Draft Minutes for March 10 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

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

Attendees:

Fujitsu: **Kenji Kazumura, Mike Denicola**
IBM: **Daniel Bandera, Kevin Sutter, Ian Robinson, Neil Patterson**
Oracle: **Will Lyons**, **Dmitry Kornilov, Bill Shannon**
Payara: not present
Red Hat: **John Clingan**
Tomitribe: **Cesar Hernandez**
Participant member representative: **Alex Theedom**
Committer member representative: **Not present**
(Quorum is 4 -- simple-majority or one-half of the members (if even number) must be present)

Eclipse: **Paul Buck, Tanja Obradovic, Paul White, Ivar Grimstad**

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the Feb 11, 18, 25, March 3 meetings will be reviewed next time.

Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls

- Kubecon Europe plan
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uECHm37ziSlVbZEALphHTqtu9XW2YMH wkLwGin7ISwM/edit#
  - The conference has been postponed. CN4J postponed as well.
  - Have communicated CN4J postponement, and that we await the Kubecon Europe plan
- Jakarta EE Update Calls
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SX WpaN3hf3wiTWQ/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
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19AfvCUdScUHwJejMYg370tum5mi7zI4 bvkZczcQXiUM/edit#gid=0
  - Emily Jiang delivered a talk today (March 10)
  - All topics for Cloud Native Java will be considered. Looking for more presentation referrals.
- Jakarta EE development survey coming up next quarter

- ○ Will be launched April 6, with feedback incorporated
- ○ Results to be published in June 16
- ○ [Draft](#) has been closed
- Foundation has created a list of enabling JUGs. Looking for members to sign up and present on Jakarta EE at JUGs. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YDTAyynuhlNVBJK-Clb4XAW7gVw0TLu5R0uV3FUkW20/edit#gid=0
- Marketing Committee did a review of KPIs, how events are being measured, for DevNexus
  - ○ Approximately 160 scans (some not measured)
  - ○ 20 member conversations, 7 different organizations
  - ○ 7 social mentions

Jakarta EE and MicroProfile

Discussion of the possibility of an umbrella WG was tabled.

Technical pull vs push model voting may start today (March 10).

Jakarta EE 9

- Progress update
  - ○ https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/17
  - ○ All specs are "In progress" (removed the first two columns of the project board since no longer needed)
  - ○ Plan to duplicate the API Milestone/RC column for the TCKs.
  - ○ Also, will update project board to plan for Wave development of final releases
  - ○ The next piece of work is for compatible implementations and TCKs.   Work has not begun yet on compatible implementations - some components have started.
    - Still waiting for Glassfish development kickoff -- Steve, Kenji, and Ed will be working together to get this kicked off
  - ○ GF issue - COS Naming Service was deleted - Bill has resolved the issue
- Update on tooling:
  - Ownership for tooling vendors being tracked below:
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBilHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit?urp=gmail_link#gid=1810653774

Operationalizing Jakarta EE Program Plan (no update)

- Tanja and Will have drafted a document that translates the goals of the 2020 plan:
  - ○ https://drive.google.com/open?id=1S053agg7BeBM4wSaGhtbANE6tlFBc3Ap0Z-e-xdEOnM

- ...Into quarterly objectives/milestones/outcomes. We will review.
  - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19du8Ccxf4aYc-q5aNnuglYR1nl00ZPUcgPeZU9uW8NE/edit#slide=id.g7b69340134_0_132
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBilHqKGSOWrcEuc/edit#gid=0
- All docs are in the Steering Committee folder, program plans. Q1 goal suggestions were reviewed and feedback was requested.
- Review Q1 goals.
  - Drive tooling support for Jakarta EE
    - Ownership for tooling vendors being tracked below:
    - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uYyX43aNIQgZfjuSeBjr4LGCEH4sBilHqKGSOWrcEuc/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 meet to discuss backward compatibility goal

Jakarta EE 8 Follow-Up

- Two new compatible implementations - JBoss 7.3 and Jeus 8.5

New Crowdcast account - for enabling alternative/remote access to JUGs

- Expected fees approximately $62/month
- There was agreement from Steering Committee to offer this to the community as an option

Release Cadence discussion (no update)

- 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 from Feb 25 meeting
  - ○ 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