Jakarta EE Spec Committee - November 30th, 2022

Attendees (present in bold):

Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu
Tom Watson - IBM - **Emily Jiang**
Ed Bratt - Oracle - **Dmitry Kornilov**
Andrew Pielage - Payara - **Petr Aubrecht**
David Blevins - Tomitribe - Jean-Louis Monteiro, **Cesar Hernandez**
Ivar Grimstad - PMC Representative
Marcelo Ancelmo - Participant Member - Abraham Marin-Perez
Werner Keil - Committer Member
Scott Stark - Red Hat - **Scott Marlow** 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 minutes from the November 16th, 2022 meeting as drafted - Approved.

Agenda:
- Ongoing tracking [spreadsheet](#) of specifications progressing through the [JESP](#) version [lifecycle](#)
- Ongoing work on and resolve Specification Committee's process enhancements items including those identified in the Jakarta EE 10 retrospective:
    - Issues with the "enhancement" label are [here](#)
    - Enhancement labeled issues in a project board is [here](#)

  See the issues in the board for updates
- 11/15/22 Does the EFSP mandate that authoritative sources live within a specification project? That is source input that ends up producing the final specification content [Tom]
        - Concerned about the situation w/ MyFaces
          https://github.com/jakartaee/faces/blob/354746532d8a325f7114c5 3ff33ce880aeaa4243/api/pom.xml#L313-L350
    - API JAR's are provided as a convenience, they are not normative. The JavaDoc and signature tests are part of the spec and therefore normative.
    - Is it a requirement that the sources used to create normative artifacts required to be managed as part of the specification project's sources?
    - Is there a situation where a committer may have merged an artifact from sources outside of the project that has provenance elsewhere?

- ○ Is there a situation where there is a committer on an open source project that is not a committer on the specification project, where that committer has contributed to an artifact that is normative?
    - ■ Scott Stark commented: This is the fundamental question given that implementation projects don't have a requirement that committers sign the specification working group agreement. If you think about this in terms of provenance as discussed in the current push for SBOMs, I don't think we want a situation where any source feeding into a specification project artifact is from a repo outside of the specification project.
  - ○ Need to establish policy (if required) that apply to all specs
  - ○ Wayne Beaton joined the meeting on November 30th to explore this topic further with the Specification Committee.
    A discussion took place to help Wayne understand the situation, he will now consider it and consult with others in the Eclipse Foundation and update the committee at a later date.
- Proposal - Cancel the next call scheduled for 12/14/22 … or is there a volunteer to chair the call?
  No objections were noted to cancel the call scheduled 12/14/22
  - ○ Note: Biweekly call series to be created starting on 01/11/23

- **Register** for JakartaOne Livestream Today! The registration link is here