Jakarta EE Spec Committee - August 6th, 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 12 co-release coordinators: **Jared Anderson**, James Perkins

Eclipse Foundation: **Tanja Obradovic**

Past business / action items:
- Approval is requested for the minutes from the July 23rd, 2025 meeting as drafted - **Approved**

Agenda:
- EE 11 Update [Ed Burns]
    - Retrospective update
        - [*Carry over from July 9th*]:
            - Retrospective was done on the platform call (issue link, document link)
            - Need to review retro link to figure out what may need action by spec committee vs others

- o Web Profile TCK challenge

    - https://github.com/jakartaee/platform-tck/issues/2394

    - Suggested solution #1: Fix it in EE 12 and close the challenge and use the workaround that we have been using for EE 8, 9, and 10.

    - Suggested solution #2: Update the test to correctly handle Jakarta Authentication to be available as an API.

        - Consensus on the call is to go with solution #2

        - Any version of the TCK can still be used if this is an issue

  - o Any remaining business on EE11

- Jakarta EE 12 Update [Jared Anderson]

  - o Platform and Platform TCK to be potentially combined

  - o Platform calls on break until the 26th August

- Jakarta EE Namespace

  - o Discuss straw poll results/voting and actions

  - o MicroProfile currently on break

  - o Do we run the straw poll again?

    - Which options?

        - Just options 1 and 4?

  - o What would be the ballot criteria on what we do the final ballot on? Would it require a super-majority of the strategic members?

  - o Do we want to simply accept MicroProfile retaining its namespace for now, and finish defining the rules later?

    - It may set a precedent

  - o With regards to exceptions: are they perpetual or temporary?

    - E.g. if MicroProfile Config comes across and retains its org.eclipse.microprofile namespace, is this forevermore or would they need to "reapply" for an exception?

  - o Discussion to continue on next call

- Ongoing tracking spreadsheet of specifications progressing through the JESP specification version lifecycle

- Issue [#55](#) - TCK Archive Format [Ed Bratt]

  - *Not discussed*

  - Check in on Ed Bratt's PR: *pending*

- Issue [#83](#) - Clean up and clarify how to list TCK service releases on spec pages [Andrew Pielage]

  - *Not discussed*

  - Check on progress of pull requests

- Issue [#74](#) - TCK challenge automatic acceptance - [Ed Bratt]

  - *Not discussed*

  - Check on progress of specifications

- Issue [#58](#) - TCK challenge templates [Andrew Pielage]

  - *Not discussed*

  - Check on progress of pull requests

- Issue [#82](#) - Consistent approach for TCK challenge exclusions [Ed Bratt]

  - Not discussed

  - Carry over from February 19th: TCK Process should be updated with something akin to Scott Starks suggestion.

- 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