

Jakarta EE Spec Committee - September 30th, 2026

Attendees (present in bold):

Kenji Kazumura - Fujitsu - Takahiro Nagao

Emily Jiang - IBM - **Tom Watson**

Dmitry Kornilov - Oracle, **Robert Patrick**

Andrew Pielage (chair) - Payara

David Blevins - Tomitribe - Jean-Louis Monteiro, **Cesar Hernandez**

Ivar Grimstad - PMC Representative

Arjan Tijms - Omnifish OU - Elected Participant Member Representative

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 September 2nd, 2026 meeting as drafted - **Approved**

Agenda:

- [Jakarta EE 12 Update](#) [Jared Anderson]
 - [Dashboard](#)
 - [Platform Minutes](#)
 - Some dates need running past the Steering Committee
 - March 31st Web Profile

- May 15th Platform (6 weeks)
- Core Profile still intended for Jakarta One
- Jakarta Rest M1 soon
- Vote to move Authorization to Web Profile:
 - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/jakartaee-platform-dev/msg04875.html>
- Ongoing tracking [spreadsheet](#) of specifications progressing through the [JESP](#) specification version [lifecycle](#)
 - Jakarta CRaC Creation Review needs kicking off and assigning a mentor
 - Ivar to kick off creation review
 - Andrew to take on mentorship
 - Check on Progress review for Jakarta Config
 - From previous calls:
 - Ondrej is aware of the need for a progress and is looking to submit one after the summer holidays:
 - <https://www.eclipse.org/lists/config-dev/msg00275.html>
 - A Jakarta Future Directions call may touch on this as the namespace is a topic on the agenda (24th Sep)
 - MicroProfile namespace was brought up on the Future Directions call
 - More appetite for compromise?
 - Project Lead needs updating - Dmitry not working on it any more
 - Emily also a project lead
 - Spec is still stuck at the point of “if MicroProfile Config moves to Jakarta then there’s no need for a separate Jakarta Config”.
 - Check on progress of [Termination Review](#) for Jakarta RPC
 - Carry over from previous call: check up on [termination review](#)
 - Still underway
- Issue [#74](#) - TCK challenge automatic acceptance - [Andrew Pielage]
 - Check in on progress of pull requests
 - Question on the TCK certification process

- Currently even if a challenge is accepted, you cannot get a CCR accepted by simply excluding the test yourself and pointing at the still open (but accepted) CCR.
 - The process currently requires a new service release of the TCK to be released
- Should we update the process to allow certification using a TCK with an accepted challenge, if you point at the accepted challenge and manually exclude the test?
- There is language in the existing process that could be read as allowing a user to exclude a test:
 - “The specification project may approve (user) workarounds for an accepted TCK challenge (as an alternative to excluding TCK tests). “
 - Multiple vendors have done this before - raised CCRs with an accepted challenge and pointed at the accepted challenge
- Should we expand the final “Filing a Certification Request” bullet point to mention that they need to point at any accepted challenges if a service release has not yet been published?
 - “A statement attesting that all TCK requirements have been met, including any compatibility rules “
 - Change to something like: “A statement attesting that all TCK requirements have been met, including any compatibility rules , and any outstanding accepted challenges are linked”.
 - No objections to requiring a certification request to include links to the accepted challenges.
 - Emily to create a PR
- Issue [#89](#) - SHA512 - [Andrew Pielage]
 - Check in on progress of pull requests
 - Could test any changes against the Wombat spec
 - Duplicate the Jenkins job with the alterations
- Promoting TCKs is a collective effort [Ivar Grimstad]

- Carry over from previous call
 - Probably worth doing a refresher course when there are more members present
 - Can we also document them in our GitHub repo?
<https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-committee>
 - Tools repository where the scripts exist:
<https://github.com/jakartaee/specification-tools/tree/master/promotion>
 - Timeboxed demonstration when we have time and enough members present
 - Todo (ivar): Add a link to the CI instance and [job](#) with a couple of bullet points explaining it
- CDI CI job was publishing to the Download area, bypassing certificate signing
 - Not sure where they got the permissions from
 - If it was inherited from the parent pom, there is a new version all specifications will have to move to anyway
- 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
 - Issue [#39](#) - Project Handbook States Service Releases Require Release Reviews
 - The EFSP states otherwise:
<https://www.eclipse.org/projects/efsp/#efsp-releases-service>
 - The Handbook is not binding, and doesn’t take precedence over the EFSP
 - It’s not really our responsibility to resolve this
 - We could file an issue?
 - Emily/Ivar to bring it up on the TAC
 - Issue [#27](#)
 - Most on call positive on it

- Would require assistance from the web dev team - we can't just add that status
 - We need to file an issue to get this addressed and work on it in tandem: <https://github.com/jakartaee/jakarta.ee>
- Looking for an assignee