

# Spec Committee Meeting Minutes February 13th, 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**

**Ivar Grimstad** - PMC Representative

**Alex Theedom** - Participant Member

**Werner Keil** - Committer Member

Eclipse Foundation: **Wayne Beaton**, Tanja Obradovic, Paul Buck, Mike Milinkovich

Wayne's notes:

February 6 Meeting minutes: Scott Stark moved, Alex Theedom second, no objections - minutes approved.

We discussed the concern raised by Scott on the mailing list.

There are a few items that I need to fully map onto the current MP process, but the one thing that stands out is the following requirement:

A Super-majority, including a Super-majority of Strategic Members, is required to approve a Profile Specification. A Specification Committee may, at its discretion, elect to label one or more Profiles as a "Platform".

The problem here is that 7 out of 11 members listed here do not actively participate in the MP specs.

<https://www.eclipse.org/membership/exploreMembership.php>

as the use of the EFSP grows, this would seem to be a growing problem as there is no guarantee that strategic members have interest in, or alignment with projects.

We need to clarify that the "Super-majority of Strategic Members" is limited to the strategic members of the Eclipse Foundation who are members of the working group (not all strategic members).

A proposal was made to consider adding some sort of penalty for not voting (without specifics).

We discussed this requirement in the context of Eclipse MicroProfile. David expressed (paraphrasing) that the MicroProfile community won't like that special control (designation of profiles) is given to paying

members". The EFSP has additional rigour and process that will be jarring to the MicroProfile community (which has established a culture of being very light on process).

A new profile will appear in MicroProfile soon.

We decided to defer further discussion regarding MicroProfile until a time when Kevin and John Clingan can join the call (perhaps this is a discussion that we should have with the entire leadership of MicroProfile).

We discussed the [Specializing the EFSP](#) document. The first section discusses the base principles and invariants. The rest of the document provides examples of how things might be tuned. Bill and David requested that document make this more clear.

The numbers in the EFSP are considered minimums (e.g. a project must engage in at least one Progress Review). A recommendation was made to explicitly state what can and cannot be "dialed down".

Wayne noted that one week has been established in the various Eclipse processes as the minimum amount of time that we can reasonably require for votes to improve the ability for the community to participate (note that in practice, votes that we actually schedule tend to start mid-week to further improve the ability for folks who are unable to connect during a standard work week).

Wayne noted that the example specializations listed are primarily either implementation details or changes in N. There is no explicit consideration for new sections or other prose. The guiding principles

Wayne offered to take another pass through the document, respond to the existing comments and issues noted here. That pass will be complete in time for our next call.

Dan noted that we have a definite need for materials to help people understand how to engage in the specialization process (new members of existing specification committees, and new working groups engaged in the specification process). We need an tutorial or some sort of "so you want to run a specification process at the Eclipse Foundation" master document that pulls everything together using existing policy documents as reference materials.

Lazy consensus of the group confirmed that the document is on the right track.

We looked briefly at the [Draft: Jakarta EE Specification Process v1.0](#) document. We decided to defer further discussion until the *specialization* document is more complete.

We discussed learning about what we want to specialize by doing. We're in a holding pattern on Jakarta NoSQL. Arjan suggested that we push forward with JSF. We need to determine what we need to make this happen in consideration of the larger plan to move us forward on Jakarta EE. Wayne agreed to chart out the path and send it to the group. Ivar made a similar offer regarding the MVC specification.