

JCP:2 Process Document

Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)

[Revision date: September 21 2011](#)

Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

Copyright (c) 1996 - 2011 Oracle America, Inc.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
I DEFINITIONS	2
II 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	11
2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT	12
2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP	12
3. DRAFT RELEASES.....	12
3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION	12
3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW	12
3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW	13
3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT	13
4. FINAL RELEASE.....	13
4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT	13
4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT	14
4.3 FINAL RELEASE	15
5. MAINTENANCE.....	15
5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	15
5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW	16
5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	16
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	17
7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES	19
III APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	19

10

11 I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

23 ~~-by means of JSR 348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group-~~
 24 ~~through the JCP~~~~This version of the JCP was developed-~~

25 An Executive Committee (EC) representing a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other
 26 members of the Java community is responsible for approving the passage of Specifications through
 27 the JCP's various stages and for reconciling discrepancies between Specifications and their
 28 associated test suites. There are two ECs: one to oversee the Java technologies for the
 29 desktop/server space (with responsibility for the Java SE™ and Java EE™ Specifications) and the
 30 other to oversee the Java technologies for the consumer/embedded space (with responsibility for the
 31 Java ME™ Specification). The EC's are considering merging the two bodies into a single one in the
 32 near future, so newly elected EC members should be aware that their terms may vary from what is
 33 specified in section ~~6~~5.4, "EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM"

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

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

51 This version of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of JSR

52 | [348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group.](#)

53 | II DEFINITIONS

54 | **Agent:** [an individual - for example an employee, a contractor, or an officer - who is](#)
55 | [authorized to act on behalf of a company or organization.](#)

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

57 | ~~**Change Log:** An area accessible from the JSR Page that lists all changes made to the~~
58 | ~~Specification, RI, TCK, and licenses since the previous release. A Change Log has six~~
59 | ~~sections: PROPOSED (changes not yet made to the Specification), ACCEPTED (changes~~
60 | ~~made to the Specification), DEFERRED (changes to be considered in a new JSR), RI~~
61 | ~~(changes made to the RI), TCK (changes made to the TCK) and LICENSING (changes to~~
62 | ~~the licensing terms)~~

63 | **Ballot:** [See Appeal Ballot, Final Approval Ballot, Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot,](#)
64 | [JSR Approval Ballot, JSR Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Renewal Ballot, JSR Renewal](#)
65 | [Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Withdrawal Ballot, Maintenance Review Ballot, Maintenance](#)
66 | [Renewal Ballot, Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot, Public Draft Specification](#)
67 | [Approval Ballot, Public Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot, Transfer Ballot.](#)

68 | **Contribution Agreement:** [A legal agreement defining the terms, particularly those](#)
69 | [concerning the grant of intellectual property rights, under which contributions are made to](#)
70 | [a project.](#)

71 | ~~**Dormant Specification (Dormant):** A Specification that does not have an identified~~
72 | ~~Maintenance Lead. All Specifications become Dormant at the end of their life cycles. A~~
73 | ~~Specification that the PMO has determined has no assigned Specification Lead or~~
74 | ~~Maintenance Lead, or that is not being actively developed and on which no further~~
75 | ~~development is anticipated.~~

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

78 | **Elected Seat:** An EC seat filled by the election process described in section ~~5.3.46.4.4~~.

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

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

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

88 | **Final Approval Ballot:** The 14-day EC ballot to approve the Final Draft along with its
89 | 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.

First-Level TCK Appeals Process: The process defined by the Spec Lead that allows ~~implementer~~[implementors](#) of the Specification to appeal one or more tests defined by the Specification's TCK. ~~Item Exception Ballot: The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include specific change items in a Maintenance Release.~~

Issue: [an explicit reference to an item defined in an Issue Tracker.](#)

Issue List: [A list of Issues generated from an Issue Tracker, identifying the disposition of each.](#)

Issue Tracker: [A mechanism to allow issues \(problems, tasks, comments, or requests for change\) to be recorded and tracked by priority, status, owner, or other criteria. The Issue Tracker should permit issues to be identified by states such as open, resolved, and closed and should support the assignment of resolution types such as deferred \(postponed to a follow-on release,\) fixed \(implemented,\) challenged \(no satisfactory resolution,\) and rejected \(deemed inappropriate or out of scope.\)](#)

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

Java Community Process Member (Member): A company, organization, or individual that has signed the JSPA and is abiding by its terms.

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

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

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

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

126 | **JSR Approval Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine if the initial JSR submission should be
127 | approved~~The EC ballot to determine if the JSR should be approved.~~

128 | **JSR Reconsideration Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine if a revisededion of an initial JSR
129 | submission should be approved.

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

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

133 | **JSR Renewal Reconsideration Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine if a revised JSR should
134 | continue its work.

135 | **JSR Review:** A ~~four~~4 week period during which the public can review and comment on a
136 | proposed new JSR before the JSR Approval Ballot.

137 | ~~during which the public can review and comment on a new JSR.~~ **JSR Withdrawal Ballot:**
138 | An EC ballot to confirm that a completed JSR that appears to have been abandoned
139 | should be withdrawn.

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

141 | **Maintenance Lead Member:** The individual JCP member who is a Maintenance Lead, or
142 | otherwise the company or organization that is represented by the Maintenance Lead.

143 | **Maintenance Release:** The final stage in the JSR maintenance process when the
144 | Specification, RI, and TCK have been updated and can be licensed by implementors.

145 | **Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Maintenance
146 | Release when Members and the public consider and comment on the change the
147 | Spec~~Maintenance Lead proposes to include in the release, as identified in the associated~~
148 | Issue List.~~items listed in the PROPOSED section of the Change Log.~~

149 | **Maintenance Review Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine whether the changes and time
150 | line proposed by a Maintenance Lead are appropriate for a Maintenance Release.

151 | **Maintenance Renewal Ballot:** a ballot during which EC members vote on whether to
152 | permit a Maintenance Lead to extend the deadline for delivery of materials for
153 | Maintenance Release, or whether the previous Maintenance Review should be rescinded
154 | and the ML be required to start the process again.

155 | **Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot:** An EC ballot to confirm that a completed
156 | Maintenance Release that appears to have been abandoned should be withdrawn.

157 | **Member:** See Agent, Java Community Process Member, Member Associate, Member
158 | Representative.

159 | **Member Associate:** An individual who is associated with a Member organization but is not
160 | an Agent of that organization.

Member Representative: An [employeeAgent](#) of a Member company or ~~an associate of a~~ Member organization who ~~has been approved by the Member to~~ represents [its interests](#) within the JCP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ratified Seat: An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in section ~~5.3.36.4.3~~.

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

Release: [A Final Release or a Maintenance Release](#)

Specification: [See Java Specification.](#)

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

Specification Lead 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

196 allows an organization to determine if its implementation is compliant with the
197 Specification.

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

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

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

204 The use of the words “must”, “must not”, “required”, “shall”, “shall not”, “should”, “should
205 not”, “recommended”, “may” and “optional” in this document is done in accordance with the
206 IETF's RFC 2119.

207 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM

208 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

209 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

210 Each Expert Group is free to use the working style that it finds most productive and appropriate, so
211 long as this is compatible with the requirements specified in this document. For example, EGs may
212 choose to operate by seeking ~~consensus~~to advance only when there is general agreement among its
213 members, or by voting on issues ~~where~~when there is disagreement.

214 As specified below, Expert Groups must operate in a transparent manner, enabling the public to
215 observe their deliberations and to provide feedback. All feedback must be taken into consideration and
216 public responses must be provided. They must maintain a publicly-accessible document archive, from
217 where all of their working materials such as source documents, meeting agendas and minutes, and
218 draft documents can be downloaded. The EC should take the Expert Group's transparency record into
219 consideration when voting on its JSR.

220 In the initial JSR submission the Spec Lead must specify the transparency mechanisms (for example,
221 the ~~mailing lists~~communication mechanisms and ~~issue T~~tracker) that the Expert Group intends to
222 adopt, and must provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO ~~will~~shall
223 publish this information on the public JSR Page. The Spec Lead must also provide a pointer to any
224 Terms of Use required to use the collaboration tools so that the EC and prospective EG members can
225 judge whether they are compatible with the JSPA.

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

231 Spec Leads should be aware of their obligations under the JSPA to license the output of their JSR on
232 Fair, Reasonable, and Non Discriminatory terms, and to make certain patent grants. Incorporating
233 feedback provided through public email ~~aliases~~lists or forums without ensuring that the provider has

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.

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

1.1.1 Mailing Lists~~PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS~~ ~~the EG must also provide a publicly readable and writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from the public. public mailing list is writable only by Expert Group members publication of the agenda, and on-going debate about JSR specifics. Non-substantive administrative matters such as notifications of meeting schedules, messages directing Expert Group members to particular documents or URLs, and reminders about voting or task assignments should be excluded from the public mailing list.~~

~~If the modifications to the reference implementation or the TCK, be used for minor administrative matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or adding new features to the JSR, changes to the membership of the Expert Group, shouldAll substantive business must be carried out on a public mailing list designated by the Spec Lead. The purpose of this list is to keep observers aware of important issues and, minor administrative issues that distract from substantive business should therefore be kept private. A private mailing list~~

Expert Groups may choose to keep purely administrative matters private but all substantive business must be performed in a manner that allows the public to observe their work and to respond to it. All proceedings, discussions, and working documents must be published, and a mechanism must be established to allow the public to provide feedback. One common way of meeting these requirements is through the use of one or more mailing lists, but other alternatives such as blogs, Wikis, and discussion forums may be preferred. Whatever communication mechanisms are chosen, these must include an archiving function so that a record of all communications is preserved. Archives must be readable by the public.³

1.1.2 ~~Issue Tracking~~ISSUE TRACKING

Issues must be tracked through a publicly readable ~~issue tracking mechanism~~Issue Tracker. The Expert Group may choose to use a publicly writable Issue Tracker, thereby permitting the public to log issues directly, or alternatively to identify formal comments in some other manner and to enter them into the Issue Tracker on behalf of the submitter. Whatever mechanism is used, a publicly-readable audit trail of all comments and Issues must be maintained.

Whenever a Spec Lead or a Maintenance Lead submits materials to the PMO for review or ballot they must also provide an Issue List indicating the disposition of all of the Issues that have been logged against the JSR. Issues logged late in the review cycle may be deferred for later consideration, and Issues that are blatantly off-topic or that appear to have submitted maliciously or erroneously may be ignored. ~~Issues logged late in the review cycle to be deferred for later consideration, and for Issues that are blatantly off-topic or that appear to have been submitted maliciously to be ignored. It is permissible for~~

In order to enable EC members to judge whether Issues have been adequately addressed, the Issue

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

³ This should not be interpreted as a requirement that Expert Groups create or maintain audio or video recordings of their meetings.

277 | List must make a clear distinction between Issues that are still open, Issues that have been deferred,
278 | and those that are closed, and must indicate the reason for any change of state.

279 | The PMO shall publish the Issue List or a pointer to it together with the other materials.

280 | EC members should review the supplied Issue List and take it into consideration when casting their
281 | ballot. If they have any reservations or concerns about a 'yes' vote, or if they wish to vote 'no,' they
282 | should accompany their ballot with comments which reference one or more Issues (perhaps logged by
283 | them) that they would like to see addressed in the future. EC members should vote 'no' if they believe
284 | that the Spec Lead or Maintenance Lead has not adequately addressed all Issues including those that
285 | have been rejected or otherwise closed by the Expert Group.

286 | **1.1.3 Response to Comments**

287 | ~~Expert Groups must respond publicly to all comments before a JSR can move to the next stage. All~~
288 | ~~comments regarding a JSR deserve a well-crafted response. Expert groups should review responses~~
289 | ~~prior to release to ensure that the response addresses the specific comment. Responses to similar~~
290 | ~~comments can be consolidated. Comments that are off-topic do not require a response but should be~~
291 | ~~denoted as such. The Executive Committee reserves the right to require that a comment deemed by~~
292 | ~~the Expert Group as off-topic be addressed before the JSR moves to the next stage. A formalized~~
293 | ~~issue-tracking mechanism will help to ensure that all issues raised by the Java community are~~
294 | ~~documented and responded to before the JSR moves to the next stage.~~

295 | **1.1.4 Changes to Licensing Terms CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

296 | ~~terms for a JSR change from one release to the next, the changes must be explicitly~~
297 | ~~listed and explained. Changes to the licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR~~
298 | ~~submission (in the case of a new JSR) or in the Change Log for Maintenance Releases.~~
299 | ~~Subsequent changes to licensing terms during the life of the JSR must be disclosed~~
300 | ~~when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public posting or review.~~

301 | ~~Existing licensees who not wish to accept a modified license when required to adopt a newer TCK will~~
302 | ~~have the option to accept the updated TCK under the previous licensing terms.~~

303 |

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

309 | For as long as a JSR is licensed and while it is legally possible to do so the Spec Lead Member must
310 | offer the RI and TCK licenses that were published at the time of Final Release, with the exception that
311 | reasonable increases in price are permitted. At subsequent Maintenance Releases alternate RI or
312 | TCK licenses may also be offered so long as all changes are disclosed, but licensees must be free to
313 | choose the original terms if they wish. For example, existing licensees who do not wish to accept a
314 | modified license when required to adopt a newer TCK shall have the option to license the updated
315 | TCK under the previous terms. If a JSR changes hands the new Maintenance Lead Member must
316 | present a license with terms comparable to or more favorable to licensees than the existing license.
317 | ~~During the lifetime of the JSR the Spec Lead must continue to offer the RI and TCK licenses that were~~
318 | ~~published at the time of Final Release, with the exception that reasonable increases in price are~~
319 | ~~permitted. At subsequent Maintenance Releases alternate RI or TCK licenses may also be offered so~~
320 | ~~long as all changes are disclosed, but licensees must be free to choose the original terms if they wish.~~
321 | ~~For example, existing licensees who do not wish to accept a modified license when required to adopt~~
322 | ~~a newer TCK shall have the option to license the updated TCK under the previous terms.~~

323 | When a newer version of a technology is created through a follow-on JSR, the Specification, RI, and
324 | TCK license terms for the new JSR may differ from those offered for the previous JSR, but any such
325 | changes must be disclosed during JSR submission. The original terms for the previous JSR must be
326 | offered for ~~the~~as long as that ~~lifetime of that~~ JSR is licensed.

327 | **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

328 | **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

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

332 | ~~-Any JCP Member, Member Representative, or Member Associate may request to join an Expert~~
333 | ~~Group at any time by submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page.~~
334 | ~~Member Associates, since they are not covered by the JSPA of their organization, must sign the JSPA~~
335 | ~~in their own right before they ~~can~~ will be permitted to join an Expert Group. Details of such requests,~~
336 | ~~including the organizational affiliation of the requester, together with the Spec Lead's official response,~~
337 | ~~substantive deliberations within the EG about the matter, and any other official decisions related to EG~~
338 | ~~membership must be published through the EG's public communication channel. The PMO will ensure~~
339 | ~~that the JSR Page lists the Members who are members of the EG together with the names of~~
340 | ~~individual Member Representatives or Member Associates where appropriate.~~

341 | **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

342 | An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. ~~When this happens, the Spec Lead-~~
343 | ~~should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to~~
344 | ~~find a replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from-~~
345 | ~~another Member. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of its-~~
346 | ~~members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group, with~~
347 | ~~the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and~~
348 | ~~request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such replacement is forthcoming, the Expert~~
349 | ~~Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the~~
350 | ~~Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any,~~
351 | ~~and work with that organization to find a suitable replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not~~
352 | ~~otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from amongst other Members.~~

353 | **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

354 | There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts
355 | is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,
356 | uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
357 | such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot
358 | be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and
359 | request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec
360 | Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is ~~an~~
361 | Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.
362 | If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from
363 | further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to
364 | the EC by following the process outlined in Section ~~0-6~~1.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

365 1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD

366 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting
367 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These
368 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be
369 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
370 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any
371 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be
372 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to
373 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is an Member Representative the PMO
374 ~~should~~shall ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead. If the Member refuses to do so, the PMO shall
375 ~~, or it may~~ seek to put in place an alternative Spec Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a transfer
376 ballot as specified in section 5.1.2 of this document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the
377 EC ~~may disband the Expert Group~~shall initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot to determine whether the JSR
378 should be shut down.

379 1.3 JSR DEADLINES

380 If a JSR does not begin Early Draft Review within ~~the first 129~~ months ~~following the of~~ completionng of
381 its ~~initial~~ JSR Approval Ballot ~~(JSR Approval)~~, or does not begin Public Review within ~~212 months~~years
382 of ~~first submitting an Early Draft~~ JSR Approval, or ~~has~~does not ~~reach~~ achieved Final Release within
383 ~~312 months~~ years of of commencing Public Review JSR Approval, then ~~a majority of~~ the EC
384 ~~may~~should initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot unless it is agreed that there are extraordinary circumstances
385 that justify the delay. The PMO ~~will~~shall inform the Spec Lead and Expert Group of this decision and
386 will request the Spec Lead and Expert Group to prepare a public statement to the EC. The JSR
387 Renewal Ballot ~~will~~shall start 30 days after the request. If the JSR Renewal Ballot is approved by the
388 EC, then another renewal ballot cannot be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

389 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to
390 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not
391 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR ~~will~~shall
392 be closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO ~~will~~shall forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR
393 Renewal Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members,
394 together with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the
395 JSR ~~will~~shall be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall ~~disband~~nd.

396 ~~If the~~ JSR that is closed through these processes was a revision to an existing Specification, the
397 Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification ~~(see section 5).~~

398 1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING

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

405 TCK license terms must permit implementors to freely and publicly discuss the testing process and
406 detailed TCK test results with ~~their customers~~all interested parties.

407 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

408 1.5.1 ~~Transparency~~TRANSPARENCY

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

411 1.5.2 ~~Draft Reviews~~DRAFT REVIEWS

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

418 1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES

419 Materials to be posted on the JCP website for review, comment, or any other official EG or EC
420 business should be submitted to the PMO, which ~~will~~shall post them on the website and announce
421 their availability to Members and the public within seven days of receipt: (holiday closures excepted.)

422 1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS

423 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any EG member can appeal to the EC regarding a
424 decision, an action or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that affects EG
425 participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means. An appeal
426 must be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO (pmo@jcp.org) in all cases, even if it
427 affects the PMO. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely, with a
428 short and relevant Subject: line, and provide all relevant documentation to support the appeal. The
429 PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than seven days ~~of~~after receipt. The EC shall then
430 respond to the appellant within 30 days, either with a resolution or with a request for clarification
431 and/or further documentation.

432 2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

433 2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

434 One or more Members ~~can~~may initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a
435 significant revision to an existing one, ~~by sending a JSR to the PMO. The JSR must use the template~~
436 ~~available at the JCP Web Site~~by submitting the JSR Proposal through the JCP website, as described
437 in the Spec Lead Guide. Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without
438 explanation at any time prior to the completion of the JSR ~~approval vote~~Approval Ballot (see section
439 2.4.3) upon request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.

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

- 441 • the Members making the request (the submitters), the proposed Spec Lead, and the initial
- 442 members of the Expert Group.
- 443 • a description of the proposed Specification.
- 444 • the reason(s) for developing or revising it.
- 445 • the primary Platform Edition, as well as any consideration given to other Platform Editions.

- 446 • an estimated development schedule.
- 447 • any preexisting documents, technology descriptions, or implementations that might be used as
- 448 a starting point.
- 449 • a transparency plan, which outlines the tools and techniques that the Spec Lead will use,
- 450 during the creation and development of the Specification, and for communicating the progress
- 451 within the Expert Group to Community Members, EC Members and the public. The EC will
- 452 expect the Spec Lead to operate the JSR in accordance with this plan.

453 2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS

454 Existing Specifications, together with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated
455 Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 45 of this document. Maintenance Lead
456 Members are expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK while
457 respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. Maintenance Leads
458 willshall therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they
459 willshall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That willshall
460 be decided by the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community
461 Member. Submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous
462 Expert Group to join the revision effort.

463 2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION

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

469 In order to guard against fragmentation, new Platform Edition Specifications willmust not substantially
470 duplicate existing Platform Editions or Profiles.

471 2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS

472 All new or revised Specifications must be compatible with the most recent versions of the targeted
473 Platform Edition Specifications. In order to achieve this, ~~all UJSRs to define new Profile Specifications~~
474 ~~or revise existing Profile Specifications must reference the latest version of the Platform Edition~~
475 ~~Specification they are based upon.~~ all UJSRs to define new Profile Specifications or revise existing
476 Profile Specifications must reference either the most recent Release version of the Platform Edition
477 Specification they are based upon or a newer version of that Specification that is under development
478 via an active UJSR.

479 2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION

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

487 Technologies may be incorporated into a Profile or Platform Edition after having been initially delivered
488 standalone. A JSR for a new version of an API that proposes to become part of a Profile or Platform
489 Edition and is considering discontinuing stand-alone availability must state the rationale for this

490 change. The public must be informed of the intention to discontinue the availability of the standalone
491 RI and TCK one ~~release~~[JSR submission](#) in advance.

492 2.2 JSR REVIEW

493 When a JSR is received, the PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the
494 appropriate EC (or to both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its JSR Page, announce the
495 proposed JSR to the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the
496 JSR's public feedback ~~alias~~[communication mechanism](#). Comments ~~will~~[shall](#) be forwarded to the EC
497 for its consideration and ~~will~~[shall](#) be made available from the JSR Page (similar comments may be
498 consolidated.). Members who are interested in joining the Expert Group (should the JSR be approved)
499 should identify themselves by submitting a nomination form to the PMO.

500 2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS ~~FOR THE RI AND TCK~~

501 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for developing the Reference Implementation and Technology
502 Compatibility Kit and for licensing them as described in the JSPA. The Spec Lead Member must
503 provide the EC with complete copies of the proposed [Specification](#), RI and TCK licenses no later than
504 the start of JSR Review. The licenses ~~will~~[shall](#) be published on the public JSR page. EC members
505 should provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community as a whole might react to
506 the terms. If the EC ~~consensus~~[Members believe is](#) that the proposed licensing terms are not
507 compatible with the licensing guidelines established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the
508 proposed JSR ~~will~~[shall](#) be delayed until Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter. The opinion of
509 Oracle legal ~~will~~[shall](#) be the final decision on the matter.

510 2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT

511 After the JSR Review, EC members ~~will~~[shall](#) review the JSR and any comments received, and cast
512 their ballot ~~below 5as specified in Section~~ to decide if the JSR should be approved.

513 If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who
514 may revise the JSR and resubmit it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the
515 original EC decision ~~will~~[shall](#) stand and the JSR ~~will~~[shall](#) be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the
516 PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) post it to the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC
517 members for a JSR Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR ~~will~~[shall](#) be closed.

518 2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP

519 ~~When a JSR is approved the PMO instructs the identified Spec Lead to form the Expert Group. JSR-~~
520 ~~being approved, the PMO instructs the identified Spec Lead to form the Expert Group. a Within 14-~~
521 ~~days of a~~ If the Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the Community before the JSR is
522 approved, the PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) request the preliminary Expert Group to choose a replacement from
523 among themselves who is willing to take on the duties defined in this document.

524 ~~alias, together with the Spec Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about~~
525 ~~this matter, and any other official decision related to EG composition, including decisions to remove or~~
526 ~~replace EG members, must be made public via the EG's public request. The sending an email to the~~
527 ~~Spec Lead of the EG There is no size limit on the Expert Group. The Spec Lead may add additional~~
528 ~~Experts at any time provided the existing EG members are consulted. New members may be added,~~
529 ~~for example, to increase diversity of opinion.~~

530 ~~Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by-~~

531 3. DRAFT RELEASES

532 3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION

533 The Expert Group should begin work by considering the requirements set forth in the JSR, any
534 contributed documents or technology descriptions, comments received during JSR Review and, if this
535 is a revision of an existing Specification, the [Change-Log/Issue List](#) kept by the Maintenance Lead
536 (see section 4.5). Additional input can be obtained from discussions with other Members, industry
537 groups, software developers, end-users, and academics. The goal is to define requirements and then
538 write a draft Specification suitable for review by the [G](#)community and the public.

539 When the Expert Group decides that the first draft is ready for review, the Spec Lead [will/shall](#) send the
540 draft, along with any additional files required for review, to the PMO. The Spec Lead should also
541 suggest the length of the Early Draft Review period if the Expert Group feels it should go beyond the
542 minimum 30 days.

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

545 3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW

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

554 3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW

555 If the Expert Group makes major revisions to the draft during Early Draft Review, the Spec Lead
556 should send the revised draft, along with a synopsis of the changes, to the PMO, [who/which shall](#)
557 publish these online and make them available for download by the public.

558 After the Early Draft Review period has ended, the Expert Group can make any additional changes to
559 the draft it deems necessary in response to comments before submitting the draft to the PMO for
560 [Public Review](#)[the next review](#).

561 3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW

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

564 The Spec Lead is responsible for ensuring that all comments are read and considered. If those
565 comments result in revisions to the draft, and those revisions result in major changes (in the opinion of
566 the Expert Group), then the Spec Lead must send an updated draft (with a summary of the changes)
567 to the PMO before the review period ends. The PMO [will/shall](#) post the new draft and the change
568 summary on the JCP Web Site and [will/shall](#) notify the public that the new draft is available.

569 3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT

570 The Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot starts when the Public Review closes. At the close of

571 | balloting, all comments submitted by EC members with their ballots ~~will~~[shall](#) be circulated to the Expert
572 | Group by the PMO.

573 | If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in
574 | response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised
575 | draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~[shall](#) stand and the JSR
576 | ~~will~~[shall](#) be closed. If a revision is received, the PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) forward it to the EC and initiate a Public
577 | Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC
578 | members with their ballots ~~will~~[shall](#) be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails,
579 | the JSR ~~will~~[shall](#) be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~[shall](#) disband. If the JSR was a revision to an
580 | existing Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current
581 | Specification (see section [45](#)).

582 | **4. FINAL RELEASE**

583 | **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

584 | If the Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot (or Reconsideration Ballot) is successful, the Expert
585 | Group ~~will~~[shall](#) prepare the Proposed Final Draft of the Specification by completing any revisions it
586 | deems necessary in response to comments received. The Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) then send the Proposed
587 | Final Draft to the PMO, ~~who~~[which](#) ~~will~~[shall](#) post it on the JCP Web Site for public download.

588 | **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

589 | The Spec Lead Member is responsible for the completion of both the RI and the TCK. JSRs that are
590 | assigned to both ECs are required to support both environments, which may require a separate RI and
591 | TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK uncover areas of the Specification that were under-
592 | defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) work with the Expert Group to correct
593 | those deficiencies and then send a revised Specification together with a summary of the changes to
594 | the PMO. Information ~~will~~[shall](#) be posted to the JCP Web Site. The Expert Group ~~will~~[shall](#) continue to
595 | consider any further comments received during this time.

596 | **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

603 | **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

604 | Depending on the nature of the problem, a successful TCK challenge will require updating one or
605 | more of the TCK, the Specification, or the RI. Within ~~one month~~[30 days](#) of the close of a successful
606 | TCK Appeal Ballot the Maintenance Lead must update these deliverables as necessary and ~~record~~
607 | [report](#) the changes ~~in the relevant sections of the Change Log. The modified Change Log, the~~
608 | ~~Specification (if changed,) and URLs for the updated RI and/or TCK must be delivered to the PMO,~~
609 | ~~who will publish them to the PMO when the Specification (if changed) and URLs for the updated RI~~
610 | [and/or TCK are delivered for publication](#) on the JCP website.

611 4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

- 618 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information
619 needed to use the TCK (e.g. ~~Tools~~ documentation for any supplied tools.) a definition and
620 explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, and the compatibility requirements that
621 must be met in addition to passing the TCK tests, ~~and any other information needed to use the~~
622 ~~TCK (e.g. ~~Tools~~ documentation).~~
- 623 • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations
624 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and
625 b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include
626 any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the
627 Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being
628 implemented.
629 These requirements must apply unless the Spec or TCK explicitly allows exceptions.
- 630 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and
631 recording of results.
- 632 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.
633 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a
634 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK
635 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the
636 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 637 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the ~~required~~ API
638 signatures ~~of~~ required by the spec are completely implemented and that ~~no non-specified~~
639 ~~APIs~~ only API signatures required by the spec are included in the JSR's namespace.

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

642 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC **willshall** stand, the PMO
643 **willshall** close the JSR, and the Expert Group **willshall** disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing
644 Specification, the Spec Lead **willshall** resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current
645 Specification (see section 4.5).

646 If a response is received, the PMO **willshall** circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval
647 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members
648 **willshall** be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will
649 be closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the
650 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification.

651 4.3 FINAL RELEASE

652 Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot or Reconsideration Ballot, the PMO will publish on
653 the JCP website the Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK and will
654 announce the availability of these materials to both Members and the public. The published TCK

655 information must include a means for any interested party to obtain a copy of the TCK documentation
656 at no charge. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The
657 Spec Lead will typically be the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and
658 others for aid in that role.

659 The Maintenance Lead must ensure that the links to the RI and TCK remain valid ~~through the lifetime~~
660 ~~of the Specification~~. If the links become broken or non-functional, the Maintenance Lead will have 30
661 days following notification from the PMO ~~of the invalid links~~ to correct them. If the problems are not
662 corrected within 30 days, the PMO will initiate a JSR Withdrawal Ballot (if no Maintenance Release
663 has been completed) or a Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot (if a Maintenance Release has
664 been made) to determine whether the Maintenance Lead shall be judged to have abandoned the JSR.
665 If the ballot passes the JSR itself or the relevant Maintenance Release will be marked as withdrawn.
666 ~~the Specification must reenter the Process at the Proposed Final Draft or Maintenance Review stage~~
667 ~~as appropriate, and complete the Final Release or Maintenance Release process again.~~
668 ~~NOTE: IP rights granted when the JSR made any previous releases are not affected by such a~~
669 ~~change in status.~~

670 5. MAINTENANCE

671 5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

672 The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,
673 and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A
674 Maintenance Lead will/shall therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions
675 to their Specification but will/shall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will
676 take place (see section 4.2.1.1).

677 ~~The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback alias through which the public may~~
678 ~~submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification. The public may~~
679 submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification by logging
680 issues through the JSR's Issue Tracker.

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

684 All changes proposed by the ML will/shall make their way into the Specification by either the
685 Maintenance Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a
686 Maintenance Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the
687 implementation of existing APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Changes introduced in
688 Maintenance Releases – for example, Modifications to existing APIs ~~or~~ or the addition of new APIs –
689 must not break binary compatibility as defined by the Java Language Specification, and should be
690 deferred to a new JSR. ~~should be deferred to a new JSR.~~

691 5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

692 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work ~~at~~ at any time (including discontinuing maintenance
693 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)
694 the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member
695 who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot
696 within ~~one month~~ 30 days to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot
697 succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can
698 be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then ~~to find a replacement, if the ML fail~~ the PMO will/shall
699 declare the Specification to be Dormant. ~~N and no further maintenance will/can be carried out. No~~

700 further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case
701 the PMO will again have again a month 30 days to initiate a Transfer Ballot. on it until a new ML is-
702 identified and ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK is transferred to the new ML's organization-
703 (subject to a successful Transfer ballot by the EG).-

704 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

705 ~~The ML will document all proposed Specification changes in the PROPOSED section of the Change-~~
706 ~~Log and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance-~~
707 ~~Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received through the Maintenance feedback alias-~~
708 ~~and must indicate the disposition of each comment (e.g. deferred with a brief explanation, rejected-~~
709 ~~with a brief explanation, included in the Change Log proposal.) This summary will be posted along-~~
710 ~~with the Change Log on the JSR Page. The PMO will then make a public announcement and begin-~~
711 ~~the review.~~

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

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

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

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

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

730 The Maintenance Lead shall document all proposed Specification changes through the Issue Tracker
731 and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. This request must be
732 accompanied by an Issue List that summarizes all formal comments that have been received and that
733 indicates the disposition of each Issue. The Maintenance Lead ~~should~~ must also supply a summary of
734 the proposed Specification changes, ideally in the form of a *diff* between the proposed and the current
735 Specification. The Maintenance Lead must also provide an estimate of when the final materials shall
736 be delivered for the Maintenance Release. If no estimate is provided the deadline will default to 30
737 days.

738 The PMO shall post the materials on the JCP website for public review. The Maintenance Lead may
739 choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received during the
740 review.

741 At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO shall initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.
742 During this ballot EC members should vote 'yes' if they agree that the Maintenance Release should
743 proceed as the Spec Lead has proposed, and 'no' if they have objections to the proposed release on
744 one of the following grounds:

- 745 • One or more of the changes proposed by the Maintenance Lead is inappropriate for a
746 Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on JSR

- An issue that was referenced in a "conditional yes" vote during an earlier development stage has not been addressed.
- The proposed Maintenance Release date is too far in the future. (EC members should bear in mind that many Maintenance Releases need to be synchronized with updates to a Platform, and that a Maintenance Review may therefore need to be carried out significantly in advance of the proposed Platform release.)
- Unreasonable changes have been made to the RI or TCK licensing terms.

'No' votes on other grounds shall be rejected by the PMO and shall be considered as abstentions. All 'no' votes must be accompanied by comments explaining the reason for the vote.

If the ballot fails, the Maintenance Lead may make any necessary corrections before requesting another Maintenance Review and ballot. The process may be repeated any number of times.

5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE

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

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

If the Maintenance Lead fails to deliver the final materials within the time-period specified at the beginning of the Maintenance Review process the PMO will inform the Maintenance Lead of an impending Maintenance Renewal Ballot, and will request the Maintenance Lead to prepare a public statement to the EC that explains the reason for the delay and provides a new deadline. 30 days after this request the PMO will initiate a Maintenance Renewal Ballot to determine whether the deadline may be extended as requested or whether the previous Maintenance Review should be rescinded and the Maintenance Lead be required to go through another Maintenance Review.

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

6.1 SCOPE

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

6.2 MEMBERSHIP

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

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

NOTE: In the near future the EC intends to merge the two ECs, and modify the number of members

788 and possibly their terms of office.

789 6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 790 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 791 2. Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.
- 792 3. Approve draft Specifications ~~for~~after Public Review.
- 793 4. Ensure that publicly expressed issues/concerns with a JSR are addressed by the Expert
- 794 Group.
- 795 5. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
- 796 6. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
- 797 7. Review proposed maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new
- 798 JSR.
- 799 8. Approve the transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
- 800 9. Decide when JSRs that have not made sufficient progress through the Process should be
- 801 withdrawn.
- 802 10. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the
- 803 organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance
- 804 may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the
- 805 EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.
- 806 11. Members of the Executive Committee shall be dedicated to the principles of full and open
- 807 competition, in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United
- 808 States and other nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can
- 809 result in criminal as well as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on
- 810 the jurisdiction. In particular, any discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of
- 811 distribution, division of markets or allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be
- 812 avoided.

813 6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM

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

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

818 6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS

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

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

821 Vacated seats ~~will~~are normally ~~be~~ filled for the remainder of their term by a special election ballot that
822 will be held no later than two months after the resignation (unless the resignation is less than six
823 months before the next scheduled annual election ballot). However, EC members may choose not to
824 fill a vacated seat in order to facilitate a reduction in the size of the ECs in anticipation of a future
825 merge into a single EC.

826 6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES

827 All JCP Members are eligible to vote in ballots for Ratified and Elected Seats subject to the provision
828 that if a Member has majority-ownership of, ~~or is the employer of,~~ one or more other Members, or if
829 one or more Members are Agents of another Member, then that group of Members ~~will~~shall collectively
830 have ~~4~~ one vote, which ~~will~~shall be cast by the person they designate to be their representative for the

831 ballot in question.

832 Annual elections for Ratified and Elected Seats ~~will~~shall be held simultaneously. Voting in these
833 elections will start in the third week of October.

834
835 In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall
836 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask
837 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also
838 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

839 6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS

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

- 841 • The PMO nominates Members to fill the vacant Ratified Seats with due regard for balanced
842 community and regional representation.
- 843 • At its discretion the PMO may choose not to nominate any candidate for a ratified seat, in order
844 to facilitate a reduction in the size of the ECs in anticipation of a future merge into a single EC.
- 845 • Eligible Members will vote to ratify each nominee over a 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.
- 846 • A nominee is ratified by a simple majority of those who cast a vote.
- 847 • If one or more of the nominees are not ratified by the vote, the PMO ~~will~~shall nominate
848 additional Members as needed and hold additional ratification ballots until the vacant seats are
849 filled.

850 6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS

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

- 853 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO ~~will~~shall post on the public JCP site a complete
854 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,
855 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 856 • Four weeks before the ~~voting~~ballot period the PMO ~~will~~shall accept nominations from the
857 Community for a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that
858 ~~employees~~Agents of JCP Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO
859 shall reject such nominations.
- 860 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
861 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.
- 862 • The nominees who receive the most votes ~~will~~shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 863 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters ~~will~~shall be given the opportunity to vote
864 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 865 • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the
866 next election.
- 867 • Ties ~~will~~shall be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt>
868 and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

869 7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES

- 870 1. All JSR ballots ~~will~~shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 871 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 872 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
873 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
874 vote at all.

4. Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions for change these should be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed. "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
6. 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.
7. Ballots to approve UJSRs ~~for new~~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.
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". .1.54~~
9. ~~Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section-~~
10. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
11. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least ~~1-month~~30 days must pass before the JSR can be reinitiated.
12. 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. ~~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.
14. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot ~~will~~shall 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~~shall 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.