

Minutes of the May 11, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu:

IBM: **Kevin Sutter, Dan Bandera**

Oracle: **Ed Bratt, Will Lyons**

Payara: **Steve Millidge**

Red Hat: John Clingan

Tomitribe: **David Blevins, Cesar Hernandez.**

Enterprise Member representative: **Jun Qian**

Participant member representative: **Martijn Verburg**

Committer member representative: **Arjan Tijms**

(Quorum is 5 -- simple-majority or one-half of the members (if even number) must be present)

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

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the April 13 meeting were approved as drafted.

Minutes of the April 27 meeting will be reviewed next time

For Next Time - Multiple Alternates

- The question was raised whether the Steering Committee should permit multiple alternates to be designated. It was agreed to review this next meeting.

JUG Istanbul has become a Guest Member of the Jakarta EE WG

- Welcome!
- We look forward to working with you

Apache Software Foundation Guest Membership Proposal

- Proposal from Eclipse Foundation
- Background
 - The Apache Software Foundation and Eclipse Foundation have been discussing Jakarta EE Working Group membership. There is a mutual agreement and interest in the ASF joining the Jakarta EE Working Group as a guest member.

Knowing the ASF involvement in Java EE / Jakarta EE (Apache Tomcat, Apache TomEE), this will be a great benefit for the Jakarta EE Working Group. Going forward we can expect more engagement of the ASF developers in the Jakarta EE specification projects in the future.

- As presented last time by Paul Buck -- Apache would like to join as a guest. Steering Committees can invite organizations to participate as guest organizations to be participants. They are listed as guest members on the participants page. Non voting. Present at committee meetings. EE Trademark guidelines -- allows guest members to use the compatible product trademarks. This is a one year term and can be renewed. There was no known urgency to approving this. It was moved that we vote on this at our next meeting.
- Subsequent Q&A in mail was concluded positively.
- Oracle moved, and Tomitribe seconded, that the following resolution be approved.
 - *RESOLVED, the Steering Committee invites the Apache Software Foundation to be a Guest member of the Jakarta EE Working Group.*

The resolution was adopted by unanimous consent.

Note the one year period will begin and terminate based on dates that the applicable documents are signed.

CN4J Joint Messaging Document

- Meeting on May 4 was cancelled
 - John has sent in mail some proposed "comparison" slide(s) at the following https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1wYBNqUHwADvipTC9fW5ugGMbDf_3_JH9skBtyPcl-IE/edit#slide=id.gbcfab764b6_0_54
 - Will attempt to come to consensus in mail, and then bring back to Steering Committees

Jakarta EE 9.1

- Notes from last meeting
 - Platform looking good. GlassFish, OpenLiberty, and WildFly are looking good to be listed on the Ballot. Payara and TomEE may be compatible in time for the launch date. (Update on 5/11 - TomEE is compatible).
 - TCKs are available. GlassFish has initiated Compatibility certification issues.
 - Marketing activities -- Neil
 - Working on plan -- outreach has started -- Vendor and VIP quotes are being solicited. Focus on the availability of multiple vendor implementations with the release.
 - Will work on social media planning kit at next Marketing call

- [PR](#) looking good to update on the “official announcements section” of the web-site.
 - Not planning a live event. Just announcements.
 - Spring Framework 6 will move to Jakarta EE 9. They plan a milestone later this year and release next year. They have a position statement on the quote list already.
- Further updates on readiness to launch on May 25 or open issues:
 - Compatibility certification requests
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/issues?q=is%3Aissue+9.1+label%3Acertification+is%3Aopen>
 - Refer to Jakarta EE 10 SOD below:
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/issues/352>
 - This was discussed at the Platform team meeting earlier today, were hoping that Scott would be here. Kevin will take point on contacting Scott. There was consensus that the Platform team can drive the directional statement.
 - Per Tanja:
 - On track for May 25
 - Working on PR Statement
 - **URGENT: [Members' quotes are needed](#)**
 - Looking for Jakarta EE 10 SOD (see link above)
 - Planning for a Web site update
 - Have quotes from Spring, Jelastic (deadline is May 14)
 - Tanja will provide an update on detailed mechanics (please update SC alias).

Jakarta EE 10 (9.1+)

- Abbreviated notes from last meeting
 - EE10 labeled issues:
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/issues?q=is%3Aissue+is%3Aopen+label%3AEE10>
 - Scott agreed to provide an initial SoD and it will be discussed at the Platform meeting. Marketing would like this at the May 11 Steering committee meeting (this meeting).
 - Scott indicates a goal is to “lighten” the burden of releases and it may be feasible to have a release this year. Goal will be to indicate this (and other things) in the SoD.
- Plan reviews
 - <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/labels/plan%20review>
 - Will be reaching out to component spec teams whether a release review date of Oct 15 would be achievable. If there is positive feedback, will target that date.
- Jakarta EE Core Profile Creation and Plan review

- <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pull/349>
- This (and relationship to Platform release) was a significant topic of review at Platform team and will continue to be.
- Jakarta Config proposal
 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dED5v0KgPtCuRlxif6cl_V_G2nKIDCwz3vZETNBgRzY/edit?ts=6086ed3c&pli=1#heading=h.hjwqu5e5ptjj
- Scott opened the following GitHub issue for SoD:
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/issues/352>

Q1 report and Q2 objectives Review

- Update from Tanja
- [Q1 2021 Jakarta EE Report](#)
- [Q2 objectives review](#)
 - Will and Tanja will meet and distribute a Q2 strawman

JakartaOne Livestream Plan/Schedule of Record

- Aug 21 - JakartaOne Livestream - Turkish
- Sept 29 - JakartaOne Livestream - Portuguese
- Oct 12 - JakartaOne Livestream - Spanish
- Dec 7 - JakartaOne Livestream 2021
 - Marketing Committee is proposing that we select a Dec 7 date for JakartaOne Livestream now, and target this as an annual event, on a cadence, independent of any specific releases, etc.
 - There was general support for this proposal.

Jakarta EE Badging Proposal

- From Neil
 - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/18b3E2PQcZ8QTJgFNc2ljb7NUE-8xlgjK/view>
- Tanja requested that committee members review this proposal (above), for discussion at the next Steering Committee meeting

Marketing Committee Update

- Continued announcement discussion for Jakarta EE 9.1 release - **Tentative Announcement date set for May 25, 2021**
- Discussed Jakarta EE Badging proposal (IBM)
 - Further review and discussion at next meeting
- Reviewed Events upcoming and proposal for use of funds
- Reviewed Developer Survey status and recommended increased focus and sharing

- Received Article proposal (Request to members to write content explaining how Jakarta EE is related to offerings)
- Received status of Whitepaper and social kit to begin sharing
- [Link to Minutes](#)
- Progress on Action Items from last time

Completed:

- [Items reported in April 13 minutes deleted]

Progressing

- 2021-02-11: All - update progress report for week ([Progress Report](#))
- 2021-02-11: Neil - Get Katacoda pricing information and policy information
- 2021-02-25: Karen - Update reporting spreadsheet to include tab for all events and participation
- 2021-03-25: Melissa - Create a document to save themes and best practices from github issues ([link to folder](#))
- 2021-03-25: All - determine theme for Kubecon presence
- 2021-03-25: All - use [social kit](#) content to help promote Developer Survey (starting April 6)
- 2021-03-25: Karen - create input form for Member Profile content.
- **2021-04-08: Karen/Neil - update Q2 priorities and Q1 report**
- **2021-04-08: Look at archiving marketing email**
- **2021-04-08: Cesar - Kubecon - Booth participation - make available for community; JUGs; (Cesar to draft a brief statement about request)**

Discussion

- (Note, Neil has given input on 9.1 plans in the 9.1 section above)
- Neil highlighted the list above calling out the work that is completed and remains in progress.
- Q1 summary report is in the works and will be ready soon
- Marketing committee is looking at upcoming events -- KubeCon EU, EclipseCon, etc. EclipseCon EU CFP opens this week.
- Paul White noted that EclipseCon sponsorships are available for member organizations. Please reach out to him, or Tanja if you wish further details about this.

Specification project patent license type choice

- E-Mail exchange between Scott Stark and Mike Milinkovich

Will, I would ask that this topic be added to the next steering committee meeting, and in addition to whether new specifications can choose between the two patent license types, I would want to discuss why this choice cannot be made for specifications that were not led by Oracle under the JCP.

Thanks

On Thu, Apr 15, 2021 at 10:52 AM Mike Milinkovich
<mike.milinkovich@eclipse-foundation.org> wrote:

On 2021-04-14 12:52 p.m., Scott Stark wrote:

In a couple different contexts it has been brought up that there are two types of patent licensing models in the EF Intellectual Property Policy document:

https://www.eclipse.org/org/documents/Eclipse_IP_Policy.pdf#

The choice for a specification project is showing up under the governance tab of the ee4j project page. For example, CDI:

I can't find what the process is for establishing a specification projects patent policy. Can a specification project's patent policy be changed?

If asked, Red Hat would not have chosen the compatible patent license approach for the projects we have historically led.

Scott,

The choice of the Compatible Patent License was a condition of Oracle in transferring those specifications from the Java Community Process to the stewardship of the Eclipse Foundation and the Jakarta EE Working Group. During the negotiations that created the Jakarta EE Working Group and the Eclipse Foundation Specification Process Red Hat made their preferences clear numerous times. Oracle remained unmoved.

Red Hat was not asked at the time because it was not an election that was available for any of the specifications transferred from the JCP.

I would recommend that the Jakarta EE Steering Committee consider adopting a clear resolution for its policy going forward for new specifications. Or at least ensure that clear decisions are made for each new specification going forward.

- Discussion Notes from last time

Scott -- IP license splits license -- Patent grant is affirmed upon implementation or after an implementation is agreed to as compatible. Can this be changed? Can new Specs. Adopt different Patent terms? Paul Buck suggests that the IP Advisory counsel may have had charter to adopt and set these terms. Would need some input from external groups to determine if existing Specs. can change their IP flow terms. Red Hat wasn't aware that this decision was an option and might have chosen a different outcome, if

the choice was given to them? We probably need to get some legal advice if it's possible to make changes to existing Specs., and/or terms for future contributions.

At least two questions:

- 1) What can be done with existing specifications if they want to change the patent transfer
 - 2) What options can be applied to new specifications in Jakarta EE with respect to patent transfer.
- Scott was to follow up with e-mail to the Eclipse Foundation, and Steering Committee.

Jakarta EE Developer Survey

- **Survey deadline extended to May 31**
- Available here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/F97CTD2>
- [Here is the Social Kit to help you promote the survey participation.](#) <--

Elections are coming up

- Chair, committer members representative and participant member representative