

1 **JCP Process Document**

3 **Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)**

4 Comments to: [pmo@jcp.org](mailto:pmo@jcp.org)

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

6 **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

## 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.

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 one or more Members 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, which 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.

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.

## I DEFINITIONS

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

**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 the PMO has determined has no assigned Specification Lead or Maintenance Lead, or that is not being actively developed and on which no further development is anticipated.

**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.

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

**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. In the case of an individual, that person may represent himself/herself, or may represent or be otherwise empowered to act on behalf of a company or organization. No more than five **individual Members** are permitted at any one time as representatives of a company or organization.

**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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

125 **Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Maintenance  
126 Release when Members and the public consider and comment on the change the Spec  
127 Lead proposes to include in the release, as identified in the associated Issue List.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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.

**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.<sup>1</sup>

**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.

The use of the words “must”, “must not”, “required”, “shall”, “shall not”, “should”, “should not”, “recommended”, “may” and “optional” in this document is done in accordance with the IETF's [RFC 2119](#).

## II THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS<sup>SM</sup> 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. They must maintain a publicly-accessible document archive, from where all of their working materials such as source documents, meeting agendas and minutes, and draft documents can be downloaded.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

196 the PMO, which will update the relevant information on the JSR Page. Any such changes must ensure  
197 that previously-published information is incorporated into the new tools. When voting to approve a  
198 JSR's transition to the next stage EC members are expected to take into consideration the extent to  
199 which the Spec Lead is meeting the transparency requirements.

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

205 The use of *Confidential materials* (as defined in the JSPA) by Expert Groups limits transparency, is  
206 strongly discouraged, and will be prohibited in a future version of the Process. If the Spec Lead  
207 intends to permit the use of *Confidential materials* (such as emails, drafts or submissions marked as  
208 *Confidential*), this must be specified in the initial Java Specification Request. Expert Groups may also  
209 choose to keep information private by means other than marking it as Confidential (for example, by not  
210 publishing it on a publicly available site).<sup>2</sup>

### 211 1.1.1 MAILING LISTS

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

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

### 224 1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING

225 Issues must be tracked through a publicly readable Issue Tracker. The Expert Group may choose to  
226 use a publicly writable Issue Tracker, thereby permitting the public to log issues directly, or  
227 alternatively to identify formal comments in some other manner and to enter them into the Issue  
228 Tracker on behalf of the submitter. Whenever a Spec Lead or a Maintenance Lead submits materials  
229 to the PMO for review or ballot they must also provide an Issue List indicating the disposition of all of  
230 the Issues that have been logged against the JSR. In order to enable EC members to judge whether  
231 Issues have been adequately addressed the Issue List must make a clear distinction between Issues  
232 that are still open, those that have been resolved, and those that are closed, and must indicate the  
233 reason for any change of state.

234 The PMO will publish the Issue List or a pointer to it together with the other materials.

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

---

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

### 241 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

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

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

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

## 257 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

### 258 **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

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

262 Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by  
263 submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page. The nomination, together  
264 with the Spec Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about this matter, and  
265 any other official decision related to EG

### 266 **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

267 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec  
268 Lead, the Expert Group, with the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally  
269 contributed the Expert, if any, and request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such  
270 replacement is forthcoming, the Expert Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec  
271 Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member  
272 who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and work with that organization to find a suitable  
273 replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a  
274 replacement from amongst other Members.

### 275 **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

276 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts  
277 is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,  
278 uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
279 such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot  
280 be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and  
281 request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec  
282 Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is a  
283 Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.



284 If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from  
285 further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to  
286 the EC by following the process outlined in Section 1.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

#### 287 **1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

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

#### 300 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

301 If a JSR does not begin Early Draft Review within the first 12 months following the completion of its  
302 initial JSR Approval Ballot (JSR Approval), or does not begin Public Review within 2 years of JSR  
303 Approval, or has not achieved Final Release within 3 years of JSR Approval, then the EC should  
304 initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot unless it is agreed that there are extraordinary circumstances that justify  
305 the delay. The PMO will inform the Spec Lead and Expert Group of this decision and will request the  
306 Spec Lead and Expert Group to prepare a public statement to the EC. The JSR Renewal Ballot will  
307 start 30 days after the request. If the JSR Renewal Ballot is approved by the EC, then another renewal  
308 ballot cannot be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

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

#### 317 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

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

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

## 326 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

### 327 1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY

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

### 330 1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS

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

## 337 1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES

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

## 341 1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS

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

## 351 2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

### 352 2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

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

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

- 359 • the Members making the request (the submitters), the proposed Spec Lead, and the initial  
360 members of the Expert Group.
- 361 • a description of the proposed Specification.
- 362 • the reason(s) for developing or revising it.
- 363 • the primary Platform Edition, as well as any consideration given to other Platform Editions.
- 364 • an estimated development schedule.

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

### **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

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

## 407 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

### 415 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

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

## 425 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

426 After the JSR Review, EC members will review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their  
427 ballot to decide if the JSR should be approved.

428 If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO will send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who may  
429 revise the JSR and resubmit it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the original  
430 EC decision will stand and the JSR will be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the PMO will post it to  
431 the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC members for a JSR  
432 Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR will be closed.

## 433 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

438

## 439 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

### 440 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

447 When the Expert Group decides that the first draft is ready for review, the Spec Lead will send the

448 draft, along with any additional files required for review, to the PMO. The Spec Lead should also  
449 suggest the length of the Early Draft Review period if the Expert Group feels it should go beyond the  
450 minimum 30 days.

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

## 453 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

### 462 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

## 469 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

## 477 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

## 489 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

### 490 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

#### 495 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

#### 503 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

#### 510 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

511 Depending on the nature of the problem, a successful TCK challenge will require updating one or  
512 more of the TCK, the Specification, or the RI. Within one month of the close of a successful TCK  
513 Appeal Ballot the Maintenance Lead must update these deliverables as necessary and report the  
514 changes to the PMO when the Specification (if changed) and URLs for the updated RI and/or TCK are  
515 delivered for publication on the JCP website.

### 516 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 523 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information  
524 needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation,) a definition and explanation of the First-  
525 level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be met in addition to  
526 passing the TCK tests
- 527 • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations  
528 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and

529           b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include  
530           any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the  
531           Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being  
532           implemented.

533           These requirements must apply unless the Spec or TCK explicitly allows exceptions.

534           • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and  
535           recording of results.

536           • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.  
537           This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a  
538           description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK  
539           test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the  
540           adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.

541           • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the API signatures  
542           required by the spec are completely implemented and that only API signatures required by the  
543           spec are included in the JSR's namespace.

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

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

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

## 555   **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

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

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

## 569 **5. MAINTENANCE**

### 570 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

576 The public may submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification  
577 by logging issues through the JSR's Issue Tracker.

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

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

#### 586 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

587 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work at any time (including discontinuing maintenance  
588 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)  
589 the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member  
590 who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot  
591 within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot  
592 succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can  
593 be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then the PMO will declare the Specification to be Dormant and  
594 no further maintenance can be carried out. No further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO  
595 unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case the PMO will have again a month to initiate a  
596 Transfer Ballot.

### 597 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

598

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

606 The PMO will post the materials on the JCP website for public review. The Maintenance Lead may  
607 choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received during the  
608 review.

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



- 613 • One or more of the changes proposed by the Maintenance Lead is inappropriate for a  
614 Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on JSR
  - 615 • The proposed Maintenance Release date too far in the future. (EC members should bear in  
616 mind that many Maintenance Releases need to be synchronized with updates to a Platform,  
617 and that a Maintenance Review may therefore need to be carried out significantly in advance  
618 of the proposed Platform release.)
  - 619 • Unreasonable changes have been made to the RI or TCK licensing terms.
- 620 'No' votes on other grounds will be rejected by the PMO and will be considered as abstentions. All 'no'  
621 votes must be accompanied by comments explaining the reason for the vote.
- 622 If the ballot fails, the Maintenance Lead may make any necessary corrections before requesting  
623 another Maintenance Review and ballot. The process may be repeated any number of times.

624

## 625 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

- 626 After a successful Maintenance Review Ballot the Maintenance Lead will update the Specification, RI,  
627 TCK, and Issue List as necessary and submit them to the PMO for publication in a Maintenance  
628 Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have been made, and publishes the  
629 Specification, the Issue List, and pointers to the RI and TCK on the JSR Web Page.
- 630 NOTE: until the Maintenance Release stage is reached any proposed changes should be considered  
631 preliminary and subject to change, and therefore should not be implemented in shipping products.
- 632 If the Maintenance Lead fails to deliver the final materials within the time-period specified at the  
633 beginning of the Maintenance Review process a Maintenance Renewal Ballot will be held to determine  
634 whether the deadline may be extended or whether the previous Maintenance Review should be  
635 rescinded and the Maintenance Lead be required to go through another Maintenance Review.

## 636 **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

### 637 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

### 640 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

- 641 There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and  
642 EE together. Each EC is composed of 16 Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.  
643 has a permanent voting seat on each EC. (Oracle representatives must not be members of the PMO.)  
644 The ECs are led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.
- 645 Should one Member on the EC acquire a majority ownership of another EC member, one of those  
646 members must resign his or her seat by the effective date of the acquisition.
- 647 NOTE: In the near future the EC intends to merge the two ECs, and modify the number of members  
648 and possibly their terms of office.

### 649 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 650 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 651 2. Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.

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

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

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

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

### **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

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

### **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

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

In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also

697 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

### 698 **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

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

### 708 **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

709 Members are selected for the Elected Seats using an open election process that is carried out as

710 follows:

- 711 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO will post on the public JCP site a complete
- 712 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,
- 713 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 714 • Four weeks before the ballot period the PMO will accept nominations from the Community for a
- 715 period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that employees of JCP
- 716 Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such
- 717 nominations.
- 718 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
- 719 14-day ballot period.
- 720 • The nominees who receive the most votes will fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 721 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters will be given the opportunity to vote
- 722 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 723 • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the
- 724 next election.
- 725 • Ties will be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt> and
- 726 using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

## 727 **7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES**

- 728 1. All JSR ballots will be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 729 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 730 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
- 731 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
- 732 vote at all.
- 733 4. Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions
- 734 for change these should be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed.
- 735 "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if
- 736 resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 737 5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 738 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
- 739 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 740 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition
- 741 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. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 5.1.
  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.

### **III 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.