Spec Committee Meeting Minutes May 22nd, 2019

Attendees (present in bold):
Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu, Michael DeNicola
Dan Bandera - IBM, **Kevin Sutter**, Alasdair Nottingham, BJ Hargrave
Bill Shannon - Oracle, Ed Bratt, **Dmitry Kornilov**, Jim Wright, Will Lyons
Steve Millidge - Payara, Arjan Tijms
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
- Approval of Meeting min May 15th. DEFERRED

Moving forward without the javax namespace
- Status of Javax thread on Platform list
  - How do we wrap up this thread? Is there a deadline?
    - June 9 deadline is the opportunity for the specification committee to intervene and change the course of the conversation.
    - Scott: summarize the positions. Be ready with a poll on that date.
    - Link to GitHub content... https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/tree/master/namespace
    - ACTION(ALL) review content and comment (pull requests welcome). Encourage community to move discussion there.
    - David: We don't have to make a public statement until after June 9th.
    - Suggestion that we try implementing both approaches.
  - Link to the latest email / document
  - ACTION (Wayne) reinforce with the community that the namespace will be "jakarta.*" (not "jakarta.ee.*"). Reference Ivar's blog post on the topic https://www.agilejava.eu/2019/05/05/jakarta-going-forward/
- Binary compatibility discussion document.
  - https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/pull/15
  - ACTION (All): Request for comment.

Jakarta EE 8 release
- Jakarta EE 8 release plan - Ed Bratt

        - Steps to Complete JESP for Jakarta EE 8 (Scott)
            - https://docs.google.com/document/d/12DsBDdDVO-jnOrrZYnOjx0tuAzZcoTumO6GvyS5c_DY/edit
        - Jakarta EE Delivery Proposal
            - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZtVZBLY2Q-zze0ftF0T0_7i0OlvhOVEkDTcBml2mG3E/edit?ts=5cccc7ce#heading=h.4wx7a313r9i6
        - ACTION (All): Review the document and provide feedback.
    - Specification Document Copyrights (Wayne)
        - We have the list of copyright holders provided by Oracle and have started the process of consolidating the list (i.e. tracking acquisitions to determine current copyright holders)
        - Agreement document created and signed by three companies, and two individuals.
        - Focusing on Platform first
        - ACTION (Wayne) develop a trackable metric.
    - Index of specification documents and associated artifacts.
        - ACTION (?): Create an issue to track requirements (DONE)
            - https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show_bug.cgi?id=547408
    - Ballot Process
        - We need to have a more transparent means of disseminating the results of specification committee votes.
        - ACTION (Scott) describe the problem and take initial leadership.
            - Part of https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/show_bug.cgi?id=547408
        - TODO Need a means to track other ballots.
    - Restructuring Review
        - ACTION (Wayne) generate a step-by-step guide to assist project teams with understanding the process. (STARTED)
            - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EewLB5S0VSDGtGJVvWPTVKRi_DyErngNX6EpyskM4Tc/edit
        - ACTION (Wayne): set up the first round of restructuring reviews (STARTED)
            - https://projects.eclipse.org/projects/ee4j/reviews/restructure-jakarta-ee-specification-projects
            - Candidates: ee4j.jaf, ee4j.javamail, ee4j.jaxb, ee4j.jaxrs, ee4j.jpa, ee4j.jstl, ~~ee4j.orb~~ (David pointed out following the meeting that Eclipse ORB is not a specification project)
        - ACTION (?) Get the marketing committee engaged.
    - Jakarta Batch is good to go.
        - ACTION (Wayne) initiate the required (~~albeit late~~) specification committee ballot to approve creation. (DONE)
    - CDI

        - Red Hat has decided to move the API and specification for CDI to Eclipse EE4J
        - ACTION (Scott) create a project proposal.
    - Dependency Injection
        - ACTION (Paul Buck) Is anybody tracking what we're doing with the dependency injection specification?
    - Bean Validation (Jakarta Bean Validation)
        - Red Hat will move to Eclipse Foundation
        - ACTION (Scott) Create a new project proposal for Jakarta Bean Validation.
    - JavaServer Faces (Jakarta Server Faces)
        - APIs are part of Eclipse Mojarra. Recommend that we leave them there.
        - ACTION (Wayne) Create a new project proposal for Jakarta Server Faces. Wayne will identify the best candidates to start the project proposal process.
    - Acronyms
        - Ivar suggested on the May 21/2019 Steering Committee call that we drop acronyms altogether in favour of concise (short) project names.
            - E.g. "Jakarta Persistence" is "Persistence" and not "JPA"
            - EJB?
        - There appeared to be general consensus among those who attended the call that this would be a good idea.
        - Wayne: does this apply to the technical namespaces?
            - General consensus was: where possible, yes.
            - This is already true for many specifications:
                a. javax.persistence.* => jakarta.persistence.*
                b. javax.transaction.* => jakarta.transaction.*
            - Simplify and consolidate where possible:
                a. javax.ws.rs => jakarta.rest.*
            - Some will just be different acronyms:
                a. javax.ejb => jakarta.jeb.* ("Jakarta Enterprise Beans")
    - TCK Process Status?
        - TCK process - Scott Stark leading the effort
            - Review new TCK Process 1.0 Draft updates
            - TCK Process - status document
            - Completion of the TCK process date targeted for end of May, 2019
        - TCK Processes should be integrated into the operations document.
        - The EMO cannot manage either the creation or the ongoing application of TCK processes; this is the responsibility of the specification committee. Either the specification committee or PMC will be required to take responsibility for determining whether or not the requirements of the TCK have been fulfilled as part of their approval process.

- Scott is working on this.
- Needs another pass.
- QUESTION: How do we change an EPL-licensed TCK into an EFTL TCK? Who creates the EFTL version?
- ACTION (Wayne) QUESTION: Do we need a click-through license acceptance to get access to the TCK/other resources (Eclipse legal question)?