

Jakarta EE Spec Committee - November 3rd, 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, Paul Buck** (chair)

Past business / action items:

- Approval is requested for the meeting minutes from the October 20th 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>
 - Release Plan
<https://eclipse-ee4j.github.io/jakartaee-platform/jakartaee10/JakartaEE10ReleasePlan>
 - Wiki <https://github.com/eclipse-ee4j/jakartaee-platform/wiki/JakartaEE10>
- Spec process discussion [All]
 - The EFSP has been updated to [EFSP 1.3](#), the Specification Committee needs to review and consider future updates to the [JESP 1.3](#), decide on next steps including timing. The JESP repo is [here](#). Redline is [here](#).
 - JESP has issues pending
 - EE10 we will remain on JESP 1.3 (based on EFST 1.2)
 - There is careful assessment and discussion required to reconcile EFSP

and JESP and also deal with the backlog of issues

- Proposed next step: review the differences, summarize the outstanding issues, on or before the conclusion of EE 10
- Where do record the version of the JESP (EFSP)

Action: Revisit in first call in 2022

- Output format for TCKs [Ed]
 - Implementers are having challenges when it comes to parsing and collecting up the output of TCKs for presenting as evidence that the product is compatible. Do we think there is consensus around regularizing this output? Is this something the Specification Team should take up and try to develop a guide, or possibly a requirement about?
Issue raised for the Platform Project to explore the topic and overtime make recommendations to the Specification Committee to be ratified and adopted. Not in scope for Jakarta EE 10.
- JPMS module name [Scott Stark]
 - The Jakarta EE10 [release plan](https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-committee/blob/master/names.adoc) defines JPMS module names in terms of this spec committee doc
<https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-committee/blob/master/names.adoc>
 - This [spreadsheet](#) contains the then current module name and the proposed module name for 9.x
 - Proposal: add an explicit JPMS module name column to this document to capture the module-info naming conventions for EE10
 - Existing usage if it is consistent with the following
 - API_PACKAGE non-jarkata package root if it makes sense (for CDI it does not)
 - Some variation of the existing project Code column

Scott to apply the proposed naming convention to all projects, and open a PR to update the naming doc accordingly. Will not affect specs that already have a JPMS module name.

The proposed (and now adopted) naming convention as best practice will be documented after the table in the names.adoc page.