

## Jakarta EE Spec Committee - April 16th, 2025

Attendees (present in bold):

**Kenji Kazumura** - Fujitsu

Emily Jiang - IBM - **Tom Watson**

**Ed Bratt** - Oracle - Dmitry Kornilov

**Andrew Pielage** (chair) - 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

Jun Qian - Primeton Information Technologies - Enterprise Member

**Zhai Luchao** - Shandong Cvicse Middleware Co. - Enterprise Member

Guest - Jakarta EE 11 co-release coordinators: **Ed Burns, Jared Anderson**

Eclipse Foundation: **Tanja Obradovic**

Past business / action items:

- Approval is requested for the minutes from the April 2nd, 2025 meeting as drafted - **Approved**

### Agenda:

- Catch up on the [Jakarta EE 11 Release Plan](#) [Ed Burns]
  - EE 11 - [Prioritized backlog](#) - [Jakarta EE11 TCK Release \(github.com\)](#) and [Jakarta EE11 TCK Release board](#)
  - Platform TCK progressing
  - 1 blocker on GlassFish - in JSP Connectors
  - Persistence - 17 failures
  - Aim is to have the TCK complete by end of April, and then be ready for ballot by 19th May
- Catch up on the [Jakarta EE 12 Release Plan](#) [Jared Anderson]
  - Project board: <https://github.com/orgs/jakartaee/projects/17/views/1>

- Release plans were due in by the 15th
  - Some still in progress
- Mentors are encouraged to proactively check when Plan Reviews are put up for review and get them into ballot.
- Ongoing tracking [spreadsheet](#) of specifications progressing through the [JESP](#) specification version [lifecycle](#)
- Issue [#55](#) - TCK Archive Format [Ed Bratt]
  - Check in on Ed Bratt's document: [link](#)
  - Check in on Ed Bratt's PR: *pending*
- Issue [#83](#) - Clean up and clarify how to list TCK service releases on spec pages [Ivar Grimstad]
  - *Carry over from Feb 19th call:*
    - Action: Ivar to update the template: [https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-committee/blob/master/spec\\_page\\_template.md](https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-committee/blob/master/spec_page_template.md) - **DONE**
  - Check on progress of pull requests
- Issue [#74](#) - TCK challenge automatic acceptance
  - Email: <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-spec.committee/msg03564.html>
  - Email has been sent, Pages first to respond
- Issue [#58](#) - TCK challenge templates
  - Check on progress of pull requests
  - Andrew Pielage to take ownership and make all of the remaining PRs
- Issue [#82](#) - Consistent approach for TCK challenge exclusions [Ed Bratt]
  - *Carry over from February 19th: TCK Process should be updated with something akin to Scott Starks suggestion.*
- MicroProfile Rehoming Proposal
  - Continue discussion from last call
  - Waiting on MicroProfile to decide
  - Until a more specific concern is raised, those present on the call don't see a need to take any action right now
    - We are happy to re-review once more information is available
  - Specifications calendar: <https://calendar.google.com/calendar/embed?src=eclipse->

[foundation.org\\_e9ki8t2gc75sh07qdh95c8ofvc%40group.calendar.google.com&ctz=America%2FToronto](https://foundation.org_e9ki8t2gc75sh07qdh95c8ofvc%40group.calendar.google.com&ctz=America%2FToronto)

- Plan Review Proposals
  - A lot of Plan Reviews for EE12 have been vague (e.g. review and fix github issues)
  - Do we need to increase the Plan Review requirements?
    - For example, any required cross-specification coordination
  - Some specifications are one-man-bands - can make more detailed plans difficult
    - All vendors can appoint a committer to each specification
  - Iterative / evolutionary plans?
    - We want to avoid high requirements to create a plan, but also the vague plans
    - We do not want to require new plan review ballots for these changes (assuming still roughly aligned to the original plan)
      - Mentor discretion to determine this - they are also welcome to bring it to the group for discussion
    - Mentor checks in every quarter (or other period of time) to review and request updates to the plan (without ballot)
    - Creation reviews should also include a plan, and these plans may evolve in the same way
    - Would this require an update to the EFSP?
      - No, apply to JESP
        - Or even just to the process guide - no ballot required
- Review other [open issues](#):
  - Determine which issues to label as “enhancement” and add to our [board](#)
  - Close issues which are no longer relevant or have been dealt with