Minutes of the November 30, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura
IBM: Ian Robinson, Alasdair Nottingham, Kevin Sutter, Neil Patterson
Oracle: Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov
Payara: Not present
Red Hat: Scott Stark
Tomitribe: David Blevins, Cesar Hernandez
Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): Jun Qian
Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): Zhao Xin
Participant member representative (LJC): 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: Paul White, Tanja Obradovic, Ivar Grimstad, Shabnam Mayel

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

> [Minutes of the November 9 meeting](#) were approved.
>
> Minutes of the Nov 23 meeting will be reviewed next time.
>
> Note we are not meeting next week.   Next meeting is scheduled for Dec 14.

Jakarta RPC Compatibility License Request and Patent License Exception Process

- Per the past two meetings, Oracle is proposing Jakarta RPC specification with Aleks Seovic as the project lead. He has requested permission to use the CPL. We request the steering committee consider our proposal and hope it will grant our request.
- Last week Oracle brought the following Resolution to the meeting. There was too little time to discuss this properly, and the consensus of the group was to defer this discussion to the Nov 30 meeting. We are proposing the following Resolution:

> Resolved, that the Jakarta EE Steering Committee approves use of the (non-default) Compatibility Patent License (CPL) for the proposed Jakarta RPC specification project.

- IBM (Ian) indicated their preference for the Implementation Patent License, because it has been selected as the default.
- Red Hat prefers the Implementation Patent License.
- IBM (Alasdair) questioned why the processes leading to the CPL request were taken was different.
- Dmitry replied that the difference resulted from the difference in timing of when the project was created.
- David commented that he believes the vote for Patent License exception be conducted after the project is approved.
- David prefers that such votes be conducted electronically.
- The proposal was not seconded and not voted on.

JakartaOne Livestream - Dec 7

- Please visit [JakartaOne Livestream 2021 webpage](#) to find out what is visible to the public, and if you have not done it yet, please register for the event.
- Status update.
- All of our support is needed in the promotion and that will further help the numbers. Our goal is to do better than last year.
- Please find attached the [JakartaOne Speaker Template](#) for the Livestream on December 7th.

Jakarta EE 10 release date

- The Marketing Committee needs this input to start the planning of Marketing activities.
- Arjan commented that there were a number of dependencies creating uncertainties, but the conclusion of the Platform team was that the current target was end of Q1, with a go/no go call 8 weeks prior to this date, with risk that the date would slip into Q2. This input is sufficient for marketing planning.

Jakarta EE 10 messaging document

- Marketing Committee requests that Steering Committee provide the Jakarta EE 10 messaging document to the Marketing Committee
- See the [Jakarta 9/9.1 messaging](#) document
- Arjan volunteered to draft this. David commented that the plans should inform the messaging, or perhaps the plans should be "improved".

Electronic Voting Mechanism Process - Follow-up from last time

- Scott Stark has indicated his general preference for an electronic voting mechanism. He indicated he would propose that any committee member can propose any item for vote using an electronic voting mechanism. Paul White indicated the Eclipse Foundation's

preference for adopting either a deliberative process, including voting (as has been the primary model at the Jakarta EE Steering Committee to date).

- Scott drafted the following resolution on Nov 23:
    - For any item put before the Steering Committee for a vote, any voting member of the Steering Committee can request that the vote be done via a 7 day electronic ballot using the Steering Committee email list.
- Mike M replied on Nov 23:
    - As framed the resolution could be used by any member of the committee to attempt to delay a decision that could otherwise be made in a properly constituted and attended meeting. From a governance perspective that is an antipattern. I would suggest that it be re-worded to make it clearer that the intent is to bring to a vote a matter which would otherwise have to wait to the next in-person meeting.
- Will replied on Nov 23:
    - Is the intent merely to permit a voting Steering Committee member to request an electronic ballot? I doubt it, but that is how the proposed resolution reads.
    - Is the intent to formally allow for Steering Committee electronic ballots, and to define a process for conducting them?   If so, that should be clarified. I think resolutions should be brought to the committee first. I have no objections to voting by electronic ballot if a member requests it, and if there is a consensus among members at the meeting to conduct the ballot that way, provided that the vote conforms to other procedures and policies of the Jakarta EE Working Group and the Eclipse Foundation. I also think it is worthwhile to describe the purpose or rationale of the resolution.
    - Is the intent to formally allow for electronic ballots at all committees, and to define a process for conducting them? My comments above apply, but conformance to the Spec Process in particular becomes more relevant, and a 7 day period would not conform to all elements of the Spec Process, and that would need to be accounted for.
    - Is the intent that if any single member of the Steering Committee requests an electronic ballot that it be mandated that an electronic ballot must be held?   I would not agree with that.
- Scott replied on Nov 23:
    - The intent is that any ballot brought to the committee for a vote can be requested to be performed via an electronic vote.
- Some specification process points discussed in prior meetings affect this Working Group, but are defined by the EFSP and outside of the scope of this Working Group. Proposals related to the Jakarta EE Specification Process are best addressed in the Specification Committee, with consultation or approval by the Steering Committee if required.
    - There is consensus on this approach

- There was significant discussion of this topic at the Nov 30 Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting.   I have summarized several points of the discussion below:
  - The value of in-person discussion vs. email discussion.   Some members place a priority on the value of real-time discussion of issues that are discussed and brought to a vote in the committee meetings, and there is a concern that this value may be lost in an electronic voting process.   Some members place a priority on the ability for individuals to review a proposal over an electronic voting period, and for opinions and rationale to be captured in a written/electronic vote over email.
  - Clarity of written proposals. Some members prefer to read a written proposal as part of an electronic ballot vs. reading a proposal in advance of a meeting where a discussion and a vote will be held. Some members believe that review of proposals prior to and/or as part of a meeting is part of the deliberative process we use within the committee, and that the content of proposals is typically discussed in multiple meetings prior to votes.
  - Ensuring full voting.   Some members are concerned that votes will be held in meetings where some members may be absent, and a majority decision may be reached in that meeting that may not reflect the majority view of the committee. Some members believe that options exist to delegate votes where necessary, and we have taken appropriate care to ensure that votes reflect a majority of the committee.
  - Clarity of the decision whether to take an electronic vote.   Some members believe that the resolution is unclear on how this decision is made.
  - Governance considerations.   The Eclipse Foundation is concerned that intermixing electronic voting with the deliberative process used within the committee may not meet the governance/by-lwas requirements of the Eclipse Foundation.   Some members did not understand the rationale for this concern.

***************************The following items were not discussed***********************************

Jakarta EE Q3 Progress Update (members were briefly reminded of this item)

- Refer to Tanja's note from Nov 15

  I'd like to remind you and invite you to review [Jakarta EE Program Progress Update - Q3 2021](), and let me know if there are any comments / questions.

Promoting contributions to implementation projects

- From email from David Blevins on Nov 29

  Could I get some time on the agenda tomorrow to talk about this?

- https://twitter.com/JakartaEE/status/1448304274417590272
- https://twitter.com/JakartaEE/status/1456615532522885124
- https://twitter.com/JakartaEE/status/1456251843496001536
- https://twitter.com/JakartaEE/status/1381670427630649344

    I think it's wonderful for us to do these cards for the specification projects. I do have concerns about doing them for implementation projects if that promotion isn't available to all implementations.

- Follow-up email from David
  - "The question I asked on the 9th which didn't get any response from you or anyone else in the Marketing Committee is 'Are we ok to do this for all implementations?'"
  - Neil replied yes, we can, this is one of our Marketing Goals, and he will put it on the Marketing Committee Agenda.

- It was agreed that bringing this to the Marketing Committee was sufficient resolution for this Steering Committee discussion.

Splitting implementation and Specification Projects

- Related to the above Arjan commented "Perhaps related to this is moving the specification / api projects to the jakarta ee repo at http://github.com/jakartaee. I think this has been on the agenda for over 2 years, but afaik not much is happening there."
- This was removed from the Program Plan and effectively delegated to ongoing work of the Platform Team and Specification Committee.   I recommend it be discussed there.

Comment from Amelia Eiras (old agenda item - let's identify next steps)

- Not addressed last meeting, can we have an owner?
  - I wonder if we could finally process this ticket request [Website Feature] Add the Jakarta EE Budget to its website under Membership Tab as a PERMANENT item #58 submitted in December 16th, 2020?

Election Process (old agenda item)

- 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?

Jakarta EE 10

- Plan reviews
  - https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/labels/plan%20review
- Jakarta EE Core Profile Creation and Plan review
  - https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pull/349
- Scott's summary on October 19:
  - https://drive.google.com/file/d/1mVd8cU9mD_2UJxcuNlQ9V05_vQ1eNmaP/view?usp=sharing