

Minutes of the March 1, 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, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: Steve Millidge, Hadar Vorenshtein

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez

Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): Jun Qian

Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): not present

Participant member representative (LJC): Martijn Verburg

Committer member representative: Arjan Tijms

We have quorum.

Eclipse: Ivar Grimstad, Paul Buck, Paul While, John Kellerman

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

The [Draft minutes of the February 1 meeting](#) were approved.

[Draft minutes of the Feb 15 meeting](#) will be reviewed next time.

Jakarta EE 10 status

- [Jakarta EE Spec Mentor Assignments & Ballot Progress](#)
 - “Done”: 6 (not counting Jakarta RPC)
 - “Ballot in process”: 2
 - PRs have been submitted for all specs!
- The current target delivery date for all component specs is to be done (approved) by May 15, such that the platform spec approval on May 15 can be started and complete by end of May.

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 on Feb 15 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.
- Will volunteered to work on updating the doc with Arjan. Please post any comments ASAP.

Jakarta EE Survey

- Note from Shabnam on Feb 28 - sharing for member awareness:

As you are aware, we were planning to launch and promote the 2022 Developer survey on 1 March.

The survey will open tomorrow, however, with many of our community members in Europe being occupied at the moment with the situation in Ukraine, we think it's best to delay all the official promotional activities (socials, mailing lists, blogs, etc.) around the survey for about a week.

We will tentatively plan to launch on 8 March instead but will take a final decision as the week progresses.

Thanks for your understanding.

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 from Feb 15 meeting:
 - 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.
- On March 1 (this meeting), the Eclipse Foundation provided an [update to the prior proposal](#)
 - Badging program vs. full certification program
 - WG members are eligible to participate in a program to issue badges, based on successful completion of a badge test that follows a common structure defined by a *Badging for Jakarta EE* project.
 - Roles of the Eclipse Foundation and the WG member are defined in the presentation.
 - There was some discussion about using Credly as the badging organization and whether alternatives have been considered e.g. <https://partnerships.coursera.org/industry>
 - Budget requires re-prioritizing \$40K for the program. There were some detailed questions about the funding details to be added to the deck.

- The question about whether “cheating” may occur - consensus was that we should take steps to minimize, but that not should preclude the testing option being proposed.
- Additional materials may be provided by the WG member, but may not be required.
- Badges would be the same regardless of provider.
- Question on why the program is being decentralized across vendors.
 - The reason is because a centralized offering from Jakarta EE (proposed last time) is more expensive from a budget POV.
- Next steps:
 - Would like for members to indicate an interest in participating in the badging program as described (or not)
 - Obtain a resolution from the Steering Committee (to be discussed on March 15 and March 29)

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 were requested to provide feedback last time. I provided input on one slide which I believe is non-controversial. I will work with Tanja to define some specific metrics for slide 13, and that will constitute our Q1 objectives.
- We will revisit the plan on an ongoing basis, including for quarterly objectives.

Member Survey

- Tanja (OOTO on March 1) conducted a member survey and has drafted a [report](#) for committee member review
- We will review the report in the March 15 meeting

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:
 - 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.

- We will vote on the above, or an alternative if a consensus emerges, on March 15.

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
 - This remains tabled on the Spec Committee agenda
- I will remove this from the Steering Committee agenda going forward

Election Process (Will will contact David to see if this item needs to be carried forward or not)

- 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?