Jakarta EE Spec Committee - July 23rd, 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 9th, 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

    - Any remaining business on EE11
    - Not all TCK JARs are available in Maven Central yet
        - Scott Marlow tackling this - missing JARs will be manually uploaded to the new portal
- Jakarta EE 12 Update [Jared Anderson]
    - Project board: https://github.com/orgs/jakartaee/projects/17/views/1
    - Platform and Platform TCK to be potentially combined - discussions and requirements in review
        - The projects would need to agree on this first
            - Ballot required?
                - Previously 7-day ballots were run
        - If they agree, previous cases were done via an EMO Restructuring Review
            - Does a Restructuring Review require anything from the Specification Committee? Needs review
        - Scope statement of the Platform project may need to be updated to cover the TCK
        - Why were they separate?
            - Somewhat a historical artefact - TCK was closed source and had different contribution processes vs. the Platform project
            - Now that the TCKs are no longer closed source and they have been refactored and split up, the argument could be made we no longer need this separation
                - Would be more consistent with other projects
        - There would end up being a union of the Platform and Platform-TCK leads & committers
        - Only the Eclipse project would change - separate mailing lists, GitHub repositories, etc. would be retained
        - Any on call opposed?
            - No

        - Discussions to continue and we will review the state of things on the next call
    - Milestone 1 due in September
    - October/November - Java 25 support
- Jakarta EE Namespace
    - Discuss straw poll results/voting
    - Options
        - Option 1 - Require existing specification projects to move all of their API package namespaces to jakarta when they move to the Jakarta specification project
        - Option 2 - Allow existing specification projects to retain their own existing package namespaces when they move to the Jakarta specification project
        - Alternative 1 - Prefer existing specification projects move their API package namespaces to jakarta but allow exceptions to be approved on case by case basis
        - Alternative 2 - Allow existing specification projects to retain their own existing package namespaces when they move but require them to change when they make a major version change to their APIs

	Option 1	Option 2	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Ed Burns (Microsoft) Guest		1		
David Blevens (Tomitribe)	1		2	
Alasdair Nottingham (IBM)		1		
Emily Jiang (IBM)		1		
Ivar Grimstad (PMC)	1			

Werner Keil (Committer Member)	1			2
Andrew Pielage (Payara)			2	1
Abraham Marin-Perez (Participant Member)				1
Kenji Kazumura (Fujitsu)	1			2
Thomas Watson (IBM)		1		
Ed Bratt (Oracle)		1	2	
(Primeton Information Technologies)				
(Shandong Cvicse Middleware Co)				
	4 - individual 4 - reps	4 - individual 2 - reps	3 - individual 3 - reps *	4 - individual 4 - reps *

- * indicates this total includes reps alternative vote to their preference

- Do we want to rerun the strawpoll with a smaller subset of options (excluding the "losers" from the first round)?
- Why would a specification want to come to Jakarta?
    - Brand strength?
        - Namespace somewhat falls under this - it's a technical issue
            - Naming is a hotly contested issue
            - If we slip in one place do we slip in others?
            - If the naming impacts the end user - how?
                - Rename package imports - user upgrade barrier

                - Transitive dependencies was the bigger issue. There are no such libraries (using the MP namespace) for this situation
                - Somewhat alleviated by transformers
            - Worth publicly documenting why whichever way we decide?
                - Document what the impact on the user (pros and cons) and any other consequences would be if we decide each way
                    - What happens if we enforce Jakarta?
                    - What happens if we don't?
                - Helps inform our decisions
    - What would we do about maintenance releases?
        - We can do maintenance releases on the old javax (EE8) namespace
            - We moved to Jakarta to allow evolution of the APIs
    - Indications from the MicroProfile straw polls is that they won't migrate to Jakarta if we enforce namespace
- Ongoing tracking spreadsheet of specifications progressing through the JESP specification version lifecycle
- Issue #55 - TCK Archive Format [Ed Bratt]
    - Check in on Ed Bratt's PR: *pending*
    - Not discussed
- Issue #83 - Clean up and clarify how to list TCK service releases on spec pages [Andrew Pielage]
    - Check on progress of pull requests
    - Not discussed
- Issue #74 - TCK challenge automatic acceptance - [Ed Bratt]
    - Check on progress of specifications
    - Not discussed
- Issue #58 - TCK challenge templates [Andrew Pielage]

    - Check on progress of pull requests
    - Not discussed
- Issue #82 - Consistent approach for TCK challenge exclusions [Ed Bratt]
    - Carry over from February 19th: TCK Process should be updated with something akin to Scott Starks suggestion.
    - Not discussed
- 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