Spec Committee Agenda September 25th, 2019

Attendees (present in bold):

Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu, **Michael DeNicola**

Dan Bandera - IBM, **Kevin Sutter**, Alasdair Nottingham

Bill Shannon - Oracle, **Ed Bratt**, **Dmitry Kornilov**, Will Lyons

Steve Millidge - Payara, **Mark Wareham**

Scott Stark - Red Hat, Mark Little, Antoine Sabot-Durand

David Blevins - Tomitribe, Richard Monson-Haefel, Jean-Louis Monterio

Ivar Grimstad - PMC Representative

Alex Theedom - Participant Member

Werner Keil - Committer Member

Eclipse Foundation: **Wayne Beaton**, Tanja Obradovic, **Paul Buck, Mike Milinkovich**

Past business / action items:
- Minutes from August 28th meeting were approved.
- Approval of the minutes from September 4th meeting was deferred pending update to minutes regarding the voting process.

Agenda
- Plan for Jakarta EE 8 Retrospective
  Notes:
  - Dedicate a future meeting to a retrospective discussion - October 9th (to be confirmed in the October 2nd call)
  - Ahead of the retrospective Committee reps to provide their input via a [shared google doc](#)
  - Retrospective call to discuss input. Call to be recorded and chair to summarize and note agreed actions future work
  - See the [Marketing Committee's retrospective](#) for reference

- Eclipse Foundation release of the JCP specification documents to the Jakarta spec projects
  - Prior to releasing the specification documents the Foundation is asking Spec Committee to provide guidance to the specification projects regarding how to convert the spec documents from JCP to Jakarta (like what was done to the Full and Web Profile spec documents - change spec name, change references to Jakarta projects and so on).

■ Include clear notification that anyone who modifies any javax namespace artifacts whatsoever is immediately required to move the entire package to the jakarta namespace.

Notes:

■ Committee members to share links to existing google doc with known / recorded steps from work done for Jakarta EE 8 as input to the guidance for spec products to Jakarta-ize the JCP spec documents.
■ Eclipse Foundation to provide the list of Spec to be made available on the 9th.
■ Specification Committee to decide on timing to release the full text specification documents to the spec projects.

○ JESP step to adopt the full text documents as the replacements for the boilerplate specifications
■ Specification Process requires that project teams engage in a formal Service Release (which requires a vote from the Specification Committee).

Note: The above process step was discussed and deemed as not required by the process. Wayne to provide process options for spec projects to update and use the full-text documents as part of either a service release or a functional release.

● Direction on evolution of specifications at Jakarta
  ○ JESP requires a Plan Review at the start of the development cycle for a specification.
  ○ Note that some project teams have already started planning; some may have already started work and are overdue for a Plan Review.

  Note: The above was discussed and noted.

● Jakarta EE Next (roadmap) - Guidance (based on community input) for evolving the specifications that are to be:
  ○ Deprecated from the platform [Oracle to come back with a proposal]
  ○ Stabilized (Included but locked down as-is / optional)
  ○ Evolved as part of a future Jakarta EE release
    ■ When a change to the jakarta.* namespace is required. If you touch it, you change it.
    ■ Has implications to Big Bang vs Incremental
  ○ XML related specifications that were taken out of Java SE

Decision: The above agenda item to be moved to the Platform Project

- Post-Jakarta EE 8 project restructuring

  Note: Wayne to send out a proposal that can be discussed in a follow-on meeting.

- Proposal needed for release cadence for specification projects and Platform & Profiles

  Decision: The above agenda item to be moved to the Platform Project

- Process clarification regarding Spec Committee in-meeting votes on Open Liberty compatibility held in September 4th call:
  - The Eclipse Foundation Bylaws, which our charters inherit from on matters where the charter is silent, provide guidance regarding voting requirements. Specifically, for all electronic votes, we have to consider all eligible voters when holding a vote (so the Spec Committee has 9 members, meaning that 5 votes are necessary for a majority, and 6 votes are necessary for a super majority). However, for votes held at a meeting where quorum is met, we need only consider the votes of those present at the meeting (so, if a meeting is held and 7 people are in attendance, then 4 votes are needed for a majority, and 5 for a super majority).

    Notes: The Minutes of the September 4th meeting were amended to reference the clarification above.

- Community Update Call on October 16th - Call for speakers & topics
-