> were approved.

The <u>Draft Minutes of the March 28, 2023 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting</u> will be reviewed next time.

Jakarta EE Track at DevNexus

Update from those who were able to attend (Tanja and Emily)

- Averaged 15-20 attendees per session
- IBM delivered whole day workshop
- Good quality of content
- Good attendance at booth
- Generally more awareness and usage of Jakarta EE and MicroProfile
- Interest from Spring developers to collaborate with Jakarta security
- Security compliance requirements driving new Jakarta EE release adoption
- Tanja will distribute a <u>summary</u> to the Steering Committee recommends repeating next year with improved marketing/promotion of the track
- Will discuss further at Marketing Committee

Jakarta EE Developer Survey

- Soft Launch March 14.
- See <u>schedule</u>.
- See the link above for language specific URLs and social kit to promote the survey
- Survey closes May 25.
- Repeat text of email

The 2023 Jakarta EE Developer Survey is now available!

Now in its sixth year, the Jakarta EE Developer Survey is a great opportunity to indicate your priorities and how you would like Jakarta EE to evolve to meet your cloud requirements.

Please take a few minutes to <u>complete the survey</u>. The results of the survey will be published in early September.

- Tracking results published here (1035 surveys completed so far, up from 555 last time): <u>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18sRRewEVmcczu2h_OByGxqD2H9Q18I0E0U</u> JbLFZXHlw/edit#gid=213240262
- Shabnam will update the above weekly
- Members please use links in the tracking doc above

Jakarta EE Platform Naming (Starter UI discussion)

- Active discussion on community mailing list and github (a good thing)
 - <u>https://start.jakarta.ee/</u>
 - <u>https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/starter/issues/238</u>
- Reza will send a proposal for Steering Committee discussion/vote next time
 - Will also include a question for guidance on whether "non-compatible" implementations should be included

Jakarta EE 11

• Reference to the Narrative around Jakarta EE 11

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1rugEgECY-ghIIbYIsBtIDb0CTk4aeOFG/ edit?usp=sharing&ouid=102001624522612058111&rtpof=true&sd=true

- The Marketing Committee, Platform Team, and Spec Committee are following up on the Jakarta EE 11 Narrative and the quarterly objectives related to it:
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1QQL-mlohA-I5-3z2vcVL8tkiBEYX_LPSB muwy77ALco/edit#slide=id.g1c9824dfc74_0_936
 - The Marketing Committee has created a social kit for promotion
 - This is under active discussion at the Platform Team and the Spec Committee
 - Jakarta EE 11 Draft Release Plan

- Has a release coordinator been identified Ed Burns is seeking a co-coordinator
- Survey sent to spec teams soliciting plans [here] 19 responses so far
 - Expecting one more response for Jakarta Concurrency
 - Nathan Rauh needs access to the google sheet Tanja will provide
- Tanja sent <u>Jakarta EE 11 Discussion Document</u> to the Jakarta EE community requesting feedback.
 - <u>GitHub issues</u> have been created from the feedback in this document
- Emily planning to promote translated versions of the Program Plan and Jakarta EE 11 narrative to Chinese community this week

Objectives

- DevNexus activities will delay review of Q1 until next meeting <u>https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1QQL-mlohA-I5-3z2vcVL8tkiBEYX_LPSB</u> <u>muwy77ALco/edit#slide=id.g1c9824dfc74_0_936</u>
 - Quick questions (discussed only briefly)
 - Deliver future Jakarta EE specification releases
 - What is the status of finding a release lead? (Mentioned above)
 - Increase Jakarta EE Brand Awareness and Adoption
 - A brief overview of Q2 activities for the Steering Committee would be useful (for a future meeting).
 - Per last time we will summarize Q1 achievements based on the status provided in marketing committee minutes <u>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fsqTGj85fi3sl5DissCOa1TX</u> <u>VRoVEwT_YE7Z9odZrXU/edit*__:lw!!ACWV5N9M2RV99hQ!OUK</u> <u>Sjn-5qRNsAqSkspyleky40c66ITASuMgff0N_a1JRK2JOT0CHEPR</u> <u>GIraJudFEoPqW3AHkdfXkY6uKAr0TmZKinfPHJA\$</u>
 - Grow and reward contributors and committers
 - This will be updated by Tanja
 - Provide Integrations as Required with MicroProfile
 - Will owes a blog
 - Alasdair mentioned broader issues under discussion
 - I don't believe the topic is ready for discussion at this meeting, but I am open to comment
 - Align Jakarta EE with future developer needs
 - Will updated the statement of the strategic goal, suggestions for Q1 objectives, and a Q2 objective to create a public page.
 - Questions from last time
 - Owner Should the Platform team own this strategic goal

- Some of the activities are not strictly technical in nature, but include requirements collection activities (e.g Developer Survey)
- Is requirements tracking in Jira part of this overall goal
- Acquire new Working Group members
 - Tanja will update as part of Q1 review

Deprecation and backwards compatibility policy (Abraham)

- The following topic was added to the agenda
 - In the last Spec Committee meeting there was a conversation about backwards-compatibility and deprecation. The conclusion was that this was probably a steering conversation. Essentially, the crux of the matter is that the <u>Compatibility Requirements</u> page talks about deprecating methods, but it doesn't seem to allow making backwards-incompatible changes; this is a bit odd because that would imply that one can deprecate a method but never remove it! Also, there are specs (like CDI) which have made backwards-incompatible changes, so in theory we've got specs that have violated these requirements.
- Paul summarized the Spec Committee discussion last time.
 - The Spec Committee has recognized that the actual level of compatibility being provided is not completely consistent with our published <u>Compatibility</u> <u>Requirements</u>.
 - The Spec Committee is in the process of refining these requirements at a detailed level.
 - When this work results in a detailed proposal it will be brought to the Steering Committee for review.
 - There is no specific target or deadline at this time.
 - We will keep this on the Steering Committee agenda for tracking purposes and awareness.