

## Minutes from Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting August 7

### Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura, Mike Denicola  
IBM: Dan Bandera  
Oracle: Will Lyons  
Payara: Steve Millidge  
Red Hat: Mark Little  
Tomitribe: David Blevins, Richard Monson-Hafael  
Martijn Verburg: (not present)  
Ivar Grimstad

Eclipse: Mike Milinkovich

### Review of Minutes from Prior Meeting

July 24 Meeting minutes were approved.

Minutes of July 31 and August 2 budget meeting will be reviewed next meeting.

August 14 meeting is cancelled. We will meet on August 21.

### Review of outcome from August 2 budget meeting

High level review of the August 2 budget meeting discussion.

Please complete doodle poll for follow-up meeting (meeting scheduled for August 22)

<https://doodle.com/poll/424g8efu9zzbiu8m>

### Follow-up on discussion of Mike Milinkovich's "Strawman Proposal for Progress in 2018" (attached)

See attachment

Brief recap of last week's discussion

- Consensus that priority must be placed on enabling evolution of the Java EE 8 technologies
- The idea of enabling use of the Jakarta EE 8 brand by implementations that pass Java EE 8 CTS is a good one, but
- This approach does not meet the needs of all Steering Committee members
- The concept of enabling use of the Jakarta EE8 brand by implementations that pass the contributed TCKs was discussed, but this raised a concern with properly transferring IP to end users
- Oracle agreed to review this proposal internally

We do not see a way to enabling this as a short-term workaround. Recommend continuing to pursue a Java TM Agreement and a specification process. There was consensus on this conclusion.

Mike Milinkovich stated that from his perspective the ability to make progress on the definition of a spec process is blocked by Oracle, and the Steering Committee feedback expressed concern that lack of forward progress will call the viability of the initiative into question. The following represented the consensus of the Steering Committee members "If Oracle is not willing to give Eclipse the capability required to update the Java EE 8 technologies, consumers of Java EE technology will move onto something else." SC members offered to help escalate the importance of this through their executives.

### **Spec Committee Update**

No significant updates

### **Marketing Committee Update**

Working towards a marketing plan by August 16. The focus on Code One and EclipseCon Europe and the messages are dependent on the state of progress by these dates. Time is short for defining technical deliverables in this timeframe. Need to know what the message is going to be by end of August.

Oracle is eager to participate in EclipseCon Europe. Will follow up between Eclipse and Oracle.

### **PMC Update**

Getting requests on the email lists regarding extending the javax namespace. Need message in response to these requests.

### **Recruitment of new members; Elections**

Open issue - will there be an additional PMC representative on the Steering Committee.

### **Status of Oracle Contributions**

The high-level status of EE4J projects from last week

- 39 project proposals have been created
- 36 project committers and resources have been provisioned
- 26 of these projects have initial contributions provided to the Eclipse IP team
- 25 of these projects have the initial contribution pushed to the Git Repository

The high-level status of EE4J projects this week

- 39 project proposals have been created
- 37 project committers and resources have been provisioned (+1)
- 26 of these projects have initial contributions provided to the Eclipse IP team
- 25 of these projects have the initial contribution pushed to the Git Repository

Oracle has another "batch" of contributions in Oracle's internal approval process.

### **Planned Jakarta EE certifications**

Not discussed

What other app servers, besides GlassFish can we expect on Jakarta EE 8 - get input from Steering Committee.

Wildfly - name clarification needed from RedHat ?

IBM Liberty

Fujitsu

Payara - ?

Weblogic - ?

TomiTribe - ?

### **Legal Documents**

All agreements in Oracle Legal review as of August 7. Hoping to progress on TCK Agreement ASAP.

Attached Message

Subject:

[jakarta.ee-steering] Strawman Proposal for Progress in 2018

From:

Mike Milinkovich <mike.milinkovich@eclipse-foundation.org>

Date:

2018-07-30 4:33 PM

To:

Jakarta EE Steering Committee <jakarta.ee-steering@eclipse.org>

All,

As I am sure many of you have noticed, progress on the new specification process has been slow. Unfortunately, I don't think that situation is going to change soon. This is a problem for all of us, as Jakarta EE needs to start demonstrating progress if developers are going to believe that this initiative is real.

At the moment our plan of record is to:

1. Release Eclipse Glassfish 5.1 certified as Java EE 8 compatible by the end of September.
2. Establish a new Jakarta EE specification process and release a Jakarta EE 8 specification by December that is identical to Java EE 8. As part of that we would also release Eclipse Glassfish 5.2 certified as Jakarta EE 8 compatible by the end of the year. Note that this requires that we have completed an arrangement with Oracle that will

allow us to create specifications using the existing spec names (e.g. "Java Message Service").

At this moment, I don't think that the second deliverable is realistic in 2018.

I would like to propose that we rethink our approach in order to deliver on the elements of Jakarta EE that we can as soon as possible. A couple of key concepts would include:

1. We decide as a group that any product which achieves "Java EE 8" certification can also be labeled as "Jakarta EE 8" certified. The Jakarta EE trademark and logo is our property. We can decide how it is used.
2. We narrow the focus of version 1.0 of the Jakarta EE spec process to focus on new specifications, rather than migrating the existing Java EE ones. That means that while Oracle is definitely involved, there is far less complexity related to their interests in protecting the Java trademark via the existing spec names and javax namespace. So instead of focusing on some very complex migration issues, let's focus instead on creating a spec process that would be attractive to MicroProfile, and JNoSQL, and the like. It seems unlikely that in the short term we are going to have the permissions that will allow us to evolve the Java EE 8 platform. So if we're going to demonstrate any ability to innovate it is going to have to come from other sources.
- 3.

With the above in place, our new plan of record would be to:

1. Release Eclipse Glassfish 5.1 certified as Java EE 8 compatible, and labeled as Jakarta EE 8 certified as well by the end of September.
2. By <<insert date here>> release a Jakarta EE 9 specification which is [Java EE 8] + [MicroProfile | JNoSQL | ??]. We would avoid the entire concept of backwards compatibility with Java EE specifications by simply saying that if a product is certified as Java EE 8 certified and it passes the TCKs for the additional specifications, it can be certified as Jakarta EE 9 compatible. Note that I think this means that no changes whatsoever will be possible to the javax namespace. We could discuss whether some innovation could occur within Jakarta's namespace although that would not be backwards compatible, which is obviously an issue.
- 3.

I am looking forward to discussing this on the steering committee call tomorrow.

Thanks.

--

Mike Milinkovich

mike.milinkovich@eclipse-foundation.org

(m) +1.613.220.3223