Approved Minutes, November 18, 2025 Jakarta EE Steering Committee Meeting

Approved Meeting Agenda

Role Call

(Bold format added to indicate attendance)
as published on jakarta.ee website

Fujitsu: **Kenji Kazumura**, Yuichi Kusano
IBM: **Alasdair Nottingham**, **Emily Jiang**, James Perkins, Jared Anderson, **Neil Patterson**
Oracle: **Ed Bratt**, Dmitry Kornilov
Payara: **Dominika Tasarz,** Steve Butler
Tomitribe: **David Blevins**, **Cesar Hernandez**
Enterprise Member representative 1: Jun Qian (Primeton)
Enterprise Member Representative 2: Zhao Xin (Shandong Cvicse Middleware Co)
Participant member representative: **Ondro Mihalyi** (Omnifish OU)
Elected Committer Representative: Vacant

Quorum is calculated as 50% or greater. Quorum is net with 4 members present.
Ballots taken during the call are decided with a simple majority of those present.

We have Quorum

IBM holds proxy for both Jun Qian and Zhao Xin

For Eclipse: **Tanja Obradovic**, Ivar Grimstad, Shabnam Mayel

Review minutes from prior meetings

Draft Minutes of October 21, 2025 Steering Committee Meeting
A proposal to adopt these minutes will be raised at the Nov 18 committee meeting.
Ed proposed these be adopted as final. Dominika seconded the proposal. There were no objections and the minutes were adopted.

Draft Minutes of Nov. 4, 2025 Steering Committee Meeting
Please review these draft minutes. We will vote to approve these meeting minutes at a future meeting.

New and Continuing Business

Note on proxy voting (Tanja)

- Tanja points out that proxy voting assignments, as communicated, may or may not be reflective of the member's wishes. Tanja referred to written instructions for delegating proxy (and also Quorum).
- Tanja has provided a reference to [this presentation](#)
- To the extent possible, when assigning proxy, the committee requests clarification from Eclipse Foundation about how members indicate their voting preferences and/or the extent of their vote.
- Section 20 sections 3 and 4 of the community bylaws. This link, [here](#).
- During the discussion, we concluded that these documents are possibly obsolete as Eclipse Foundation is now a Belgian based corporation
- Tanja will work with Eclipse Foundation to ensure they are correct and consistent with the latest incorporation of Eclipse. Specifically for Proxy voting.
- For the purposes of this meeting (Nov. 11, 2025), any resolutions we agree to take up will be conducted as an e-mail vote.

Jakarta Working Group 2026 Program Plan

- The plan was amended to include additional promotional activity for all Jakarta EE members as well as related efforts. The Marketing committee activity slides are adopted to reflect these goals.
- The plan, as amended, was adopted without objection by the committee.
- The [Approved Candidate 2026 Program Plan](#) is available in the [Steering Committee Folder / Program Plans / 2026](#)
- Tanja will submit to EMO for review and development of the 2026 financial plan

- This is a record of the previous discussions this committee had held in development of our proposed plan for CY 2026.
    - [Draft 2026 Program Plan](#)
    - All members of the committee were invited to review the draft plan. A special meeting was conducted Tuesday Oct. 28. The draft slides, as of Nov. 3, reflect these discussions.
    - The draft plan is one input used by the Eclipse Foundation for allocating staff to work in support of these goals
    - It is a meeting goal to vote to adopt this draft plan (possible with modifications made at the meeting) during the meeting of Nov. 4th.
    - See also, Ondro Mihályi's e-mail (subject: "Relationship of EE4J with Jakarta EE and broadening scope to other implementations") suggesting we add a goal to promote all Jakarta EE implementations in a neutral fashion.
    - Discussion

- - - Tanja presented the draft plan as of the meeting.
      - Slide 8, no meeting input
      - Slide 9, no meeting input
      - Slide 10, no meeting input
      - Slide 11, no meeting input
      - Slide 12, no meeting input
      - Discussed slide 11, feedback is, this slide indicates a preference for Eclipse implementations. Change monitor use of tags … to remove specifics of EE4j program and inviting
      - Discussion about – should working group funds be used to promote any implementation? Use a submission form for all messaging.
      - Marketing committee to create a submission process
      - The plan was submitted for approval. Tomitribe seconded the motion and the plan was adopted without objection
  - If there is sufficient agreement, the Chair will propose the draft plan be adopted as our initial plan for CY 2026

  - We will review the proposed program plan for 2026
  - Tanja reviewed the slides from the link above
  - Nov 4, will vote to adopt the candidate plan
  - Last Nov. meeting, will vote to adopt the final plan with financial details included (Nov 18th).
  - Discussion points:
      - Working group will only take up – assessment of retrospectives. Are these achieving the desired results? (dropped the point related to EE 12)
      - No updates to the EE 12 release goals
      - Continue the long term vision goal
      - Under drive creation/updates… We do not believe that any general compensation for committers will be possible. Some directed remuneration may be possible. Travel stipends, SWAG, etc. Will keep the top-level goal.
      - Remove "charter changes" as a top-level goal.
      - No changes to the MicroProfile merge goal
      - Neil presented the top-level goals for the CY2026 marketing goals. (slide 8 of [Marketing plan deck](#))
          - Moving the developer survey to bi-yearly (no survey next week)
          - Attempting to reach users earlier in their career.
          - "Drum-beat" of updates via web-site updates. Promotion of specs. As they complete and inform the community of changes.
      - Grow contributors detail slide – some rework is needed for this point.
  - Previously:
  - The program plan for 2026 is due by the end of October
  - Please review the proposed program plan.
  - I propose the following

- ○ Discuss the proposed program plan for 2026 in Oct. 7 (completed)
- ○ Take committee input and incorporate commentary and other committee input at our next meeting, Oct. 21
- ○ We will vote to adopt the 2026 program plan at our meeting Nov. 4
- ○ Previous context on the program plan
- ● CY 2025 Program Plan
- ● Draft 2026 Program Plan
- ● Please note the following dates:
  - ● **Mid-September (Now):** Program and Marketing Plan (Development Phase)
  - ● **Mid-October:** Draft Program and Marketing Plans created
  - ● **Late October:** Candidate Program Plans approved by Steering Committees
  - ● **Early November:** Eclipse Foundation creates Financial Plans in support of Program Plans
  - ● **Mid-November:** Program and Financial Plans reviewed with Steering Committees (Consultation Phase)
  - ● **Late November:** Program and Financial Plans approved by Steering Committees
- ○ Tanja presented the Draft 2026 Program Plan slide deck
  - ■ Reviewed 2025 proposals successful or otherwise
  - ■ Ed solicited updates from Marketing and Specification and Platform Committer teams. Marketing input will be discussed on 2025.10.2025
  - ■ Suggestion (from Ondro Mihalyi: Collaborate with MicroProfile WG to facilitate a move to Jakarta EE Working Group

Working Group Process Revisions - (Previously Fee Changes) Information Session Recording & Slides

- ● Tanja has circulated a new proposal attachment via e-mail. Due to the very late timing of this proposed change Eclipse has adjusted the implementation timing for changing fees for the Jakarta EE working group to CY 2027. Please see e-mail from Tanja, subject "Charter update - Draft Jakarta EE Working Group Charter for your review", dated 11/16/2025, 12:13 PM.
  - ○ There are currently two fee proposals (one from Eclipse, one proposal from IBM)
  - ○ The 2nd Eclipse proposal includes language deferring fee changes for existing members until 2027.
- ● Prior Discussion
  - ○ A proposed fee change draft was circulated as an attachment to e-mail sent to the Steering Committee e-mail list, Oct 4th, 2026.
    - ■ This proposal substitutes Euros for US Dollars. Members have pointed out this constitutes a roughly 15% raise in the cost of working group membership

- A second proposal has been submitted, October 30, 2026 that proposes to adjust the working group fees to generally hold the working group costs even, based on USD.
  - A follow-up response to the IBM proposal was provided by Tanja.
  - In this note, Tanja informs the committee the Red Hat will not be renewing their membership next year.
  - Further, she suggests the combination of Red Had dropping out of the working group and the proposed change (e.g. Strategic top-tier membership of €240,000) together could result in a net decrease of operating funds for the working group of $135,000 (Spot check Google says €1 = $1.15USD).
- I have asked Tanja to have our current expense / spending sheet available for our discussion so we can evaluate, if expense reductions are likely, where will the committee be able to make recommendations (what is fixed overhead and what is variable and/or optional)
  - As an aside, I will note there are a few other points in the presentation that we should consider, once we have concluded our discussion about working group fee-structure.
- Discussion
  - Alasdiar provided an explanation of the IBM re-proposed fee structure. He made an attempt to round the numbers in an attempt to keep the numbers "clean" but ended up rounding them down.
- In the case you missed the call please find attached the [recording](#) and [slides](#) from today's Information Session on the Proposed Eclipse Foundation Working Group Process Revisions.
- Discussion and comments from this presentation as they apply to our working group
  - If you have not reviewed the slides and/or listened to the recording, please do so as soon as possible. We will have a draft resolution to take up in reaction to the slides
  - We will have to have a 'diff' of the charter changes prior to the meeting where this proposal is to be voted on. New language must be delivered to the mailing list prior to Oct. 28th. Informally, this is expected to replace USD with EUR for all currency notations in the charter
- Please follow discussion in the email thread "Charter update - Draft Jakarta EE Working Group Charter for your review"

2026 Working Group Financial Plan

The working group is anticipating a $50K reduction in revenue due to Red Hat withdrawing from participation. This is offset some, due to new members that joined in CY 2025
Some members of this committee met on Tuesday Nov. 11 to review the budget line-items from 2025. We will review these findings.
Tanja will present a 2026 Working Group Financial Plan that we will review.

- Tanja showed the proposed financial plan
- Tanja shared the descriptive narrative of the budget line-items.
- David recommended we share both of these in the [Jakarta EE budget Google Drive](#)
- Alesdair suggested that budget questions should become a frequent review item of this committee.
- Tanja will perform some house-keeping with the historic budget documents and she points to the fact the Marketing Committee budget is updated quarterly.
- David points out that the budget line-item for Specification Management in the proposed budget may need to be reviewed. We had an unstructured discussion about that specific line-item.
- The committee has requested additional details regarding the Specification Committee management, line-item.

Due to time constraints, the meeting ended at this point.

Jakarta EE and AI

- **Updates for 2025.11.04**
  - **Creation Review Ballot for Jakarta EE Agentic AI Project**
    - The EMO approved creation of the Jakarta EE Agentic AI project.
    - The working group Creation Review Ballot for Jakarta EE Agentic AI project appears to be on track for approval.
    - The ballot will close Nov. 5.
    - Please consider voting, if you have not cast your ballot.
- **Previously Discussed**
  - **Public Review started the GitLab issue link for input and debate is** https://gitlab.eclipse.org/eclipsefdn/emo-team/emo/-/issues/1065 Proprasal link [Jakarta Agentic Artificial Intelligence](#)
  - Comments and/or feedback
  - This item was not discussed live in the meeting of 10/21.
  - Blog was published at [this link](#)
  - Jakarta EE AI project is in review but the project proposal page has not yet been made public.
    - When it is made public, [the proposal will be at this link.](#)
  - Notes about news from these past two weeks
    - Ed Burns update
    - Neil will discuss the slides from [this PDF link](#).
  - Update from Ed Burns (from last meeting)
    - Ed Burns' e-mail about blog question/challenge from Brian Benz ([e-mail to jakartaee-platform-dev mailing list](#)).
      - Ed is requesting input on a possible response to Brian Benz's GitHub Gist "[What's Up with Open Standard Enterprise Java and AI?](#)"

- Any new status? (No e-mail responses are apparent from the thread. No new conversation/comments to the original Gist since the previous meeting.)
- Ed Burns update: Question – who is the author? Is preference is that this be authored by the platform committer team.
- From the Platform there was a recommendation to look / listen to the Jakarta EE Futures call with Markus Eisele
- Refer to the Platform Committer Team Minutes from today's meeting.
- Further movement forward for this will be discussed/driven from the Platform Project meetings (weekly). Neil will carry this forward for amplification in the Marketing committee.

Working Group Charter Scope

(Previously, part of MicroProfile working group Merge)
- Ondro Mihályi has written a response to this proposal, see e-mail with the subject "Relationship of EE4J with Jakarta EE and broadening scope to other implementations" dated Nov. 4, 2025, 4:06AM PST. This may also be relevant to the Draft working group plan (as he has written in his proposal)
- Tomitribe have submitted a charter scope proposal that would amend the charter to explicitly include projects that are Specification related only. This proposal would require all implementation projects be removed from the Jakarta EE Working Group.
- In practice, looking at the Jakarta EE Project Management Interface pages, all projects beginning with 'Eclipse' would be removed from the Jakarta EE working group.
- Sample charter modification test has been provided in this Google Document
- A straw poll was initiated at the time
  - I am not aware of any conclusive response tally
- This has been discussed in several meetings.
- I'm adding this here for us to work this issue separate from the discussion about merging/welcoming MicroProfile to the Jakarta EE Working Group.

Jakarta EE 12

- Jakarta EE 12
  - **Update from Platform Committer Team**
    - Currently, the Platform Committer team does not see a need to adjust the delivery dates for EE 12.
    - OSSRH
      - Snapshot releases are possible
      - Staged releases are still work inn progress.
    - This item was not discussed in the meeting of 10/21
  - **Previous context**
    - New status board for Milestone 1

- OSSRH snapshot progress. Staging is still in progress.
- Including Query for the EE 12 Platform specification is in progress.
  - Committer Ballot ends Monday
- Ballot to restructure TCK and Platform projects was successfully concluded
- OSSRH
  - There continue to be issues that are being worked through.
  - There will be delays if any component requires release before these are resolved.
  - Jared
    - Snapshot publishing now working (unverified as of yet)
    - Parent pom updated in snapshot form
    - Staging solution not yet in place
    - Currently Sonatype does not do staging in new OSSRH
    - https://www.eclipse.org/lists/cross-project-issues-dev/msg20066.html has the latest details of status for OSSRH
- Jakarta EE Query Specification
  - Ongoing discussions regarding adding Jakarta Query to the Jakarta EE Web Profile specification. There is concern that existing specifications (Data and Persistence) are not willing to adopt the proposed Jakarta Query before it is confirmed to be accepted by the Platform committer team.
  - If interested, please review the Jakarta EE Platform meeting notes log. (Link to be provided).
  - Interested members should follow the discussion in the Platform committee meetings.
  - Jared:
    - Discussed today on platform
    - Coming ballot to include in Platform and WebProfile by end of week
- [Jakarta EE 12, Draft Release Plan](#)
- [Issues with EE12 label](#)
- [Jakarta EE 12, Plan Review Status Board](#) – the release reviews are generally completed We won't track this going forward.
- Latest report updates
  - Teams are focused on revising Specification drafts and creating update PRs.
- Plan is to start Milestone 1 in September
- Complete issues for release (OSSRH updates)
- Jared has a good idea of milestones for Milestone 1.
- No additional support from other Jakarta EE committees is needed at this point
- Jakarta EE 12 M1 dashboard created:https://github.com/orgs/jakartaee/projects/20/views/1 .
- Aiming for October 15 as the deadline for M1.
- Issues created for all projects and present in dashboard

■ Pending email to spec-leads to broadcast further

MicroProfile joining Jakarta EE

- **Discussion and update from committer teams and/or committees**
- **Update for 2025.11.04**
  - ○ This item was not discussed in the meeting of 11/04
- **Update for 2025.10.21**
  - ○ This item was not discussed in the meeting of 10/21
- **Update 2025.10.07**
  - ○ MicroProfile Steering Committee, scheduled for Sept. 30, call did not achieve quorum and has been rescheduled to Tuesday Oct. 14th.
- **Updates from MicroProfile Steering Committee Discussion**
- **Previous context**
  - ○ **Steering Committee Discussion 2025.09.09:**
    - ■ There was some question about the JESP language that may require name-space choices.
      - ● David Blevins suggested that the Specification Committee had in the past mutually agreed `jakarta` would be the required namespace and groupId.
      - ● The committee asked that he please find the relevant Jakarta EE process documents to identify where there is text that needs to be reviewed.
      - ● David also suggested he was surprised that the namespace topic was considered concluded without a resolution.
        - ○ The committee asked David Blevins to please review the e-mail history, the various straw polls, and previous meeting minutes, to see if his assertion remains.
    - ■ Dominica requested access to the Spec. committee meeting minutes log
      - ● She has confirmed that she has the necessary access
  - ○ Discussion also at today's EE Platform meeting.
    - ■ Emily has volunteered to write a proposal for the two working groups to merge their efforts.
  - ○ Funding discussion – Update from Marcin
    - ■ Marcin has prepared a document that captures the main points that have been raised. [Please review his note, here](#).
    - ■ We will have discussion on these points at the meeting.
    - ■ Request that Marcin review the comments that have been entered. Also, to please focus this document on the topic of Funding, specifically as it relates to the proposed Charter update from Davie Blevins (link below).
  - ○ **Previous discussion (2025.09.09):**
    - ■ Marcin presented his findings in the linked note.
      - ● There were clarifying comments and discussion in the meeting.
      - ● Implementations and Specifications are currently included in the Jakarta EE Charter. This may not be clear to all members.

- **Moving forward, the following topic is moved to the heading, [Working Group Charter Scope](#).**
- We briefly looked directly at the Charter Update edit as proposed by D. Blevins (linked below) and there was some discussion. The discussion had to be closed off due to time, without allowing for conclusion.
- Points raised include:
  - We have not found suitable replacement implementations that are consistently willing to work to the time-lines of the Jakarta EE Working Group.
  - Should this working group actively promote / mentor community member participation in just EE4J implementation projects? Why not WELD (CDI implementation), or JBatch (Batch implementation)?
  - Should the working group remove the implementation projects that are currently named "Eclipse <project>" (e.g. Eclipse GlassFish) from Jakarta EE Working Group?
  - Ed Bratt raised the history that the original rationale for tight coupling between the specification and an implementation is this is believed to force higher quality specifications and prevent instances where specifications describe features (or combinations of features) that could not be fully realized and finally, provide vendor assurances that implementations can actually be written.
- Suggested action for next meeting:
  - Ed recommended we rename this to 'Proposed Working Group Charter Change' – Remove charter elements that include implementations.
  - Marcin, please continue to refine your overview document.
  - Members, please review the material here and linked below and be prepared for further discussion about the proposed update to the Jakarta EE Working Group Charter.
- Previous discussion:
  - Some discussion about funding – in specific funding GlassFish discussion about vendor favoritism. E-mail link needed. Discussion about the definition of "Vendor". Some ideas that creating a separate working group for GlassFish and maybe related projects. Marcin is willing to take this up as a discussion for this committee. Will create an action for the next meeting to continue and start a structured discussion about keeping GlassFish
  - [Charter update from D. Blevins](#)
  - [Discussion thread](#) – for D. Blevins Proposal (Subject: [jakarta.ee-community] MicroProfile, Jakarta EE, GlassFish/EE4J)
  - [Slack Thread on Namespace / process](#) – (This thread is discussion about Namespace requirements and if we need to make working group process changes)
- **Discussion (2025.09.25)**
  - Resolution mentioned in Sept 9th minutes passed by the Specification Committee on the September 3rd meeting.

- Emily to draft proposal to send to the platform dev list with a way forward with regards to namespace and migrating projects
- Ed Burns:
  - Does not see anything controversial with replacing EE4J with Jakarta EE
  - If there are any unintentional changes to updating the charter, we could update the charter again.
- Alasdair:
  - Concerns there may be something we haven't anticipated from an Eclipse perspective that may affect implementation delivery that would slow us down.
- All agreed we would need to review the mentoring program scope.
- Dominika:
  - Positive support from Payara, would vote +1

JaklartaOne Activity

China Tech Talk
- This was an in-person event, Sept. 25, 2025
- This item was not discussed in the meeting of 10/21

JakartaOne LiveStream Dec 2nd
- CFP closed. 202 submissions vs 39 last year
- 94 registrations.
- **Vendor talks**
  - Vendor session Tracking Sheet: **https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1jkvN2BxqJHvnknpMbEZj_zmCaoxMlRjzhXHO7Gn-LLE/edit?usp=sharing**
- Sponsorship Proposal / Outline
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lFgIAb8scZoaU4BNjW5F6gFM6XfnOWQzTYmtxsjbc3I/edit?usp=sharing

Update from Jakarta EE Future Direction Team

- This item was not discussed in the meeting of 10/21
- Update from Neil (if present)
- (Possible feed for Long term road map)

Marketing Committee

- This item was not discussed in the meeting of 10/21

- Previous context
  - We did the retrospective on the previous meeting
  - **Supporting quotes** requested from members for the launch of the Developer survey report, **25 September is the deadline**
    - **Survey report link**
    - **PR document link**

Other News