

Jakarta EE Future Directions - interest group meeting-20260205_170317UTC-Meeting Recording

February 5, 2026, 5:03PM

1h 0m 3s



0:08

Hello.



Jan Westerkamp 0:11

Hello.



Michael Redlich 0:12

How are you?



Jan Westerkamp 0:13

Ah, fine. Busy, but...



Michael Redlich 0:15

Yeah, yeah.



Jan Westerkamp 0:17

And you?



Michael Redlich 0:18

Yeah, yeah, you know, same, same. So.



Jan Westerkamp 0:24

I was a little bit surprised that this call uses teams.



Michael Redlich 0:31

Yes, it has since day one, so.



Jan Westerkamp 0:36

Because that was initiated by Microsoft originally.

MR Michael Redlich 0:37

OK.

Yeah, I don't. That's a good question. I don't know.

So, hey, Steve. Hey, James. So, so how's how's the the transition over there?

SB Steve Butler 0:48

Hey there, finally got the system working. It hates.

We're still working between Zoom meetings and Teams meetings, and it keeps causing my machine headaches moving between the two of them every every meeting. So we shall get there.

MR Michael Redlich 1:03

Um.

Yeah, so uh, it was to.

JW Jan Westerkamp 1:10

Yep, the first time I saw the combined logo.

SB Steve Butler 1:16

Uh, it's a working background at the moment, so.

MR Michael Redlich 1:22

So is the is the company name called Payara Dash Azul?

SB Steve Butler 1:29

Um.

MR Michael Redlich 1:31

Or a little dash.

SB Steve Butler 1:32

It's it's a I mean it's it's a it's a it's a a a wholly owned takeover. So I mean basically it's it's as all Para will probably carry on as a product name it's known in the marketplace

and everything. So it'll probably stay branded like that but you know it's. It's a wholly owned product match.

MR **Michael Redlich** 1:54

Oh, OK. So yeah, it was one of the meetings on Tuesday. I think Alfonso put a PR dash Azul and it just made me remember that when Exxon and Mobil merged in 1999, it was Exxon Mobil, but the brands.

You know, the gas station stayed the same. I think that was different from, was it BP, Amoco? I think all the Amocos became BP, you know, so on. But you know, Exxon Mobil was different.

SB **Steve Butler** 2:15

Yeah.

MR **Michael Redlich** 2:27

In that so, but yeah.

SB **Steve Butler** 2:30

Yeah, I've I've, I've been through it before in the past with takeovers and and you know the the original product company name still carried on in in in millions of people's homes in routers still carrying the old name of the old company so.

MR **Michael Redlich** 2:38

OK.

But OK, so, but it's so as long as the payout, you know, the payout brand is going to remain the same, right? I mean, nothing will change in terms of releases. Yeah. Yeah. So, OK, that's good. That's good. But I'm sure there's a lot of chaos.

SB **Steve Butler** 2:51

OK, will do. Yeah.

There always isn't these things.

MR **Michael Redlich** 3:01

Yeah, I it's.

SB **Steve Butler** 3:04
It's it's it's it's my fifth takeover to go through so.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 3:08
Oh.

MR **Michael Redlich** 3:09
Oh geez, I I survived the Exxon Mobil merger back then, so that was enough for me. Everybody was on bated breath when they got their meeting to see whether or not you had a job in the merged company.

SB **Steve Butler** 3:11
Yes.
I the the the good thing with Para and and Azula is the products don't clash so.

MR **Michael Redlich** 3:23
Oh.
Yeah.
Right, right. Yeah. Not not much, uh, overlap of that. So.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 3:30
Yeah.

MR **Michael Redlich** 3:38
Cool. Where's uh? Where's Neil? Haven't uh.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 4:00
So you're still waiting for somebody?

MR **Michael Redlich** 4:03
I thought Neil always facilitates these meetings.

JA **Jared Anderson** 4:08
Well, it says he's on vacation.

MR **Michael Redlich** 4:10

Oh, OK, that will explain why he hasn't answered my e-mail yet, so.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 4:10

OK.

OK.

JA **Jared Anderson** 4:18

I know he was planning a cruise. I don't know if this is the timing for it, but I know it's one of the things he was doing.

MR **Michael Redlich** 4:24

No. OK, good for him. Awesome. No. All right. I think. I think Tanja actually is the meeting organizer here. So yeah, created by Tanja.

JA **Jared Anderson** 4:41

It's already recording, so you're set that way.

MR **Michael Redlich** 4:44

OK. All right.

All right, let's see Brian's joining us.

All right. Well, it's 12:08. I suppose we should move forward, right?

So I think, uh, John, you're on the air this time.

SB **Steve Butler** 5:00

That's good.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 5:03

OK, yeah, hopefully I had some bad experience today with the teams session, so hopefully it does not freeze and crash.

MR **Michael Redlich** 5:03

Yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 5:20
No, that's the wrong one.
Uh, this one.
Can you see my screen?

MR **Michael Redlich** 5:35
Yes.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 5:36
I don't want to switch into the presentation mode because then I cannot see you anymore.

SB **Steve Butler** 5:36
Yep.

JP **James Perkins** 5:36
Yes.

MR **Michael Redlich** 5:37
Yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 5:45
So yeah, today I would like to talk with you about the microprofile config future directions and maybe the microprofile future directions too as.
You've noticed the last time, yeah, that IBM proposal was rejected by the spec committee because IBM.

MR **Michael Redlich** 6:03
Mm.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 6:16
Yeah, included the namespace discussion with the move of the the working group content to keep the original namespace of micro profile.
Yeah, if you're interested, we can go to a short history of that. So it basically started

with a Jakarta E development got stuck, then microprofile was created at the Eclipse Foundation.

Jakarta E was donated to the Eclipse Foundation by Oracle. The the Jakarta E development continued as Jakarta E. Then CN4J was created to align Jakarta E and microprofile.

And then transition of micro profile config was planned within the scene for J Alliance and yeah.

And that stopped at some point. I think the main reason was the two working groups doing releases to different times and when one side is able to talk and move things forward.

The other side is preparing a new release and was busy and that was in both directions over a longer time. So the config transition stuck basically. Then there was an initiative to, yeah, create a Jakarta config specification.

And yeah, I did not take part of that in detail, but yet that there was no agreement which features should be included there. And then it stopped and then it was restarted by Dimitri.

With a minimum viable product approach, so defining a subset where everybody can agree on and that stop too. I think the latest change even in the in the minutes of these Jakarta.

Discussions with in 2023.

And meanwhile, the scene for J alliance was declared as deprecated from the Jakarta site. By the way, that was not initiated from the microprofile site, and on the microprofile site we were a little bit surprised about that.

But somebody within Jakarta decided not to use that brand or or do communication in that way anymore. Maybe this was because in the meantime, Jakarta Future Directions was initiated.

By people who originally not involved in that scene for J community. Somehow it stopped. And then yeah, the there's a mistake.

The Jakarta well, some sort of config was required to include Jakarta no SQL because these people don't want to take the burden on the users to configure XML files.

For that spec. So they want to depend on microprofile config or something alike and the discussion started again to move the config spec over. That was communication on a lot of different mailing lists. Yeah, not the CN4J.

Alliance mailing list unfortunately. So the communication and the attendees were distributed and some people who are not registered to both mailing lists will only

receive half of the communication.

Threat at the end, yeah, when discussing to move config over, we came to that idea. It might make sense to move the whole microprofile working group content over to Jakarta.

And that ends in a proposal. I think Emily Jiang defined that with.

John Klingen to yeah, move the micro profile specifications and content over to Jakarta and including keeping the original namespace. The reason behind that was they don't want to.

Break introduce a breaking change with that transition. Yeah, and that was not, from my perspective, not reflecting the majority and at the end it was rejected by the spec committee.

Because the majority thinks, yeah, keeping the micro profile namespace forever might be a burden in the long run, and I personally agree with that. But before we had a lot of discussions in.

These mailing lists and also voting that even in the micro profile working group, the people, yeah, there's a majority.

That's the.

People think when the content is moved over to a different organization naming the Jaka, the Jakarta E working group, then the namespace should be changed too.

Yeah, to have a unified user experience and a future proof naming convention established for users. And yeah, there's also still a majority, I think that agrees.

To move all the microprofile working group content over to Jakarta E besides that IBM proposal failed and so I would like to take over and move these things forward in a way.

That we can get some progress on that topic. So that means Jakarta No SQL still needs config when it should be integrated into.

The platform or maybe the web profile of Jakarta and that should not be a dependency to an outside organization specification, so don't have circular dependencies in that way.

So some the minimum would be move the config spec over and yeah, when having a Jakarta config spec at the end in the core profile that would be beneficial to a lot of other.

Jakarta specifications. So there's still a need to do that. And there are two ways from my perspective. Yeah, moving the whole content over.

The Big Bang approach if you like to, where the namespace might change during

that transition, we could use the pattern like the Java E to Jacati migration. To make that happen in the way that everybody can follow and we do not unnecessary break things and make a transition easy as easy as possible. And there's another step then that need to be done when moving the content into a future Jakarta micro profile that the conflict spec then need to be moved into the core profile from that profile.

That could be a single step or that could be separate steps.

To keep a separate profile and not include everything of micro profile within the core profile, which might be an option too, could make sense because some specifications are not that stable and need higher release cadence.

That we have at the moment. An example is micro profile telemetry, which depends on the open telemetry SDK and there are still a lot of small breaking changes in the naming conventions of metrics, for example.

And yeah, to keep up with that speed and to make sure to reach some stability for the rest of the specifications, it could make sense to have a separate profile on the Jakarta side for that micro profile content.

As a Jakarta micro profile.

The other way is to start with MP config and move that into a Jakarta config specification only. So then the namespace will pretty sure change to the Jakarta namespace.

The profile will change and so it will end up in the core profile and.

There it could make sense to create then later an MP config specification based on that Jakarta config specification for a transition phase.

To keep that dependency on the micro profile sites combined and support the original namespace for example and the original APIs.

By the way, if there are questions, comments, please speak up.



Michael Redlich 17:45

Yeah, just just real quick, a couple quick comments. First thing I when Jakarta Config was first created, someone explained to me, I think it was Roberto that the difference between Jakarta Config and.



Jan Westerkamp 17:45

So the.

Yeah.

MR **Michael Redlich** 18:02

Micro profile can take was the CDI aspect of it. So that was that was one thing and I don't know if that's still an issue if in order for this to move forward and the other thing I I think with.

Option #2 you have on that slide moving micro profile config into Jakarta config. So I guess it sounds like micro profile config would still exist and depend on Jakarta config. But then if Jakarta config winds up in the core profile, this makes sense because.

The core specs of micro profile do depend. You know is is on the. Yeah, you're saying core profile twice. The the main umbrella of the micro profile specs does have Jakarta core profile in it.

So I I think that would make sense, right? Does anybody else see that what I'm seeing or OK?

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 19:01

Yeah.

Yeah, you're adding an important point. There's that MP config dependency on CDI, which prevents a general configuration even for CDI itself using MP config at the moment as it is.

MR **Michael Redlich** 19:19

Mhm.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 19:23

And therefore we discussed that for a while within a micro profile, there should be a split up of that specification into two parts. One is the CDI dependent part.

MR **Michael Redlich** 19:24

Do you want to talk?

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 19:38

I put a star in here because the names are not fixed, but something like Jakarta config CDI in the future and something like Jakarta config core and the core part is not dependent on CDI, so it can be used.

Used to configure all the specifications that don't have a CDI dependency and don't want to have that because they are CDI itself or below that in the dependency tree and that.

Would be also beneficial for external users outside of Jakarta and microprofiles or any library can then use that as a dependency because it has no further dependencies.

So that's one of the things that need to be done and also it need to be then need to be a decision where to do it, do it on the micro profile site now or do it on the Jakarta site when it is moved.

From my perspective, it would make sense to do it on the microprofile side as we have a high release and simplified processes so we could do that faster. But yeah, that is a decision that need to be done.

When the transition is planned.

So yeah, that decision requires also support from the working groups. Unfortunately, as the IBM proposal failed, IBM decides officially to not support a new transition.

Which is sad news, which means also compatible implementation need to be found on the micro profile sites that helps to move these things forward.

Maybe that changes again, yeah, but a compatible implementation on the micro profile and the Jakarta site for that transition is required.

That's on the on the last slide. I think I made a point to that. So a general issue that need to be addressed when moving a spec from micro profile to Jakarta is.

In micro profile all the specs, the component specs have a single git repo multi module Maven approach. So there's a component spec that contains.

The parent POM and then some Mavens or defined Maven sub modules as the spec, the API and the TCK and that is not the case or not even the default.

On the Jakarta side, sometimes for historical reasons because the TCK was closed source originally, but new aspects use the same approach. Concurrency I think is an example when I'm right for that.

But there are also specs in Jakarta that use three different git repos, one for the spec document, one for the API, and one for the TCK.

I think that's a severe issue because when you want to add a feature then you need to change the spec documents to document that feature at maybe a new methods to the API and also need to add a test in the TCK.

And with the current setup, you need to align that manually, so you cannot have a single git commit that covers these three aspects for a new feature. The spec team

need to manage that manually by linking them.

Or something like that. With that multi module approach it can be a single git commit that contains these three changes together and tracks them together so. That's a benefit from the organizational perspective. What most of the Jakarta specs use is 1 git repository for the spec document and the API, so the.

Open source part for a long time and then separate TCK git repo for the originally closed source part. Yeah, maybe merging them in the future could make sense, but. The benefits when having these that fixed setup is that all the automation can be done in a parent project which is implemented as a micro profile parent.

Which contains a lot of configuration that is continuous integration relevant. So building the spec document in the right way, executing the tests, doing it in the right order, etcetera. So.

Also checking the version against the API changes, for example to make sure that the releasing is done in the right way. So if the API changes, it must minimum a minor release, et cetera.

That is that automation, yeah, is maintained within that MP parent project and there is no equivalent at the moment on the Jakarta side, so when the spec is moved.

A copy of that micro profile parent need to be moved to or that automation need to be integrated into the component spec and then maintained separately and not in sync anymore.

Which will be, yeah, a way back from my perspective. So the issue especially with microprofile config is microprofile config was not maintained for a long time because it was.

Expected to be moved to Jakarta and that specification depends on a very outdated version of microprofile parent which is 2.8.

Which depends on Jakarta CDI 3.00 and also Java SE8, so that's Jakarta E 9.

There is currently a plan to do a new Microprofile 7.2 release and the changes planned for MP config is to update to at least the latest 2.X version of the.

Which fixes some of the issues because in that configuration sometimes there are dependencies outdated or even.

Configured versions of plugins, for example, have issues, even security issues that need to be fixed and addressed.

The problem is that's a later point on the slides too, that the microprofile community or the majority of the microprofile community decided at some point microprofile is something completely independent of Jakarta.

And loosely coupled.

Which is a mistake from my perspective, because there's a hard dependency to Jakarta specifications, but the yeah, where vendors that could not catch up with the latest Jakarta E version.

And they want to support even the newest micro profile features with the newest version and not to back port micro profile features to a former major release of the component specs.

And yeah, that created some issues with the parent because originally the parent was, yeah, updated for a new micro profile umbrella spec release to the newest dependencies and then all the released component specs using that latest.

Parent version and at the moment in microprofile there are some specifications that require Jakarta EE10 as dependencies and some require Jakarta EE89. Sorry 9 is correct.

And therefore two major versions of that MP parent need to be maintained. So the current version is 3 dot X and config is still depending on 2 dot X.

And yeah, when migrating these specifications or config itself only, yeah, there need to be a way to do that so all the vendors and users can catch up.

And yeah, use Eclipse Converter for example to do that transition in an automated way. That means it need to be planned.

We could follow what we did for the Jakarta E to Java E to Jakarta E transition, so doing a major release.

Use that as a base in from micro profile and create a Jakarta release with only the namespace change. Also the the other factors how to the requirements to run the TCK for example.

That legal impacts, how to use the brand, et cetera, that can be changed in that Big Bang approach and then that change can be automated when it's defined in that way. So it would be a relatively simple.

Transition just using open rewrite or Eclipse Converter for example to do that switch and then further improvement starts on the Jakarta side from that point on.

Um.

Yeah, we need to define a Jakarta E version to start with. Yeah, the 7.2 release requires Jakarta E10 as a minimum and should be also tested with Jakarta E 11.

Um.

Maybe it could make sense to do that transition starting with Jakarta 11 dependencies only.

May create a config that's depending on Jakarta. I mentioned that and then the other way that was discussed is alternatively to support both the namespace.

This is in that new spec.

That has some impact. Roberto Cortes mentioned that that could create additional runtime loads when running that spec in that way. So we need to think which way we want to go in that.

To show that graphical view. So we have that.

Plant microprofile config release. That's 3.1 dot one. It's a patch release.

To update the parent POM. Yeah, it consists of the spec document, the API and the TCK in that way. That's the parent version that is chosen and that defines the dependency to Jacquard.

Yeah, and if we want to base it on 11, we need to, yeah, use a parent 4 dot X to make that happen.

That split you mentioned, Michael. Yeah, when we might do a major release that does that split as the packages are split, Roberto said that should be a major release if we do.

That yeah, that might be split it into a specification that is named Microprofile conflict CDI or something and microprofile config core which has no CDI dependency.

That does not mean that CDI can depend on it when it stays within micro profile, but it could be prepared for a transition in micro profile in that way.

OK.

Otherwise we would have the circular dependency between these organizations.

When the split is done within Jakarta or the splitted version is moved to Jakarta, it would like look like this and then CDI could use the Jakarta config core specification to do the configuration of CDI itself.

For example.

And yeah, a new major release on a micro profile could depend on it. And yeah, if we make the transition as easy as possible, micro profile config version based on Jakarta config.

Could be done.

Yeah, if that need to be a major release that need to be discussed in that way if it does not break anything and only extending the namespace and the configuration namespace.

It might be a 4.1 release to.

Yeah, some organizational things for that move. It requires majorities in both working groups. So micro profile need to decide to donate that specification and. On the Jakarta site, somebody needs to accept it officially.

As I said at the beginning, I see still a majority for that move and I also see a majority for that namespace change.

That these two majorities or decisions have some intersections for some members and they're voting, but I think when viewed separately on these issues on the namespace and the Moodle issue, they're still.

In the majority. So it would be interesting if something has changed because there were some changes that had team moved into IBM. Some people were silent in the past and recently discussed it.

Or changed their mind, so that will be interesting. But voting is required and the majority to make it happen is required, which means some of the concerns need to be addressed.

Also, as I mentioned, a compatible implementation in both working groups is required for that transition. In the best case it's the same, but yeah, at least one on each side is required to do further releases.

At the moment IBM still moves forward and pushes the microprofile 7.2 release, so maybe IBM could cover the microprofile side, but on the Jakarta side at least.

Somebody needs to pick it up there too.

There's a Jakarta spec committee constraint that.

Yeah, happened a few years ago during the Christmas time and the Jakarta namespace.

Must be used for the API. That was consensus, but yeah, a majority in the spec committee decided that the TCK must use a different namespace.

That's an issue. When you want to do a clean and intuitive Maven multi module setup, then all the package names and module names should be In Sync.

And a different namespace. Yeah, creates confusion. Microprofile itself is a proof that the TCK and the API could have the same namespace.

But I think the the surklet implementation of some vendors has an issue with it to run the TCK and therefore decided everybody has to choose something else.

Not Jakarta. So maybe we need to rediscuss that, which could be a longer discussion or the shortcut would be accepting a short exception for these moved micro profile specs.

That they can keep the Jakarta namespace when the namespace is changed.

But that's a barrier that need to be done and that need to be done within Jakarta.
Um.

The major release need to be prepared and we need to decide which Jakarta E release is used as a dependency. So when we want to change the namespace, we don't want to change the Jakarta E dependencies.

With it in the best case to make that transition as smooth as possible. But that means on the microprofile side, when that preparation is done on the microprofile side, microprofile need to depend for example on Jakarta 11 to make that happen.

Where it is 10 and in some cases even 9 at the moment. So that's something that need to be solved on the micro profile site or it can be done only when the content is moved over to Jakarta and then changed there but.

Then it would mean the Jakarta working group need to do a micro profile release with the micro profile namespace within Jakarta which.

Don't seems right to me to.

And could create some confusion and discussion.

Um.

Yeah, what we discussed. Um, uh.

It's also that the meeting transparency and openness within micro profile is different than in Jakarta. In Jakarta some meetings are open to everybody like the most of the. Component spec meetings or the platform meeting, also the TCK meeting, but the spec meeting or the steering committee meeting closed.

To guests, they need to be invited, which happens sometimes, but they are not open or not open in every iteration. So there were open spec steering committee meetings in the past.

Past like on Eclipse Con for example. But yeah, that openness would get lost if micro profile working group content is moved into Jakarta and that created some concerns. Against that move, especially from Red Hat in the past, and I can agree. So changing that might be beneficial for Jakarta.

Also, having recordings of these meetings could be helpful because some of these discussions, yeah, hidden behind the fence, for example, that decision that lead to that namespace decision.

Or also the decision about the IBM proposal for moving microprofile working group content into Jakarta and it would be more transparent to everybody why somebody voted in a specific way.

Um.

That helps for everybody to understand what's the problem and how to solve it.
Um, so?

That are points that could help to convince micro-profile people to even move the whole content of micro-profile into Jakarta if they have the same experience as before. Also community involvement could be addressed maybe within.

Another elected community member in these committees with voting right. That's another idea. So I think the the current working group definition allows to have multiple.

Community members to be elected into these meetings.

That also, of course, requires somebody who wants to take over that role. That's another side, but these are ideas.

So that's the end from my side questions.

MR **Michael Redlich** 45:11

Yeah, just now one thing, John, there was in your one slide on the micro profile config split.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 45:20

That one or?

MR **Michael Redlich** 45:20

One before that, I think. No, the one before that. Yeah. Oh, wait, no, no, there was something that referenced.

Jakarta EE9 at the at the bottom of your flow chart or that one. That's that's it. Yeah, the web, the Jakarta E9 web profile and.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 45:32

Uh.

Yeah, the core profile that did not exist.

MR **Michael Redlich** 45:43

Right. But why? No, right. And and I'm just curious because like a profile 71 has uses Jakarta EE10 oh core profile so.

So why are they using the 9 web profile? Maybe that's more of my question.

JW Jan Westerkamp 46:06

Yeah, that is because microprofile config lacks for years on maintenance because it was expected to be moved to Jakarta. So nobody worked on it because of that. To, yeah, don't disturb any transition, basically. And then the versions just outdated. That's the reason and.

MR Michael Redlich 46:27

OK.

Oh, OK. So yeah. Oh, so I'm looking at the releases for micro profile config and the last time was October 13th, 2023. So 2 1/2 years ago, roughly. Oh, OK, I see that makes sense then. OK, gotcha.

JW Jan Westerkamp 46:45

Yeah, and even there's a release candidate for 3.1.1, but it changes only the parent version from 2.8 to 2.12 I think.

MR Michael Redlich 46:50

Yeah.

Mhm.

Uh.

Well, right. Yeah. Yeah. Say I'm looking at the tags and it has. Yeah, just what you mentioned. It was 3 weeks ago. OK, Gotcha. Gotcha. All right. Yeah, I it seems to me and and you know, I don't.

attend all the micro profile meetings. It seems like the discussions to move micro profile into Jakarta EE have stalled. Is that because of that vote on the namespace that failed?

Or do you? What? What do you know about that?

JW Jan Westerkamp 47:36

Yeah, I think it only stalled because yeah, as I understood IBM, yeah, had to clear. A vision how that move need to be done and as that was not accepted, IBM is not supporting it and IBM and Red Hat, yeah, and now joined forces.

MR **Michael Redlich** 48:02
Mm, yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 48:10
And it's the core driver within micro profile also within Jakarta. So you'd only need to look at the the attendees where they came from like here.

MR **Michael Redlich** 48:10
Mhm, yeah, yeah.
Yep.
Yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 48:27
The majority, or even half in this case left is from IBM or former Red Hat, which is now IBM and yeah, as it does not work as.

MR **Michael Redlich** 48:29
Yeah, yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 48:43
IBM plant, at least on the micro profile side, yeah, they don't want to push it anymore, but said if one somebody wants to take over.

MR **Michael Redlich** 48:54
Hmm.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 48:59
Yeah. And therefore, yeah, I tried to take over. I was busy the last weeks. I got some with my company spin off some public funding, which requires a lot of documentation to be done for a midterm review, so.

MR **Michael Redlich** 49:16
Mm.

JW Jan Westerkamp 49:17

And also another issue is my organization moved the domain but struggled to create a new mail server so I cannot access the mailing list in the writing form at the moment.

So therefore it's a good chance here to at least communicate these slides. Hopefully when I have writing access to the mailing list again, then I can push that on the mailing list and start a discussion there in a wider community.

MR Michael Redlich 49:45

Mm.

JW Jan Westerkamp 49:55

But I think um.

That depends on you, but if scene for J Alliance is not existing anymore, discussing that topic as a community, a joint community between Microprofile and Jakarta.

MR Michael Redlich 50:07

Right.

JW Jan Westerkamp 50:17

In the Jakarta future direct and could make sense. Also future iterations could make sense. I don't know how you think about that.

MR Michael Redlich 50:22

Mhm.

Well, yeah, I I I thought that was a great thing we did for a few weeks a couple of years ago, you know, to get together, have those meetings on the CN4J evidence. But then, yeah, like you said, it just abruptly ended.

JW Jan Westerkamp 50:46

Yeah.

MR Michael Redlich 50:46

That it might be time to right, might be time to resurrect it again.

Yeah, well, yeah.

JW Jan Westerkamp 50:56

I failed because at the end the Eclipse Foundation staff told me not to use it anymore. I was a little bit surprised about that, but yeah, so I tried to find new ways and.

MR Michael Redlich 50:56

Yeah.

Oh, OK.

JW Jan Westerkamp 51:12

I tried to join the Jakarta config discussions. There's only meeting minutes from 2023 left.

MR Michael Redlich 51:28

No, boy.

JW Jan Westerkamp 51:29

And the meeting link is not valid anymore. So that was today, two hours before this meeting. I usually cannot attend that every week because there's an adoptium steering committee meeting at the same time slot.

MR Michael Redlich 51:33

Uh.

JW Jan Westerkamp 51:47

But yeah, we need to find a way to discuss, discuss this, these topics and it would be beneficial, for example, to especially invite Dimitri and Roberto.

MR Michael Redlich 52:03

Mm.

JW Jan Westerkamp 52:04

To that topic to move things forward because they're even more in details than me. Also, Emily worked on that as far as I remember.

MR **Michael Redlich** 52:09

Next.

OK.

Yeah, yeah, I just pulled up the meeting and it's and and yeah, it's May 11th of 2023 now.

All right. Well, this this was any other, anybody questions from Brian or James?

BS **Brian Stansberry** 52:35

Not really a question, just um, I'll just throw this out 'cause I've never stated it, at least probably before. But one concern I have about this beyond all the namespace and working group and all that. Um.

Is the idea of config being used with a whole lot of Jakarta specs. I can certainly see that with like things that are traditionally configured via, you know, deployment descriptors and annotations and stuff. But I definitely have concern about, you know, the the dozens of independent Jakarta specs.

Deciding that they're going to configure the the application server runtime independently and leading to a mess. So I have a very large concern about that as a implementation vendor that has a very strong configuration model.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 53:15

Hmm.

Hmm.

MR **Michael Redlich** 53:22

Mm.

BS **Brian Stansberry** 53:23

So that that's just something I want to throw out there for the to to be in the air that it's something if if Config ever moves into Jakarta, that is something I think the platform is gonna have to keep a careful line on to make sure that we have a. A consistent configuration model and not a 50 different specs, all deciding to implement how to configure an HTTP listener type thing.

MR **Michael Redlich** 53:42

Yeah.

OK. Yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 53:52

Yeah, that's an important point. That's from the user's perspective, one of the most pains. So the code works on a different application server as before usually.

MR **Michael Redlich** 53:54

Yep.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 54:07

But yeah, if you move from one application application vendor application server vendor to another, yeah, these deployment descriptors and things, these are creating breaking changes where you need to work on and.

MR **Michael Redlich** 54:17

Uh.

Um.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 54:24

I think that's if should become unified, requires a separate specification that defines unified.

Runtime configuration. That might be an idea to solve that.

MR **Michael Redlich** 54:44

Yeah.

BS **Brian Stansberry** 54:46

Um.

And that's, yeah, my my biggest concern is if it wasn't in any way unified and thought through and as opposed, you know, let's say the respect decided this is how you configure these particular things where server does something slightly different and then implementers have to figure out how to.

MR **Michael Redlich** 54:49

Yeah.

Right, right.

BS **Brian Stansberry** 55:03

Make it all work.

MR **Michael Redlich** 55:07

Yeah, so for me personally, you know, experience wise at least with Jakarta, no SQL, you know, no problem using micro profile config to point to a no SQ, you know to a Mongo DB database for example and.

But I didn't consider that for other, you know, other specifications. So interesting, but yeah.

That's why we have these meetings. Yeah, yeah.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 55:32

I think, yeah. And what you said, Brian, that issue was basically one of the reasons why that Jakarta conflict approach gets stuck because.

BS **Brian Stansberry** 55:34

Yep.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 55:48

There was no agreement between the vendors which features need to be implemented. And yeah, then Dimitri's approach was, yeah, use the the minimum consensus as a start.

But even that failed, unfortunately.

MR **Michael Redlich** 56:08

Yeah.

Hmm.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 56:10

So I think when micro profile config is moved to Jakarta as Jakarta config, yeah, there

should be a new subset that is matching or in the best case the full set of the original micro profile.

Config spec. If we want to make that Jakarta E to Java E pattern as a transition, then it should be feature complete with the original spec.

To make that transition as easy as possible and then further development could start.

MR **Michael Redlich** 56:52

Mm.

Yeah, it was. It was interesting. I think I made a small contribution to Jaccarda to configure a couple of years ago. I think it was actually documentation related or or. But in any event, next thing you know, the entire repo seemed to have gotten wiped out. I'm like, wait a minute.

But I I don't know if it's still to go to the repository, have to go find it, but but I remember there was some work there and you know it was next thing you know it's gone. So not quite sure why that was.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 57:35

There's also some some worse thing that could happen and I really don't wish that will happen if, as I said, there need to be a majority in both sides for that migration.

MR **Michael Redlich** 57:53

Mm.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 57:54

The worst scenario I could imagine is there's no agreement on the micro profile side to move that spec over and then there's still a need on the Jakarta side to create one and creating one that is not matching.

To the microprofile config implementation and yeah, that would be really worse as an outcome and I think that's a good reason to work on that transition in a way that it is not breaking, especially on the microprofile side.

MR **Michael Redlich** 58:27

M.

Yeah.

JW Jan Westerkamp 58:33

At the end.

MR Michael Redlich 58:36

Yeah, I found the Jakarta config repository and the last time things were updated was two years ago. So there is content there now, but so things were evolving.

JW Jan Westerkamp 58:46

Hmm.

MR Michael Redlich 58:53

But yeah, I guess we'll try to try to figure that out. It's.
Interesting, interesting story.

BS Brian Stansberry 59:07

No, thank you, John. Yeah, I'm sorry, John. I need to go, but I appreciate them hearing all the.

MR Michael Redlich 59:08

Yeah, yeah.
So yeah.

JP James Perkins 59:12

Yeah, same. All right, thank you.

JW Jan Westerkamp 59:12

Yeah. Thank you. Welcome.

MR Michael Redlich 59:14

So who's who's who started the Who started the teams meeting? I all I have is the leave button.

JP James Perkins 59:23

It wasn't me.

MR **Michael Redlich** 59:23

So if we all just, we all just leave, then I guess the recording stops, I guess, yeah.

JP **James Perkins** 59:28

I'm guessing I'm still learning about teams, so I don't know.

BS **Brian Stansberry** 59:29

Yeah, I think it was Jared Anderson who started it. I think he was. He was originally listed as the host when he was here. So yeah, we'll see what happens.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 59:32

OK.

MR **Michael Redlich** 59:33

Oh, did he? OK, OK. Oh, OK. So he must have. Well, he left. So, yeah, that's good. John, thank you very much for for presenting this. This is pretty cool. There's a lot to discuss on the future of microprofile config and and you know, Jaccardi.

JP **James Perkins** 59:36

Oh, OK, perfect.

All right. Thanks, guys. Yeah.

BS **Brian Stansberry** 59:43

And.

MR **Michael Redlich** 59:53

Jakarta config, so appreciate it.

JP **James Perkins** 59:56

All right, thank you. Bye.

JW **Jan Westerkamp** 59:57

Thank you. Bye, bye.



MR **Michael Redlich** 59:57

All right, folks, take enjoy the rest of your day. All right, bye.



BS **Brian Stansberry** 59:59

You too. Bye bye.



JP **James Perkins** 59:59

You too, bye.



● stopped transcription