

Minutes of the March 29, 2022 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura

IBM: Ian Robinson, Alasdair Nottingham, Neil Patterson, Emily Jiang

Oracle: Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov, Ed Bratt

Payara: 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: Tanja Obradovic, Ivar Grimstad, Shabnam Mayel

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

[Draft Minutes of the March 15, 2022 meeting](#) will be reviewed next time.

Jakarta EE 10 status

- [Jakarta EE Spec Mentor Assignments & Ballot Progress](#)
 - “Done”: 10 (as of March 28, not incl Jakarta RPC - vs. 6 on March 15)
 - “Ballot in process”: 5 (vs. 6 on March 15)
- 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.

Proposed JESP Update

- From the Spec Committee meeting minutes
 - General guidance on the authorized usage of the jakarta package namespace governed by the Jakarta EE Working Group and the EFSP
 - Proposed JESP update authored to provide guidance, see <https://github.com/jakartaee/JESP/pull/8>
 - PR was unanimously approved by the Jakarta EE Specification Committee:
- Also see <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-spec/msg02258.html>

- The Specification Committee decided to refer the update to the Steering Committee for their approval.
- The Steering Committee agreed to review and vote on the following resolution at this meeting.
 - RESOLVED, the Jakarta EE Steering Committee approves the version 1.4 of the JESP with changes proposed in <https://github.com/jakartaee/JESP/pull/8>.
- The resolution was approved unanimously.
- Mike Milinkovic must approve the change, at which time the JESP document will be updated. The Eclipse Foundation will coordinate.

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 created a V1 draft and provided a link
 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1y_yi9ysLeC_S8PcBJn2u53pwNeYLMCeGigtqkGlb8/edit
- Will created a V2 draft which we reviewed last time:
 - <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bNjyMiQsiYQwFrDto8x3lxf1JtE-M-Pedh8f13lUh9c/edit>
- Review the V2 draft which has been updated based on member comments - thank you
 - Will summarized major points of input and how they were addressed
 - Will will review/incorporate Emily's comments and then hand this document over to Marketing Committee. Neil will update the group next time on any improvements and/or adds to compatible implementations.

Badging proposal feedback

- Refer to prior meeting minutes for background
- On March 1, 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.
- Members entered their feedback into the March 15 meeting minutes below:

Oracle’s response to Tanja’s questions:

1. Do you think this program would be beneficial for Jakarta EE?
[WAL]In general, yes. The benefit would depend on the level member support and member implementation.
2. Would you participate in a badging program?
[WAL]Oracle would be open to participate in a badging program, though we have not done an implementation analysis. Support for a Core Profile test would be a key consideration.
3. What is the major obstacle for initiating the program this year?
[WAL]Member support and member implementation is important per above. This may not be an obstacle, but the support needs to be demonstrated. Any resolution approving additional budget for badging should identify existing budget areas that would be cut and be approved by the Steering Committee.

Tomitribe’s response to Tanja’s questions:

Tomitribe does not intend to implement and support the Jakarta EE badging program as described in “Jakarta EE Badging Proposal - Collaboration Model.pdf.”

In favor of vendor neutrality, we firmly believe WG participating companies shouldn’t be:

- Implementing, delivering, and scoring tests on their vendor platforms using the common content.
- Delivering tests are responsible for the localization of content if desired.
- Issuing, managing and supporting badges they implement

We believe the activities listed above should be hosted, implemented, supported, and deliverable in a centralized approach within the Jakarta EE website <https://jakarta.ee>.

Members of the WG ought to participate in the collaborative development of the platform, and it would be useful to commit to that for planning purposes.

Cost reductions for the tooling and hosting, integrations, and supporting platform must be further analyzed and presented to this committee to better understand the current program proposal costs.

IBM's response:

IBM would be interested in participating in the program. Re-casting this in terms of WG member effort with smaller EF cost covered through reassignment (if agreed by the WG) of existing budget was a welcome step.

Fujitsu's response:

For now, Fujitsu is not so much interested in this program because of the resources. Specifically the cost of the localization of contents is expected too high. But without having localized contents the value of this program is very low for non English people.

- The Eclipse Foundation agreed to draft a resolution for discussion at today's (March 29) meeting. See email from Tanja dated March 25:

As we are expecting discussion / voting on Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting on Tuesday March 29th regarding badging program for Jakarta EE, here is the resolution text we may want to use:

Resolved: The Jakarta Steering Committee approves the Badging Program for Jakarta EE as proposed in Jakarta EE Badging Proposal - Collaboration Mode along with proposed adjustment of the 2022 working group budget, and asks the Eclipse Foundation staff to implement the program.

- Some notes on the discussion were as follows:
 - IBM: generally supports the proposal, but their vote would be dependent on community support/enthusiasm for it
 - Oracle: believes this would generally be good for Jakarta EE, provide there is commitment to do the work (similar to IBM's comments). Would want the Marketing Committee to propose how the Marketing Budget line items should be changed if the proposal were approved (vs. Steering Committee deciding)
 - Martijn: There would be some level of skepticism from the developer community on such a program
 - Tomitribe: Would not for the proposal, for the reasons given above.
 - Fujitsu: Not so interested in participating, for the reasons given above.
 - Payara: Do not have the bandwidth/resources to support in the short term, may be interested in the medium/long term.
 - Arjan: Likes the proposal
- The consensus was that the Steering Committee should ask the Marketing Committee for input and comments on the proposal and budget suggestions, with the idea that the Steering Committee should take Marketing Committee feedback into consideration for a vote.

Member Survey

- Tanja conducted a member survey and has drafted a [report](#) for committee member review in this meeting
- We reviewed the deck. Some key comments:
 - 54% of respondents said they would consider increasing membership fees to support programs such as developer certification, badging, evangelist programs. This feedback is different from the Steering Committee feedback in the prior badging discussion (see notes above).
 - 85% of respondents said they might be able to help acquire more members
 - 92% of respondents indicated interest in a F2F meeting (e.g. at EclipseCon)

Election Process (Request that EF share the thinking on this topic)

- The following topic has been included in Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting agendas for many months but never prioritized for discussion. The election process calendar has been a topic of discussion at the Eclipse Foundation looking more generally across working groups. We requested that the Eclipse Foundation share its thinking on this topic in a future meeting.
 - 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?

Program Plan Quarterly Objectives

- Included in the Agenda as a reminder Q1 will close this week
 - [2022 Program Plan Quarterly Objectives](#)
- This update defines our Q1 objectives.
- We will revisit the plan on an ongoing basis, including for quarterly objectives.