

JSR 352 Expert Group Meeting
February 24th, 2012
Minutes

Meeting Time: 9-10:00AM ET

Attendees:

Kevin Connor
Tim Fanelli
Mahesh Kannan
Wayne Lund
Michael Minella
Chris Vignola

References: EGAagenda-24Feb2012 (slides)

Discussion Summary:

Group walked through the referenced slides. The following points were made:

- The group spent considerable time discussing proposed annotations for exposing and passing properties to batch applications. It was a good discussion, but the group was unable to fully come to terms with how to model these concepts in an annotation-based approach. The following opinions were expressed:
 - Michael - the proposed annotations are "painful".
 - Tim - like the concept, but prefers more concise syntax.
 - Wayne - @Property annotations shows weakness of annotation approach.
 - Mahesh - maybe EJB3 @Resource approach with xml override is useful model.
 - Chris - well, maybe this discussion reveals limitation of an all-annotation approach; perhaps xml is inevitable.
 - Kevin, annotations could still be used, but need not be this cumbersome.
- Wayne briefly described the Parameter Builder approach of Spring Batch. The idea of providing code that deals with building up a batch job's properties is an interesting idea and requires further development in the context of this specification.
- The need for typed parameters/properties (not just strings) was mentioned. (Editor: sorry, I did not capture the source).
- The group then started a discussion of launching. We identified API, command line, and webui as potential source of job launches. The group discussed the concept of a programmatic job launcher as an integral part of a batch application - as is done with Spring Batch. We juxtaposed this against the WebSphere batch xJCL job submission approach. Both models have

advantages. We need more time on this topic.

- Lastly, we continued the discussion from Feb22 about whether to combine or separate launch/operator/explorer operations into distinct interfaces, as is done with Spring Batch. The group concluded launch is logically separate from operator/explorer functions, which are related to the job repository. We saw no compelling reason to separate operator/explorer functions.
- The group meets again on Wednesday, 29 February 2012. The main topic of discussion will continue the launcher discussion and then move on to listeners and concurrency.

Submitted,

Chris Vignola

February 28th, 2012