

Minutes of the October 27, 2020 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: **Kenji Kazumura**

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

Oracle: **Will Lyons, Ed Bratt**

Payara: **Steve Millidge**

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

Tomitribe: **David Blevins, Cesar Hernandez**

Enterprise Member representative: **Not present**

Participant member representative: **Martijn Verburg**

Committer member representative: **Not present**

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

Eclipse: **Ivar Grimstad, Paul White, Paul Buck, Tanja Obradovic, Shabnam Mayel, Karen McNaughton**

Welcome Karen!

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the October 6, 13 and 20 meetings were approved.

Jakarta EE 9 Spec Project Status

- Spec status summary
 - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YTUpfdLZZrk2_UGwoX2w0seOCueRO3sQJjWxpDAa7g/edit#gid=0
- Spec project board (new column for links to TCK and GF board)
 - <https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/17>
- TCK issues
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-tck/issues>
- Schedule
 - <https://eclipse-ee4j.github.io/jakartaee-platform/jakartaee9/JakartaEE9#jakarta-e-e-9-schedule>
- Specs open for ballot
 - <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/labels/ballot>
- October 20 status

- 7 specs need to be to ballot for Friday
 - All but JSP seem to be in reasonable shape
- JSP is outstanding and at risk
 - Arjan offered to step forward and look at it (have not looked at it much to date)
 - David offered to round up support from Tomitribe
 - Kevin offered to help Paul Nicolucci with the spec process
 - Eliot offered to recruit support from Payara
 - Reviewed JSP membership list and what would be required to get this done
 - TCK related issues are almost resolved.
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-tck/pull/545>
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-tck/issues/430>
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-tck/pull/536>
 - We need two more things to proceed the ballot.
 - (1) to promote the TCK.
 - (2) to create the certification request
- David suggested as part of next year's planning we actively review all projects to see which are thin on contributors
- Following the individual specs, we will need to complete the Platform Specs
- October 27 status - Update from Kevin
 - "WooHoo! Through a lot of hard work this past week, you were able to get all of the non-Platform related Specifications to Ballot! Congratulations!"
 - More work to do on Platform specs, but achieving the above was a key goal for last week and a significant milestone.

Eclipse GlassFish 6.0 Status - Steve Millidge/Eliot Martin

- Project board for GlassFish <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/glassfish/projects/1>
- TCK issues: <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/glassfish/issues?q=is%3Aissue+is%3Aopen+label%3Aee9-tck>
- October 20 Status
 - Open issues re: CORBA testing that will be reviewed at Spec Committee tomorrow
 - Was looking like too many RMI/IIOP tests were being excluded - Scott Marlow is looking at a solution
- October 27 status
 - Goal to have a staged final release for GlassFish and TCK this week
 - Some doc updates and other work must still be completed

2021 Program Plan

- See pdf of [2021 Working Group Program Plan Process](#) and PPT of the [Draft Proposal 2021 Jakarta EE Program Plan](#) in this folder:
 - https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1_TobVjm4SF69rrSrQ8LbPwI9CXhmMtha

- **Discussion**

1) Thank you for your input including

- Comments in the doc: [Draft Proposal 2021 Jakarta EE Program Plan](#)
- David's input: [Additional Proposed Goals](#)

2) Review dates

- Nov 4 - plan
- Nov 18 - budget
- Dec 3 - revised plan and budget

3) Plan is intended to define our priorities, and represents an agreement on what we work towards.

4) Plan is by majority vote. The plan can be changed.

5) Steering Committee does not have to drive details of all decisions. Marketing, spec committees and other program teams can drive decisions within their scope, perhaps more efficiently.

6) After reviewing the slides and feedback, there are core issues that we should discuss before going into the details of the slides and specific feedback. I would like to take a straw poll (non-binding) on where we are on each of these topics. Let's stay focused on the primary topics, not the details.

Fujitsu:

IBM:

Oracle:

Payara:

Red Hat:

Tomitribe:

Enterprise Member representative:

Participant member representative:

Committer member representative:

Core issues - key outcomes of the discussion below are bolded

1) CN4J alliance: Shall we formalize the CN4J alliance and transfer Jakarta EE budget as proposed, and use this as a baseline assumption in CY2021 planning?

- Alliance doc draft:
https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1tqHnuvTkES1jIV5tDBezrrKRSTzA_bv21poO8rjyN4Q/edit?ts=5f11fa24#slide=id.g8d80e7e2aa_0_16
- Potential next steps
 - Flesh out alliance doc
 - Transfer from Jakarta EE budget to MicroProfile budget
 - Update draft budget:
 - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1JqQ_sjBTdk-qxH0cs5r9cDhLlwrKxsP4LKqwlcXAZ1A/edit#gid=1727074758
 - EF recommends unanimous agreement among Strategic members
 - This will also require super-majority votes of the Steering Committee to change the dues and amend the charter.
 - Need plan for socialization with other WG members
- Straw (non-binding) poll: Shall we formalize alliance and transfer Jakarta EE budget as proposed, and use this as a baseline assumption in CY2021 planning?

Fujitsu: Y

IBM: Y

Oracle: Y

Payara: TBD (not assessed yet)

Red Hat: Y

Tomitribe: Y

Enterprise Member representative: not present

Participant member representative: Y

Committer member representative: not present

Based on the straw poll above we will proceed with this baseline assumption.

2) Major technical projects - a number of projects are being proposed/discussed

- Jakarta EE 9 JDK 11 release
- Jakarta EE 10 release
- Standalone TCKs
- Decompose TCKs that have downstream specification tests
- Standalone spec releases
- Eliminate GlassFish dependency
- Consider support for legacy Jakarta EE 8 applications in a more formalized way either via a legacy profile or more standardized tooling.

Discussion:

- Is doing all of the above achievable?
 - RH - Agree this is aggressive. Doing EE 10 release with significant content would be aggressive
 - TT - Have 9.1 plan with specific deliverable, doing EE 10 seems aggressive for 2021, recommend several point releases
 - Payara - need to deliver some functionality, whether it is a point release or major. Change from EE8->EE9 is bigger than what would be expected from a point release
 - IBM - Agree a point release would be more narrow in impact from Platform POV, though deeper for specific steps. EE9 on JDK 11 should be top priority; Need to consider what is tractable in CY2021 - not sure we have done the analysis
- How will we solicit community input?

Straw poll: What should be the top focus areas

Consensus: Top priorities should be:

- EE 9 on JDK 11
- Update individual specs
- Do a point release(s) of the platform (incremental features)
 - Detailed schedule TBD
 - Need more community feedback
 - Need to streamline release process
- Implied in the priorities above is that TCK refactoring work and GF elimination should be background activities.
- David noted that he views it as very important to split implementation and specification projects, wants the flexibility to make progress in this area this year, and that absence of progress on this during CY2021 would affect Tomitribe's commitment to Jakarta EE moving forward.

I will update the plan doc to reflect these priorities above. Please consider the discussion and be prepared to discuss next week.

3) Release model and other areas for innovation (not discussed due to time constraints)

Release cadence

Time boxed release model

Grow & Reward Specification Contributors

"Legacy" Profile

Areas of innovation

- Community innovations
- AOT
- reactive/asyns

Discussion: What should be the priority?
How is community input reflected?

Straw Poll: How important is defining these?

4) How to drive the brand and community awareness

- Do we agree this is an important priority?
- Slides 6- 9 and David's slide 5 cover this topic - I think we should consider it a single topic/goal area
- Recommend data collection/readout on activities with the highest payoff
- How much to promote Jakarta EE 9 vs existing Jakarta EE (EE 8)
- Straw Poll: Task Mktg Comm to propose a Marketing plan based on CY2020 budget

It was agreed this is an important priority.

Neil agreed to take this general topic on and discuss it at the Marketing Committee. This should reflect the planning assumption that we will drive the CN4J alliance.

The request of Neil (and the goal) would be to have a top level summary for inclusion in our program plan next week.

5) CI infrastructure costing and allocation

- What level of readout on current costing and allocation is requested.
- CY21 budget will depend on major technical projects (#2 above)

Discussion:

- Under-budgeted last year

The consensus was that the Eclipse Foundation should prepare a strawman plan based on utilization data from this year that should feed into the budget.

6) New Developer/Evangelist programs (slide 9 and perhaps David's slide 4)

- Recommend delegate to Marketing Committee (and perhaps spec committee for contributor program)
- Straw poll for feedback on such programs

Discussed only briefly - Marketing Committee encouraged to incorporate into Marketing plan.

7) Acquisition of new WG members (not discussed due to time constraints)

- This past year the Steering Committee has not acted on this
- Straw poll: Is this a major priority for the Steering Committee for next year

8) David's proposal: (not discussed due to time constraints)

- Believe this is covered above, but let's review to be sure
- https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1-zvmW0nezn9Bp4aYYafaw9Mxl6n4-qgEXvvuOmyGDM0/edit#slide=id.g9591dbaa17_0_14

9) What should be our assumption about travel and conferences (not discussed due to time constraints)

- Straw poll - what should we budget for
 - Full travel and physical conferences all of CY21
 - Full travel and physical conferences six months of CY21
 - No travel or physical conferences during CY21

Next Steps - Process

Agreed to proposed process

- **Oct 27-Nov 1: Based on consensus input**
 - **I will update draft plan doc to reflect goal of pursuing CN4J alliance**
 - **I will update the plan doc to reflect technical project priorities discussed. Please consider the discussion and be prepared to discuss next week.**
 - **Marketing Committee will provide summary slides for marketing plan**
 - **Eclipse Foundation to prepare a CI resource strawman plan based on CI utilization data from this year that should feed into the CY2021 budget.**
 - **I will work with EF to create a "working budget" : (CY20 minus MPWG allocation)**

- **Nov 2-6: Revise draft plan presentation, based on consensus input, with placeholders for “delegated” content, for review in:**
 - **Pre-meeting on Monday Nov 2 (propose 12-1 Eastern time)**
 - **Steering Committee meeting Nov 3**
 - **Review updated plan presentation**
 - **Begin budget review “working budget”: (CY20 minus MPWG allocation)**
 - **Review additional a/i review**
 - **Marketing committee plan update**
- **Nov 9-13:**
 - **Nov 10:**
 - **Review strawman budget at Steering Committee**
 - **Review any updates to program plan**
- **Nov 16-20**
 - **Finalize budget on Nov 18**
 - **Begin updates to final program plan**
- **Nov 23-Dec 3**
 - **Finalize program plan**

=====

The items below were not discussed. Headings retained as a record for future meetings

Jakarta EE 2020 Operational Plan (not discussed)

Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls (not discussed)

Jakarta EE Roadmap/Release Cadence - Ivar Grimstad (not discussed)

Tooling (not discussed)