

Jakarta EE Spec Committee - April 2nd, 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 March 19th, 2025 meeting as drafted - **Approved**

Agenda:

- Catch up on the [Jakarta EE 11 Release Plan](#) [Jared Anderson]
 - EE 11 - [Prioritized backlog](#) · [Jakarta EE11 TCK Release \(github.com\)](#) and [Jakarta EE11 TCK Release board](#)
 - Web Profile release review PR created: <https://github.com/jakartaee/specifications/pull/802>
 - Ballot ongoing - supermajority reached, though not everyone has yet voted
 - Platform TCK progressing
 - Initial delivery estimate: 1 month
 - Will happen this quarter

- Web Profile and Core Profile POM
 - Not normative, provided for convenience
 - No action required at this time
- Do we want to adjust the language slightly? Currently the Platform and Web Profile pages say that they have “removed all usages of the Security Manager”
 - Change to “Remove Security Manager requirements”?
- Catch up on the [Jakarta EE 12 Release Plan](#) [Jared Anderson]
 - Project board: <https://github.com/orgs/jakartaee/projects/17/views/1>
 - Aim to get Plan Reviews in by the 15th April
 - Do we need to increase the Creation Review requirements?
 - Require a Progress Review within x months (instead of the standard 12)?
 - Do they need to list milestones?
 - Would require adjusting the [JESP](#) text
 - Need to be careful that we don’t make the requirements too stringent
 - We shall make an issue to investigate and discuss in the [specification committee repo](#)
- Ongoing tracking [spreadsheet](#) of specifications progressing through the [JESP](#) specification version [lifecycle](#)
- Issue [#55](#) - TCK Archive Format
 - 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
 - *Carry over from Feb 19th call:*
 - Action: Ivar to update the template: https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-committee/blob/master/spec_page_template.md
 - Check on progress of pull requests
- Issue [#74](#) - TCK challenge automatic acceptance
 - Email: <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-spec.committee/msg03564.html>
 - *Carry over from Feb 19th call:*
 - *An issue will be created to track this*

- *Should we instead track it in the existing issue in a similar manner to [#83](#)?*
 - Yes - Andrew will add a comment to issue #74
 - Issue [#58](#) - TCK challenge templates
 - Check on progress of pull requests
 - No noticeable progress, mentors reminded to create the pull requests and then update the appropriate checkboxes in the issue
 - Issue [#82](#) - Consistent approach for TCK challenge exclusions
 - *Carry over from February 19th: TCK Process should be updated with something akin to Scott Starks suggestion.*
 - No progress
 - MicroProfile Rehoming Proposal
 - MicroProfile Working Group raised concerns about the openness of Jakarta EE
 - What is meant by “openness”?
 - The specification committee mailing list is private
 - It is publicly indexed however: <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakarta.ee-spec.committee/2025/Mar/index.html>
 - The approved meeting minutes for the specification committee are published to the website and to the public specification mailing list
 - Is this about participation?
 - Do we actually need the private mailing list?
 - Could run most things in the public by default
 - Do we want to open up the regular specification committee meeting which is currently private?
 - Possibly once a quarter?
 - Encourage feedback via GitHub issues?
 - Allow “listen only” participation?
 - The MicroProfile mailing list conversation: <https://groups.google.com/g/microprofile/c/6HI5JrZi3c>
- 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

