

Minutes of the September 28, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura

IBM: Dan Bandera, Ian Robinson, Kevin Sutter, Alasdair Nottingham (guest), Neil Patterson

Oracle: Ed Bratt, Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: not present

Red Hat: Mark Little, Scott Stark, John Clingan

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez, Jonathan Gallimore (attending)

Enterprise Member representative: Not present

Participant member representative: Not present (provided delegation)

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

Note: Ian Robinson will become the primary representative to the Steering Committee, with Alasdair as alternate and as a member of the Marketing Committee. Dan Bandera will be retiring from IBM.

The group voted by acclamation to offer Dan our congratulations and thank you for his contributions!!

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the September 14 meeting were approved.

Elections

- Note from Zahra Fazli on Sept 23:

All,

The nomination period for elections to the Jakarta EE committees closed yesterday, September 22, 2021.

The positions have all been filled by acclimation, therefore, I'm pleased to announce the representatives for 2021-2022 on the committees are:

Participant Representative:

STEERING COMMITTEE- Martijn Verburg (London Java Community)

SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE- Marcelo Ancelmo (London Java Community)

MARKETING COMMITTEE- Tetiana Fydorenchyk (Jelastic)

Committer Representative:

STEERING COMMITTEE- Arjan Tijms

SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE- Werner Keil

MARKETING COMMITTEE- Otavio Santana

Thank you to the representatives for stepping forward to participate!

Kind Regards,

Zahra

- Congratulations and thank you to the representatives above. The positions are effective immediately.

Jakarta Config Patent License

- From last week's meeting
 - See email forwarded to Steering Committee September 14 AM
 - Before rebaloting the Jakarta Config spec, Dmitry ran a vote among members of the project team proposing use of the Compatible Patent License

From: Dmitry Kornilov

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 10:59 AM

To: Jakarta Config project developer discussions

<config-dev@eclipse.org>

Subject: Jakarta Config patent license ballot results

Hi,

Jakarta Config ballot is finished. Ballot results:

CPL:

Dmitry Kornilov
Laird Nelson
Jan Supol
Tomas Langer
Kenji Kazumura
Steve Millidge
Ondro Mihalyi
Takahiro Nagao

Total: 8

IPL:

Emily Jiang
David Lloyd
Roerto Cortez
Mark Struberg
Tom Evans
David Blevins

Total: 6

CPL won with 8 votes vs 6 for IPL.

The next step is asking the steering committee approval to use CPL for Jakarta Config. I'll bring it to the meeting agenda today.

- Will Lyons proposed that the Steering Committee approve use of the (non-default) Compatibility Patent License (CPL) for the Jakarta Config specification project. Discussion topics included.
 - Whether this is the recommended process/approach for granting exceptions to the default Implementation Patent License. The current version of the Eclipse Foundation Spec Process (EFSP) does not currently define such a process/approach, but this is the process/approach being proposed for the next revision of the EFSP.
 - If the Steering Committee approves use of CPL with Jakarta Config, the expectation would be that the Jakarta Config spec project would be proposed with CPL.
 - If the Steering Committee does not approve use of CPL with Jakarta Config, the Jakarta Config project team would need to consider what next steps to take based on that decision.

- As time was running out, we agreed to defer a vote on the proposal to the next Steering Committee meeting to ensure that proper consideration is given to the proposal.
- In the Steering Committee Meeting on September 28 (this meeting) Will Lyons proposed that the Steering Committee approve use of the (non-default) Compatibility Patent License (CPL) for the Jakarta Config specification project.

The prior meeting's discussion was reviewed to ensure the implications of the proposal were clear.

The proposal was seconded and voted on as follows:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura (+1)

IBM: Dan Bandera, Ian Robinson, Kevin Sutter, Alasdair Nottingham (guest), Neil Patterson (-1)

Oracle: Ed Bratt, Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov (+1)

Payara: not present

Red Hat: Mark Little, Scott Stark, John Clingan (-1)

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez, Jonathan Gallimore (attending) (+1)

Enterprise Member representative: Not present

Participant member representative: Martijn Verburg Not present (provided delegation) (+1)

Committer member representative: Arjan Tijms (+1)

The vote passed by 5 to 2 votes. The proposal was approved.

Jakarta EE Working Group Meeting (see email from Will Lyons dated August 31)

- Proposed Agenda for Working Group Meeting

Proposed 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 and accomplishments through Q3

- Include drill-down on the following by other presenters
- Jakarta EE Specifications Update
- Jakarta EE Marketing Update
- Jakarta EE and MicroProfile

2) Review of Program Planning Status for CY2022

3) Open forum for input

- CY2022 Program Plan
- Making the Working Group more valuable for members

- We agreed to set the date, and circulate this Agenda for Working Group (including non-SC members) for feedback and conclude on the agenda at this meeting. My email was sent Sept 17 but went to a “bounces” alias. My apologies. Tanja scheduled this meeting on Sept 24.
- The Steering Committee agreed to the proposed agenda.

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
 - The Steering Committee agreed to the following next steps:
 - Distribute the CY2021 program plan as a reference
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1ovAE7dfZ-QoBKfph4UzwgvD8DM8dftiTXaxuy7-rOMl/edit#slide=id.gae9757cb85_0_0
 - Steering Committee members will provide feedback for CY2022 by COB next Weds (Sept 22)
 - Will and Tanja created a (very draft) CY2022 program plan outline:
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1HOxe-zXRTTUzFcyllxKwsYukWQg5FORb0iayTVIt6U4/edit#slide=id.gae9757cb85_0_0
 - See email from Will on Sept 25:
 - To prepare for next week’s Steering Committee meeting, Tanja and I have updated this outline document:
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1HOxe-zXRTTUzFcyllxKwsYukWQg5FORb0iayTVIt6U4/edit#slide=id.gae9757cb85_0_0
 - General comments on the doc:
 - The document should be considered as an initial draft/strawman plan. It will be used to guide the conversation at Steering Committee Sept 28.

- Comments embedded in the doc represent some of the discussion points that will be raised.
 - Slide 2 is copied from the CY2021 program plan, copying the goals from last year.
 - Slide 3 is a draft/strawman set of CY2022 goals, largely based on last year, with an additional suggested goal “Drive new value-add Jakarta EE Programs”.
 - There are detailed slides for each of the goals on slide 3, primarily copied from the CY2021 Program Plan, but with some updates and comments.
 - Two suggestions or requests of committee members:
 - Please review prior to the meeting and feel free to add your comments to the doc.
 - I believe much of the CY2022 plan would be an extension to the CY2021 plan. But please give some thought to how we should adapt our plans moving forward, whether that means adopting new initiatives, placing more emphasis in certain areas, or de-emphasizing activities.
- The following are notes from the discussion:
 - Regarding High Level Goals:
 - Scott Stark: Scale back on evangelism. Trying to deliver marketing in addition to the specs is not seen as valuable.
 - Dan Bandera: It takes a long time to build a brand. It’s premature to make the judgment that the marketing is not paying off.
 - Ian Robinson: Not prepared to give up on marketing.
 - Will Lyons: Agreed that we should continue marketing efforts and from Oracle’s perspective the marketing is achieving good results.
 - Mark Little: We should try to learn from projects like Apache Camel, which don’t need marketing to be successful.
 - Arjan Tijms: We need more committers and a larger committer base. There is not enough activity in the committer specs.
 - Regarding Delivering Jakarta EE releases in 2022:
 - Dan Bandera: When we have something to launch which has new functionality, that’s when you can crow about it and we will have that opportunity with Jakarta EE 10.
 - Scott Stark: Jakarta EE 10 with the new profile will give us something new to promote.
 - Arjan Tijms: Would focusing on one brand and combining Jakarta EE and MicroProfile in a single Working Group be better?
 - John Clingan: The notion of combining the Working Groups has been discussed and it has been concluded that there will continue to be two Working Groups.
 - Regarding Simplifying Release Process

- Paul Buck - It's going to get better and needs to and we are happy to continue this work
 - Spec Committee has been making progress in these areas
 - Arjan Tijms - There are still a lot of tedious copy/paste tasks required in the process
 - Requested that Paul Buck take these items back to the spec committee to update
- Regarding Advance Implementation Neutrality
 - Scott Stark - Doing the minimum to remove dependencies on GlassFish in EE10 plan, which is the main goal
 - These items should continue to be pursued by the platform team
- Requested that Neil Patterson discuss marketing plans with the Marketing Committee to propose goals for the coming year
- Will will make minor slide updates
- We will cover the remainder of the draft slides next time

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

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

- 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>
 - 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.