Jakarta EE Spec Committee - November 17th, 2021

Attendees (present in bold):

Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu
Kevin Sutter - IBM - Tom Watson, Emily Jiang
Ed Bratt - Oracle - Dmitry Kornilov
Andrew Pielage - Payara
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
Zhai Luchao - Shandong Cvicse Middleware Co. - Enterprise Member

Eclipse Foundation: Tanja Obradovic, Wayne Beaton, Paul Buck (chair)

Past business / action items:

● Approval is requested for the meeting minutes from the November 3rd meeting as drafted - Approved.

Agenda:

● Ongoing tracking spreadsheet of individual specs progressing 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
  ○ Wiki https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/wiki/JakartaEE10

● Project creation item delegated by Steering Committee to the Spec Committee [Spec Committee chair asked the Steering Committee chair for the details, to be added when available.]
  ○ References:
    Eclipse Foundation Development Process
    ○ https://www.eclipse.org/projects/dev_process/
    Eclipse Foundation Development Handbook
    ○ https://www.eclipse.org/projects/handbook/#starting-proposal
Proposal:

- When the EMO has decided a spec Project Proposal is ready to be posted for Community Review, the governing Spec Committee needs to be notified on their public discussion mailing list as the Community Review is underway (see EFSP Issue 68).
- Any feedback that the Committee members have at that phase can be recorded as part of the Community Review (wherever that is recorded today).
- The feedback provided during that Community Review phase can influence the proposal or not. If it is ignored, then when the Creation Review happens and the Spec Committee has a vote, it may get voted down.
- The details of the specification project (scope, description, committer list, patent license) must be locked down before the Creation Review starts (the creation review requires and includes the ballot of the specification committee). This means that the Specification Committee must, during the time between when the project proposal is posted for Community Review and the start of the Creation Review (this period of time is referred to as the “Community Review period”), work with the project team to stabilise the details of the project and with the steering committee to resolve any exceptional patent license selection. Presumably, the Specification Committee will resolve their work before engaging the steering committee to grant an exception (in the event that an exception is required). The Steering Committee will need time to consult internally before rendering a vote, so the length of the Community Review period is very much dependent on how long the committees require to complete their review work.

See - https://github.com/EclipseFdn/EFSP/issues/68

Jakarta Specification Committee supports the proposal with the following two requests:

1. Be clear about where comments are to be made, currently there appear to be 3 places where comments can be documented (see Notes below)
2. When notifying the Specification Committee regarding the Community Review, provide a date by which input is expected by.

[Both requests were subsequently made to and accepted by the
Notes:

○ Kevin - Not always clear where comments on Proposals are to be recorded? On the issue? Where should the feedback be recorded, for Jakarta RPC there appear to be 3 locations:
  ■ https://projects.eclipse.org/proposals/jakarta-rpc
  ■ https://projects.eclipse.org/reviews/jakarta-rpc-creation-review
  ■ https://gitlab.eclipse.org/eclipsefdn/emo-team/emo/-/issues/111
○ Ed - Apply the proposed process set in issue #68 to all project proposals (spec and non-spec projects)
○ Ed - Assure that the Community Review and Creation Review phases are clearly delineated.
○ Emily - Can we do a better job helping project initiators engage with Platform Project and the broader community.
○ Emily - Be clear about how long the Community Review period is ongoing for?
○ Scott - What about a socialization phase that could occur during a Proposal phase, special case since specs apply to multiple open source implementations. A pre-approval is desired before exiting the Proposal phase.
○ Ed - We should be open to all proposals, and it is up to the Platform Project to decide if an individual spec is included in the Platform. We want to attract many new spec projects including ones we have not thought of. Creating a spec project does not assure inclusion in the Platform.
○ Emily - Vendor neutrality is important, need to see that projects have a diverse set of committers.
○ Ed - The spec committee could vote down a specification Creation Review if the project did not have committer diversity. In general, at each JESP Review step, the committee members are free to establish their position when voting.
○ Ed - Specs that get through a creation review may never actually get to a Release Review
○ Kevin - Jakarta RPC, initial committers are currently Oracle committers. Feedback on the diversity of committers can be provided during Community Review. WG members are encouraged to submit names for initial committers.
○ Ed - Once the spec project is created, WG members can assign a single committer (if the WG member has no other committers on the project).

• Jakarta EE Commons Spec. Proposal -- FYI notice -- Ed Bratt
  Also see Scott Starks email message to jakarta-platform-dev mailing list