

# Jakarta EE Spec Committee - May 19th, 2021

*Attendees (present in bold):*

**Kenji Kazumura** - Fujitsu

**Dan Bandera** - IBM - Kevin Sutter, Tom Watson

**Ed Bratt** - Oracle - Dmitry Kornilov

**Andrew Pielage** - Payara - Matt Gill

**Scott Stark** - Red Hat - Mark Little, Scott Marlow

David Blevins - Tomitribe - **Jean-Louis Monteiro**, Cesar Hernandez

**Ivar Grimstad** - PMC Representative

**Marcelo Ancelmo** - Participant Member - Martijn Verburg

**Werner Keil** - Committer Member

**Jun Qian** - Primeton - Enterprise Member

Eclipse Foundation: **Tanja Obradovic**, **Wayne Beaton**, **Paul Buck** (chair)

Past business / action items:

- Approval is requested for the meeting minutes from the May 5th meeting as drafted - Approved.

## Agenda:

- Ongoing tracking [spreadsheet](#) of individual specs progress through the [JESP](#)
  - Jakarta EE 10 Plan Review PRs - Candidate specifications
    - <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pulls>
- Noting the Compatible Implementation(s) used in [Release Review](#) and the [Ratification](#) step of specifications. Kevin's proposal for review and decision:
  - PR: <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pull/379>
  - Preview: <https://deploy-preview-379--jakartaee-specifications.netlify.app/specifications/platform/9.1/>

Discussion: Instead of listing the CI used for ratification on specification page, create a link to the list of CIs. Two lists are needed, one for Platform and one for Web Profile.

Also applicable to all specifications. The lists need to be locked down at ratification ie. they are not updated by CCRs that come along later.

- Ed asked, should we do this for all specs or just Platform and Web Profile? Yes, for all specifications
- Governance: These lists need to be locked down at ratification, and have a formal process for creating.

- Ivar & Kevin to propose an approach to do this. Proposal to be reviewed and voted on either on the list or on a follow-on meeting.
- Proposal from Dan, Kevin and Scott S. for how to handle optional features in Jakarta EE specifications including Platform and Web Profile. The proposal is [here](#).
  - Discuss next steps to finalize the review and proceed to a resolution

Spec committee members that are not aligned with proposal 1. or 2., are requested to make suggested edits to these options or introduce a new option for consideration.
- Process to revise the EFSP is underway, Jakarta EE Specification Committee asked to name their representative to the EFSP revision committee
  - Background - Wayne's [board](#) to manage all of the issues that he's tracking for this iteration

Dan, Kevin, Scott S. volunteered to represent the Specification Committee
- Can't recall if it's been discussed already. So please apologize for the stupid question. <https://projects.eclipse.org/proposals/jakarta-config> ← license is ASL v2. Do we want Eclipse instead? [Jean-Louis]
  - Topic was discussed on Slack, the outcome: The ASLv2 was chosen because there is code being brought in from MicroProfile Config.
- Establish minimum contributors/committers a specification needs - See our Jakarta EE Program Plan [Q2 objectives](#) [Tanja]
  - Based on the metrics, all our specification projects have 6+ eligible committers
  - The data for these projects is available on the [Jakarta EE Working Group Metrics](#) page

*The following item were not covered and will be added to the agenda for next meeting*

- Who can initiate specification ballots for the Specification Committee? Our current practice is that the ballots is initiated by the assigned Specification Committee mentor
  - Plan Review for Jakarta Messaging 3.1 was initiated by a committer on the specification project
  - Consider governance, [EFSP](#) and [Spec Committee Operations Guide](#) implications