

Minutes of the February 1, 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, Ed Bratt, Dmitry Kornilov

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 (joined later)

Committee member representative: Arjan Tijms

We have quorum.

Eclipse: Tanja Obradovic, Shabnam Mayel, Ivar Grimstad, Paul Buck, Paul White, John Kellerman

Would like to cover initial topics briskly to permit 20-30 mins for Badging Program review

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings (5 mins)

The [Draft Minutes of the January 11](#) meeting were approved.

Working Group Meeting (5 mins)

- Thanks to the presenters
- Feedback on the meeting
 - Will said there was not much participation, Paul said this was not unusual
 - Neil suggested “three questions” for the next meeting putting the onus on participants to comment
 - Tanja commented that this meeting was focused by intention on the Program Plan which required a certain amount of time. We will have more flexibility with respect to content in future meetings.
- Please provide your feedback to the Jakarta EE Working Group Member Survey google form. Tanja will send out another reminder notice. Will close within 2 weeks.
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd4fTcLTNWL3WhvwIFjXLyWx3BkOHeehZfl1rXHAAclXtxpng/viewform>

- Plan minutes
 - Send out links to all the slides, and recording, with attendees
 - Send out reminder to fill the survey out (with reminder of target)

Jakarta EE Ecosystem categories (5 mins)

- Following the Working Group meeting a question was raised about what the “PaaS Offerings” category is and how offerings are assigned
 - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gEv8IK2xXYJxf2i0uUCwflBMPybF9XM0czhA--hdRaE/edit#gid=0>
- Will defer to next meeting

Jakarta EE Q4 Progress Update (5 mins)

- Tanja distributed on Jan 14 and summarized during the Working Group meeting
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1Wrly4R8xoudj95IEFULsZEqp3sPfOlti74juM4-OYDY/edit#slide=id.gd037bb6413_0_0
- Happy to see new spec contributors (slide 17)
- No further questions or follow-up

Jakarta EE Developer Survey (5 mins)

Shabnam has sent email with a survey timeline and draft questions and requested feedback by January 27 (see email):

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10regclkXhVAOzmW3QQo3g7-D0kF-ltO9tNMru80eykU/edit#gid=599163621>

Super Majority Calculation (5 mins)

- E-mail discussion on this topic regarding how abstentions are counted in super majority votes
- Key communication from Paul White is excerpted below - Paul will update the operations guide clarifying this counting mechanism, and will put this item on the list for future charter updates:

tl; dr - abstentions aren't used in computing whether a matter passes. i.e., the 0's are not used in either the numerator or in the denominator in computing the results of a vote. However, abstentions do count towards determining whether quorum is met.

Longer justification/explanation.

The voting model we use in all working groups is based on the Eclipse Foundation AISBL charter, which in turn is written in conformance with relevant Belgian law.

In every instance where a vote is to be held, whether electronic or in person, all eligible voters are invited to cast their ballot. At the completion of voting, the comparison of positive votes (+1s) and negative votes (-1s) is used to determine whether the matter being voted on is passed, be it simple or super majority. 0s (abstentions) are not used in the calculation of whether the matter is passed - neither in the numerator nor in the denominator of the computation.

A specific example of the actual language in the charter taken from Section 20.8, states in part:

"Unless these Bylaws or the Belgian BCCA require another majority, any decision of the General Assembly shall require a simple majority of the votes cast of the Voting Members present, represented or participating remotely in the meeting Abstentions, blank or invalid votes do not count in the calculation of the majority, neither in the numerator nor in the denominator."

Similar language is used to describe every voting procedure in the charter.

- Alasdair commented that we must ensure that, on any vote requiring a super majority, before we vote, that voting members understand that abstentions do not count as per the eclipse bylaws.

Jakarta EE Badging Proposal (20-30 mins)

- In CY2021 we funded a project to perform an evaluation of such a program
- John Kellerman presented on this topic and findings and recommendations
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1EaXtL7GPmhLzYt4iDtMQ8JQjfwCuoy-uABhqkCEva_k/edit#slide=id.gfb9bc4e20a_0_18
- There was general agreement that such a program would be valuable, however, regarding "Options for Funding":
 - Some members felt that such a program should be funded out of the Program Plan (not for an additional member fee), based on priority. If it were not funded from the Program Plan, that implied a decision on priority for this year.
 - It was acknowledged that charging for badges or re-prioritizing would create "friction", and reworking this year's budget to providing the level of funding proposed would be difficult.
- We agreed to proceed per the "Next Steps" slide with a key milestone being "Steering Committee's agreement [*or not*] to move forward with program in principle (target within 45 days)". [*Italicized comment added to indicate that there was not agreement, at this meeting, to move forward*].

- The specific first step will be for each member to review the proposal and come prepared to the next meeting to discuss.

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

Jakarta EE 10 status (if time permits)

- [Jakarta EE Spec Mentor Assignments & Ballot Progress](#)
 - “Done”: 3 (not counting Jakarta RPC)
 - “Ballot in process”: 2
- Do the Spec Committee and Platform Team have what they need from the Steering Committee at this time to move the project forward?
 - The general requirement is for resources to move the project forward
 - Please highlight specific resource requirements to this group if that will be helpful
 - Arjan identified a need for assistance with the Jakarta Faces TCK
 - Has progress/communication happened on this

Jakarta EE 10 messaging document (if time permits)

- The Steering Committee will provide the Jakarta EE 10 messaging document to the Marketing Committee
- See the [Jakarta 9/9.1 messaging](#) document
- Arjan volunteered to draft this. [Update?](#) -> https://docs.google.com/document/d/1y_yi9ysLeC_S8PcBJn2u53pwNeYLMCeGigtqkGlb8/edit

Splitting implementation and Specification Projects (if time permits)

- Conclusion of the discussion from last time was that:
 - Steering Committee representatives should review the current (organic) direction and determine if this direction meets committee expectations.
 - Paul also suggested that Ed forward this to the Spec Committee alias.
- Has this issue progressed

Electronic Voting Mechanism Process (for next time)

- See [Draft Minutes of the December 14](#) for detailed discussion from last time.
- Scott agreed to amend his proposed resolution to reflect the discussion, and to request the Eclipse Foundation comment on the revised resolution before bringing it to the Committee. I have reached out to Scott asking how he would like to resolve.
- I will draft a proposal for next meeting

Election Process (Will will contact David and structure this item for committee discussion)

- 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?