Jakarta EE Spec Committee - January 27th, 2021

Attendees (present in bold):

Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu
Dan Bandera - IBM - Kevin Sutter, Tom Watson (guest)
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
Scott (Congquan) Wang - Primeton - Enterprise Member

Eclipse Foundation: Wayne Beaton, Tanja Obradovic, Paul Buck (chair)
References: JESP, Spec Committee page including approved meeting minutes

Past business / action items:

● Approval is requested for the meeting minutes from the January 13th meeting as drafted - Approved.

Agenda:

● Ongoing tracking spreadsheet of individual specs progress through the JESP

● Jakarta EE 9.1 Platform Spec, Plan Review update [Kevin]
  ○ https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaeec-platform/pull/299
  Public ballot of the 9.1 release plan to follow Steering Committee’s endorsement to proceed to that step

● Review and discuss Jakarta EE 9 Specification Committee EE 9 Retrospective
  The in-progress retrospective document was sent to the jakartaeec-spec-project-leads and jakarta.ee-spec mailing lists for additional community input

● Establish plan to provide the Specification Committee’s input for the Simplify Release Process objective in the Jakarta EE Program Plan - Quarterly Progress
  ○ See slides 5 & 6
  For Q1 this item was added - Infra required for concurrent testing Java 8 and Java 11 support starting w/ EE 9.1. See draft proposal from Scott Marlow is here.
  The committee will review the retrospective and identify items for Q2, Q3 and Q4.

● Continue working on the Release Review requirement for a Service (Patch) Release
  ○ PR for the updated JESP - https://github.com/jakartaeec/jakarta.ee/pull/1050
○ PR to Modify ops guide for a Service Release - https://github.com/jakartaee/jakarta.ee/pull/1047
○ Issue created against the EFSP - https://github.com/EclipseFdn/EFSP/issues/29
○ Refine the definition of “significant” in the EFSP to be “No functionality changes whatsoever to the specification” in the JESP. Consider applying the condition to just the specification document.
○ Is a ballot always required? The Specification Committee acts in its best judgement whether a ballot is needed.

Changes to the EFSP regarding Service Release will be contemplated in the next rev of the process.

■ Open issues to the EFSP as required

Wayne to investigate leveraging an “errata” approach to handling no-functionality-changes

● **Note**: Call on February 10th is at 2:00PM UTC / 6:00AM PD / 9:00AM ET / 3:00PM CET / 10:00PM CT / 11:00PM JT
○ Calls now alternate every two weeks at 17:00 and 14:00 UTC