Minutes of March 19 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

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

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura, Michael DeNicola
IBM: Dan Bandera, Kevin Sutter
Oracle: Will Lyons
Payara: Steve Millidge
Red Hat: Mark Little, John Clingan
Tomitribe: David Blevins, Richard Monson-Haefel
Martijn Verburg - arrived late
Ivar Grimstad

Eclipse: Mike Milinkovich

Review of Minutes from Prior Meeting

We will review minutes of the February 19th, February 26th and March 5th meetings next week.

Trademark Licensing Agreement and Other Agreements

See note from prior meetings on this discussion topic.

The Eclipse Foundation replied last week to Oracle's revisions provided last week to the Trademark License Agreement, Specification Copyright License, Working Group Participation Agreement, and the Member Committer Agreement that were provided by Oracle, as discussed at last week's Steering Committee meeting.

Ensuing discussions have resulted in a series of 4 meetings to discuss the above this week.   I feel more optimistic than last week about the successful resolution by April 1. Mike agrees there has been an improvement.

Tracking open issues from March 5:
- Tomitribe's participation agreement is also outstanding, due to slow progress with the Apache Software Foundation. The last meeting we agreed to discuss this (the latest update from Apache was a couple of weeks ago, being reviewed at Apache Legal). There is no update from Apache.   David will attempt to push this forward over the next week.
- The Fujitsu Participation Agreement is due April 1.

○ Last week Kenji was preparing to execute the Agreement by this date. It may be one week late.

Eclipse GlassFish release and TCK testing

Any update on the following:
https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show_bug.cgi?id=543917

Progress has been made on this bug, but this continues to impact work Oracle is doing and is not fully resolved.   If this continues, this will become a blocking issue. We're hoping that new hardware will create a more stable environment.

Marketing Committee Update

Update on the compatibility logo decision. Marketing committee met last week and decided to defer the vote until March 28.

Reminder on the developer survey - will close March 25. As of today, had 1389 participants. Please encourage participation. Request made through the JCP PMO.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JakartaEEWG

Stephanie Swart has created a promotional kit with some social media content and a few graphics to use.   Please see the Google Doc:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Vbzosq2PZuTyVC0okdSYUf9vAVoKSmJWh7J_7dOSRyQ/edit?usp=sharing

There will be a Working Group meeting (name TBD) on March 27.

Jakarta EE 8 Release

The scope of the release was agreed to as described in the following document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/15rsZ5e3ONjsJjP635yev3dVjV5ZiKdIvRuHXQXpwQus/edit

The "Next Steps" document provides an overview of the current plan:
https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1VFaaE5-HaDIdm4c-IdJTcyO0sGoYcumGchq_aoNUq2M/edit#slide=id.g4d87466c3c_0_0

The following Google doc is being updated:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15HdTmpvlVIW53zm6wGwZoli5c1kRzM79G-ZDHe4FVMs/edit#gid=503170349

The following suggestion from Tanja was discussed:

For Jakarta EE 8 we will create the specification documents by authoring a scope and combining that with the output of JavaDoc. We are doing this to be able to get the required IP lock-in done for Jakarta EE 8, while we work in parallel to get the copyright assignment for the full specifications. This will be required for Jakarta EE9. Our objective is to take the work to gather all the copyright assignments off the critical path for Jakarta EE 8.

There was general support for this approach from Steering Committee members.   This topic will be discussed between Oracle and Eclipse this week.

It was noted that in previous discussions Eclipse felt that we would need an SC member on every spec project.   Mike now believes that Eclipse only requires a participant on the platform specification. There was general support for this approach from Steering Committee members.

Questions/Comments I have (there may be others):
- Did the Spec Committee review the "spec" tab last week, including leadership of the pillar? No, last week EFSP 1.1 was approved for recommendation to Eclipse Executive Director.   JESP V1.0 will be reviewed for review at the Spec Committee meeting this week. Hope to review the pillar tab this week.
- Updates on compatible implementations tab/discussion.   Payara and Oracle meet on the plan for Eclipse GlassFish 5.2.   Yamini will not be leading her projects this week. Steve Millidge will stay on as the GlassFish project lead.   Still looking for a named lead for the Eclipse GlassFish 5.2 lead.   The intent is to limit the scope of this as much as possible, to re-release components addressing any requirements from the Jakarta EE 8 specs. No changes to TCKs are anticipated.
- Progress on running TCKs contributed to Jakarta against implementations other than Eclipse GlassFish. Kevin reported making progress from an OpenLiberty testing perspective.   Mark Little reported that Wildfly was able to pass all but the JAXB(?) test. The default is/should be to share any issues and resolutions publicly. No "issues/bugs" have been filed as far as Oracle is aware.

Budget Issue

Follow-up on the review of updates to the proposed Working Group budget.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rj5t8aswPsTMlPqM4s9UBOnCE2SjEYAyekF6RSBd1r4/edit

We will vote on this budget proposal next week. (Will be earlier in the agenda next time).

Proposed Specification Names

This agenda item is a placeholder for now.   The Spec Names list is here:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1_f-VsI8pjCBSc0gFrItz-Axdw8oK5dfcM2H9mFrPxxE/edit#gid=157814126

Clarification from Oracle last time:
- Would project URLs need to change: e.g.
  https://projects.eclipse.org/projects/ee4j.jms
  - The answer is yes, they would need to change. We are working on a defining a convention for this and would prefer to communicate this after Eclipse has a chance to review this.
- Would javax package names need to change e.g. javax.jms - no, there is not a requirement to change

Jakarta Summit

Consensus has been to work on defining an agenda when there is more clarity on the resolution of legal issues.