

2 **JCP-2 Process Document**

3

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

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

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

7 **CONTENTS**

8

I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....2

II DEFINITIONS .....2

III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM .....6

1. GENERAL PROCEDURES.....6

1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....6

1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....8

1.3 JSR DEADLINES.....9

1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....9

1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....9

1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....10

1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....10

2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION .....10

2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....10

2.2 JSR REVIEW .....12

2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT .....12

2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP .....12

3. DRAFT RELEASES.....13

3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION .....13

3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW .....13

3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW .....13

3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT .....13

4. FINAL RELEASE.....14

4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT .....14

4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT .....14

4.3 FINAL RELEASE .....15

5. MAINTENANCE.....16

5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....16

5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW .....16

5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....17

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES .....17

6.1 SCOPE .....17

6.2 MEMBERSHIP .....17

6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....17

6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM .....18

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES .....19

## I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

An Executive Committee (EC) representing a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other members of the Java community is responsible for approving the passage of Specifications through the JCP's various stages and for reconciling discrepancies between Specifications and their associated test suites. There are two ECs: one to oversee the Java technologies for the desktop/server space (with responsibility for the Java SE™ and Java EE™ Specifications) and the other to oversee the Java technologies for the consumer/embedded space (with responsibility for the Java ME™ Specification). The EC's are considering merging the two bodies into a single one in the near future, so newly elected EC members should be aware that their terms may vary from what is specified in section 65.4, "EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM"

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

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

## II DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Elected Seat:** An EC seat filled by the election process described in section [5.3.46.4.4](#).

**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.

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

**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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

155 **Ratified Seat:** An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in section ~~5.3.3~~6.4.3.

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

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

159 **Specification Lead (Spec Lead):** The Expert responsible for leading the effort to develop  
 160 or make significant revisions to a Specification and for completing the associated  
 161 Reference Implementation and Technology Compatibility Kit. A Spec Lead (or the Spec

162 Lead's host company or organization) must be a Java Community Process Member.

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

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

168 **Transfer Ballot:** The EC ballot to approve transfer of ownership of a Specification, RI, and  
169 TCK from one Member to another Member.<sup>1</sup>

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

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

## 174 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS <sup>SM</sup> PROGRAM

### 175 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

#### 176 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

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

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

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

---

<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.



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

#### 205 **1.1.1 Mailing Lists**MAILING LISTS

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

215 If the ~~public mailing list is writable only by Expert Group members~~Expert Group uses a mailing list  
216 ~~writable only by Expert Group members~~, then the EG must also provide a publicly readable and  
217 writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from the public.

#### 218 **1.1.2 Issue Tracking**ISSUE TRACKING

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

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

230

#### 231 **1.1.3 Response to Comments**

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

---

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

#### 240 **1.1.4 Changes to Licensing Terms-CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

241 ~~If the licensing terms for a JSR change from one release to the next, the changes must be explicitly-~~  
242 ~~listed and explained. Changes to the licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR submission (in the~~  
243 ~~case of a new JSR) or in the Change Log for Maintenance Releases. Subsequent changes to~~  
244 ~~licensing terms during the life of the JSR must be disclosed when the Specification is next submitted~~  
245 ~~to the PMO for public posting or review.~~

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

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

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

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

264

### 265 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

#### 266 **1.2.1 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

#### 278 **1.2.2 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

279 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts  
280 is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,  
281 uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
282 such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot  
283 be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and  
284 request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec



285 | Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is a ~~an~~  
286 Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.  
287 If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from  
288 further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to  
289 the EC by following the process outlined in Section ~~0-6~~1.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

### 290 1.2.3 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD

291 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting  
292 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These  
293 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be  
294 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
295 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any  
296 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be  
297 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to  
298 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is a ~~an~~ Member Representative the PMO  
299 should ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead, or it may seek to put in place an alternative Spec  
300 Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a ~~t~~Transfer ~~b~~Ballot as specified in section 5.1.21 of this  
301 document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the EC ~~may disband the Expert Group~~ will  
302 ~~initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot to determine whether the JSR should be shut down.~~

## 303 1.3 JSR DEADLINES

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

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

## 320 1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING

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

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

## 329 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

### 330 1.5.1 ~~Transparency~~TRANSPARENCY

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

### 333 1.5.2 ~~Draft Reviews~~DRAFT REVIEWS

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

## 340 1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES

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

## 344 1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS

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

## 354 2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

### 355 2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

356 One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant  
357 revision to an existing one, ~~by sending a JSR to the PMO. The JSR must use the template available at~~  
358 ~~the JCP Web Site~~by submitting the JSR Proposal through the JCP website, as described in the [Spec](#)  
359 [Lead Guide](#). Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without explanation at  
360 any time prior to the completion of the JSR ~~approval vote~~Approval Ballot (see section ~~21.3~~) upon  
361 request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.

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

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

- 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 45 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 **releaseJSR submission** in advance.

## 411 2.2 JSR REVIEW

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

### 419 2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS ~~FOR THE RI AND TCK~~

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

## 429 2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT

430 After the JSR Review, EC members will review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their  
431 ballot as specified in Section [56](#) below to decide if the JSR should be approved.

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

## 437 2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP

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

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

445 Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by  
446 ~~sending an email to the Spec Lead of the EG~~[submitting their nomination via the online form provided](#)  
447 [on the JSR Page](#). The ~~request~~[nomination](#), together with the Spec Lead's official response, substantive  
448 deliberations within the EG about this matter, and any other official decision related to EG  
449 composition, including decisions to remove or replace EG members, must be made public via the EG's  
450 public [aliasmailing list](#).

## 451 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

### 452 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

### 465 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

#### 474 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

478 After the Early Draft Review period has ended, the Expert Group can make any additional changes to  
479 the draft it deems necessary in response to comments before submitting the draft to the PMO for  
480 ~~Public Review~~the next review.

### 481 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

### 489 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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



491 balloting, all comments submitted by EC members with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert  
492 Group by the PMO.

493 If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in  
494 response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised  
495 draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC will stand and the JSR will be  
496 closed. If a revision is received, the PMO will forward it to the EC and initiate a Public Draft  
497 Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members  
498 with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR will be  
499 closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the  
500 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 45).

## 501 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

### 502 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

#### 507 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

#### 515 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

#### 522 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

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

### 529 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

530 When the Expert Group is satisfied that the TCK provides adequate test coverage, the RI correctly



531 implements the Specification, and the RI passes the TCK, the Spec Lead will send the Final Draft of  
532 the Specification to the PMO together with instructions on how EC members can obtain the RI and  
533 TCK for evaluation. The PMO will circulate the materials to the EC and initiate the Final Approval  
534 Ballot. At the close of balloting, all EC comments will be sent to the Expert Group by the PMO.

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

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

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

552 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC will stand, the PMO will  
553 close the JSR, and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing  
554 Specification, the Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification  
555 (see section 45).

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

## 561 4.3 FINAL RELEASE

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

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

## 576 5. MAINTENANCE

### 577 5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

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

583 ~~The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback alias through which the public may~~  
584 ~~submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification. The public may~~  
585 ~~submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification by logging~~  
586 ~~issues through the JSR's issue-tracking mechanism.~~

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

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

#### 595 5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

596 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work ~~at~~ at any time (including discontinuing maintenance  
597 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)  
598 the ML, ~~with the assistance of the PMO~~, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member  
599 who is willing to take on the task. ~~If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot~~  
600 ~~within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot~~  
601 ~~succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can~~  
602 ~~be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then to find a replacement, if the ML fails~~ the PMO will declare  
603 the Specification to be Dormant. ~~and no further maintenance will~~ can be carried out. ~~No further~~  
604 ~~Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case the~~  
605 ~~PMO will have again a month to initiate a Transfer Ballot. on it until a new ML is identified and~~  
606 ~~ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK is transferred to the new ML's organization (subject to a~~  
607 ~~successful Transfer ballot by the EC).~~

### 608 5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW

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

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

618 At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO will initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.  
619 During this ballot EC members should vote "yes" if they agree that the Maintenance Release should

620 go ahead as the Spec Lead has proposed, and “no” if they believe that one or more of the changes  
621 proposed by the ML is inappropriate for a Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on  
622 JSR. “No” votes must be accompanied by comments in which the offending ~~items~~changes are  
623 identified and the reasons for the objection are explained.

624 If there are any “no” votes the PMO will within two weeks initiate an Item Exception Ballot for each  
625 change that EC members have objected to.

626 NOTE: there is no minimum number of “yes” votes required to move forward with the proposed  
627 Maintenance Release, and “no” votes cannot prevent a ~~R~~release unless the ML is unwilling to defer  
628 items subsequently disallowed in an Item Exception Ballot.

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

## 634 5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE

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

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

## 642 6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

### 643 6.1 SCOPE

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

### 646 6.2 MEMBERSHIP

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

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

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

### 655 6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 656 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 657 2. [Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.](#)
- 658 3. Approve draft Specifications ~~for~~after Public Review.
- 659 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.

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 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).

### 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 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

### 6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS

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

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

#### 710 6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS

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

- 713 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO will post on the public JCP site a complete  
714 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,  
715 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 716 • Four weeks before the ~~voting~~b period the PMO will accept nominations from the Community for  
717 a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that employees of JCP  
718 Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such  
719 nominations.
- 720 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a  
721 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.
- 722 • The nominees who receive the most votes will fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 723 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters will be given the opportunity to vote  
724 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 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. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 734 5. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a  
735 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 736 6. Ballots to approve UJSRs ~~for new~~that define the initial version of a new -Platform Edition  
737 Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least  
738 a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are  
739 cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 740 7. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 45.1.
- 741 8. "No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation of the changes (if any) that would  
742 persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 743 9. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 744 10. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before  
745 the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 746 11. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a  
747 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are  
748 cast.
- 749 12. An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third  
750 of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.

751 13. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot will be approved only if each  
752 EC approves it separately.

## 753 **IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA**

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

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