

# Spec Committee Meeting Minutes April 10th, 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 March 27th and April 3rd
  - Ivar moved, Dan second, no objections - meeting minutes are approved
- [JESP v1.0](#)
  - JESP v1.0 adopted by simple majority at Steering Committee
  - Suggestion for improvements; work for JESP v1.1
    - Bill is proposing a discussion on version 1.1 to make it more suitable for MP  
The default review period is 14 days. At any time during those 14 days, any Participant may extend the review period to a total of up to 30 days.
    - Update JESP to document specs that need to deal with javax namespace restrictions
    - EF to reach out the MP and seek their input on the JESP, their mailing list
      - Provide summary of suggestion back to this committee
    - Use GitHub to track suggestions / issues related to JESP
  - [Specializing the EFSP for Jakarta EE](#)
  - [JESP operational document](#)
- Jakarta EE 8 release
  - Please refer to [the spreadsheet document](#) summarizing activities related to Jakarta EE 8 release and Jakarta EE 9 planning
    - For the purpose of this call we will only be focusing on Specification Tab and TCK tab but only TCK Process part, the rest should be discussed at the Steering Committee level.
      - For the CI tab, please review Kevin Sutter's email

- We reviewed and updated the Specification Tab
  - JavaDoc generated specification documents
    - a. We agreed to use ASCII format for the specification documents
    - b. We need to create a Template to be used for the Specification documents, so we can have a uniformity and similar look and feel
    - c. The specification documents will be created using JavaDoc and have the final version as ASCII file and have a pointer to the source link. Each project team will be responsible for doing this. Considering this is a new process to all, **Arjan Tijms** from Payara go through the process and report back on findings to others. Arjan will do this for the Security spec.
  - Specification names: The question has been raised on who has the authority for deciding on the Specification name
    - a. The new names suggestions, approved by Steering and Specification committee, has been provided for the community (Wayne's and Ivar's blog) for review and there is quite a bit of discussion on the mailing list. So we need to be clear who has authority to make the final call if any conflicts.
    - b. EF/Tanja reviewed and Specification Committee should have final say in the case of any conflict / controversy regarding Specification names
  - Looking at the timelines
    - a. Bill raised that Progress review has not been taken into consideration and the timelines need to be adjusted
      - i. At the current plan we will have 2 reviews: Restructuring review and Release review
      - ii. Restructuring review can start only when all the necessary information is collected: scope, project names, specification names and specification documents.
      - iii. The question is do we need to have an additional Progress review so the Specification Committee

can review the information provided before we start with Restructuring review.

- Moving forward without the javax namespace
  - We agreed to discuss this topic on our next call
  - [Document](#) capturing the discussion points (copy David's email)