**Minutes of April 9 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting**

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

**Attendees:**

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura, Mike Denicola
IBM: Dan Bandera, Ian Robinson, Kevin Sutter
Oracle: Will Lyons
Payara: Steve Millidge
Red Hat: Scott Stark, John Clingan
Tomitribe: David Blevins, Richard Monson-Haefel
Martijn Verburg - not present
Ivar Grimstad

Eclipse: Paul White and team

**Review of Minutes from Prior Meeting**

The Minutes of March 26 Steering Committee Meeting were approved.

Minutes of the April 2 Meeting will be reviewed next time.

**Oracle and Eclipse Agreement and Other Agreements**

Per email sent April 8, last Friday, Oracle signed the Member Committer and Contributor Agreement (MCCA) and the Jakarta EE Working Group Participation Agreement (WGPA).

Last week, Oracle and Eclipse reviewed the following plan for concluding key Agreements.

> Between Eclipse and Oracle, the intent is that:
>
> 1) We intend to sign MCCAs and JWGA within the next few days. [Update - this item is now complete].
>
> 2) We have agreed to the following conceptual plan for licensing Oracle specification content to enable delivery of a Jakarta EE 8 specification that includes:
>
> - A Platform specification with TCK, with spec text, that defines functionality “as is” in the current Java EE 8 spec.
>
> All copyright holders must sign off on their contributions to the current Platform doc before we can publish (as discussed at the JCP)

- Component specifications, for components that Oracle has been the spec lead for, with Javadoc, and TCKs, and a statement that the component spec meets the same compatibility requirements as the Platform spec. Providing spec text is optional (if permissions are obtained), but not required. This is an enhancement in order to speed the ability to get the platform done.

- RH and IBM will need to make corresponding spec contributions for specs they own.

3) #2 requires that Oracle and Eclipse sign a Specification Copyright Agreement, which we intend to complete within the next week. [Update - Drafts of this Agreement have been exchanged over the past week. The latest draft was provided by Eclipse on Sunday]

4) We believe we can begin creating draft Jakarta EE 8 specs, under EPL, within the next week or two. [Update - I believe that creation of draft component specs could proceed at this time.]

5) Future specifications can use the javax namespace in a compatible manner, but will not be able to evolve/modify the Javax namespace. New functionality will evolve in the Jakarta namespace.

Eclipse noted it is drafting copyright agreements for other Jakarta EE WG members and other spec contributors.

See link below for Jakarta Namespace and GroupId:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-jQy5e8NxDMDfOkc8jGsJ23ZNUaigAfWpWvsAnj23XM/edit#heading=h.ma7xbsxflh33

Update on other member agreements

- Update on Tomitribe's participation agreement. There is a lead on the Apache side who has been identified. The Apache Software Foundation expressed interest in being made a voting member of the Jakarta EE Working Group. This topic was discussed but not resolved last week. The following discussion transpired on April 9.

  Tomitribe's need is for TomEE to be listed as a Jakarta EE branded implementation on the Eclipse site. Tomitribe does not need the Jakarta EE logo to be listed on the Apache site. Tomitribe has requested Apache's permission for TomEE logo usage on the Eclipse site. Tomitribe provides support for TomEE, but does not own logo. Options:

  - Current Jakarta EE rules of using the Jakarta EE logo - cannot put product next to logo unless you are a WG member. One option is to

make an exception to this rule in the case of TomEE. A/I: David and Paul White will draft a proposed approach for review at Steering Committee during the next 1-2 meetings.
    - Another option is to make Apache a member of the WG. This is only required because of the logo requirements described above. Objections were raised to this approach last time. This is not an option at this time.

- The Fujitsu Participation Agreement is due April 1.
    - As of last Steering Committee meeting, Kenji was pushing on this, but the Agreement is expected to be delivered early next week.

**Eclipse GlassFish release and TCK testing**

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

Oracle reports that TCK testing seems to be stabilizing. We still have occasional troubles, but the results are looking better.

**Marketing Committee Update**

Update on the compatibility logo rollout.

Waiting on guidance from Eclipse IP Advisory Committee on branding guidelines.

There is a debate on the content of the logos, differentiating between a Jakarta EE WG members, and a Jakarta EE committer (which would require a third logo). This will be discussed at Marketing Committee next meeting.

Any update on developer survey analysis. No update - will have results at the end of April.

**Jakarta EE 8 Release**

The scope of the release has been 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

General Updates:

- Jakarta EE Steering Committee Approval of the Jakarta EE Specification Process. A note from Wayne on April 4 is excerpted below:

    > Greetings Jakarta EE Steering Committee,
    >
    > The Jakarta EE Specification Committee has concluded its work on the first release of the Jakarta EE Specification Process (JESP) and now, per the Jakarta EE Working Group Charter, we require you to "Review and approve the specification process."
    >
    > I have attached the JESP (marked "Draft") to this message for your review. The JESP builds on the Eclipse Foundation Specification Process (EFSP), which itself builds on the Eclipse Development Process. As as been discussed with the specification committee, we do expect that this document will evolve as we engage in actual specification work. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.
    >
    > I hereby request that the steering committee review and approve the JESP. I'm pretty sure that the charter is silent on how the steering committee implements an approval process, so I recommend a simple majority vote during a regularly-scheduled meeting.

    This proposal was voted on by Steering Committee members on April 9. Votes were cast as follows:

    > Fujitsu: Yes
    > IBM: Yes
    > Oracle: No (for reasons described in separate mail)
    > Payara: Yes
    > Red Hat: No (for reasons described in separate mail)
    > Tomitribe: Yes
    > Martijn Verburg - not present
    > Ivar Grimstad Yes

    The Jakarta EE Specification Process (JESP) 1.0 is approved.

- Oracle intends to sign up for leading the TCK work and Eclipse GlassFish 5.1 “as is” (note correction from the 5.2 reference in prior notes), pending conclusion of the agreements discussed above.

- Tanja noted there were revisions to time estimates for specification related work in the planning sheet. She requested that members review time estimates in their respective sections of the planning sheet.
    - This is likely to change as a result of the Jakarta EE 8 spec approach referenced earlier in these meeting minutes.
    - Discussed the PMC should coordinate generate of Javadoc from contributed code.

- Tanja created a messaging document:
    - As we are working towards Jakarta EE 8 release, can we again create a document that will outline our key messaging that we'll use for the upcoming events and conferences? That way and across the Jakarta EE Working Group we can have the same communication.
      Here is the document we we used around ECE and Code One
      Jakarta EE Messages at Code One and ECE
      Could we put the topics as an Agenda item for the call tomorrow?

- Ivar raised the issue around communicating limitations of using the javax namespace. I suggested Oracle and Eclipse draft a message for review next time. This will be on the agenda for next week's meeting.

**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.