

Minutes of the November 9, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura

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

Oracle: Ed Bratt, Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: Not present

Red Hat: John Clingan, Scott Stark

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez

Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): Jun Qian

Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): Zhao Xin

Participant member representative: Marcelo 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

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the October 12 and October 26 meetings were approved.

Minutes of the October 19 Working Group meeting minutes have been published:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yiXQKIW0S2hgQMA1r5TzINY9iZ6fqdcF/view?usp=sharing>

Jakarta EE Working Group Meeting

- Resources available in community drive:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZpqHUDrh-LAwLp9vr-Aw6Wg0z4lqpYcY>
- Cadence of meetings
 - Neil recommended four times/year
 - Propose the following schedule.
 - January 18, 2022
 - April 12, 2022

- July 12, 2022
 - October 11, 2022
- Will confirm at next Steering Committee meeting

Program Plan and Budget Process

- Eclipse budgeting process reference.
 - Program plan due 1st week of November
 - Budget due third week of November
 - https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1_TobVjm4SF69rrSrQ8LbPwI9C
- See notes from prior meeting minutes for additional references
- Email from Will Lyons on November 5

I have updated the Program Plan per the last Steering Committee discussion, and it includes slides provided by the Marketing Committee. This is a new document “2022 Jakarta EE Program Plan For Steering Committee Review and Approval”:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/10x09waDu--fo17W1-Fb1jwwj9yjrWluDM0ZKK1WkBUM/edit#slide=id.gae9757cb85_0_0

You can compare it to V2 which we discussed last meeting:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1FI71lorGfKVpKINnUPYkqkIErXDlxO1IKaA-mOXAGMA/edit#slide=id.gae9757cb85_0_0

There may be a minor tweak here or there, but please review the “2022 Jakarta EE Program Plan For Steering Committee Review and Approval” doc and be prepared to vote on the plan at the next Steering Committee meeting on Nov 9.

- Since I sent the email above
 - Ed Bratt has commented on slide 5
 - I have retitled the document as “Candidate 2022 Jakarta EE Program Plan For Steering Committee Review and Approval”
- Proposed Resolution:

Whereas, the Eclipse Foundation has established as Working Groups Annual Program Plan & Budget Process as summarized [here](#) that requires the approval of a Candidate Program Plan,

Resolved, that the [Candidate 2022 Jakarta EE Program Plan](#) be approved as drafted.

Fujitsu: +1
 IBM: +1
 Oracle: +1
 Payara: +1
 Red Hat: +1
 Tomitribe: +1
 Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): +1
 Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): +1
 Participant member representative: not present
 Committer member representative: +1

The resolution is passed and the Candidate Program Plan is approved.

Jakarta EE Strategic Member Fees

- At the October 26 Steering Committee meeting there was discussion about whether or not to change the Jakarta EE WG Strategic Member Fees, in the interest of maintaining total Jakarta EE WG + Microprofile WG Fees for Strategic Members of the Jakarta EE WG who are also MicroProfile WG members.
- The options discussed at the last meeting, and in subsequent email exchanges, have been summarized at:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-77rxSfuqpb_1RgiZxtBx2nTo0IRWKW6YteBv68012k/edit
- My summary of Steering Committee member responses prior to the Nov 9 meeting is as follows:

	Option 1	Option 1.a	Option 2	Option 2.a	Option 3
Oracle		Preference			
Payara	First Preference		Second Preference		
LJC	First Preference		Second Preference		No
Red Hat	First Preference		Second Preference		No
Tomitribe	Third? Preference		Second? Preference	First? Preference	
Shandong CVISCE	First Preference		Second Preference		
Primeton	First Preference*				

IBM		Preference if MPWG fees reduced	Preference if MPWG fees not reduced		
Fujitsu		Acceptable	First Preference	First Preference	

*If there are multiple WG fee discounts

- Will recommended that the Jakarta EE WG allow the MicroProfile WG fee vote to complete. If the MicroProfile WG changes its fees, he believed the consensus will be to leave Jakarta EE fees as is, with no need to vote on fee changes.
- During the Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting on November 9, it was noted that based on the MicroProfile votes cast up to that time, the proposed changes to the MicroProfile fee structure were likely to pass. This would narrow the range of options to “Option 1.a” and “Option 2.a”.
- Given the general group preference for “Option 1”, Will said his expectation is that the general group preference would be “Option 1.a” over “Option 2.a” and to leave the Jakarta EE fees as is. This would become the default if the MicroProfile fee structure changes passed. A supermajority vote would be required for “Option 2.a” which appeared unlikely.
- Some members requested that they be given the opportunity to consider options “1.a” and “2.a” which were added to the options list after the original options list was presented for feedback.

Jakarta RPC Compatibility License Request and Patent License Exception Process

- 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.
- There has also been discussion about a presentation on the Jakarta RPC proposal and on the Patent License Exception Process. Some points of discussion:
 - Presenting on proposals before they are spec projects
 - Changing the Jakarta EE Spec process
 - Changing the Eclipse Foundation Spec Process
 - Jakarta EE Steering Committee Voting Processes
- Comments from prior agendas included below:
 - 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.)
- This question may be affected by the status of the EFSP
- Discussion during the November 9 meeting
 - Oracle agrees that projects should be presented consistent with their actual approval status (e.g. if a creation review has not yet been approved, the project should be presented that way). There appeared to be consensus on this point.
 - Some specification process points discussed above 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.
 - Regarding patent license exception approvals, Oracle highlighted its request in this meeting, for a vote at the next (Nov 23) meeting.
 - Scott Stark 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).

-----Time did not permit discussion of the following items-----

Jakarta EE Q3 Progress Update

- Do not expect to have time for review this meeting, but noting for future review:
https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1-cTpe3mLLERiJKONAgY9KbGeoWBcS4Cz-_D1GBoH6xE/edit#slide=id.gd037bb6413_0_0

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?

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
- Please sign up for Vendor Talks
 - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1jknN2BxqJHvnknpMbEZj_zmCaoxMIRjzhXHO7Gn-LLE/edit#gid=1128549320

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_2UJxcuNIQ9V05_vQ1eNmaP/view?usp=sharing