

Minutes of June 8, 2021 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Please refer to your meeting invitation for the zoom password.

Attendees:

Fujitsu: Not present

IBM: Dan Bandera, Kevin Sutter, Neil Patterson

Oracle: Ed Bratt, Will Lyons, Dmitry Kornilov

Payara: Eliot Martin

Red Hat: John Clingan, Scott Stark

Tomitribe: Cesar Hernandez, Jonathan Gallimore

Enterprise Member representative: Jun Qian

Participant member representative: Martijn Verburg

Committer member representative: Not present

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

Eclipse: Ivar Grimstad, Paul Buck, Tanja Obradovic, Paul White, Karen McNaughton

Review of Minutes from Prior Meetings

Minutes of the May 11 meeting were approved.

Minutes of the May 25 meeting will be reviewed next time

Proposal on [Developer badging / certification](#) - Neil Patterson

- Neil Patterson reviewed this proposal
- Discussion topics
 - The proposal envisions that any vendor implementation may provide a lab that could be used by end users to fulfill badge requirement, focused exclusively on standard Jakarta EE features (and not vendor-specific features)
 - Vendor-provided labs which not expose vendor features
 - Defining lab standards would require a significant effort
 - General questions about how lab materials would be “constrained” to meet the above requirements, if a vendor implementation were exposed
 - Suggestion that perhaps the underlying vendor implementation should not be exposed. Unclear whether this would be practical.
 - Badges would use Jakarta EE branding
 - IBM offering to contributing Skills Network environment for lab delivery environment

- The Skills Network would not promote IBM or the IBM brand to users in the delivery environment itself, though an IBM implementation may be visible in one of the vendor lab options.
 - Skills Network is integrated to Acclaim badging site
- There was general support for the concept of creating a developer badging process, such as that outlined, in support of the goals described.
- The committee requested that the team take the next step and elaborate on the proposal in more detail.

Patent License Option

- See below e-mail from Will Lyons on May 25

Oracle would like to discuss the following at Steering Committee tomorrow:

1. Oracle proposes that the Specification Committee declare the current Jakarta Config specification project invalid, because the Jakarta EE Specification Process was not followed properly during the creation review and creation of the Jakarta Config specification project.
2. To ensure all members on the Jakarta EE Steering Committee are informed on this topic, we request that the presentation given to the MicroProfile Steering Committee be given at the next Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting. We also request that the Eclipse Foundation, perhaps via the IP Committee, clarify whether, in the view of the Eclipse Foundation, a Platform specification can include a mix of specification(s) that include a Compatible Patent License Option and specification(s) that include an Implementation Patent License Option. We recommend that members be given the opportunity to express their preference for a Compatible vs Implementation Patent License Option.
3. The Eclipse Foundation has just opened an issue on this topic <https://github.com/EclipseFdn/EFSP/issues/51>. If there is a Steering Committee policy vote on this topic, we recommend that the Steering Committee vote on this topic be held after #1 and #2 are completed.
4. We recommend that a new creation review for the Jakarta Config specification be initiated after #1 and #2 and #3 (if a policy vote will be held and if #3 is applicable) are completed.

Additional information is provided below:

1. Oracle proposes that the Specification Committee declare the current Jakarta Config specification project invalid, because the Jakarta EE Specification Process was not followed properly during the creation review and creation of the Jakarta Config specification project.

The Eclipse Foundation Specification Process states that: “All artifacts related to a ballot must be delivered in distribution form to the Specification Committee prior to the start of the ballot period, must not change during the ballot period (with the exception of minor corrections that do not change the semantic intent, as determined by the Specification Committee), and must persist in the delivered form following the ballot as part of the public record.” This is an important provision of the specification process, and the process was not followed properly.

The Jakarta Config project proposal was created with the selection of the Compatible Patent License Option. A ballot was initiated on May 19. As of May 20, eight of the nine Spec Committee members had voted to approve this proposal, including the selection of the Compatible License Option. There were no dissenting votes. The ballot was closed on May 26 or 27, with no changes to any votes after May 20, and with no changes to the artifacts related to the ballot, including the selection of the Compatible License Option. The vote was 8-0 (with one member not voting) meeting the required Spec Committee supermajority to approve the proposal, including the selection of the Compatible License Option. After the ballot was closed, the project was created, including the selection of the Compatible License Option. After the project was created, the Compatible Patent License Option was changed to the Implementation Patent License Option.

Although a resolution was approved at Steering Committee on May 25 stating that “Steering Committee approves the use of the Implementation Patent License as defined in the Eclipse Foundation Intellectual Property Policy for the Jakarta Config project”, it is not the role of Steering Committee resolutions to change artifacts related to a ballot during a ballot review period. That was the apparent intent of the resolution, and that intent would violate the provision of the Specification Process that “artifacts... must not change during the ballot period”. It is also not the role of Steering Committee resolutions to change how artifacts related to a ballot are persisted in delivered form, after the ballots have been approved per the Specification Process. This was the effect of the resolution, and this effect violated the provision of the Specification Process that “artifacts... must persist in the delivered form following the ballot”.

In the interest of following proper Jakarta EE Specification Process that all parties have agreed to, and in the interest of ensuring that all responsible parties are able to vote on Spec project ballots with appropriate information, and recognizing that there are differing views on which Patent License Option should be used for Jakarta EE, we propose the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Jakarta EE Steering Committee requests that the Jakarta EE Specification Committee invalidate the current Jakarta Config specification

project, because the Jakarta EE Specification Process was not followed properly during the creation review for the Jakarta Config specification.

2. To ensure all members on the Jakarta EE Steering Committee are informed on this topic, we request that the presentation given to the MicroProfile Steering Committee be given at the next Jakarta EE Steering Committee meeting. We also request that the Eclipse Foundation, perhaps via the IP Committee, clarify whether, in the view of the Eclipse Foundation, a Platform specification can include a mix of specification(s) that include a Compatible Patent License Option and specification(s) that include an Implementation Patent License Option. We recommend that members be given the opportunity to express their preference for a Compatible vs Implementation Patent License Option.

During the discussion of Patent License Options at Steering Committee on May 25, it was acknowledged that at least one member was not familiar with these Patent License Options, and that the viability of issuing a Platform specification containing a combination of Patent License Options had not been assessed by the Eclipse Foundation. It is our understanding that Patent License Options may not be changed after Spec projects are created, and all approved Jakarta EE Specifications currently use the Compatible Patent License Option. Use of an Implementation License Option by the Jakarta Config project may preclude its inclusion into a Jakarta EE Platform specification that includes any of these Jakarta EE Specifications. This is a material issue affecting our approach to the inclusion of Jakarta Config in Jakarta EE specifications, and the Jakarta EE Working Group needs to be informed about it.

We believe a simple request of the Eclipse Foundation would be sufficient to initiate this activity.

3. The Eclipse Foundation has just opened an issue on this topic <https://github.com/EclipseFdn/EFSP/issues/51>. If there is a Steering Committee policy vote on this topic, we recommend that the Steering Committee vote on this topic be held after #1 and #2 are completed.

4. We recommend that a new creation review for the Jakarta Config specification be initiated after #1 and #2 and #3 (if a policy vote will be held and if #3 is applicable) are completed.

- Oracle (Will) reviewed the above, with particular focus on point #1 above.
- Payara (Eliot) agreed in principle, indicating that we have a process and we should follow it.
- Red Hat (Scott) commented that the handling of the Patent License is not well defined in the current process and that the actions were taken in response to that.

- The Eclipse Foundation (Paul Buck) said that he would like some runway to consider the above, before commenting.
- IBM (Dan) said he would like to review the Spec Process in detail before commenting.
- Tomitribe (Cesar) said he would like to analyze the process.
- IBM (Kevin) commented that in terms of the timing of the selection of the Patent License Option, the MicroProfile community is still defining the process
- There was consensus to delay a vote on any resolution until next meeting on June 22.

The meeting was adjourned. The following topics were not covered.

Acquire New Working Group Members

- A Q2 objective is to "Identify ways to find potential new members".
- Tanja was tasked with this objective and will go over a short [presentation](#) on the call this coming Tuesday.
- The committee was asked to review the slides prior to the call.

Jakarta EE Presence in Asia

- See the [short report](#) we discussed on the Steering Committee call last time.
- 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

Objectives Review

- We need to review, adjust and redefine Q3 objectives that we set out early this year.
- Please refer to:
 - The [2021 Jakarta EE Program Plan - by quarter](#) presentation and
 - The [corresponding Q3 2021](#) tab in the spreadsheet

Multiple Alternates

- The question was raised on May 11 whether the Steering Committee should permit multiple alternates to be designated. It was agreed to review this during this meeting.
- A resolution was suggested on May 25.

RESOLVED, the Jakarta EE Working Group committees shall allow their committee members to designate up to two designated alternates who may participate in committee meetings, and may, in the absence of the primary committee member, vote on resolutions brought to the committees. Only the primary committee member, or one of the designated alternates, may vote on any resolution.

- The Eclipse Foundation requested additional time to review the proposal, and to comment on this in the next meeting. Paul White sent out mail dated June 7:

On behalf of the Foundation, we believe this resolution is unnecessary as the Jakarta EE Charter already allows for any representative on a committee to have another individual represent them, or to assign their vote via proxy to another committee member. In both cases, the bar is low to assign such a proxy. Specifically, the Charter states:

"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."

Thus, we are recommending against moving forward with the proposed resolution.

Jakarta EE 10 (9.1+)

- Status from last time
- Plan reviews
 - <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/labels/plan%20review>
 - Will be reaching out to component spec teams whether a release review date of Oct 15 would be achievable. If there is positive feedback, will target that date.
 - 7 project leads have responded covering multiple (approx 15) specifications.
- 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.
- Jakarta Config proposal (see prior agenda item on patent licenses)
 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dED5v0KgPtCuRlxif6cl_V_G2nKIDCwz3vZETNBgRzY/edit?ts=6086ed3c&pli=1#heading=h.hjwqu5e5ptjj
- Scott opened the following GitHub issue for SoD:
 - <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/issues/352>

Marketing Committee Update

- Update from Neil as time permits

Jakarta EE Developer Survey

- Survey closed
- Schedule for results?

CN4J Joint Messaging Document

- John has sent in mail some proposed “comparison” slide(s) at the following https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1wYBNqUHwADvipTC9fW5ugGMbDf_3_JH9skBtyPcl-IE/edit#slide=id.gbcfab764b6_0_54
- It was proposed that these comparison slides be dropped, but there is not consensus on this proposal.
- John and I will schedule another meeting on this topic.

Elections are coming up

- Chair, committer members representative and participant member representative