# Minutes of January 28 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

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

Attendees (to be confirmed):

Fujitsu: **Mike Denicola**, **Kenji Kazumura**
IBM: **Dan Bandera**, **Kevin Sutter, Ian Robinson**
Oracle: **Will Lyons**, **Bill Shannon**, **Dmitry Kornilov**
Payara: **Steve Milidge**
Red Hat: **Mark Little, John Clingan, Scott Stark**
Tomitribe: **Cesar Hernandez**
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 White**, **Wayne Beaton**, **Ivar Grimstad**, **Tanja Obradovich, Shabnam Mayel**

**Review of Minutes from Prior Meeting**

We will review Jan 14 and Jan 21 meetings next time.

**Jakarta EE 8 Follow-Up**

- Tweet on Sonatype migration completed
  https://twitter.com/JakartaEE/status/1222210788859043841

**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)

- Discussion of resolution at:
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mbAPsGq6Npq1fKFe7J0g2uAkWT8wgsBvbFLVISPnxMU/edit
  - The text was modified as follows.  The Google doc remains open for comment.
  - Please vote by e-mail on your approval (or not) for the resolution as written.  In the interest of achieving full participation, if we have not all voted by mail, we will conclude the voting at the Feb 4 Steering Committee meeting.

    > Resolved that the Jakarta EE Working Group Steering Committee endorses the following statement to be communicated openly to the Microprofile, Jakarta EE, and cloud native, and Java developer communities.
    >
    > Jakarta EE Working Group is Open to Forming a Working Relationship with MicroProfile
    >
    > The Jakarta EE Working Group is open to considering the possibility of forming a joint Working Group with the MicroProfile community.   We recognize that forming a joint Working Group would require significant modifications to the current Jakarta EE Working Group charter, and are open to that prospect.   We are open to considering the current Cloud Native for Java Working Group proposal, and/or evolving that proposal, and potentially other proposals, together with the MicroProfile community, in an effort to best meet the needs of MicroProfile and Jakarta EE, and to create more opportunities for synergy between the two efforts.  The Jakarta EE Working Group Steering Committee would be open to proposals for collaborative processes that may achieve a consensus approach to a joint Working Group, or working with a standalone Working Group.  We are open to discuss whatever approach works best, and would welcome MicroProfile community feedback.

**Jakarta EE 9**

- Any update
  - Add link to GitHub board:  https://github.com/orgs/eclipse-ee4j/projects/17
  - EJB project needs a release plan - in process
- Update on tooling:
  - As noted last time, should reach out to tools teams and projects (Eclipse, IntelliJ, WDT…) requesting support
  - **Tooling discussion**: Tanja -- Eclipse Che will be willing to pick up support for Jakarta EE. Suggests adding commentary via PRs.

- **Additional discussion**: Arjan suggests investigating work with plugins. Arjan will take another run at this - creating a list of tools to work with. Check back on this item next week.

**Discussion on membership fees**

- See the proposal approved at the following URL: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VMXVzdfBflKfhW0rmTJXI2sRAdECaVTXnElZ_RSrUME/edit# .
- The Eclipse Foundation will take the necessary steps to implement the proposal, including drafting a Consent Agreement, and preparing a flowchart explaining the process steps.  Leaving this topic on the agenda until the topic is closed out.
- Goal is still to wrap up by end of January, may go into early February.
- There was a discussion about whether the proposal would address the requirement of the individuals requesting it.   Cesar will follow-up.

**Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls**

- JakartaOne Livestream Japan
  - Last meeting, Kenji reviewed the agenda for the event on Feb 26 - any update?
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/17KbwfheYJ0UABlxMdUi27HWvIgF2WCugM53KQ3jy0hg/edit#
  - There is still space for Vendor talks. Payara, Fujitsu, Oracle and IBM have committed vendor sessions. Other vendors wishing to participate contact Kenji by end of January.
- Kubecon Europe plan
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uECHm37ziSlVbZEALphHTqtu9XW2YMHwkLwGin7ISwM/edit#
  - Please review the above and share any comments/concerns today so we can wrap up the agenda and communicate it.
  - 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.
    - 35 registrants as of today.
    - Would expect to follow a similar pattern in Kubecon NA (Boston)
  - Highlighting Strategic WG members is requested.
  - There was an announcement this week from Eclipse about this event
- Jakarta EE Update Calls
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SXWpaN3hf3wiTWQ/edit#
  - Next call is Feb 12.
  - Will finalize the agenda next week.

- Jakarta Tech Talks - Tanja is open for suggestions
  - Looking for more topics, had a couple of sign ups last week.
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19AfvCUdScUHwJejMYg370tum5mi7zI4bvkZczcQXiUM/edit#gid=0
  - All topics for Cloud Native Java will be considered. Looking for more presentation referrals.
- DevNexus Atlanta -- Feb 19-21
  - There will be an Eclipse Foundation booth. Eclipse will be hosting a reception Feb. 19th. **EF is soliciting for help staffing the booth. Please use the booth link to review the schedule and sign up.**
- Jakarta EE development survey coming up next quarter
- The Q4 Marketing Operations Update is provided at the following link: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1f9BbTdBfntK36LmQNdeaqz43NMNH3hZvEoWly3Mid-A/edit#slide=id.g6475e3fe34_0_169

**JakartaOne**

- The group discussed and accepted the e-mail update from Paul White, copied below.

  I had the action item to determine whether and when we might be able to launch JakartaOne as a major in-person conference.  This was started 2 years ago, and in both 2018 and 2019 we decided to defer until we had innovation happening.

  The conference marketplace has shifted significantly, and as a result we are recommending that the working group NOT embark on creating JakartaOne as an in-person, stand-alone major conference.

  The primary reason for this recommendation is that Red Hat and IBM are driving the creation of J4K conference as a stand-alone major conference. This, along with Oracle organizing CodeOne, leaves us without our major Strategic members backing a Jakarta EE led initiative (I am assuming Fujitsu will not want to do this alone).

  Note that the J4K conference organizers are inviting Jakarta EE to be a part of this event through sponsorship, participation in the program committee, participation in a community pavilion, etc.  We will be asking the Marketing Committee to engage more fully with the conference organizers to sort out this participation.

  Separate from an in-person event, we do think we are well on our way to establishing JakartaOne Livestream as a fantastic virtual conference series, and are recommending the working group "double down" on this investment.

I look forward to answering any questions you have at the next meeting.


**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=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
- **Discussion**: All docs in Steering Committee folder, program plans. Committee members are requested to review and comment on these docs during the next week. Q1 goal suggestions should be reviewed and feedback is requested.
- Reviewed the slide (link above) and also the quarter by quarter goals spreadsheet.
- Committee members can review and comment in the documents and/or directly to Tanja and Will.


**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 continue to work on this and confirmed they will have an update next week.


**Release Cadence discussion (not discussed):**

- 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.
- ● What is the proposed action to be taken on this topic?