

# Minutes of the October 12, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Not present

IBM: Ian Robinson, Kevin Sutter, Alasdair Nottingham, Neil Patterson

Oracle: Ed Bratt, Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: not present

Red Hat: Scott Stark

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez

Enterprise Member representative: Not present

Participant member representative: Marcelo Sousa Ancelmo

Committee member representative: Arjan Tijms

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

Eclipse: Paul White, Paul Buck, Tanja Obradovic, Ivar Grimstad, Shabnam Mayal

## Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the September 28 meeting were approved.

## Jakarta EE Working Group Meeting

- Contacts for Working Group members
  - Will send out personal mails
- Feedback received on agenda from Amelia Eiras
  - No new topics
  - Ordering suggestion to get feedback earlier in the process
  - Need context on Program Plan, but we might consider an alternative structure (see below)
  - Would like to identify speakers
- Decided on Alternative Agenda for Working Group Meeting

Date: October 19 12:30 Eastern Time

Goal of the Meeting is to solicit input from members on what would make the Working Group and membership more valuable for them.

1) Overview of CY2021 program plan, accomplishments through Q3, and CY2022 Draft Plan (10 mins)

Call out we will focus on major areas

2) Jakarta EE Specifications - CY2021 and CY2022 (10 mins) - Paul or “volunteer”

- Accomplishments
- Plans and feedback

3) Jakarta EE Platform Team - CY2021 and CY2022 (10 mins) - Scott

- Accomplishments
- Plans and feedback

4) Jakarta EE Marketing - CY2021 and CY2022 (10 mins) - Neil

- Accomplishments
- Plans and feedback

5) Other Program Plan Items - CY2021 and CY2022 (10 mins) - Will (or subsequent Volunteer)

- Making Jakarta EE more valuable for members
- Accomplishments
- Plans and feedback

6) Wrap-up (Will)

## **Program Plan and Budget Process**

- From last meeting minutes:
  - Paul White reviewed the Eclipse budgeting process so we can begin our planning for CY2022.
    - Program plan due 1st week of November
    - Budget due third week of November
  - A link to the presentation we reviewed is provided below:
    - [https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1\\_TobVjm4SF69rrSrQ8LbPwI9CXhmMtha](https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1_TobVjm4SF69rrSrQ8LbPwI9CXhmMtha)
  - See Sept 28 Meeting minutes for notes from last week’s discussion
    - I made minor slide updates
  - Reviewed the remainder of the draft slides not reviewed on Sept 28
    - Align Jakarta EE and MicroProfile slide
      - The group agreed with my comments
      - Ian requested adding commentary on MicroProfile budget

- Enable Ecosystem Transition to jakarta namespace
      - Kevin and Arjan made comments suggesting retention of this goal, even though progress has been limited in CY2021
    - Grow & Reward Committers and Contributors
      - Arjan suggested we consider monetary rewards
      - Alasdair recommended recognizing contributors to Specs and TCKs over compatible implementations
      - Arjan suggested follow up on splitting spec projects from TCKs
    - Acquire new working group members
      - Consensus to retain this goal, but recognize growth may be only incremental
  - Review progress from Sept 28
    - 2022 Strategic Goals
      - This slide will be adjusted to match final plan content
    - Deliver Jakarta EE releases in 2022
      - This slide is OK, Scott will cover the topic in Oct 19 meeting
    - Simplify Release Process and Advance Implementation Neutrality
      - The Spec Committee and Platform Team are making ongoing progress in these areas
      - For example, per Kevin, Jakarta EE 10 will be updating the Platform Specification to define the required content of "compatible implementations". This will allow the possibility of using alternate compatible implementations (ie. not just glassfish) for specification ratification.
      - The Spec Committee/Platform Team prefers to work on these items, but not to have specific slides/goals that are tracked
      - We will likely drop these slides entirely
      - Spec Committee designees will present on this topic Oct 19
    - Drive new value-add Jakarta EE Programs
      - This slide is likely to be dropped and any new programs reflected in the Marketing Committee plan "Drive Jakarta EE Brand, Awareness and Adoption"
      - Neil will present on this topic on October 19

-----Time did not permit covering the following topics-----

- Review fee structure
- Comment from Amelia Eiras
  - 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?

- I also wonder if the 2022 drafts (both general and marketing budgets) are going to be shared via this 2 forums before the private vote (by the Steering Cmtee) stamps it?

## Patent License Exception Process

- Note from Scott Stark on Oct 7:

As outlined in <https://github.com/EclipseFdn/EFSP/issues/67>, Red Hat believes that we are not adequately dealing with the requirements around choosing a patent license for a specification project. We propose that any future voting on license exceptions be done via an electronic 7 day ballot.

This should be an agenda item for the next Steering Committee meeting.

- Note from Kevin Sutter on Oct 7

I would like to point out one additional disconnect with choosing a patent license...

The ballot for allowing an exception to the default patent license is a simple majority. And, this is held in the Steering Committee.

While, the ballot for a project creation review is a super majority. And, this is held in the Spec Committee.

Since there is mucho overlap between the Steering and Spec Committee participation, this project creation ballot could override the patent license exception ballot. I raised this issue while reviewing the EFSP 1.3, but it was determined to be beyond the 1.3 version. (I still need to create a separate issue for the next rev of the EFSP.)

## JakartaOne Livestream status report (Tanja Obradovic)

- Update from Tanja
- Link to be added
  - [https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/10BfyhzP2GNfMme9siD2f8Af5\\_MGTQzWFOXIG2751yEE/edit#slide=id.gef656cc992\\_1\\_16](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/10BfyhzP2GNfMme9siD2f8Af5_MGTQzWFOXIG2751yEE/edit#slide=id.gef656cc992_1_16)
- Please sign up for Vendor Talks
  - [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1jknN2BxqJHvnknpMbEZj\\_zmCaoxMIRjzhXHO7Gn-LLE/edit#gid=1128549320](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1jknN2BxqJHvnknpMbEZj_zmCaoxMIRjzhXHO7Gn-LLE/edit#gid=1128549320)

## Election Process

- 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](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>
  - Had reached out to component spec teams whether a release review date of Oct 15 would be achievable.
- 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.
- As of August 31:
  - Release plan for Full Platform and Web Profile has been balloted and approved. Core Profile has also been balloted and approved.
  - Red Hat will drive the EE 10 release (Scott is designated release lead)
  - We are targeting Q1 CY2022 GA (per the release plan), which will require that all individual component specifications be released by Q4 CY2021.

#### Objectives Review - Reminder of action items, please review spreadsheet for your items

- Review, adjust and redefine Q3 objectives that we set out early this year.
  - The [2021 Jakarta EE Program Plan - by quarter](#) presentation and
  - The [corresponding Q3 2021](#) tab in the spreadsheet
- Follow-up items from last time:

- Cesar Hernandez to check in w/ David progress and expectations regarding “Advance Implementation Neutrality” objectives - no update
  - If we do not have a plan by end of Q3 for pursuing this, I prefer to drop this topic
- Paul Buck has followed up w/ Neil and Shabnam to request updates to the “Drive Jakarta EE Brand, Awareness and Adoption” objectives
  - Is “Content for Jakarta EE as a reliable, trusted platform for End-User Innovation” a Q3 objective - no update
  - [Neil - Marketing committee agreed that we would be producing articles aligned with the objective “Promote Jakarta EE as a reliable, trusted platform for cloud-native innovation”]
- Paul Buck has followed up with Martijn on “Enable Ecosystem Transition to jakarta namespace” objectives
  - There are a number of objectives listed as dependent on a “lead” (see xls) - these are being pursued
- Will Lyons/John Clingan to define a specific goal for Technical Jakarta EE/MicroProfile alignment forum and plan (e.g. Core Profile, Config) - John has called a meeting for this time next week (August 10).
  - Update from last week’s meeting
- Will Lyons to prepare a specific proposal for a meeting of all Working Group members in September.

### **Jakarta EE Presence in Asia**

- See the [short report](#) we discussed on the Steering Committee call on June 8.
- A/I: Committee members were requested to propose someone from their organizations, or from external organizations, who can help organize Jakarta EE activities and:
  - Speaks Chinese and English
  - Is local to the China timezone
- A/I: It was agreed we should hold a meeting with Chinese members to hear directly from them what would be most helpful to them in promoting Jakarta EE in China. Such a meeting would need to be moderated by someone who is bilingual.
  - No member has identified such a contact
- Will to follow up with Tanja on this after Labour Day

### **Acquire New Working Group Members**

- A Q2 objective is to "Identify ways to find potential new members".
- Paul reviewed a short [presentation](#) on June 22
- Kevin expressed interest in seeing pipelines.
- Questions were raised about whether we could do more for JUGs and cloud providers.



- A/I: Will volunteered to draft specific suggestions for group review
  - Will will do so for the next meeting.