

Minutes of the December 14, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Kenji Kazumura

IBM: Ian Robinson, Neil Patterson, Emily Jiang

Oracle: Will Lyons, Ed Bratt, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: Steve Millidge

Red Hat: Mark Little, Scott Stark, John Clingan

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez

Enterprise Member representative (Primeton): not present

Enterprise Member representative (Shangdong CVICSE): not present

Participant member representative (LJC): Martijn Verburg

Committer member representative: Arjan Tijms

(Quorum is 5 -- simple-majority or one-half of the members (if even number) must be present)

Eclipse: Paul Buck, Tanja Obradovic, Shabnam Mayel, Ivar Grimstad (joined late)

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

[Minutes of the Nov 23 meeting](#) were approved.

[Minutes of the November 30 meeting](#) will be reviewed next time.

Meeting Schedule

Next meetings are:

- January 11th
- January 18th - Jakarta EE WG meeting
 - The group agreed that Tanja and Will prepare the agenda for this meeting.
 - Input is welcome.

JakartaOne Livestream - Dec 7

- Congratulations on the JakartaOne Livestream event
- A Livestream report is being prepared, link will be provided here, we will continue to update it: [Report on JakartaOne Livestream 2021 event](#)
 - 912 registered, 377 live attendees, Approx 160 replays as of Dec 14

- Somewhat lower than last year
- Well organized and executed
- Zoom for presenters preferred
- Need more promotion to compete with virtual events
- Report links chat activity volume to topics of discussion
- Poll data indicates reaching new contacts
- Will make recordings available in YouTube and promote
 - <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLutlXcN4EAWCxiFhy8X7vi4gxqVUNbqkl>

Jakarta EE 10 status

- Delayed by 1 quarter; Scott will send a note to spec leads/platform list with a drop dead date for component specs to deliver a specification committee PR by Feb 28 or miss the EE10 release. Platform and profiles will be delivered in Q2. As always the bottleneck is TCKs and compatible implementations.

Jakarta EE 10 messaging document

- The Steering Committee provide the Jakarta EE 10 messaging document to the Marketing Committee
- See the [Jakarta 9/9.1 messaging](#) document
- Arjan volunteered to draft this. David commented that the plans should inform the messaging, or perhaps the plans should be “improved”.
- Reviewing to ensure we make progress on this item.
- Need 8-10 weeks prior to release. Look for an update in January.

State of the Community for 2021

- Ivar prepared a short report of the state of the community for 2021 that he shared with the Steering Committee.
- Link to presentation below:
<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1I1RDkvZVSLzKDkgnFPnVYIDGLOxoXXhMCSx6JepgFt4/edit?usp=sharing>

Marketing Budget

- The Marketing Committee has voted on and approved a Marketing Plan for CY2022, based on the approved program plan and budget.
- The following is the link to this document:
 - https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1vBoqg_ZVbxPD6XP2h5BfQW8nTdB7h9JaUnsKGFXCjhU/edit#slide=id.g6b21b1d107_1_85

Electronic Voting Mechanism Process - Follow-up from last time

- Scott Stark has 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).
- Scott drafted the following resolution on Nov 23:
 - For any item put before the Steering Committee for a vote, any voting member of the Steering Committee can request that the vote be done via a 7 day electronic ballot using the Steering Committee email list.
- Mike M replied on Nov 23:
 - As framed the resolution could be used by any member of the committee to attempt to delay a decision that could otherwise be made in a properly constituted and attended meeting. From a governance perspective that is an antipattern. I would suggest that it be re-worded to make it clearer that the intent is to bring to a vote a matter which would otherwise have to wait to the next in-person meeting.
- Will replied on Nov 23:
 - Is the intent merely to permit a voting Steering Committee member to request an electronic ballot? I doubt it, but that is how the proposed resolution reads.
 - Is the intent to formally allow for Steering Committee electronic ballots, and to define a process for conducting them? If so, that should be clarified. I think resolutions should be brought to the committee first. I have no objections to voting by electronic ballot if a member requests it, and if there is a consensus among members at the meeting to conduct the ballot that way, provided that the vote conforms to other procedures and policies of the Jakarta EE Working Group and the Eclipse Foundation. I also think it is worthwhile to describe the purpose or rationale of the resolution.
 - Is the intent to formally allow for electronic ballots at all committees, and to define a process for conducting them? My comments above apply, but conformance to the Spec Process in particular becomes more relevant, and a 7 day period would not conform to all elements of the Spec Process, and that would need to be accounted for.
 - Is the intent that if any single member of the Steering Committee requests an electronic ballot that it be mandated that an electronic ballot must be held? I would not agree with that.
- Scott replied on Nov 23:
 - The intent is that any ballot brought to the committee for a vote can be requested to be performed via an electronic vote.
- Some specification process points discussed in prior meetings 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.

- There is consensus on this approach
- There was significant discussion of this topic at the Nov 30 Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting. I have summarized several points of the discussion below:
 - The value of in-person discussion vs. email discussion. Some members place a priority on the value of real-time discussion of issues that are discussed and brought to a vote in the committee meetings, and there is a concern that this value may be lost in an electronic voting process. Some members place a priority on the ability for individuals to review a proposal over an electronic voting period, and for opinions and rationale to be captured in a written/electronic vote over email.
 - Clarity of written proposals. Some members prefer to read a written proposal as part of an electronic ballot vs. reading a proposal in advance of a meeting where a discussion and a vote will be held. Some members believe that review of proposals prior to and/or as part of a meeting is part of the deliberative process we use within the committee, and that the content of proposals is typically discussed in multiple meetings prior to votes.
 - Ensuring full voting. Some members are concerned that votes will be held in meetings where some members may be absent, and a majority decision may be reached in that meeting that may not reflect the majority view of the committee. Some members believe that options exist to delegate votes where necessary, and we have taken appropriate care to ensure that votes reflect a majority of the committee. [Describe the delegation]
 - Clarity on the decision whether to take an electronic vote. Some members believe that the resolution is unclear on how and for what purpose the decision shall be made.
 - Timing. Some members believe that one voting procedure will be faster than the other.
 - Governance considerations. The Eclipse Foundation is concerned that intermixing electronic voting with the deliberative process used within the committee may not meet the governance/by-laws requirements of the Eclipse Foundation. Some members did not understand the rationale for this concern and have observed that electronic votes have been taken in the past.
- During the Dec 14 meeting, we reviewed the items captured above. The outcome of the subsequent discussion was as follows:
 - A reminder there is a process for delegating votes.
 - If a committee member is unable to attend a meeting where a vote is planned, and if he/she is unable to have a delegate from his/her member organization represent him/her, then the committee member may delegate their vote by proxy to another committee member, by sending an email in advance to the entire committee, or at a minimum to the proxy and the chair of the Committee, granting that member the right to vote by

- proxy for him/her. The member voting by proxy may decide to indicate their voting preference publicly, or may do so privately to the proxy.
- I have quoted from Paul White's mail of June 7 and the Jakarta EE Charter document below for reference:
 - "In the event a Body member is unavailable to attend or participate in a meeting of the Body, they may send a representative and may vote by proxy, or they may be represented by another Body member by providing written proxy to the Body's mailing list in advance, which shall be included in determining whether the representative is in Good Standing."
 - It was agreed that electronic voting at the Jakarta EE Steering Committee would be reasonable if the following criteria were met:
 - A 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 Spec process guidelines mandating a 2-week voting period (it is unlikely that this circumstance would occur in a Steering Committee vote), AND
 - The following guidelines *generally* applied and justified holding the vote electronically. It would be difficult to document and rigidly enforce all conditions that would justify holding the vote electronically, but the following represent the general intent:
 - There had been adequate discussion of the topic in the meeting or prior meetings
 - Note that voting electronically in order to conduct the discussion in email, instead of in a meeting, would not be considered a valid rationale for an electronic vote.
 - There was not adequate time to vote on the topic during the meeting.
 - 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.
 - Scott agreed to amend his proposed resolution to reflect the above, and to request the Eclipse Foundation comment on the revised resolution before bringing it to the Committee.
 - Note: Red Hat's committee membership will change in the coming year, but we will work out the spirit of the agreement above.

Jakarta EE Q3/Q4 Progress Update

- Refer to Tanja's note from Nov 15

We regard the [Jakarta EE Program Progress Update - Q3 2021](#) as final.

- The timing of the Q4 progress report will be early January and NLT than the Jan 18 Working Group meeting.

There was not sufficient time to discuss the following topics.
Happy Holidays and Happy New Year to all and see you in 2022.

Splitting implementation and Specification Projects

- Related to the above Arjan commented “Perhaps related to this is moving the specification / api projects to the jakarta ee repo at <http://github.com/jakartaee>. I think this has been on the agenda for over 2 years, but afaik not much is happening there.”
- This was removed from the Program Plan and effectively delegated to ongoing work of the Platform Team and Specification Committee. It will be discussed there.

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?

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?