**Jakarta EE Spec Committee - April 30th, 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 16th, 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
    - Bad news: Data outage
        - https://gitlab.eclipse.org/eclipsefdn/helpdesk/-/issues/6001
        - Some Jenkins CI data loss may occur
        - Unknown affect on timelines
            - Should be simple matter of time (not complex to correct)
    - Good news: Worrisome issue resolved (turned out to be simple)
        - https://github.com/jakartaee/platform-tck/issues/2183

- o Some tests are being excluded
- Catch up on the Jakarta EE 12 Release Plan [Jared Anderson]
  - o Project board: https://github.com/orgs/jakartaee/projects/17/views/1
  - o Still waiting on Messaging, Interceptors, Activation, and Mail
    - ▪ Discussions ongoing
- Ongoing tracking spreadsheet of specifications progressing through the JESP specification version lifecycle
  - o **Jakarta Security 5.0**: The plan indicates that Jakarta Authorization and Jakarta Authentication may be updated as well. Do we need separate plan reviews for these at this point, or can we handle them under the Security plan for now?
    - ▪ Initial thoughts are that they do not need individual plans yet
  - o **Jakarta Validation 4.0**: The plan references issues in the old issue tracker. I have asked them to migrate the reference ones and add the migration issue to the plan. Should we abort the ballot until this is done?
    - ▪ It can continue, though the issues are expected to be resolved
      - • Would we need to kick off another ballot for any changes to this plan?
        - o No
          - ▪ It's mentor discretion to decide if changes are large enough to warrant a progress review
          - ▪ Plans are allowed to change
- Issue #55 - TCK Archive Format [Ed Bratt]
  - o Check in on Ed Bratt's PR: *pending*
- Issue #83 - Clean up and clarify how to list TCK service releases on spec pages
  - o Check on progress of pull requests
- Issue #74 - TCK challenge automatic acceptance
  - o Check on progress of specifications
  - o Platform project is pushing the individual specifications to be responsive
  - o Two week lazy consensus window possibly too short?
    - ▪ Possibly stress that this only kicks in if nobody comments at all?
    - ▪ Two weeks is a suggestion - individual specifications can pick their own lazy consensus windows
      - • They can also change it later
- Issue #58 - TCK challenge templates [Andrew Pielage]

- o Check on progress of pull requests

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

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

- Plan Review Proposals

  - o The regular check ins would potentially be done by the Platform team

  - o Spec Committee to check back in on this in 4 months.

- Review other [open issues](#):

  - o Determine which issues to label as "enhancement" and add to our [board](#)

  - o Close issues which are no longer relevant or have been dealt with