

# Jakarta EE Spec Committee Agenda September 2nd, 2020

Attendees (present in bold):

**Kenji Kazumura** - Fujitsu

**Dan Bandera** - IBM - **Kevin Sutter**

**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

**Scott (Congquan) Wang** - Primeton - Enterprise Member

Eclipse Foundation: Wayne Beaton, **Tanja Obradovic**, Paul Buck, **Christie Witt**

Reference: [EFSP](#), [JESP](#)

Past business / action items:

- Approval is requested for the meeting minutes from the August 26th meeting as drafted - Approved.

## Agenda:

- Jakarta EE 9 Specification Ballots
  - Summary tracking spreadsheet for EE 9 Specs and Mentors:  
[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YTUpfdLZZrk2\\_UGwoX2w0seOCulseRO3sQJljWxpDAa7g/edit#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YTUpfdLZZrk2_UGwoX2w0seOCulseRO3sQJljWxpDAa7g/edit#gid=0)
    - Focus on “Close” items to initiate ballots
    - Focus on missing PR links since they are outstanding
    - Mentors do need to initiated the ballots
    - Please vote ASAP once the the email is out
    - Mentors please send reminder notes for voting
  - David performed a quick scan of all Specification and API source looking for errant `javax` references. He created PRs for affected components. Thank you!
  - [Ed] JSONP and SOAP with Attachments appear to be ready but are waiting on final approval by Mentor. Is there any action the teams can take to move these toward the ballot?
- Closing of Ballots [KWS]
  - If not everyone has voted, do we allow stragglers? (In Jakarta EE 8, we did bend the rules a bit here.)
  - If the final ballot contains non-voters, then the row should indicate something to the effect of “no vote cast”.

- Minutes:
  - Mentor should send a reminder note to the missing voters prior to end of vote.
  - Log “no vote cast” in final ballot for missing votes.
- Potential for lost checklist items. [KWS]
  - The PR finalization checklist has work items for both the Mentors and the Spec Project team. We (Spec Committee) have control over the Mentoring items. We do not have control over the Spec Project team.
  - Problem is that once the PR is merged, then the PR and the associated checklist items for the Spec Project team fall off the radar.
  - Two choices.
    - Move the PR merge item to the end of the checklist and we can't do that until the Spec Project team completes their items. Easy, but why set up this dependency?
    - Split the checklist into two. One for the Mentors and use the other checklist as input for a separate Issue against the Spec Project team. A bit more work, but it separates the dependency.
  - Minutes
    - Option 2 - split the checklist into two parts and create a separate issue against the Spec Project team. This will require an update to our final checklist.
- XML Web Services dependency in Web Profile [KWS]
  - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakartaee-platform-dev/msg02164.html>
  - Some Web Profile TCKs are referencing `jakarta.xml.ws.WebServiceRef`. The testcase used to use `javax.xml.ws.WebServiceRef` since it was part of Java SE 8 and accessible. The Jakarta version is an optional component of Jakarta EE 9 and probably shouldn't become a dependency of the Web Profile.
  - Resolution? Modify the Web Profile testcase? Move testcase to Full Platform? Change reference back to `javax` since we're only requiring Java SE 8 in Jakarta EE 9?
  - Minutes:
    - If the API has been renamed as part of Jakarta EE 9, then we need to use the updated API.
    - These testcases should be marked Optional since XML Web Services is marked Optional.
    - Need to evaluate whether the intent of the tests should stay in the Web Profile bucket or move to Full Platform.
- What link to use in pre-ballot Compatibility Certification Requests [Ed]?
  - If the team uses the final TCK d/I, the link doesn't resolve. This makes it impossible to evaluate the CCR since there's no TCK to check, nor check the SHA. The only place this seems to exist is in the Specification PR and there's no checklist reference for that PR in the CCR checklist. I would recommend the CCR always use a URL to an actual TCK location. If it's pre-final, the SHA can be used to determine it is/was the same TCK.
  - Minutes:

- The CCR should contain both the staged and final locations of the TCK.
- Mentors, please **remind** your API project teams to promote TCKs [Ed]
  - For Specs. with TCKs that come from Jakarta EE TCK (there are 20!) they need to notify the TCK team that they approve the TCK and then verify that it has been promoted. Otherwise, the TCK may be rebuilt and the SHA codes will change. Each spec. Should have a “Review and Promote” issue ([list](#)) which should be used for this notification.
- Adhoc agenda item on Jakarta branding [David]
  - Branding discussion: we should be mindful of proper use of brand implementation vs specification. The implementation should not be using “Jakarta xyz” as the name of the implementation. For example, the compatible implementation for Jakarta SOAP with Attachments should not be “Jakarta SOAP with Attachments Implementation”. If anything, we could follow the example set by Activation -- Eclipse Implementation of Jakarta SOAP with Attachments.  
Proper brand use example: *Eclipse implementation of Jakarta Activation 1.2.2*

Not discussed

- Updates to the Compatible Products page for product version and Jakarta EE versions. [Christie]
 

We shared all proposals for the Committee’s comments in the email. Here is [the file link](#). (PW: JakartaR0cks!)

Examples from Kevin on CRs:  
[Link for all Compatibility Certification Requests](#)  
[Link to all Open Liberty Compatibility Certification Requests](#)
- Allowed javax references
  - <https://gist.github.com/dblevins/9a6d4b1c90986a4116dd738c9e5ef212>
- Recording of the Specification Committee calls? [Werner]
  - Who can join the Specification Committee calls?
  - [Jakarta EE Working Group Charter](#) - reference
  - We will further discuss on the next call, Sept 2nd