

Minutes of the February 15, 2022 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura

IBM: Ian Robinson, Emily Jiang, Neil Patterson

Oracle: Will Lyons, Ed Bratt, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: Steve Millidge

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez

Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): Not present

Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): not present

Participant member representative (LJC): Martijn Verburg

Committee member representative: Arjan Tijms

We have quorum.

Eclipse: Tanja Obradovic, Shabnam Mayel, Ivar Grimstad, Paul Buck, Paul While, John Kellerman

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

The [Draft minutes of the February 1 meeting](#) will be reviewed next time.

Review Draft Jakarta EE 10 messaging document

- The Steering Committee has agreed to provide the Jakarta EE 10 messaging document to the Marketing Committee
- See the [Jakarta 9/9.1 messaging](#) document
- Arjan volunteered to draft this and has provided a link to the draft -> https://docs.google.com/document/d/1y_yi9ysLeC_S8PcBJn2u53pwNeYLMCeGigtqkGlb8/edit
- We reviewed the doc briefly including the following comments:
 - Compatible implementations should be featured first, followed by implementations that include compatible implementations of certain spec APIs, and tooling that supports the implementations/APIs
 - It was suggested we roll up the messaging into major themes such as Modernization, Simplification and Lighter-weight

- CDI-lite, Core Profile, Java SE updates, and Compatibility are all important to highlight. Faces updates were also mentioned.
- Members agreed to post comments to the doc.

Badging proposal feedback

- Refer to [Draft minutes of the February 1 meeting](#) and the [Badging Proposal](#).
- Refer to Tanja's mail from Feb 10:

In our [last meeting](#) on February 1st, John Kellerman presented a proposal for a [Jakarta EE Badging Program](#). We ran out of time at the meeting for the full discussion and wanted to leave time for each member to review the slides, form an opinion, and follow up comments / questions about the program.

To help set us up for a productive discussion on the topic in the next meeting, maybe an email thread on this can get the conversation? For starters answers to some basic questions would help. We would appreciate finding out from the members on the Jakarta EE Steering Committee:

- a. Do you think this program would be beneficial for Jakarta EE?
- b. Would you participate in a badging program?
- c. What is the major obstacle for initiating the program this year?

Your input will help us revise the proposal to align with our joint interests.

- Summary of input:
 - IBM had the same input as last time, that such a program would be valuable should be funded out of the Program Plan (not for an additional fee), based on priority. If it were not funded from the Program Plan, that implied a decision on priority for this year.
 - Oracle generally agreed with IBM's input.
 - Payara felt the program would be beneficial, but had concerns about the costs and whether Payara had all of the skills required to implement such a program.
 - Arjan noted the proposal hinges on a tutorial which itself needs to be updated.
 - Tomitribe felt the proposal was good, but there would be a challenge in creating content. Any "paying option" would require more thought.
 - Fujitsu felt the proposal may be beneficial but the costs quoted were too high. Any such proposal would also need to be localized (translated into local languages).
 - Martijn thought the proposal was worth trying, with the most cost-effective approach, and agreed that content must be localized.

- The Eclipse Foundation will continue to evaluate and tune the proposal. It is recognized that we need to target a directional decision by mid- to late- March.

Program Plan Quarterly Objectives

- In prior years we have monitored quarterly progress against the Program Plan
- I propose that we continue this practice in CY2022
- Tanja has drafted a quarterly objectives tracking document for review and feedback:
 - [2022 Program Plan Quarterly Objectives](#)
- Committee members are requested to provide feedback

Jakarta EE Ecosystem categories

- Following the Working Group meeting a question was raised about what the “PaaS Offerings” category is and how offerings are assigned
 - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gEv8IK2xXYJxf2i0uUCwflBMPybF9XM0czhA--hdRaE/edit#gid=0>
- It was agreed the the PaaS Offering category was mislabeled, and this will be corrected
- We discussed whether such categories should be governed, and it was agreed that a lightweight process would be best. The xls owner should create the categories as the opener deems appropriate with input from team members if provided. If there are specific objections they could be raised to the xls owner, or to this committee if required.

Electronic Voting

- Refer to the [December 14 meeting minutes](#)
 - It was agreed that electronic voting at the Jakarta EE Steering Committee would be reasonable if the following criteria were met:
 - A member proposed an electronic vote, AND
 - There was either consensus agreement among members present to hold the vote electronically, or there was a majority vote among members present to hold the vote electronically, AND
 - The vote would not violate any EFSP or Jakarta EE Spec process guidelines mandating a 2-week voting period (it is unlikely that this circumstance would occur in a Steering Committee vote), AND
 - The following guidelines *generally* applied and justified holding the vote electronically. It would be difficult to document and rigidly enforce all conditions that would justify holding the vote electronically, but the following represent the general intent:
 - There had been adequate discussion of the topic in the meeting or prior meetings

- Note that voting electronically in order to conduct the discussion in email, instead of in a meeting, would not be considered a valid rationale for an electronic vote.
 - There was not adequate time to vote on the topic during the meeting.
 - There was a desire to ensure that all members had the opportunity to vote on a particular item, if not all members were present and/or had not delegated their vote by proxy.
- I have drafted the following Resolution for discussion in email, and in the next meeting, for a vote:
 - Resolved, that the Jakarta Steering Committee approves the following use of electronic voting in Jakarta EE committee meetings, under the circumstances described below:
 - A committee member proposed an electronic vote, AND
 - There was either consensus agreement among members present to hold the vote electronically, or there was a majority vote among members present to hold the vote electronically, AND
 - The vote would not violate any EFSP or Jakarta EE Specification process guidelines mandating a 2-week voting period, or any other Eclipse Foundation requirements, AND
 - The following guidelines generally apply and justify holding the vote electronically:
 - There has been adequate discussion of the topic in the meeting or prior meetings
 - Voting electronically in order to conduct the discussion in email, instead of in a meeting, is not considered a valid rationale for an electronic vote.
 - There was not adequate time to vote on the topic during the meeting, or there was a desire to ensure that all members had the opportunity to vote on a particular item, if not all members were present and/or had not delegated their vote by proxy.

-----Did not discuss items below this line-----

Jakarta EE 10 status (if time permits)

- [Jakarta EE Spec Mentor Assignments & Ballot Progress](#)
 - “Done”: 3 (not counting Jakarta RPC)
 - “Ballot in process”: 2
- Do the Spec Committee and Platform Team have what they need from the Steering Committee at this time to move the project forward?
 - The general requirement is for resources to move the project forward

- Please highlight specific resource requirements to this group if that will be helpful
- Arjan identified a need for assistance with the Jakarta Faces TCK
 - Has progress/communication happened on this

Splitting implementation and Specification Projects (if time permits)

- Conclusion of the discussion from a prior meeting was that:
 - Steering Committee representatives should review the current (organic) direction and determine if this direction meets committee expectations.
 - Paul also suggested that Ed forward this to the Spec Committee alias.
- Has this issue progressed

Election Process (Will will contact David and structure this item for committee discussion)

- Original note from Zahra

The Jakarta EE Working Group Charter [1] identifies three key committees to drive the various facets of the working group for which there are annual elected positions to be filled: the Steering Committee, the Specification Committee, and the Marketing and Brand Committee.

The elected positions are to represent each of the Enterprise Members, Participant Members, and Committer Members. Note that Strategic Members each have a representative appointed to these committees, and thus Strategic member companies do not participate in this election.

Through this email, we are announcing that the Foundation will hold elections on behalf of the working group using the proposed timetable listed below.

All members are encouraged to consider nominating someone for the positions, and self-nominations are welcome. The period for nominations is September 8, 2021 - September 16, 2021. Nominations should be sent to this mailing list indicating related Committee/Seat.

Once nominations are closed, we will announce the candidates, and will distribute ballots via email. The election process will follow the Eclipse “Single Transferable Vote” method, as defined in the Eclipse Bylaws [2].

The winning candidates will be announced on this mailing list shortly after the elections are concluded.

Election Schedule

Nomination Period: September 8, 2021 - September 16, 2021

Election Period: September 21 - 28, 2021

Winning Candidates Announced: September 30, 2021

The following positions will be filled as part of this election:

Steering Committee

One seat allocated for Participant Members

One seat allocated for Committer Members

Specification Committee

One seat allocated for Participant Members

One seat allocated for Committer Members

Marketing and Brand Committee

One seat allocated for Participant Members

One seat allocated for Committer Members

Please note while all Committees provide for two seats allocated for Enterprise Members, there are currently only two Enterprise level members of the working group. As a result, there is no requirement to hold an election for those seats.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

[1] https://www.eclipse.org/org/workinggroups/jakarta_ee_charter.php

[2] <https://www.eclipse.org/org/documents/>

Best Regards,

Zahra

- See email from David Blevins on Sept 10:

Seems like we need to make a decision if we want the elections to be at the same time every year or for a 12-month period regardless of when they happen. Here are all our election announcements to date:

June 10, 2018 - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-wg/msg00087.html>

May 21, 2019 - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-wg/msg00288.html>

March 30, 2020 - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-wg/msg00410.html>

January 4, 2021 - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-wg/msg00577.html> (marketing committee only)

I can live with either a fixed time every year or a strict 12-month policy. Some thoughts on both.

12-MONTH APPROACH

We had vacancies in the Marketing Committee from 2020 elections. We filled them earlier this year. If we follow the strict 12-month rule, we'd need to omit them from the elections we just announced. This means those seats will be out of sync with the rest. That can be survivable, but there are some policies we'd need to decide. One is what happens if someone is elected as a chair, but their seat goes up for election mid-year and they do not win? Or they're elect to a seat, but change their membership class in January?

CALENDAR APPROACH

As far as I know, Memberships are not for 12 month terms, but begin in January and are pro-rated till Dec 31st if you join mid-year. This can be simpler, but can result in shorter terms in the event a vacant seat is filled mid year. If we go this route, we'd be likely smarter to keep elections fairly close-ish to the start of the year. Last year we kicked off in March, which gives us a good 9 month overlap with everyone's Eclipse and Working Group memberships, which seems pretty good. Elections can then also be a predictable event for the community.

In this approach sometimes people's seats will be shorter if they're filling a vacant seat.

What are people's thoughts or preferences?