

Jakarta EE Spec Committee Agenda May 13, 2020

Attendees (present in bold):

Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu

Dan Bandera - IBM - **Kevin Sutter**

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

Mark Wareham - Payara - **Matt Gill**

Scott Stark - Red Hat - Mark Little

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

Ivar Grimstad - PMC Representative

Martijn Verburg - Participant Member

Werner Keil - Committer Member

Scott (Congquan) Wang - Primeton - Enterprise Member

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

Past business / action items:

- Request for approval of the minutes from the April 29th meeting as drafted.

Agenda

- Review the process simplifications document being prepared by Dmitry and Kevin. Target is to review the completed draft in the May 13th Spec Committee meeting.

[Dmitry, Kevin]

- <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yp06hI4fULu5SVPlc96EK8IIzrAb8WFmg79QQfzjwY0/edit>
- Proposal was reviewed and discussed and a question was asked can the PR itself be simplified?
- The PR content all seems “required”.

Spec Committee is asked to review and provide input on the doc. To be revisited in the next meeting on 27th.

- Improving the formatting of specification project pages - Review mockups - To be revisited again in the meeting on the 13th. [Christie if available]

- <https://github.com/jakartaee/jakarta.ee/issues/572#event-2924526244>

Need to add the metadata field for the short text description 57 to 60 characters. Work to continue on the issue.

- What are the requirements for TCK licenses for artifacts in Maven Central?

<https://jakarta.ee/committees/specification/tckprocess/>

Can the TCK be dual licensed at Maven Central - EFTL & Apache or EPL?

Input from Wayne Beaton:

- The requirement is that in order to be considered a valid Compatible Implementation, the vendor must run the EFTL version of the TCK.

- So... if the way that you run the TCK to validate a Compatible Implementation is to acquire it via Maven Central, then there must be a means of acquiring the TCK under the EFTL from Maven Central.
 - Dual licensing (of the final ratified artifact only) would satisfy the requirement.
- i) Question: Does Maven Central support dual licensing or do two copies need to be pushed to Maven Central. One with open source lic and the other with EFTL.
- ii) EF to confirm that the dual lic approach is acceptable.
- Creation ballot for Jakarta MVC specification project [Ivar]
Item discussed. Vote underway on the public Spec Committee list. Question was asked regarding when to do the PR to create the spec page?
<https://projects.eclipse.org/proposals/jakarta-mvc>

The following topics were not covered in the May 13th meeting

- How to handle revisions to TCKs [Ed]
 - When a TCK revision is needed/produced by an API project team, what process requirements are followed? What about older TCK releases?
 - I would propose
 - Some type of notification including a change overview
 - Existing TCK versions ought to remain valid and published
 - Perhaps some limitations
 - Ex. in JCP Challenged tests could only be excluded or new tests added optional/alternates
 - If needed, verification that ancillary change requirements (i.e. the tests are rolled up into Platform TCK) are also handled
- Milestone Release Artifacts [KWS]
- Steering Committee on April 7th, 2020 requested a future action for the Spec Committee to structure a discussion on how MP specs may be consumed for Jakarta EE
 - Noted here and to be tabled for a future meeting