

# Jakarta EE Spec Committee - June 2nd, 2021 [1300 UTC]

*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 19th meeting as drafted - Approved

## Agenda:

- Ongoing tracking [spreadsheet](#) of individual specs progress through the [JESP](#)
  - Jakarta EE 10 Plan Review - Candidate specifications
    - PRs <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pulls>
    - Project Board <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/projects/1>
- 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
    - a. Spec Committee members need to initiate a ballot, we can provide visibility to who on the Committee has been assigned to a particular specification review request so the project can contact the committee member as needed.
    - b. Chair to assign the PR to the mentor and note in the tracking spreadsheet.  
Consider updating the Operations Guide.

Note: The following item was deferred until the next call on June 16th or for discussion on the mailing list. During this call, Kevin embedded some comments.

- 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/>
- Comparison to existing content:  
<https://jakarta.ee/specifications/platform/9.1/>

[05/19] 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
  - [KWS] I don't agree with this assumption. The reason that Platform and Web Profile are special is because we have the official Compatible Implementation page (<https://jakarta.ee/compatibility/>). The other specs do not have these official pages and list out all CIs...
- Governance: These lists need to be locked down at ratification, and have a formal process for creating.
  - [KWS] Do we? If we just use a 'ratification' label on the specific CCR(s), then isn't that sufficient? Any modification to the use of these tags is historically recorded in the CCRs.
- 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.
  - [KWS] Ivar and I can further discuss alternatives.
- 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

[05/19] 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.

[06/02] The Spec Committee discussed and an action was assigned

- Individual specifications can either be added to a Profile, or a vendor could choose to provide an implementation of specification alongside a Profile. No need to handle this as Optional. For example MVC if part of the Web Profile would be provided in an implementation of the Web Profile, alternatively if not in the Web Profile, it could be provided by a vendor with an implementation of Web Profile.
- Where would we document this, once decided? We can defer how we implement it to later?
- How does this apply to the existing individual specifications that have optional

features or variations (for SE and EE)?

- ACTION: Dan to collaborate with Paul to author a resolution for the policy, once authored, post the draft to the private list for final input by committee members and then it will go to ballot on the discussion list.

Reminder: In the June 16th call, discuss the Specification Committee's Q3 Jakarta EE Program Plan Objectives.