Meeting Minutes of February 25 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

The Zoom ID is: https://eclipse.zoom.us/j/499849869

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Mike Denicola
IBM: Daniel Bandera, Kevin Sutter, Ian Robinson
Oracle: Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov, Bill Shannon
Payara: Steve Millidge
Red Hat: John Clingan, Scott Stark
Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez, David Blevins
Participant member representative: not present
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, Paul White, Tanja Obradvic

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the Feb 11 and 18 meetings will be reviewed next time.

Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls

- JakartaOne Livestream Japan (Feb 26)
  - Update from Mike and Tanja
  - 137 registrants
  - Red Hat is participating
  - Please promote
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/17KbwfheYJ0UAbLxMdUi27HWvlgF2WCugM53KQ3jy0hg/edit#

- Kubecon Europe plan (Mar 30-Apr 2, 2020)
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uECHm37ziSlIvZEALphHTqtu9XW2YMHwkLwGin7ISwM/edit#
  - Update on agenda, registration, volunteers.
  - Expecting approximately (up to) 300 participants. Cloud Native Computing Foundation, IBM, RedHat and Oracle are sponsors at this time.
    - Looking for volunteers for booth coverage at Kubecon. No volunteers yet!
■ 77 registrants as of last week. More promotion is welcome. Please promote. Social media Kit to use to promote
  ■ Would expect to follow a similar pattern in Kubecon NA (Boston)
    ○ Highlighting Strategic WG members is requested.
● Welcome Primeton (Enterprise member) and Kingdee Apusic (participant member)
    ○ Primeton is eligible to be nominated as a Steering Committee member
    ○ EF will send an invite to them
● Jakarta EE Update Calls
    ○ https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SXWpaN3hf3wiTWQ/edit
    ○ Next call on 18 March. Steve Millidge and Kevin Sutter will present.
    ○ May consider a talk on breaking down the TCKs (future)
● Jakarta Tech Talks - Tanja is open for suggestions
    ○ One on Feb 25 on MicroProfile 3.3
    ○ Looking for more topics.
    ○ https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19AfCUDscUHwJejMYq370tum5mi7zl4bvkzcQXiUM/edit#gid=0
    ○ All topics for Cloud Native Java will be considered. Looking for more presentation referrals.
● DevNexus Atlanta -- Feb 19-21
    ○ Conference sold out
    ○ 161 leads (vendor comparative data requested)
      ■ Will review and contact, encourage them to join the Jakarta EE community
      ■ Tracking of goals requested (at Marketing Committee)
        ○ 130+ attendees for the Cloud Native for Java meetup
        ○ Booth placement was not optimal (free) - should consider leveraging vendors
        ○ Feedback - vendors have demo focus
● Jakarta EE development survey coming up next quarter
    ○ Draft available for comment (look at through lens of continuity + new)
    ○ Last year’s survey results are published here:
    ○ Received feedback from Ian and Kenji - additional feedback requested
    ○ Deadline for feedback is Thursday Feb 27
● The Q4 Marketing Operations Update is provided at the following link.
  https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1f9BbTdbfntK36LmQNdeagz43NMNH3hZvEoWy3Mid-A/edit#slide=id.g6475e3fe34_0_169
● Enterprise engagement deck updated recently, please modify/use in recruiting efforts. Feedback requested on this deck - e.g. usefulness.
● A membership prospectus has been published at:
● Foundation has created a list of enabling JUGs. Looking for members to sign up and present on Jakarta EE at JUGs.
Operationalizing Jakarta EE Program Plan

- Tanja and Will have drafted a document that translates the goals of the 2020 plan:
  - https://drive.google.com/open?id=1S053agg7BeBM4wSaGhtbANE6tIFBc3Ap0Ze-xdEOOnM
- ...Into quarterly objectives/milestones/outcomes. We will review.
  - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19du8Ccx4aYc-q5aNnuglYR1nl00ZPUcgPeZU9uW8NE/edit#slide=id.g7b69340134_0_132
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBiHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit#gid=0
- All docs are in the Steering Committee folder, program plans. Q1 goal suggestions were reviewed and feedback was requested.
- We will review Q1 goals.
  - Drive tooling support for Jakarta EE
    - Ownership for tooling vendors being tracked below:
      - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBiHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit?urp=gmail_link#gid=1810653774
  - Drive acquisition of new working group members
    - Not practical for WG members to drive and report on membership recruitment in their customer base
  - Dan and Will will meet in next week to discuss backward compatibility goal

Jakarta EE 8 Follow-Up

- All known follow-up issues concluded
- Will reserve this as an agenda item for open issues on Jakarta EE 8

Jakarta EE 9

- Eclipse Jenkins status issue is resolved
- Update on Jakarta EE 9 progress
  - https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/17
  - EJB project is now in ballot, making progress.
  - Activation project is now in ballot.
  - Recruiting for jstl
  - Next piece of work is for compatible implementations and TCKs (risky)
  - GF issue - COS Naming Service was deleted - Bill requested detail of issue
- Update on tooling:
  - Ownership for tooling vendors being tracked below:
Jakarta EE and MicroProfile

- MicroProfile team members have distributed a proposal for a WG for MicroProfile. One of the proposals involves a combined Jakarta EE/MicroProfile Working Group. The intent is that if the combined proposal is recommended, that proposal would be brought to the Jakarta EE WG.
  - The proposal is to have a soft stake in the ground by end of Feb, possibly sooner, and votable proposal end of March
  - Most comments are being made in MicroProfile GitHub Sandbox. Proposed modifications are via pull requests and comments often occur on those pull requests.
- Hangout at 11 AM PST using zoom: https://eclipse.zoom.us/j/949859967 a continuation of a bi-weekly (now weekly) call to work on input and issues related to working group for MicroProfile. ([MicroProfile calendar](https://eclipse.zoom.us/j/949859967))
- A blog has been published at: https://blogs.oracle.com/theaquarium/jakarta-ee-working-group-is-open-to-forming-a-working-relationship-with-microprofile

See:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1buHrDkynsaQQPj-vTop3uUzQ1IsyDsORDILvgD74CHk/edit#heading=h.xg3r945h2b2i

Also see:

Steve published an additional alternative at:
https://blog.payara.fish/microprofile-and-jakarta-ee-technical-alignment

John C commented last week that his interpretation of Steve’s suggestion was that it was more limited (to Jakarta EE and MP) than might have been suggested by the CN4J group. The EF’s position is that it is attempting to meet the needs defined by the community and does not have a strong position on it - Paul will come back with a comment on intended scope this week. Ian questioned whether an “umbrella” WG could be created which might have multiple underlying or related working groups.

Allowing Java User Group use of Jakarta EE, and use of the brand more generally
• The Steering Committee generally supports use of the Jakarta EE brand in this manner, and has recommended creating some structured process around it.
• The Eclipse Foundation has drafted an Agreement which could be used with JUGs, not yet a program for operationalizing this.
• Similar question came up in the context of “Starter Project for Jakarta EE”. This is approved.
  ○ The request to the Steering Committee should then be to formulate some guidelines as to when it is ok to call a project "Jakarta EE <something>“ and when does it have to be "<something> for Jakarta EE”.
• From last time: Wayne and Dan will meet this week.

Release Cadence discussion

• 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
  ○ 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