

2
3
4
5
6
7
8

JCP Process Document

Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)
Comments to: pmo@jcp.org
Copyright (c) 1996 - 2011 Oracle America, Inc.

CONTENTS

I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
II	DEFINITIONS	2
III	THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM	6
1.	GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	6
1.1	EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	6
1.2	EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	8
1.3	JSR DEADLINES.....	9
1.4	COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	9
1.5	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	9
1.6	PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	10
1.7	ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	10
2.	INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION	10
2.1	INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	10
2.2	JSR REVIEW	12
2.3	JSR APPROVAL BALLOT	12
2.4	FORM THE EXPERT GROUP	12
3.	DRAFT RELEASES.....	13
3.1	WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION	13
3.2	EARLY DRAFT REVIEW	13
3.3	PUBLIC REVIEW	13
3.4	PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT	13
4.	FINAL RELEASE.....	14
4.1	PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT	14
4.2	FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT	14
4.3	FINAL RELEASE	15
5.	MAINTENANCE.....	16
5.1	MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	16
5.2	MAINTENANCE REVIEW	16
5.3	MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	17
6.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	17
6.1	SCOPE	17
6.2	MEMBERSHIP	17
6.3	EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	17
6.4	EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM	18
7.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES	19

I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The international Java community develops and evolves Java™ technology specifications using the Java Community Process (JCP). The JCP produces high-quality specifications using an inclusive, Consensus building approach that produces a Specification, a Reference Implementation (to prove the Specification can be implemented), and a Technology Compatibility Kit (a suite of tests, tools, and documentation that is used to test implementations for compliance with the Specification).

Experience has shown that the best way to produce a technology specification is to gather a group of industry experts who have a deep understanding of the technology in question and then have a strong technical lead work with that group to create a first draft. Consensus around the form and content of the draft is then built using an iterative review process that allows an ever-widening audience to review and comment on the document.

This version of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of JSR 348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group.

An Executive Committee (EC) representing a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other members of the Java community is responsible for approving the passage of Specifications through the JCP's various stages and for reconciling discrepancies between Specifications and their associated test suites. There are two ECs: one to oversee the Java technologies for the desktop/server space (with responsibility for the Java SE™ and Java EE™ Specifications) and the other to oversee the Java technologies for the consumer/embedded space (with responsibility for the Java ME™ Specification). The EC's are considering merging the two bodies into a single one in the near future, so newly elected EC members should be aware that their terms may vary from what is specified in section 6.4, "EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM"

There are four major stages in this version of the JCP:

1. **INITIATION:** A Specification targeted at the desktop/server or consumer/embedded space is initiated by community member(s) and approved for development by the responsible EC. A group of experts is formed to assist the Spec Lead with the development of the Specification.
2. **DRAFT RELEASES:** The Expert Group develops the Specification through an iterative process, releasing drafts for public review and comment. After the formal Public Review the EC holds a ballot on whether the JSR should proceed to the Final Release stage.
3. **FINAL RELEASE:** The Spec Lead submits the Specification to the PMO for publication as the Proposed Final Draft. When the RI and TCK are completed, and the RI passes the TCK, the Specification, the RI, and the TCK are submitted to the PMO, who circulates them to the responsible EC for final approval.
4. **MAINTENANCE:** The Specification, Reference Implementation, and Technology Compatibility Kit are updated in response to ongoing requests for clarification, interpretation, enhancements, and revisions. The responsible EC reviews proposed changes to the Specification and indicates which can be carried out immediately and which will require the changes to be implemented in a new JSR.

II DEFINITIONS

Appeal Ballot: The EC ballot to override a first-level decision on a TCK test challenge.

Change Log: An area accessible from the JSR Page that lists all changes made to the

Specification, RI, TCK, and licenses since the previous Release. A Change Log has six sections: PROPOSED (changes not yet made to the Specification), ACCEPTED (changes made to the Specification), DEFERRED (changes to be considered in a new JSR), RI (changes made to the RI), TCK (changes made to the TCK) and LICENSING (changes to the licensing terms)

Consensus: The use of the word “consensus” refers always to “rough consensus” as defined in section 3.3 of the IETF's [RFC 2418](#): “[...] consensus does not require that all participants agree although this is, of course, preferred. In general, the dominant view of the working group shall prevail. (However, “dominance” is not to be determined on the basis of volume or persistence, but rather a more general sense of agreement). [...] Note that 51% of the working group does not qualify as “rough consensus” and 99% is better than rough. It is up to the Chair to determine if rough consensus has been reached (IETF Working Group Guidelines and Procedures).

Contribution Agreement: A legal agreement defining the terms, particularly those concerning the grant of intellectual property rights, under which contributions are made to a project.

Dormant Specification (Dormant): A Specification that does not have an identified Specification Lead or Maintenance Lead. All Specifications become Dormant at the end of their life cycles.

Early Draft Review: A 30 to 90 day period during which the public reviews and comments on the draft Specification.

Elected Seat: An EC seat filled by the election process described in section 6.4.4.

Executive Committee (EC): The Members who guide the evolution of the Java technologies. The EC represents a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other Members of the Java Community. EC members are appointed in an annual election process. The EC Policies and Procedures are in the EC Standing Rules, which is a separate document.

Expert: A Member or Member Representative who has expert knowledge and is an active practitioner in the technology covered by the JSR.

Expert Group (EG): The group of Experts who develop or make significant revisions to a Specification.

Final Approval Ballot: The 14-day EC ballot to approve the Final Draft along with its associated RI and TCK.

Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot: The 14-day EC ballot to reconsider an initial rejection of a Final Draft, RI, and TCK.

Final Draft: The final draft of the Specification that will be put forward for EC approval.

Final Release: The final stage in the JSR development process when the Specification, RI, and TCK have been completed and can be licensed by implementors.

89 **First-Level TCK Appeals Process:** The process defined by the Spec Lead that allows
90 implementers of the Specification to appeal one or more tests defined by the
91 Specification's TCK.

92 **Item Exception Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include specific
93 change items in a Maintenance Release.

94 **Java Community Process (JCP):** The formal process described in this document for
95 developing or revising Java technology Specifications.

96 **Java Community Process Member (Member):** A company, organization, or individual
97 that has signed the JSPA and is abiding by its terms. In the case of an individual, that
98 person may represent himself/herself, or may represent or be otherwise empowered to act
99 on behalf of a company or organization. No more than five **individual Members** are
100 permitted at any one time as representatives of a company or organization.

101 **Java Specification (Specification):** A written specification for some aspect of the Java
102 technology. This includes the language, virtual machine, Platform Editions, Profiles, and
103 application programming interfaces.

104 **Java Specification Request (JSR):** The document submitted to the PMO by one or more
105 Members to propose the development of a new Specification or significant revision to an
106 existing Specification.

107 **Java Specification Participation Agreement (JSPA):** A one-year renewable agreement
108 between Oracle America and a company, organization or individual that allows the latter
109 entities to participate in the Java Community Process.

110 **JCP Web Site:** The web site where anyone can stay informed about JCP activities,
111 download draft and final Specifications, and follow the progress of Specifications through
112 the JCP.

113 **JSR Approval Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine if the JSR should be approved.

114 **JSR Reconsideration Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine if a revised JSR should be
115 approved.

116 **JSR Page:** Each JSR has a dedicated public web page on the JCP Web Site where the
117 JSR's history is recorded and where other relevant information about the JSR is published.

118 **JSR Renewal Ballot:** An EC ballot to confirm that a JSR should continue in its work.

119 **JSR Renewal Reconsideration Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine if a revised JSR should
120 continue its work.

121 **JSR Review:** A 4 week period during which the public can review and comment on a new
122 JSR.

123 **Maintenance Lead (ML):** The Expert responsible for maintaining the Specification.

124 **Maintenance Release:** The final stage in the JSR maintenance process when the

125 Specification, RI, and TCK have been updated and can be licensed by implementors.

126 **Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Maintenance
127 Release when Members and the public consider and comment on the change items listed
128 in the PROPOSED section of the Change Log.

129 **Maintenance Review Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine whether the changes proposed by
130 a Maintenance Lead are appropriate for a Maintenance Release.

131 **Member Representative:** A person who is an employee or agent of a Member company
132 or a Member organization and who has been authorized by that Member to represent its
133 interests within the JCP.

134 **Platform Edition Specification (Platform Edition):** A Specification that defines a
135 baseline API set that provides a foundation upon which applications, other APIs, and
136 Profiles can be built. There are currently three Platform Edition Specifications: Java SE,
137 Java EE, and Java ME.

138 **Profile Specification (Profile):** A Specification that references one of the Platform Edition
139 Specifications and zero or more other JCP Specifications (that are not already a part of a
140 Platform Edition Specification). APIs from the referenced Platform Edition must be included
141 according to the referencing rules set out in that Platform Edition Specification. Other
142 referenced Specifications must be referenced in their entirety.

143 **Program Management Office (PMO):** The group within Oracle America that is
144 responsible for administering the JCP and chairing the EC.

145 **Proposed Final Draft:** The version of the draft Specification that will be used as the basis
146 for the RI and TCK.

147 **Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot :** The EC ballot to determine if a draft should
148 proceed after Public Review.

149 **Public Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot :** The EC ballot to determine if a
150 revised draft should proceed after Public Review.

151 **Public Review:** A 30 to 90 day period when the public can review and comment on the
152 draft Specification.

153 **Ratified Seat:** An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in section 6.4.3.

154 **Reference Implementation (RI):** The prototype or "proof of concept" implementation of a
155 Specification.

156 **Release:** A Final Release or a Maintenance Release

157 **Specification Lead (Spec Lead):** The Expert responsible for leading the effort to develop
158 or make significant revisions to a Specification and for completing the associated
159 Reference Implementation and Technology Compatibility Kit. A Spec Lead (or the Spec
160 Lead's host company or organization) must be a Java Community Process Member.

Spec Lead Member: The individual JCP member who is a Spec Lead, or otherwise the company or organization that employs, and is represented by, the Spec Lead.

Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK): The suite of tests, tools, and documentation that allows an organization to determine if its implementation is compliant with the Specification.

Transfer Ballot: The EC ballot to approve transfer of ownership of a Specification, RI, and TCK from one Member to another Member.¹

Umbrella Java Specification Request (UJSR): A JSR that defines or revises a Platform Edition or Profile Specification. A UJSR proceeds through the JCP like any other JSR.

The use of the term **day** or **days** in this document refers to calendar days unless otherwise specified.

III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESSSM PROGRAM

1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

Each Expert Group is free to use the working style that it finds most productive and appropriate, so long as this is compatible with the requirements specified in this document. For example, EGs may choose to operate by seeking Consensus or by voting on issues where there is disagreement.

As specified below, Expert Groups must operate in a transparent manner, enabling the public to observe their deliberations and to provide feedback. All feedback must be taken into consideration and public responses must be provided. In the initial JSR submission the Spec Lead must specify the transparency mechanisms (for example, the mailing lists and issue tracker) that the Expert Group intends to adopt, and must provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO will publish this information on the public JSR Page. The Spec Lead must also provide a pointer to any Terms of Use required to use the collaboration tools so that the EC and prospective EG members can judge whether they are compatible with the JSPA.

If the EG changes its collaboration tools during the life of the JSR these changes must be reported to the PMO, who will update the relevant information on the JSR Page. Any such changes must ensure that previously-published information is incorporated into the new tools. When voting to approve a JSR's transition to the next stage EC members are expected to take into consideration the extent to which the Spec Lead is meeting the transparency requirements.

Spec Leads should be aware of their obligations under the JSPA to license the output of their JSR on Fair, Reasonable, and Non Discriminatory terms, and to make certain patent grants. Incorporating feedback provided through public email lists or forums without ensuring that the provider has signed the JSPA or an equivalent Contribution Agreement may make it impossible to meet these requirements or may expose the Spec Lead Member to legal liability.

The use of *Confidential materials* (as defined in the JSPA) by Expert Groups limits transparency, is strongly discouraged, and will be prohibited in a future version of the Process. If the Spec Lead intends to permit the use of *Confidential materials* (such as emails, drafts or submissions marked as

¹ Transfer of ownership does not mean transfer of IP rights, only transfer of the right to start again. The new Spec Lead can, however, negotiate a transfer of IP with the old Spec Lead.

199 *Confidential*), this must be specified in the initial Java Specification Request. Expert Groups may also
200 choose to keep information private by means other than marking it as Confidential (for example, by not
201 publishing it on a publicly available site).²

202 **1.1.1 MAILING LISTS**

203 All substantive business must be carried out on a public mailing list designated by the Spec Lead. The
204 purpose of this list is to keep observers aware of important issues and, minor administrative issues
205 that distract from substantive business should therefore be kept private. A private mailing list should
206 be used for minor administrative matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or
207 adding new features to the JSR, changes to the membership of the Expert Group, publication of the
208 agenda, and on-going debate about JSR specifics. Non-substantive administrative matters such as
209 notifications of meeting schedules, messages directing Expert Group members to particular
210 documents or URLs, and reminders about voting or task assignments should be excluded from the
211 public mailing list.

212 If the Expert Group uses a mailing list writable only by Expert Group members, then the EG must also
213 provide a publicly readable and writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from
214 the public.

215 **1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING**

216 Issues must be tracked through a publicly readable issue tracking mechanism. Formal comments
217 must be entered into the issue-tracker, and all open issues must be responded to publicly before the
218 JSR moves to the next stage. If the EG decides to reject a suggested change then the response in the
219 issue-tracker must include a rationale for rejection. Responses stating that the suggested change will
220 be made at a later date (but before the JSR or Maintenance Release is finalized) are permissible; in
221 these cases the issue should be kept open until the change has actually been made. The issue-
222 tracking mechanism must make a clear distinction between open, responded-to, and closed issues so
223 the EC can clearly judge whether the EG has met its obligation to respond to all issues.

224 EC members, when voting to approve a JSR's advance to the next stage, should take into
225 consideration the EG's responses to comments, and may insist that a suggestion or issue the EG
226 considers resolved be re-addressed before the JSR moves on.

227

228 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

229

230 As described in Section 2.2.1 below, the proposed licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR
231 submission. The Specification License must not be modified after initial submission since to do so
232 could invalidate IP grants. It may be necessary, however, to modify the proposed RI or TCK license.
233 Any such changes must be disclosed when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public
234 posting or review.

235 During the lifetime of the JSR the Spec Lead must continue to offer the RI and TCK licenses that were
236 published at the time of Final Release, with the exception that reasonable increases in price are
237 permitted. At subsequent Maintenance Releases alternate RI or TCK licenses may also be offered so
238 long as all changes are disclosed in the Change Log, but licensees must be free to choose the original
239 terms if they wish. For example, existing licensees who do not wish to accept a modified license when
240 required to adopt a newer TCK will have the option to license the updated TCK under the previous
241 terms.

2 The EC intends to remove the Confidentiality language from the next version of the JSPA.

242 When a newer version of a technology is created through a follow-on JSR the Specification, RI, and
243 TCK license terms for the new JSR may differ from those offered for the previous JSR, but any such
244 changes must be disclosed during JSR submission. The original terms for the previous JSR must be
245 offered for the lifetime of that JSR.

246

247 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

248 **1.2.1 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

249 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec
250 Lead, the Expert Group, with the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally
251 contributed the Expert, if any, and request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such
252 replacement is forthcoming, the Expert Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec
253 Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member
254 who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and work with that organization to find a suitable
255 replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a
256 replacement from amongst other Members.

257 **1.2.2 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

258 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts
259 is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,
260 uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
261 such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot
262 be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and
263 request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec
264 Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is a
265 Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.
266 If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from
267 further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to
268 the EC by following the process outlined in Section 1.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

269 **1.2.3 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

270 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting
271 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These
272 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be
273 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
274 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any
275 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be
276 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to
277 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is a Member Representative the PMO
278 should ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead, or it may seek to put in place an alternative Spec
279 Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a Transfer Ballot as specified in section 5.1.1 of this
280 document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the EC will initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot to
281 determine whether the JSR should be shut down.

282 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

283 If a JSR does not begin Early Draft Review within the first 12 months following the completion of its
284 initial JSR Approval Ballot (JSR Approval), or does not begin Public Review within 2 years of JSR

285 Approval, or has not achieved Final Release within 3 years of JSR Approval, then the EC should
286 initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot unless it is agreed that there are extraordinary circumstances that justify
287 the delay. The PMO will inform the Spec Lead and Expert Group of this decision and will request the
288 Spec Lead and Expert Group to prepare a public statement to the EC. The JSR Renewal Ballot will
289 start 30 days after the request. If the JSR Renewal Ballot is approved by the EC, then another renewal
290 ballot cannot be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

291 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to
292 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not
293 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC will stand and the JSR will be
294 closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO will forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR Renewal
295 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members, together
296 with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR will be
297 closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the
298 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 5).

299 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

300 The Spec Lead is responsible for defining the process whereby the TCK is used to certify
301 implementations of the JSR as compatible. The Maintenance Lead must submit to the PMO at least
302 quarterly, and at every Maintenance Release, a list of all implementations that have been certified as
303 compatible and that have been released publicly or commercially. The PMO will publish this
304 information on the JCP website. If the Spec Lead submits the information in the form of a pointer to an
305 already published list the PMO may choose simply to reference that list rather than duplicate it.

306 TCK license terms must permit implementors to freely and publicly discuss the testing process and
307 detailed TCK test results with all interested parties.

308 **1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

309 **1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY**

310 All substantive Executive Committee business should be conducted in the most transparent manner
311 possible. EC transparency requirements are specified in a separate document, EC Standing Rules.

312 **1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS**

313 During Draft Review periods EC members are strongly encouraged to have one or more technical
314 members of their organizations review the draft in order to uncover possible duplication of features or
315 services between the draft and other Specifications. EC members should inform the Expert Group of
316 any such discoveries using the feedback mechanism specified by the Spec Lead. EC feedback is
317 particularly important to the Expert Group, and EC members are encouraged not to wait until ballot
318 periods to raise concerns and issues.

319 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

320 Materials to be posted on the JCP website for review, comment, or any other official EG or EC
321 business should be submitted to the PMO, which will post them on the website and announce their
322 availability to Members and the public within seven days of receipt.

323 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

324 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any EG member can appeal to the EC regarding a

325 decision, an action or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that affects EG
326 participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means. An appeal
327 must be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO (pmo@jcp.org) in all cases, even if it
328 affects the PMO. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely, with a
329 short and relevant Subject: line, and provide all relevant documentation to support the appeal. The
330 PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than seven days after receipt. The EC shall then
331 respond to the appellant within 30 days, either with a resolution or with a request for clarification
332 and/or further documentation.

333 **2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION**

334 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

335 One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant
336 revision to an existing one, by submitting the JSR Proposal through the JCP website, as described in
337 the [Spec Lead Guide](#). Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without
338 explanation at any time prior to the completion of the JSR Approval Ballot (see section 2.3) upon
339 request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.

340 The following is some of the information required to be included with each JSR:

- 341 • the Members making the request (the submitters), the proposed Spec Lead, and the initial
342 members of the Expert Group.
- 343 • a description of the proposed Specification.
- 344 • the reason(s) for developing or revising it.
- 345 • the primary Platform Edition, as well as any consideration given to other Platform Editions.
- 346 • an estimated development schedule.
- 347 • any preexisting documents, technology descriptions, or implementations that might be used as
348 a starting point.
- 349 • a transparency plan, which outlines the tools and techniques that the Spec Lead will use,
350 during the creation and development of the Specification, and for communicating the progress
351 within the Expert Group to Community Members, EC Members and the public. The EC will
352 expect the Spec Lead to operate the JSR in accordance with this plan.

353 **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

354 Existing Specifications, together with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated
355 Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 5 of this document. Maintenance Lead
356 Members are expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK while
357 respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. Maintenance Leads
358 will therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they will not
359 have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That will be decided by
360 the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community Member.
361 Submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous Expert
362 Group to join the revision effort.

363 **2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION**

364 Changes to the Java programming language, the Java virtual machine (JVM), the Java Native
365 Interface (JNI), packages in the "java.*" space, or other packages delivered only as part of Java SE,
366 have the potential to seriously disrupt the installed base if carried out inconsistently across the
367 Platform Editions. In order to protect the installed base, any such changes can only be accepted and
368 carried out within a UJSR for Java SE.

369 In order to guard against fragmentation, new Platform Edition Specifications will not substantially
370 duplicate existing Platform Editions or Profiles.

371 **2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS**

372 All new or revised Specifications must be compatible with the most recent versions of the targeted
373 Platform Edition Specifications. In order to achieve this, all UJSRs to define new Profile Specifications
374 or revise existing Profile Specifications must reference the latest version of the Platform Edition
375 Specification they are based upon.

376 **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

377 The technology that a JSR defines can be delivered as part of a Profile or Platform Edition, it can be
378 delivered stand-alone, or both. The JSR submission form requires the submitter to state whether the
379 JSR's RI and TCK should be delivered as part of a Profile or Platform Edition, in stand-alone manner,
380 or both. The final decision whether a specific JSR is included in a Profile or a Platform Edition is made
381 by the Spec Lead and Expert Group of that Platform Edition JSR or Profile JSR, and confirmed by the
382 EC ballots on those JSRs. If the Platform Edition or Profile JSR turns down the request for inclusion,
383 then the JSR for the API will be required to deliver a stand-alone RI and TCK.

384 Technologies may be incorporated into a Profile or Platform Edition after having been initially delivered
385 standalone. A JSR for a new version of an API that proposes to become part of a Profile or Platform
386 Edition and is considering discontinuing stand-alone availability must state the rationale for this
387 change. The public must be informed of the intention to discontinue the availability of the standalone
388 RI and TCK one JSR submission in advance.

389 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

390 When a JSR is received, the PMO will give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the appropriate EC
391 (or to both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its JSR Page, announce the proposed JSR to
392 the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the JSR's public feedback
393 mailing list. Comments will be forwarded to the EC for its consideration and will be made available
394 from the JSR Page (similar comments may be consolidated.). Members who are interested in joining
395 the Expert Group (should the JSR be approved) should identify themselves by submitting a
396 nomination form to the PMO.

397 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

398 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for developing the Reference Implementation and Technology
399 Compatibility Kit and for licensing them as described in the JSPA. The Spec Lead Member must
400 provide the EC with complete copies of the proposed Specification, RI and TCK licenses no later than
401 the start of JSR Review. The licenses will be published on the public JSR page. EC members should
402 provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community as a whole might react to the
403 terms. If the EC Consensus is that the proposed licensing terms are not compatible with the licensing
404 guidelines established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the proposed JSR will be delayed until
405 Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter. The opinion of Oracle legal will be the final decision on
406 the matter.

407 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

408 After the JSR Review, EC members will review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their
409 ballot as specified in Section 6 below to decide if the JSR should be approved.

410 If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO will send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who may

411 revise the JSR and resubmit it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the original
412 EC decision will stand and the JSR will be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the PMO will post it to
413 the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC members for a JSR
414 Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR will be closed.

415 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

416 Within 14 days of a JSR being approved, the PMO instructs the identified Spec Lead to form the
417 Expert Group. If the Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the Community before the
418 JSR is approved, the PMO will request the preliminary Expert Group to choose a replacement from
419 among themselves who is willing to take on the duties defined in this document.

420 There is no size limit on the Expert Group. The Spec Lead may add additional Experts at any time
421 provided the existing EG members are consulted. New members may be added, for example, to
422 increase diversity of opinion.

423 Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by
424 submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page. The nomination, together
425 with the Spec Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about this matter, and
426 any other official decision related to EG composition, including decisions to remove or replace EG
427 members, must be made public via the EG's public mailing list.

428 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

429 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

430 The Expert Group should begin work by considering the requirements set forth in the JSR, any
431 contributed documents or technology descriptions, comments received during JSR Review and, if this
432 is a revision of an existing Specification, the Change Log kept by the Maintenance Lead (see section
433 5). Additional input can be obtained from discussions with other Members, industry groups, software
434 developers, end-users, and academics. The goal is to define requirements and then write a draft
435 Specification suitable for review by the Community and the public.

436 When the Expert Group decides that the first draft is ready for review, the Spec Lead will send the
437 draft, along with any additional files required for review, to the PMO. The Spec Lead should also
438 suggest the length of the Early Draft Review period if the Expert Group feels it should go beyond the
439 minimum 30 days.

440 Multiple Early Drafts (and Early Draft Reviews) are encouraged where the Expert Group feels that this
441 would be helpful.

442 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

443 Refinement of the draft Specification begins when the PMO posts it to the JCP Web Site and
444 announces the start of Early Draft Review. Anyone can download and comment on the draft. The goal
445 of Early Draft Review is to get the draft Specification into a form suitable for Public Review as quickly
446 as possible by uncovering and correcting major problems with the draft. Early Draft Review is an early
447 access review, and should ideally take place when the Specification still has some unresolved issues.
448 The public's participation in Early Draft Review is an important part of the JCP. In the past, comments
449 from the public have raised fundamental architectural and technological issues that have considerably
450 improved some Specifications.

451 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

452 If the Expert Group makes major revisions to the draft during Early Draft Review, the Spec Lead
453 should send the revised draft, along with a synopsis of the changes, to the PMO who publish these
454 online and make them available for download by the public.

455 After the Early Draft Review period has ended, the Expert Group can make any additional changes to
456 the draft it deems necessary in response to comments before submitting the draft to the PMO for the
457 next review.

458 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

459 Public Review begins when the PMO posts a new draft Specification on the JCP Web Site and
460 announces its availability for public review and comment.

461 The Spec Lead is responsible for ensuring that all comments are read and considered. If those
462 comments result in revisions to the draft, and those revisions result in major changes (in the opinion of
463 the Expert Group), then the Spec Lead must send an updated draft (with a summary of the changes)
464 to the PMO before the review period ends. The PMO will post the new draft and the change summary
465 on the JCP Web Site and will notify the public that the new draft is available.

466 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

467 The Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot starts when the Public Review closes. At the close of
468 balloting, all comments submitted by EC members with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert
469 Group by the PMO.

470 If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in
471 response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised
472 draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC will stand and the JSR will be
473 closed. If a revision is received, the PMO will forward it to the EC and initiate a Public Draft
474 Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members
475 with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR will be
476 closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the
477 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 5).

478 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

479 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

480 If the Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot (or Reconsideration Ballot) is successful, the Expert
481 Group will prepare the Proposed Final Draft of the Specification by completing any revisions it deems
482 necessary in response to comments received. The Spec Lead will then send the Proposed Final Draft
483 to the PMO, who will post it on the JCP Web Site for public download.

484 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

485 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for the completion of both the RI and the TCK. JSRs that are
486 assigned to both ECs are required to support both environments, which may require a separate RI and
487 TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK uncover areas of the Specification that were under-
488 defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead will work with the Expert Group to correct those
489 deficiencies and then send a revised Specification together with a summary of the changes to the
490 PMO. Information will be posted to the JCP Web Site. The Expert Group will continue to consider any
491 further comments received during this time.

4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS

The Spec Lead is also responsible for establishing a clearly defined First Level TCK Appeals Process to address challenges to tests contained in the TCK. This process must be described in the TCK documentation. Implementers who are not satisfied with a first level decision should appeal to the EC by documenting their concerns in an email message to the PMO. The PMO will circulate the request to the EC, together with any information received from the ML concerning the rationale for the first-level decision, and initiate a 7-day Appeal Ballot.

4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT

Depending on the nature of the problem, a successful TCK challenge will require updating one or more of the TCK, the Specification, or the RI. Within one month of the close of a successful TCK Appeal Ballot the Maintenance Lead must update these deliverables as necessary and record the changes in the relevant sections of the Change Log. The modified Change Log, the Specification (if changed,) and URLs for the updated RI and/or TCK must be delivered to the PMO, who will publish them on the JCP website.

4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT

When the Expert Group is satisfied that the TCK provides adequate test coverage, the RI correctly implements the Specification, and the RI passes the TCK, the Spec Lead will send the Final Draft of the Specification to the PMO together with instructions on how EC members can obtain the RI and TCK for evaluation. The PMO will circulate the materials to the EC and initiate the Final Approval Ballot. At the close of balloting, all EC comments will be sent to the Expert Group by the PMO.

The TCK submitted as part of the Final Draft must meet the following requirements:

- Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, a definition and explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be met in addition to passing the TCK tests, and any other information needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation).
- Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and recording of results.
- Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality. This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the required API signatures of the spec are completely implemented and that no non-specified APIs are included in the JSR's namespace.

If the Final Approval Ballot fails, the Spec Lead will have 30 days to revise the Specification, RI, and TCK in response to EC concerns and to resubmit modified materials to the PMO.

If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC will stand, the PMO will close the JSR, and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 5).

If a response is received, the PMO will circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members will be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will be closed

536 and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the Spec
537 Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification.

538 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

539 Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot or Reconsideration Ballot, the PMO will publish on
540 the JCP website the Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK and will
541 announce the availability of these materials to both Members and the public. The published TCK
542 information must include a means for any interested party to obtain a copy of the TCK documentation
543 at no charge. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The
544 Spec Lead will typically be the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and
545 others for aid in that role.

546 The Maintenance Lead must ensure that the links to the RI and TCK remain valid through the lifetime
547 of the Specification. If the links become broken or non-functional, the Maintenance Lead will have 30
548 days following notification from the PMO of the invalid links to correct them. If the problems are not
549 corrected within 30 days, the Specification must reenter the Process at the Proposed Final Draft or
550 Maintenance Review stage as appropriate, and complete the Final Release or Maintenance Release
551 process again. NOTE: IP rights granted when the JSR made any previous Releases are not affected
552 by such a change in status.

553 **5. MAINTENANCE**

554 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

555 The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,
556 and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A
557 Maintenance Lead will therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions to
558 their Specification but will not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take
559 place (see section 2.1.1).

560 The public may submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification
561 by logging issues through the JSR's issue-tracking mechanism.

562 The ML will consider all requests and will decide how and if the Specification should be updated in
563 response. The ML is not required to do all these tasks alone, but is free to consult with the former
564 members of the Expert Group, or any other sources, to assist with the Maintenance duties.

565 All changes proposed by the ML will make their way into the Specification by either the Maintenance
566 Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a Maintenance
567 Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the implementation of existing
568 APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Modifications to existing APIs or the addition of new
569 APIs should be deferred to a new JSR.

570 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

571 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work at any time (including discontinuing maintenance
572 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)
573 the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member
574 who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot
575 within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot
576 succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can
577 be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then the PMO will declare the Specification to be Dormant and
578 no further maintenance can be carried out. No further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO

579 unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case the PMO will have again a month to initiate a
580 Transfer Ballot.

581 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

582 The ML will document all proposed Specification changes in the PROPOSED section of the Change
583 Log and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance
584 Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received through the issue tracker and must
585 indicate the disposition of each comment (e.g. deferred with a brief explanation, rejected with a brief
586 explanation, included in the Change Log proposal.) This summary will be posted along with the
587 Change Log on the JSR Page. The PMO will then make a public announcement and begin the review.

588 The ML may choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received
589 during the review.

590 At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO will initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.
591 During this ballot EC members should vote "yes" if they agree that the Maintenance Release should
592 go ahead as the Spec Lead has proposed, and "no" if they believe that one or more of the changes
593 proposed by the ML is inappropriate for a Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on
594 JSR. "No" votes must be accompanied by comments in which the offending changes are identified and
595 the reasons for the objection are explained.

596 If there are any "no" votes the PMO will within two weeks initiate an Item Exception Ballot for each
597 change that EC members have objected to.

598 NOTE: there is no minimum number of "yes" votes required to move forward with the proposed
599 Maintenance Release, and "no" votes cannot prevent a Release unless the ML is unwilling to defer
600 items subsequently disallowed in an Item Exception Ballot.

601 At the end of Maintenance Review and any subsequent Item Exception Ballots, the ML will update the
602 Specification, moving all approved revisions from the PROPOSED to the ACCEPTED section of the
603 Change Log. Items voted down in an Item Exception Ballot must be moved to the DEFERRED section
604 of the log. Other changes not incorporated into the Specification may be left in the PROPOSED
605 section or moved to the DEFERRED section at the ML's discretion.

606 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

607 At any time after a Maintenance Review Ballot and possible Item Exception Ballot the Spec Lead will
608 update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Change Log as necessary and submit them to the PMO for
609 publication in a Maintenance Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have been
610 made, and publishes the Specification, the Change Log, and pointers to the RI and TCK on the JSR
611 Web Page.

612 NOTE: until the Maintenance Release stage is reached any proposed changes should be considered
613 preliminary and subject to change, and therefore should not be implemented in shipping products.

614 **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

615 **6.1 SCOPE**

616 The Executive Committee (EC) oversees the development and evolution of the Java technologies
617 within the JCP.

618 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

619 There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and
620 EE together. Each EC is composed of 16 Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.
621 has a permanent voting seat on each EC. (Oracle representatives must not be members of the PMO.)
622 The ECs are led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.

623 Should one Member on the EC acquire a majority ownership of another EC member, one of those
624 members must resign his or her seat by the effective date of the acquisition.

625 NOTE: In the near future the EC intends to merge the two ECs, and modify the number of members
626 and possibly their terms of office.

627 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 628 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 629 2. Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.
- 630 3. Approve draft Specifications after Public Review.
- 631 4. Ensure that publicly expressed issues/concerns with a JSR are addressed by the Expert
632 Group.
- 633 5. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
- 634 6. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
- 635 7. Review proposed maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new
636 JSR.
- 637 8. Approve the transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
- 638 9. Decide when JSRs that have not made sufficient progress through the Process should be
639 withdrawn.
- 640 10. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the
641 organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance
642 may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the
643 EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.
644

645 Members of the Executive Committee shall be dedicated to the principles of full and open competition,
646 in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United States and other
647 nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can result in criminal as well
648 as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on the jurisdiction. In particular, any
649 discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of distribution, division of markets or
650 allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be avoided.

651 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

652 EC members serve three-year terms, which are staggered so that a third of the seats are up for
653 election each year.

654 On each EC there are two Ratified Seats for every Elected Seat (currently 10 Ratified Seats and 5
655 Elected Seats) plus one permanent seat held by Oracle America, Inc.

656 **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

657 EC Members may resign their seats at any time during their term.

658 EC members who fail to remain Java Community Members forfeit their EC seat.

659 Vacated seats will be filled for the remainder of their term by a special election ballot that will be held
660 no later than two months after the resignation (unless the resignation is less than six months before
661 the next scheduled annual election ballot).

662 **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

663 All JCP Members are eligible to vote in ballots for Ratified and Elected Seats subject to the provision
664 that if a Member has majority-ownership of, or is the employer of, one or more other Members, then
665 that group of Members will collectively have 1 vote, which will be cast by the person they designate to
666 be their representative for the ballot in question.

667 Annual elections for Ratified and Elected Seats will be held simultaneously. Voting in these elections
668 will start in the third week of October.

669
670 In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall
671 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask
672 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also
673 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

674 **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

675 Members are selected for the Ratified Seats using a ratification ballot which is carried out as follows:

- 676 • The PMO nominates Members to fill the vacant Ratified Seats with due regard for balanced
677 community and regional representation.
- 678 • Eligible Members will vote to ratify each nominee over a 14-day ballot period.
- 679 • A nominee is ratified by a simple majority of those who cast a vote.
- 680 • If one or more of the nominees are not ratified by the vote, the PMO will nominate additional
681 Members as needed and hold additional ratification ballots until the vacant seats are filled.

682 **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

683 Members are selected for the Elected Seats using an open election process that is carried out as
684 follows:

- 685 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO will post on the public JCP site a complete
686 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,
687 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 688 • Four weeks before the b period the PMO will accept nominations from the Community for a
689 period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that employees of JCP
690 Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such
691 nominations.
- 692 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
693 14-day ballot period.
- 694 • The nominees who receive the most votes will fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 695 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters will be given the opportunity to vote
696 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 697 • Ties will be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt> and
698 using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

699 **7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES**

- 700 1. All JSR ballots will be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 701 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 702 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
703 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
704 vote at all.
- 705 4. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.

5. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
6. Ballots to approve UJSRs that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
7. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 5.1.
8. "No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation of the changes (if any) that would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
9. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
10. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before the JSR can be reinitiated.
11. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast.
12. An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.
13. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot will be approved only if each EC approves it separately.

IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA

Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation Agreement will be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

1. Only EC members can initiate a JSR to revise one of these documents.
2. Each EC must approve the JSR.
3. The Expert Group consists of both ECs with a member of the PMO as Spec Lead.
4. There is no Reference Implementation or Technology Compatibility Kit to be delivered and no TCK appeals process to be defined.