Minutes of December 10 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

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

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Mike Denicola, Kenji Kazumura
IBM: Dan Bandera, Kevin Sutter
Oracle: Will Lyons, Bill Shannon
Payara: Steve Millidge
Red Hat: Mark Little, Scott Stark, John Clingan
Tomitribe: David Blevins, Cesar Hernandez
Participant member representative: Martijn Verburg (not present)
Committer member representative: Arjan Tijms

Eclipse: Paul White, Thabang Mashologu, Wayne Beaton, Ivar Grimstad, Tanja Obradovich, Shabnam Mayel, Mike Milinkovich, Paul Buck

Review of Minutes from Prior Meeting

Minutes of Nov 26 meeting were approved.

Minutes of Dec 3 meeting will be reviewed next time.

No meeting on December 24 and December 31.

Jakarta EE 8 Follow-Up

- Publishing spec docs - review the following status doc
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18SraPxRBCOyaS6w-UV6TR-UA1bWy1--sV0ky6msAjWY/edit?usp=sharing
  - Spec copyright assigned for 49% of spec documents (up from 46% last time).
  - Specs contributed for 49% of spec documents (up from 46% last time).
- Contributing GF 4.X Japanese documentation
  - Still working
- David/Eclipse and Sonatype have come to an agreement on approach.   Ball is in their court.   David will communicate to the community.

Jakarta EE and MicroProfile

- MicroProfile team members are preparing a proposal for a WG for MicroProfile. Received good feedback from Mike, was planned for publishing to MicroProfile community last week for discussion. 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.
  - Not quite released yet. Almost ready. Hope to push out tod

Jakarta EE 9

- Steering Committee requested delivery plan by December 9 [1]
- The following strawman proposal spreadsheet was distributed by Kevin two weeks ago:
  - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1EN5UEzxFV1Buk7yqdQAweaynWJ3UNn2BjN7blXn9vh4/edit#gid=0
- We discussed the draft Jakarta EE 9 Release Plan
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/18cwfYhEqv_msIdH1DSVDXJc-QaUJ6zjPgmG6JHfLRrA/edit?usp=sharing
  - The team believes it meets the requirements of the resolution
  - Have agreed on scope (e.g. Jakarta XML Web Services, and Jakarta XML Binding as optional), agreed to make Java SE 11 the base version, though will support Java SE 8 as well
  - Have agreed to release a release candidate spec, approx two months before final release date.
  - Need to update the release plan and define release dates
  - Intend to publish a plan for platform team review and finalize in next week's platform team meeting and hope to review at SC as well
  - Working assumption is that Eclipse GlassFish would be the compatible implementation for the Platform Specification Version, because it is the only implementation that currently supports all of the optional features
  - All Steering Committee members should review the plan and comment prior to next week's meeting (after Steve's updates Thursday)

  [1]Steering Committee Resolution from October 29

  RESOLVED, the Jakarta EE Steering Committee requests that the Jakarta EE Platform Project leadership deliver a Jakarta EE 9 Delivery Plan to the Steering Committee no later than December 9, 2019, for the Steering Committee to consider adopting as the roadmap for Jakarta EE 9, and that the Jakarta EE 9 Delivery Plan accommodate the following constraints:
    - *Implements the "big bang"*
    - *Includes an explicit means to identify and enable specifications that are unnecessary or unwanted to be deprecated or removed*
    - *Moves all remaining specification apis to the Jakarta namespace*

> *• States that no new specifications are to be added, apart from specifications pruned from Java SE 8 where appropriate, unless those specifications clearly will not impact the target delivery date*
>
> *The plan shall define a delivery date, and the team should view meeting the above requirements in as early a timeframe as possible as a higher priority than adding additional functionality to the release.*

> *The resolution is based on the following assumptions with respect to roles:*
>
> 1. *The Steering Committee owns the roadmap. As owner, it can define the requirements needed and delegate to the Platform Project. The Steering Committee is ultimately responsible for the delivery of Jakarta EE 9, which it delegates to the Platform Project.*
> 2. *The Platform Project owns development of its release plan. It also has to generate its Spec plan, as it is also a Specification Project. It also owns its delivery plan.*
> 3. *The Spec Committee approves spec release plans developed by Spec projects. Given the Platform Project is a Specification Project, the Platform Project's spec release plan needs to be approved.*

> Additional comments
> - As noted last time, should reach out to tools teams (Eclipse, IntelliJ, WDT…) requesting support

Discussion on membership fees

- Email from Scott below

  While looking into what resources are available to contribute to the JAXB and JAX-WS specs in terms of updates, two of the main contributors to Apache CXF have indicated that they cannot work on these specification projects because their company(~200M in revenue) is unwilling to pay the $20k fee required by the current participation agreement: https://www.eclipse.org/org/workinggroups/wpga/jakarta_ee_working_group_participation_agreement.pdf

  When I went through the various levels of membership, it seems like they could come in as committer members at both the Eclipse Foundation and Jakarta EE Working Group levels and have a zero dollar cost to

participate in these specifications. Am I correct in that reading of these various documents defining the requirements for a Specification Project member?

https://www.eclipse.org/projects/efsp/#efsp-projects
https://www.eclipse.org/org/workinggroups/jakarta_ee_charter.php
https://www.eclipse.org/org/workinggroups/wpga/jakarta_ee_working_group_participation_agreement.pdf
https://www.eclipse.org/membership/become_a_member/membershipTypes.php#committer

This topic, and alternative solutions for this issue, were discussed.

The Eclipse Foundation emphasized, and it was agreed by the Steering Committee, that Jakarta EE Working Group membership definitions, benefits, and fee structures, and requirements for assignment of IP by Jakarta EE Working Group members who participate in specification projects have been defined by the Jakarta EE Working Group and the Steering Committee, and not by the Eclipse Foundation.   Some of the email discussion on the topic might have suggested that the Jakarta EE Working Group membership structure was Eclipse Foundation-driven, and that is not the case.

The Steering Committee agreed that:
- There is a requirement for proper management of IP flows from individuals and companies participating in specification projects, such that the Jakarta EE WG can create specifications with proper assignment of contributed IP.   Jakarta EE WG membership agreements accomplish this.
- We would like to create a zero cost Jakarta EE WG alternative for individuals who wish to participate in specification projects, in cases where their employers are not willing to sign Jakarta EE membership agreements.   The Eclipse Foundation will consider this and propose alternatives.

Marketing Committee Update and Jakarta EE Update Calls

- General updates
- Jakarta EE Update Meeting - please suggest other topics
  - Planned for December 11
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U81TZ2F_nhg6WxoE1VnpUUEQ09r8SXWpaN3hf3wiTWQ/edit
  - Considering retrospective and marketing plan for Jan 15 meeting
- Jakarta EE Tech Talks - Tanja is open for suggestions

- ○ https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/19AfvCUdScUHwJejMYg370tum5mi7zI4bvkZczcQXiUM/edit#gid=0

Operationalizing Jakarta EE Program Plan

- Tanja is working on a document that translates the goals of the 2020 plan into quarterly objectives/milestones/outcomes.
- Goal is to review the document next week and to discuss using this to guide Steering Committee oversight.

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, has recommend 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".
  - ○ 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".
- Dan met with Wayne on this topic. Will come back with a recommendation next meeting.