

## Minutes of the March 15, 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

Oracle: Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov, Ed Bratt

Payara: Steve Millidge, Hadar Vorenshtein

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez, David Blevins, Jonathan Gallimore

Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): Jun Quian

Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): not present

Participant member representative (LJC): not present

Committer member representative: not present

We have quorum.

Eclipse: Paul Buck, Paul White, Tanja Obradovic, Shabnam Mayel

### Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

The [Draft minutes of the Feb 15 meeting](#) were approved.

The [Draft minutes of the March 1 meeting](#) were approved.

### Welcome Beijing Vsettan Data Technology Co. Ltd. to the Jakarta EE Working Group!

From email:

Dear Jakarta EE Working Group members,

I'm Yueqiang Liu, the Jakarta EE working group representative of Beijing Vsettan Data Technology Co. Ltd. It's my honor to become a member of the big family.

I'm honored to introduce my company: Beijing Vsettan Data Technology Co. Ltd.(hereinafter referred to as Vsettan) is a high-end basic software service provider that can provide database and middleware products and services at the same time. Vsettan focuses on providing industry users with xigema series basic software with high performance, high stability, high availability and high security, and meets the requirements of core business systems in finance, telecommunications, government, energy, transportation, retail and other industries. Vsettan has established good cooperative relations with more than

100 partners in related industries such as CPU, server, operating system and industrial applications.

I'm also honored to introduce my boss Yong Deng, the CEO of my company, an outstanding and passionate leader, and Jia Li, the COO, who is responsible for the operation of our company. Wei Zhang is the CTO and my direct leader and Jinxian Wang is responsible for the marketing of my company and our products.

Thanks very much for Tanja's detailed, patient and professional support for joining the work group, thanks very much for your warm welcome, looking forward to sincere cooperation with you in the future.

Best Regards,

Yueqiang

Tanja suggested we revisit the topic of reaching out to Chinese members specifically.

### **Jakarta EE Survey**

- Note from Shabnam on Mar 9 - sharing for member awareness:

Hi All,

The [2022 Jakarta EE Developer Survey](#) is now available!

The Jakarta EE Developer Survey is a great opportunity to indicate your priorities and how you would like Jakarta EE to evolve to meet your cloud requirements.

Please take a few minutes to complete the survey. The results of the survey will be published in June.

Also, to maximize our outreach, we are reaching out to our community channels to promote the survey. Can you please share this link and help us engage with the community?

To make it easier to promote we have created [Social Kit](#) to use and promote on socials.

Please use the same link to promote: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/9TTJ7CB>

- So far we have 372 responses! Most of the traffic coming from EF:  
<https://oracle.zoom.us/j/5038581115?pwd=b2dubkw1K0kxSjNOckoxWFkzaJMQT09>

## Jakarta EE 10 status

- [Jakarta EE Spec Mentor Assignments & Ballot Progress](#)
  - “Done”: 6 (not counting Jakarta RPC)
  - “Ballot in process”: 6 (up from two on March 1)
- 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.

## 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 volunteered to draft this and has provided a link to the draft
  - [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1y\\_yi9ysLeC\\_S8PcBJn2u53pwNeYLMCeGigtcqkGlb8/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1y_yi9ysLeC_S8PcBJn2u53pwNeYLMCeGigtcqkGlb8/edit)
- We reviewed the doc briefly on Feb 15 including the following comments:
  - Compatible implementations should be featured first, followed by implementations that include compatible implementations of certain spec APIs, and tooling that supports the implementations/APIs
  - It was suggested we roll up the messaging into major themes such as Modernization, Simplification and Lighter-weight
  - CDI-lite, Core Profile, Java SE updates, and Compatibility are all important to highlight. Faces updates were also mentioned.
- Will attempted a V2 draft which we will review for feedback:
  - <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bNjyMiQsiYQwFrDto8x3lxf1JtE-M-Pedh8f13lUh9c/edit>
  - Summary of approach:
    - Attempted to address Neil’s comments:
      - Can we get a solid view into the updates that will draw the most attention. The new and shiny items and the key value, both technical and business, are needed to allow us to promote the release and get the most attention.
    - Reused much of Arjan’s content
    - Adopted Steve’s suggestion of themes: Modernization, Simplification, Lightweight
    - Used positioning from Kevin Sutter’s presentation at Jakarta Livestream in December
    - Borrowed from spec overviews
  - Feedback
    - This structure is closer to what the Marketing Committee requires
    - Members will provide feedback in the doc and Will will update

## 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.
  - Next steps:
    - Would like for members to indicate an interest in participating in the badging program as described (or not)
    - Obtain a resolution from the Steering Committee (to be discussed on March 15 and March 29)
- For today’s meeting (March 15)
  - Members entered their feedback into the 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 the next meeting.

## Electronic Voting

- Refer to the [December 14 meeting minutes](#) and [March 1 meeting minutes](#)
- Will Lyons drafted the following Resolution for discussion, sent in email on Feb 28
  - Resolved, that the Jakarta Steering Committee approves the following use of electronic voting in Jakarta EE committee meetings, under the circumstances described below:
    - A committee member proposed an electronic vote, AND
    - There was either consensus agreement among members present to hold the vote electronically, or there was a majority vote among members present to hold the vote electronically, AND
    - The vote would not violate any EFSP or Jakarta EE Specification process guidelines mandating a 2-week voting period, or any other Eclipse Foundation requirements, AND
    - The following guidelines generally apply and justify holding the vote electronically:
      - There has been adequate discussion of the topic in the meeting or prior meetings
        - Voting electronically in order to conduct the discussion in email, instead of in a meeting, is not considered a valid rationale for an electronic vote.
      - There was not adequate time to vote on the topic during the meeting, or there was a desire to ensure that all members had the opportunity to vote on a particular item, if not all members were present and/or had not delegated their vote by proxy.

- The resolution was proposed, voted on and passed unanimously.

### **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 the next meeting.
  - RESOLVED, the Jakarta EE Steering Committee approves the version 1.3 of the JESP with changes proposed in <https://github.com/jakartaee/JESP/pull/8>.

### **Member Survey**

- Tanja conducted a member survey and has drafted a [report](#) for committee member review in this meeting

### **Program Plan Quarterly Objectives**

- Brief review of updates from last time (see slide 14)
  - [2022 Program Plan Quarterly Objectives](#)
- This update defines our Q1 objectives.
- We will revisit the plan on an ongoing basis, including for quarterly objectives.

### **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](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?