

# JCP-2 Process Documents

## JCP-2: Process Document

### Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)

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

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

~~The formal procedures for using the Java Specification development process~~

### Version 2.8 (sometime in 2011)

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

~~Copyright (c) 1996 – 2009 Sun Microsystems, Inc. ???~~

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
I DEFINITIONS .....	2
II THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM .....	6
1. GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	6
1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY .....	6
1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP .....	8
1.3 JSR DEADLINES.....	9
1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	9
1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	10
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.....	12
3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION .....	12
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 .....	18
6.4	EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM .....	18
7.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES .....	19
III	APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	20

## ~~EXECUTIVE SUMMARY~~

## ~~FUNDAMENTAL DEFINITIONS~~

### ~~1. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION~~

### ~~2. CREATE THE EARLY DRAFT~~

### ~~3. COMPLETE THE SPECIFICATION~~

### ~~4. MAINTENANCE~~

## ~~A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES~~

## ~~B. REVISING THE JCP AND JSPA~~

## 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 ~~Sin~~ "Internet-time" 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.

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

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 6.5.4, "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)~~ 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 ~~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~~ 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~~ shall 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

**Agent:** an individual - for example an employee, a contractor, or an officer - who is authorized to act on behalf of a company or organization.

**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 Maintenance Lead. All Specifications become Dormant at the end of their life cycles.~~ 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.

95	<b>Early Draft Review:</b> A 30 to 90 day period during which the public reviews and comments on the draft Specification.
96	
97	<b>Elected Seat:</b> An EC seat filled by the election process described in section <del>5.3.4</del> 6.4.4.
98	<b>Executive Committee (EC):</b> 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.
99	
100	
101	
102	
103	<b>Expert:</b> A Member or Member Representative who has expert knowledge and is an active practitioner in the technology covered by the JSR.
104	
105	<b>Expert Group (EG):</b> The group of Experts who develop or make significant revisions to a Specification.
106	
107	<b>Final Approval Ballot:</b> The 14-day EC ballot to approve the Final Draft along with its associated RI and TCK.
108	
109	<b>Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot:</b> The 14-day EC ballot to reconsider an initial rejection of a Final Draft, RI, and TCK.
110	
111	<b>Final Draft:</b> The final draft of the Specification that will be put forward for EC approval.
112	<b>Final Release:</b> The final stage in the JSR development process when the Specification, RI, and TCK have been completed and can be licensed by implementors.
113	
114	<b>First-Level TCK Appeals Process:</b> 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.
115	
116	
117	<del><b>Item Exception Ballot:</b> The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include specific change items in a Maintenance Release.</del>
118	
119	<b>Issue:</b> an explicit reference to an item defined in an Issue Tracker.
120	<b>Issue List:</b> A list of Issues generated from an Issue Tracker, identifying the disposition of each.
121	
122	<b>Issue Tracker:</b> 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.)
123	
124	
125	
126	
127	
128	<b>Java Community Process (JCP):</b> The formal process described in this document for developing or revising Java technology Specifications.
129	

130 | This version of the JCP was developed through the JCP by means of ???, led by ??? and the  
131 | combined Executive Committees as the expert group.

132 | An Executive Committee (EC) representing a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other  
133 | members of the Java community is responsible for approving the passage of specifications through  
134 | key points of the JCP and for reconciling discrepancies between specifications and their associated  
135 | test suites. There are two ECs: one to oversee the Java technologies for the desktop/server space  
136 | (with responsibility for the Java SE™ and Java EE™ specifications) and the other to oversee the Java  
137 | technologies for the consumer/embedded space (with responsibility for the Java ME™ specification).

138 | There are four major steps in this version of the JCP:

- 139 | 1. **INITIATION**: A specification targeted at the desktop/server or consumer/embedded space is  
140 | initiated by community member(s) and approved for development by the responsible EC.
- 141 | 2. **EARLY DRAFT**: A group of experts is formed to develop a preliminary draft of the specification  
142 | that both the community and the public will then review. Anyone with an Internet connection  
143 | can read and comment on the draft. The expert group uses feedback from the review to revise  
144 | and refine the draft.
- 145 | 3. **PUBLIC DRAFT**: The draft goes out again for review by the public. The expert group uses the  
146 | feedback to further revise the document. At the end of this review, the EC decides if the draft  
147 | should proceed. If approved by the EC, the leader of the expert group sees that the reference  
148 | implementation and its associated technology compatibility kit are completed before sending  
149 | the specification to the responsible EC for final approval.
- 150 | 4. **MAINTENANCE**: The completed specification, reference implementation, and technology  
151 | compatibility kit are updated in response to ongoing requests for clarification, interpretation,  
152 | enhancements, and revisions. The responsible EC can review all proposed changes to the  
153 | specification and indicate which ones can be carried out immediately and which will require the  
154 | specification to be revised by an expert group. Challenges to one or more tests in a  
155 | specification's technology compatibility kit are ultimately decided by the responsible EC if they  
156 | cannot be otherwise resolved.

## 157 | **II FUNDAMENTAL DEFINITIONS**

158 | **Java Community Process (JCP)**: The formal process described in this document for developing or  
159 | revising Java technology specifications.

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

162 | **Java Specification Participation Agreement (JSPA)**: A one-year renewable agreement between  
163 | Sun Microsystems and a company, organization or individual that allows the latter entities to  
164 | participate in the Java Community Process.

165 | **Executive Committee (EC)**: The Members who guide the evolution of the Java technologies. The EC  
166 | represents a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other Members of the Java Community.  
167 | Members must have signed the EC acceptance letter in order to serve on the EC. The EC Policies  
168 | and Procedures are in Appendix A.

169 | **Program Management Office (PMO)**: The group within Sun Microsystems that is responsible for  
170 | administering the JCP and chairing the EC.

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

174 | **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.  
**Platform Edition Specification (Platform Edition):** A Specification that defines a baseline API set that provides a foundation upon which applications, other APIs, and Profiles can be built. There are currently three Platform Edition Specifications: JJava SE, Java EE and Java ME.

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

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

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

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

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

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

216 | **Member Representative:** An ~~employee~~ Agent of a Member company or ~~an associate of a~~  
217 | Member organization who ~~has been approved by the Member to~~ represents its interests  
218 | within the JCP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

241 | **Release:** A Final Release or a Maintenance Release

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

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

248 | **Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK):** The suite of tests, tools, and documentation that  
249 | allows an organization to determine if its implementation is compliant with the  
250 | 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](#).

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

~~**JCP Specification Page (Spec Page):** Each Specification approved for development or revision will have a dedicated public web page established on the JCP Web Site to contain a history of the passage of the Specification through the JCP, including a record of the decisions, actions, and votes taken by the EC with respect to the draft Specification.~~

## 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~~ 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~~ communication mechanisms and ~~issue T~~ tracker) that the Expert Group intends to adopt, and must provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO ~~will~~ shall publish this information on the public JSR Page. The Spec Lead must also provide a pointer to any Terms of Use required to use the collaboration tools so that the EC and prospective EG members can judge whether they are compatible with the JSPA.

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

---

<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.



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

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

### 301 **1.1.1 Mailing Lists** PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

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

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

### 322 **1.1.2 Issue Tracking** ISSUE TRACKING

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

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

333 In order to enable EC members to judge whether Issues have been adequately addressed the Issue  
334 List must make a clear distinction between Issues that are still open, that have been deferred, and

---

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

335 | those that are closed, and must indicate the reason for any change of state.  
336 | The PMO shall publish the Issue List or a pointer to it together with the other materials.  
337 | EC members should review the supplied Issue List and take it into consideration when casting their  
338 | ballot. If they have any reservations or concerns about a 'yes' vote, or if they wish to vote 'no,' they  
339 | should accompany their ballot with comments which reference one or more Issues (perhaps logged by  
340 | them) that they would like to see addressed in the future. EC members should vote 'no' if they believe  
341 | that the Spec Lead or Maintenance Lead has not adequately addressed all Issues including those that  
342 | have been rejected or otherwise closed by the Expert Group.

### 343 | **1.1.3 Response to Comments**

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

### 352 | **1.1.4 ~~Changes to Licensing Terms~~ CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**~~If the licensing-~~ 353 | ~~terms for a JSR change from one release to the next, the changes must be explicitly~~ 354 | ~~listed and explained. Changes to the licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR~~ 355 | ~~submission (in the case of a new JSR) or in the Change Log for Maintenance Releases.~~ 356 | ~~Subsequent changes to licensing terms during the life of the JSR must be disclosed~~ 357 | ~~when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public posting or review.~~

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

360 |

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

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

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

## 376 | 1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP

### 377 | 1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION

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

381 | Any JCP Member, Member Representative or Member Associate may request to join an Expert Group  
382 | at any time by submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page. Member  
383 | Associates, since they are not covered by the JSPA of their organization, must sign the JSPA in their  
384 | own right before they can be permitted to join an Expert Group. Details of such requests, together with  
385 | the Spec Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about the matter, and any  
386 | other official decisions related to EG membership must be published through the EG's public  
387 | communication channel.

### 388 | 1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP

389 | An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. ~~When this happens, the Spec Lead~~  
390 | ~~should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to~~  
391 | ~~find a replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from~~  
392 | ~~another Member. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of its~~  
393 | ~~members as the new Spec Lead.~~ If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group, with  
394 | the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and  
395 | request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such replacement is forthcoming, the Expert  
396 | Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the  
397 | Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any,  
398 | and work with that organization to find a suitable replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not  
399 | otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from amongst other Members.

### 400 | 1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS

401 | There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts  
402 | is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,  
403 | uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
404 | such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot  
405 | be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and  
406 | request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec  
407 | Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is a ~~an~~  
408 | Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.  
409 | If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from  
410 | further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to  
411 | the EC by following the process outlined in Section ~~0.6~~1.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

### 412 | 1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD

413 | There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting  
414 | in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These  
415 | concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be  
416 | proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
417 | such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any  
418 | three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be  
419 | made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to

420 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is ~~an~~ Member Representative the PMO  
421 ~~should~~shall ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead. If the Member refuses to do so, the PMO shall  
422 ~~, or it may~~ seek to put in place an alternative Spec Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a transfer  
423 ballot as specified in section 5.1.2 of this document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the  
424 EC ~~may disband the Expert Group~~shall initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot to determine whether the JSR  
425 should be shut down.

## 426 1.3 JSR DEADLINES

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

435 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to  
436 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not  
437 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR ~~will~~shall  
438 be closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO ~~will~~shall forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR  
439 Renewal Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members,  
440 together with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the  
441 JSR ~~will~~shall be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing  
442 Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current  
443 Specification (see section 5).

## 444 1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING

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

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

## 454 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

### 455 1.5.1 ~~Transparency~~TRANSPARENCY

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

### 458 1.5.2 ~~Draft Reviews~~DRAFT REVIEWS

459 During Draft Review periods EC members are strongly encouraged to have one or more technical  
460 members of their organizations review the draft in order to uncover possible duplication of features or  
461 services between the draft and other Specifications. EC members should inform the Expert Group of

462 any such discoveries using the feedback mechanism specified by the Spec Lead. EC feedback is  
463 particularly important to the Expert Group, and EC members are encouraged not to wait until ballot  
464 periods to raise concerns and issues.

## 465 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

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

## 469 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

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

## 479 **2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION**

### 480 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

481 One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant  
482 revision to an existing one, ~~by sending a JSR to the PMO. The JSR must use the template available at~~  
483 ~~the JCP Web Site~~by submitting the JSR Proposal through the JCP website, as described in the [Spec](#)  
484 [Lead Guide](#). Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without explanation at  
485 any time prior to the completion of the JSR ~~approval vote~~Approval Ballot (see section 24.3) upon  
486 request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.

## 487 **~~3. 1. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION~~**

### 488 **~~3.1 1.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST~~**

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

492 ~~**definition -- Umbrella Java Specification Request (UJSR):** A JSR that defines or revises~~  
493 ~~a Platform Edition or Profile Specification. A UJSR proceeds through the JCP like any~~  
494 ~~other JSR.~~

495 ~~**definition -- Expert:** A Member representative who has expert knowledge and is an active~~  
496 ~~practitioner in the technology covered by the JSR.~~

497 ~~**definition -- Expert Group:** The group of Experts who develop or make significant~~  
498 ~~revisions to a Specification.~~

~~**definition -- 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.~~

~~One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant revision to an existing one, by sending a JSR to the PMO. The JSR must use the template available at the JCP Web Site. Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without explanation at any time prior to the completion of the JSR approval vote (see section 1.3) upon request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.~~

#### 4. The following is some of the information required to be included with each JSR:

- the Members making the request (the submitters), ~~the proposed Spec~~ **Specification** Lead, and the initial members of the Expert Group.
- a description of the proposed ~~S~~ **Specification**.
- the reason(s) for developing or revising it.
- 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 ~~S~~ **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.

##### 4.1.1 ~~1.1.1~~ 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 4.5 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~~ **shall** therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they ~~will~~ **shall** not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That ~~will~~ **shall** be decided by the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community Member. ~~Along with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 4 of this document. Maintenance Leads (and their host companies or organizations) are expected to assume long term ownership of their Specifications, RIs, and TCKs with due respect of the will of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. This means that Maintenance Leads will automatically be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications going forward 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 (or Members). The only provision is that the submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous Expert Group to join the revision effort.~~

##### 4.1.2 ~~1.1.2~~ 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~~ **as part**



544 | ~~of Java~~ SE, have the potential to seriously disrupt the installed base if carried out inconsistently across  
545 | the Platform Editions. In order to protect the installed base, any such changes can only be accepted  
546 | and carried out within a UJSR for Java SE.

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

#### 549 | **4.1.3 ~~1.1.3~~ PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM** 550 | **EDITIONS**

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

#### 555 | **4.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

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

#### 568 | **4.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

#### 576 | **4.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS ~~FOR THE RI AND TCK~~**

577 | The Spec Lead Member is responsible for developing the Reference Implementation and Technology  
578 | Compatibility Kit and for licensing them as described in the JSPA. The Spec Lead Member must  
579 | provide the EC with complete copies of the proposed Specification, RI and TCK licenses no later than  
580 | the start of JSR Review. The licenses ~~will~~shall be published on the public JSR page. EC members  
581 | should provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community as a whole might react to  
582 | the terms. If the EC ~~consensus~~Consensus is that the proposed licensing terms are not compatible with  
583 | the licensing guidelines established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the proposed JSR  
584 | ~~will~~shall be delayed until Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter. The opinion of Oracle legal  
585 | ~~will~~shall be the final decision on the matter.



## 586 | 4.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT

587 | After the JSR Review, EC members ~~will~~shall review the JSR and any comments received, and cast  
588 | their ballot ~~below 5as specified in Section~~to decide if the JSR should be approved.

589 | If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO ~~will~~shall send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who  
590 | may revise the JSR and resubmit it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the  
591 | original EC decision ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR ~~will~~shall be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the  
592 | PMO ~~will~~shall post it to the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC  
593 | members for a JSR Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR ~~will~~shall be closed.

## 594 | 4.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP

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

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

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

## 606 | 5. DRAFT RELEASES

### 607 | 5.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION

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

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

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

### 620 | 5.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW

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

628 | improved some Specifications.

## 629 | **5.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

630 | If the Expert Group makes major revisions to the draft during Early Draft Review, the Spec Lead  
631 | should send the revised draft, along with a synopsis of the changes, to the PMO, ~~who~~which shall  
632 | publish these online and make them available for download by the public.

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

## 636 | **5.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

## 644 | **5.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

645 | The Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot starts when the Public Review closes. At the close of  
646 | balloting, all comments submitted by EC members with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert  
647 | Group by the PMO.

648 | If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in  
649 | response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised  
650 | draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR  
651 | ~~will~~shall be closed. If a revision is received, the PMO ~~will~~shall forward it to the EC and initiate a Public  
652 | Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC  
653 | members with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails,  
654 | the JSR ~~will~~shall be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an  
655 | existing Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current  
656 | Specification (see section 45).

## 657 | **6. FINAL RELEASE**

### 658 | **6.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

#### 663 | **6.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

664 | The Spec Lead Member is responsible for the completion of both the RI and the TCK. JSRs that are  
665 | assigned to both ECs are required to support both environments, which may require a separate RI and  
666 | TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK uncover areas of the Specification that were under-

667 | defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall work with the Expert Group to correct  
668 | those deficiencies and then send a revised Specification together with a summary of the changes to  
669 | the PMO. Information ~~will~~shall be posted to the JCP Web Site. The Expert Group ~~will~~shall continue to  
670 | consider any further comments received during this time.

## 671 | **6.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

## 678 | **6.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

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

## 686 | **6.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 693 | • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information  
694 | needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation,) a definition and explanation of the First-  
695 | level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be met in addition to  
696 | passing the TCK tests, ~~and any other information needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools-~~  
697 | ~~documentation)-~~
- 698 | • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations  
699 | a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and  
700 | b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include  
701 | any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the  
702 | Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being  
703 | implemented.

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

## 705 | **~~1.1.5 CONTINUED AVAILABILITY~~**

706 | ~~The technology that a JSR defines can be delivered as part of a Profile or Platform Edition, it can be~~  
707 | ~~delivered stand-alone or both. Future versions of the technology may be integrated into a Profile or a~~  
708 | ~~Platform Edition while previous versions were not. The submitter of a JSR will be required, via the JSR-~~  
709 | ~~submission form, to indicate if it is the submitter's goal to deliver the JSR's RI and TCK as part of a~~

710 | ~~Profile or Platform Edition, stand-alone or both. When delivering the JSR's RI and TCK integrated into~~  
711 | ~~a Profile or Platform Edition and not delivering these separately and where the RI and TCK of previous~~  
712 | ~~versions were available separately, the submitter must state the rationale. Also in this case the JSR~~  
713 | ~~Review (see section 1.2) will be 4 weeks instead of 14 days.~~

714 | ~~A JSR for a new version of an API that proposes to become part of a Profile or Platform Edition and is~~  
715 | ~~considering discontinuing stand-alone availability where the previous JSR for this API did not indicate~~  
716 | ~~this plan, must make that proposal to discontinue stand-alone availability one version ahead.~~

#### 717 | ~~1.1.6 PLATFORM INCLUSION~~

718 | ~~JSRs that want to be considered to be included in the definition of a Platform Edition or a Profile~~  
719 | ~~should describe this intent in the JSR's submission. The final decision whether a specific JSR is~~  
720 | ~~included in a Profile or a Platform Edition is made by the Spec Lead and Expert Group of that Platform~~  
721 | ~~Edition JSR or Profile JSR, and confirmed by the EC ballots on those JSRs. If the Platform Edition or~~  
722 | ~~Profile JSR turns down the request for inclusion, then the JSR for the API will be required to deliver a~~  
723 | ~~stand-alone RI and TCK.~~

### 724 | ~~6.3 1.2 JSR REVIEW~~

725 | ~~**definition -- JSR Review:** A 2 or 4 week period when anyone with an Internet connection~~  
726 | ~~can review and comment on a new JSR.~~

727 | ~~**definition -- JSR Page:** Each initiated JSR will be published on a public area of the JCP~~  
728 | ~~Web Site.~~

729 | ~~When a JSR is received, the PMO will give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the appropriate EC~~  
730 | ~~(or both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its JSR Page, announce the proposed JSR to~~  
731 | ~~the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the e-mail address listed~~  
732 | ~~on the JSR Page. All comments received will be made available from the JSR Page (similar comments~~  
733 | ~~may be consolidated) and forwarded to the EC for its consideration. Members who are interested in~~  
734 | ~~joining the Expert Group (should the JSR be approved) should identify themselves by submitting a~~  
735 | ~~nomination form to the PMO. As described by section 1.1.5 the review period will be either 2 or 4~~  
736 | ~~weeks.~~

#### 737 | ~~6.3.1 1.2.1 EARLY WARNING AND FEEDBACK ON LICENSING TERMS FOR THE RI AND~~ 738 | ~~TCK~~

739 | ~~The Spec Lead's company or organization is responsible for the Reference Implementation (RI) and~~  
740 | ~~Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK) and its licensing under terms compatible with the licensing~~  
741 | ~~guidelines established for use within the JCP. The Spec Lead will provide the EC with the terms under~~  
742 | ~~which the RI and TCK will be licensed no later than the start of JSR Review. The Spec Lead must~~  
743 | ~~provide complete copies of the licenses that they intend to use, not simply a summary of some of the~~  
744 | ~~terms. The licenses will be published for public access with links on the public JSR page. If the Spec~~  
745 | ~~Lead subsequently determines that circumstances require a change to one or more of the licenses it~~  
746 | ~~provided, the Spec Lead shall provide both the revised licenses and the reasons for the changes to~~  
747 | ~~the EC. EC members will provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community might~~  
748 | ~~react as a whole to the terms.~~

749 | ~~If Expert Group members are required to enter into an agreement (other than the JSPA) for access to~~  
750 | ~~Expert Group infrastructure (such as Expert Group mail lists, document or code repositories, etc.), the~~  
751 | ~~Spec Lead must include references to the licenses for use of these services in the Java Specification~~  
752 | ~~Request. Since hosting services may impose licensing requirements on Expert Group members, this~~  
753 | ~~information may be considered by the EC during the JSR Approval Ballot. If the Expert Group switches~~  
754 | ~~to a different hosting service after the JSR Approval Ballot, the Spec Lead must obtain EC approval~~

755 | and update the public Spec Page on the JCP Web site.

## 756 | ~~6.4 1.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT~~

757 | ~~definition – JSR Approval Ballot: The EC ballot during the last 14 days of the JSR~~  
758 | ~~Review to determine if the JSR should be approved.~~

759 | ~~During JSR Review, EC members should review the JSR (with its proposed Spec Lead and initial~~  
760 | ~~Expert Group), any comments and nominations received, and cast their ballot to decide if the JSR~~  
761 | ~~should be approved.~~

762 | ~~definition – JSR Reconsideration Ballot: The EC ballot to determine if a revised JSR~~  
763 | ~~should be approved.~~

764 | ~~If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO will send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who will~~  
765 | ~~have the option of revising the JSR and resubmitting it to the PMO within 14 days. If a revised JSR is~~  
766 | ~~not received in that time, the original EC decision will stand and the JSR will be closed. If a revised~~  
767 | ~~JSR is received, the PMO will post it to the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and~~  
768 | ~~send it to all EC members for a JSR Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR will be closed.~~

## 769 | ~~7. 2. CREATE THE EARLY DRAFT~~

### 770 | ~~7.1 2.1 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP~~

771 | ~~When a JSR is approved, the PMO will notify the identified Spec Lead to form the Expert Group. If the~~  
772 | ~~Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the Community before the JSR is approved, the~~  
773 | ~~PMO will request the initial Expert Group to choose a replacement from among themselves who is~~  
774 | ~~willing to take on the duties defined in this document (including taking responsibility for the RI and~~  
775 | ~~TGK, working towards the estimated schedule given in the JSR, and assuming the position of~~  
776 | ~~Maintenance Lead as described in section 4).~~

777 | ~~There is no size limit on the Expert Group. The Spec Lead may add additional Experts at any time~~  
778 | ~~provided the existing Expert Group is consulted first. New members may be added, for example, to~~  
779 | ~~increase diversity of opinion. A Spec Lead recruits new Experts by approaching other Members~~  
780 | ~~directly and working with them to identify an expert and bring him or her into the Expert Group.~~

#### 781 | ~~7.1.1 2.1.1 FREEDOM OF WORKING STYLE~~

782 | ~~Each Expert Group is free to define and follow whatever working style it finds most productive and~~  
783 | ~~appropriate as long as it is compatible with the JCP. Use of the Internet is encouraged. E-mail~~  
784 | ~~exchanges on mailing lists established for the use by the Expert Group, along with conference calls~~  
785 | ~~and group meetings, have been used by past Expert Groups to discuss and resolve issues raised as~~  
786 | ~~the draft evolves. In-person group meetings are useful but they tend to slow down work considerably~~  
787 | ~~due to the need to coordinate schedules.~~

788 | ~~Spec Leads are encouraged to choose a style that provides maximal transparency to the Expert~~  
789 | ~~Group, community, the EC members and the public. The PMO provides Spec Leads with tools and~~  
790 | ~~techniques for making the actions of their Expert Groups transparent, and the EC members expect~~  
791 | ~~Spec Leads to carefully choose which tools are best for their Expert Groups and commit to using~~  
792 | ~~them. Transparency is valuable to everyone in the community, especially the Expert Group, because it~~  
793 | ~~offers broader feedback to the group and helps build broader support for the final spec. The public~~  
794 | ~~JSR page must contain information on what transparency techniques are being used by the Expert~~  
795 | ~~Group and this information must be current before any JSR Ballot.~~

796 | ~~The use of JSPA Confidential materials (as defined in the JSPA) by Expert Groups limits transparency~~  
797 | ~~and is strongly discouraged. If the Spec Lead intends to permit the use of JSPA Confidential materials~~  
798 | ~~(such as emails, drafts or submissions marked as Confidential), this must be specified in the initial~~  
799 | ~~Java Specification Request before the JSR Approval Ballot. Expert Groups may also choose to keep~~  
800 | ~~information private by means other than marking it as Confidential (e.g. by not publishing it on a~~  
801 | ~~publicly available site).~~

## 802 | ~~7.1.2 2.1.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP~~

803 | ~~An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. When this happens, the Spec Lead may~~  
804 | ~~approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to find a~~  
805 | ~~replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from another~~  
806 | ~~Member if desired. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of~~  
807 | ~~its members as the new Spec Lead provided he or she is willing to take on all of the responsibilities~~  
808 | ~~defined in this document.~~

## 809 | ~~7.1.3 2.1.3 UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS~~

810 | ~~There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts~~  
811 | ~~is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group. These concerns should be brought to~~  
812 | ~~the attention of the Spec Lead and/or the EC as quickly as possible so they may be proactively~~  
813 | ~~addressed and resolved. The Expert Group members are expected to make a reasonable effort to~~  
814 | ~~resolve any such issues among themselves. If a 2/3 majority of the members of the Expert Group find~~  
815 | ~~that a Spec Lead is being unresponsive, or if a 2/3 majority of the EC determines that the Expert~~  
816 | ~~Group is no longer capable of carrying out a vote, and the Spec Lead does not work to resolve the~~  
817 | ~~situation in a timely manner, the EC may direct the PMO to ask the Member who provided the Spec~~  
818 | ~~Lead to provide a replacement or may direct the PMO to ask a different Member to provide a~~  
819 | ~~replacement.~~

## 820 | ~~7.2 2.2 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION~~

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

827 | ~~When the Expert Group decides that the first draft is ready for review, the Specification Lead will send~~  
828 | ~~the draft, along with any additional files required for review, to the PMO. The Specification Lead should~~  
829 | ~~also suggest the length of the Early Draft Review period if the Expert Group feels it should go beyond~~  
830 | ~~the minimum 30 days.~~

## 831 | ~~7.2.1 2.2.1 CONFIRMATION OF LICENSING TERMS FOR RI AND TCK~~

832 | ~~The Spec Lead's company or organization is responsible for the Reference Implementation (RI) and~~  
833 | ~~Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK) and its licensing under terms compatible with the licensing~~  
834 | ~~guidelines established for use within the JCP. The Spec Lead will provide the EC with confirmation of~~  
835 | ~~the terms under which the RI and TCK will be licensed at each review period. EC members will~~  
836 | ~~provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community might react as a whole to the~~  
837 | ~~terms. The Spec Lead must provide complete copies of the licenses that they intend to use, not simply~~  
838 | ~~a summary of some of the terms. The licenses will be published for public access with links on the~~  
839 | ~~public JSR page. If the Spec Lead subsequently determines that circumstances require a change to~~  
840 | ~~one or more of the licenses it provided, the Spec Lead shall provide both the revised licenses and the~~



841 | reasons for the changes to the EC.

## 842 | **7.3 2.3 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

843 | **definition – Community Review:** A 30 to 90 day period when Members review and  
844 | comment on the draft Specification.

845 | **definition – Early Draft Review:** A 30 to 90 day period, coexistent with Community  
846 | Review, when the public review and comment on the draft Specification.

847 | Refinement of the draft Specification begins when the PMO posts it to the JCP Web Site and  
848 | announces the start of Early Draft Review to all of the Members and the public. Anyone with access to  
849 | the Internet can download and comment on the draft. The goal of Early Draft Review is to get the draft  
850 | Specification into a form suitable for Public Review as quickly as possible by uncovering and  
851 | correcting major problems with the draft. Early Draft Review is an early access review, designed to  
852 | ideally take place when the specification still has some unresolved issues. The public's participation in  
853 | Early Draft Review is an important part of the JCP. In the past, comments from the public have raised  
854 | fundamental architectural and technological issues that have considerably improved some  
855 | Specifications.

856 | All comments from Members and the public should be sent to the e-mail feedback address listed in the  
857 | draft. The Spec Lead is responsible for ensuring that all comments are read and considered. Members  
858 | have a right to receive a response to their comments. For simplicity, similar comments may be  
859 | combined and responded to as one. All comments received must be made available from the JSR  
860 | Page (similar comments may be consolidated). Before the Public Review, a brief Expert Group  
861 | response to each of the Early Draft Review comments must be made available from the JSR page.

### 862 | **7.3.1 2.3.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

863 | If the Expert Group makes major revisions to the draft during Early Draft Review, the Spec Lead  
864 | should send the revised draft, along with a synopsis of the changes, to the PMO. The PMO will notify  
865 | Members of any updated drafts and change synopses received and make them available for download  
866 | by Members and the public.

867 | During Early Draft Review, EC members are strongly encouraged to have one or more technical  
868 | members of their organizations carry out a review of the draft in order to uncover possible duplication  
869 | of features or services between the draft and other Specifications. EC members should inform the  
870 | Expert Group of any such discoveries using the Member e-mail feedback address listed in the draft so  
871 | they can be considered and responded to like all Member comments. EC member feedback is  
872 | important to the Expert Group, and EC members are encouraged not to wait until ballot periods to  
873 | voice concerns and issues.

874 | After the Early Draft Review period has ended, the Expert Group can make any additional changes to  
875 | the draft it deems necessary in response to comments before submitting the draft to the PMO for  
876 | Public Review.


## 877 | **8. 3. COMPLETE THE SPECIFICATION**

### 878 | **8.1 3.1 PUBLIC REVIEW**

879 | **definition – Public Review:** A 30 to 90 day period when the public can review and  
880 | comment on the draft Specification.



881 Public Review begins when the PMO posts a new draft Specification on the JGP Web Site and  
882 announces it to both Members and the public. Anyone with access to the Internet can download and  
883 comment on the draft.

884 All comments from Members and the public should be sent to the e-mail feedback address listed in the  
885 draft. The Spec Lead is responsible for ensuring that all public comments are read and considered. If  
886 those comments result in revisions to the draft, and those revisions result in major changes (in the  
887 opinion of the Expert Group), then the Specification Lead will send an updated draft (with synopsis of  
888 the changes) to the PMO at any time up until the last 7 days of the review period (the draft is frozen  
889 during the last 7 days of Public Review).  Order for the EC to complete their Public Draft Specification  
890 Approval Ballot). The PMO will post both the new draft and the change synopsis to the JGP Web Site  
891 and notify both Members and the public. All comments received must be made available from the JSR  
892 Page before the end of the Review so that they can be considered by the EC during the ballot (similar  
893 comments may be consolidated). Before the Proposed Final Draft, a brief Expert Group response to  
894 each of the Public Review comments must be made available from the JSR page.

895 EC members are strongly encouraged to have one or more technical members of their organizations  
896 carry out a review of the draft early on in Public Review, in order to uncover possible negative changes  
897 since Early Draft Review. EC members should inform the Expert Group of any such discoveries using  
898 the Member e-mail feedback address listed in the draft so they can be considered and responded to  
899 during the review period, like all Member comments. EC member feedback is important to the Expert  
900 Group, and EC members are encouraged not to wait until ballot periods to voice concerns and issues.

## 901 **8.2 3.2 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

902 **definition – Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot** : The EC ballot to determine if a  
903 draft should proceed after Public Review.

904 The Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot is carried out during the last 7 days of the Public  
905 Review. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members with their ballots will be  
906 circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO.

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

909 If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in  
910 response to the concerns raised by the EC and submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised draft  
911 is not received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC will stand and the JSR will be  
912 closed. If a revision is received, the PMO will forward it to the EC and initiate a Public Draft  
913 Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members  
914 with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR will be  
915 closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the  
916 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 4).

## 917 **8.3 3.3 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

920 If the Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot (or reconsideration ballot) is successful, the Expert  
921 Group will prepare the Proposed Final Draft of the Specification by completing any revisions it deems  
922 necessary in response to comments received. The Spec Lead will then send the Proposed Final Draft  
923 to the PMO who will announce it to both Members and the public and post it on the JGP Web Site for  
924 public download.

### 925 | **8.3.1 3.3.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

926 | The Spec Lead is responsible for the completion of both the Reference Implementation (RI) and  
927 | Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK). JSRs which are assigned to both ECs are required to deliver an  
928 | RI and TCK that are applicable to the Java ME environment and to the Java SE or Java EE  
929 | environment. This may require a separate RI and TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK  
930 | uncover areas of the Specification that were under-defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead  
931 | will work with the Expert Group to correct those deficiencies and then send a revised Specification  
932 | (with synopsis of the changes) to the PMO. All such revisions and change synopses received will be  
933 | posted to the JCP Web Site and announced to both Members and the public. The Expert Group will  
934 | continue to consider any further comments received during this time.

### 935 | **8.3.2 3.3.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

939 | The Spec Lead is also responsible for establishing a clearly defined First Level TCK Appeals Process  
940 | to address challenges to the tests contained in the TCK. This process must be described in the  
941 | documentation included in the TCK (see Section 4.3 for information on the full TCK Appeals Process).  
942 | Examples of First Level TCK Appeals Process applicable to situations ranging from simple API  
943 | Specifications all the way up to Platform Edition Specifications can be found in the TCK section of the  
944 | JCP Web Site.

## 945 | **8.4 3.4 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

946 | **definition -- Final Draft**: The final draft of the Specification that will be put forward for EC  
947 | approval.

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

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

955 | Each TCK submitted as part of the Final Draft must meet the following requirements:

- 956 | • Include all TCK documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, definition and  
957 | explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, and any other information needed to use  
958 | the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation).

959 | Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and  
960 | recording of results.

- 961 | • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.  
962 | This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a  
963 | description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK  
964 | test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a Coverage Document  
965 | for the EC members to use in evaluating the sufficiency of the TCK. This executive summary of  
966 | the TCK should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, description of  
967 | means used to validate the quality of the TCK, criteria used to measure TCK test coverage of

968 | ~~the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and~~ justification for the adequacy of TCK  
969 | quality and its test coverage.

- 970 | • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the ~~required API~~  
971 | ~~signatures of~~ required by the spec are completely implemented and that ~~no non-specified-~~  
972 | ~~APIs~~ only API signatures required by the spec are included in the JSR's namespace. ~~required-~~  
973 | ~~API signatures of the spec are completely implemented.~~

974 | If the Final Approval Ballot fails, the Spec Lead will have 30 days to revise the Specification, RI, and  
975 | TCK in response to EC concerns and to resubmit modified materials to the PMO ~~definition -- Final-~~  
976 | ~~Approval Reconsideration Ballot. The 14-day EC ballot to reconsider an initial rejection of a Final-~~  
977 | ~~Draft, RI, and TCK.~~

978 | If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC ~~will~~ shall stand, the PMO  
979 | ~~will~~ shall close the JSR, and the Expert Group ~~will~~ shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing  
980 | Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~ shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current  
981 | Specification (see section 45) ~~the Final Approval Ballot fails, the Spec Lead will have 30 days to revise-~~  
982 | ~~the RI and/or TCK in response to any EC concerns. At the same time, the Expert Group will have 30-~~  
983 | ~~days to revise the Final Draft in response to any EC concerns and send it to the PMO.~~

984 | If a response is received, the PMO ~~will~~ shall circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval  
985 | Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members  
986 | ~~will~~ shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will  
987 | be closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the  
988 | Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification. ~~no responses are-~~  
989 | ~~received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision of the EC will stand, the PMO will close the-~~  
990 | ~~JSR, and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the-~~  
991 | ~~Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 4).~~

## 992 | 8.5 FINAL RELEASE

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

1000 | The Maintenance Lead must ensure that the links to the RI and TCK remain valid through the lifetime  
1001 | of the Specification. If the links become broken or non-functional, the Maintenance Lead will have 30  
1002 | days following notification from the PMO of the invalid links to correct them. If the problems are not  
1003 | corrected within 30 days, the Specification must reenter the Process at the Proposed Final Draft or  
1004 | Maintenance Review stage as appropriate, and complete the ~~Final Release or Maintenance-~~  
1005 | ~~Release~~ Release process again. NOTE: IP rights granted when the JSR made any previous R~~r~~eleases  
1006 | are not affected by such a change in status.

## 1007 | 9. MAINTENANCE

### 1008 | 9.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

1009 | The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,  
1010 | and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A  
1011 | Maintenance Lead ~~will~~ shall therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions

1012 | to their Specification but ~~will~~shall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will  
1013 | take place (see section 4.2.1.1).

1014 | ~~The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback alias through which the public may~~  
1015 | ~~submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification.~~ The public may  
1016 | submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification by logging  
1017 | issues through the JSR's Issue Tracker.

1018 | The ML ~~will~~shall consider all requests and ~~will~~shall decide how and if the Specification should be  
1019 | updated in response. The ML is not required to do all these tasks alone, but is free to consult with the  
1020 | former members of the Expert Group, or any other sources, to assist with the Maintenance duties.

1021 | All changes proposed by the ML ~~will~~shall make their way into the Specification by either the  
1022 | Maintenance Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a  
1023 | Maintenance Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the  
1024 | implementation of existing APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Modifications to existing  
1025 | APIs or the addition of new APIs should be deferred to a new JSR.

## 1026 | 9.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

1027 | If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work ~~at~~ any time (including discontinuing maintenance  
1028 | activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)  
1029 | the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member  
1030 | who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot  
1031 | within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot  
1032 | succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can  
1033 | be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then ~~to find a replacement, if the ML fail~~the PMO ~~will~~shall  
1034 | declare the Specification to be Dormant. ~~N~~ and no further maintenance ~~will~~can be carried out. No  
1035 | further Transfer Ballots shall be initiated by the PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which  
1036 | case the PMO will have again a month to initiate a Transfer Ballot. ~~on it until a new ML is identified and~~  
1037 | ~~ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK is transferred to the new ML's organization (subject to a~~  
1038 | ~~successful Transfer ballot by the EC).~~

## 1039 | 9.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW

1040 | ~~If a response is received, the PMO will circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval~~  
1041 | ~~Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members will be~~  
1042 | ~~circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will be closed~~  
1043 | ~~and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the Spec~~  
1044 | ~~Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification.~~

1045 | ~~All materials needed to publish a Final Release must be provided to the PMO before the start of the~~  
1046 | ~~Final Approval Ballot. Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot, the PMO will publish the~~  
1047 | ~~Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK.~~

## 1048 | 9.3 ~~3.5~~ FINAL RELEASE

1049 | ~~Specifications that are approved by the EC during the Final Approval Ballot (or the reconsideration~~  
1050 | ~~ballot) will be posted by the PMO on the JCP Web Site and an announcement made to both Members~~  
1051 | ~~and the public. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The~~  
1052 | ~~Spec Lead will typically be the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and~~  
1053 | ~~others for aid in that role.~~

## 1054 | **10. 4. MAINTENANCE**

### 1055 | **10.1 4.1 KEEP THE SPECIFICATION UP TO DATE**

1056 | **definition – Maintenance Lead (ML) :** The Expert responsible for maintaining the  
1057 | Specification.

1058 | The Maintenance Lead is responsible for carrying out maintenance on the Specification and dealing  
1059 | with errata by fielding requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification  
1060 | from both Members and the public via an e-mail address listed in the Specification. The ML will  
1061 | consider all requests and will decide how and if the Specification should be updated in response. The  
1062 | ML will typically be the Spec Lead from the Expert Group that developed the Specification. The ML is  
1063 | not required to do all these tasks alone. The ML may find it very helpful to recruit members of the  
1064 | Expert Group that helped to develop the Specification to assist with the Maintenance duties.

#### 1065 | **10.1.1 4.1.1 THE MAINTENANCE LEAD MAKES A LONG TERM COMMITMENT**

1066 | The Maintenance Lead (and his or her host company or organization) is expected to assume long-  
1067 | term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK with due respect of the will of the Java Community  
1068 | Members with regard to evolution. This means that a Maintenance Lead will automatically be the Spec  
1069 | Lead for all significant revisions to their Specification going forward but he or she will not have the  
1070 | exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place (see section 1.1.1).

#### 1071 | **10.1.2 4.1.2 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

1072 | **definition – Dormant Specification (Dormant) :** A Specification that does not have an  
1073 | identified Maintenance Lead. All Specifications become Dormant at the end of their life-  
1074 | cycles.

1075 | **definition – Transfer Ballot:** The EG ballot to approve transfer of ownership of a  
1076 | Specification, RI, and TCK from one Member to another Member.

1077 | If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work for whatever reason (including discontinuing  
1078 | maintenance activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision  
1079 | initiated by a JSR) the ML should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member who is willing to  
1080 | take on the task. If the ML fails to find a replacement, the PMO will declare the Specification to be  
1081 | Dormant. No further maintenance will be carried out on it until a new ML is identified and ownership of  
1082 | the Specification, RI, and TCK is transferred to the new ML's organization (subject to a successful  
1083 | Transfer ballot by the EG).

### 1084 | **10.2 4.2 THE MAINTENANCE CYCLE**

1085 | The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback email address for requests for  
1086 | Specification clarifications, corrections or changes from the public. The ML will review all comments,  
1087 | identify common themes, and arrange with the PMO to make a list of frequently raised issues  
1088 | available from the document's Spec Page. The ML is free to consult with the former members of the  
1089 | Expert Group, or any other sources, for advice on how to revise the Specification. All change items  
1090 | proposed by the ML will make their way into the Specification by either the Minor Revision process  
1091 | (described in section 4.2.1) or by a JSR.

1092 | **10.2.1 4.2.1 MINOR REVISION PROCESS**

1093 | **definition – Minor Revision:** Minor changes made to a Specification by the ML.

1094 | **definition – Change Log:** An area accessible from the Spec Page that lists all changes  
1095 | made to the Specification after Final Release. There are three sections: PROPOSED  
1096 | (changes not yet made to the Specification), ACCEPTED (changes made), and  
1097 | DEFERRED (change items to be considered in a new JSR).

1098 | **definition – Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a  
1099 | Minor Revision when Members and the public consider and comment on the change items  
1100 | listed in the PROPOSED section of the Change Log.

1101 | The ML will arrange to have all change items placed into the PROPOSED section of the Change Log  
1102 | and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance  
1103 | Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received at the Maintenance feedback email  
1104 | address (similar comments may be consolidated) and indicate the disposition for each comment (e.g.  
1105 | deferred with a brief explanation, rejected with a brief explanation, included in Change Log proposal).  
1106 | This will be posted along with the Change Log on the Spec Page. The PMO will make a public  
1107 | announcement and begin the review.

1108 | The ML may choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received  
1109 | during review. All comments will be available from the Spec Page. At the end of Maintenance Review,  
1110 | the ML will update the Specification, document all revisions in the ACCEPTED section of the Change  
1111 | Log, and delete the corresponding entries in the PROPOSED section. All changes not incorporated  
1112 | into the Specification may be either left in the PROPOSED section or moved to the DEFERRED  
1113 | section.

1114 | **10.2.2 4.2.2 THE EC MAY DEFER MINOR REVISION ITEMS**

1115 | **definition – Item Exception Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include  
1116 | specific change items in a Minor Revision.

1117 | During Maintenance Review an EC member may request that specific proposed change items be  
1118 | deferred to the next JSR. Any such request must be made to the PMO no later than the close of  
1119 | Maintenance Review. If requests are received, the PMO will circulate the requests to all EC members  
1120 | and initiate a 7 day Item Exception Ballot within 2 weeks after the close of the Maintenance Review. At  
1121 | the close of the Item Exception Ballot, the PMO will post the ballot results to the Change Log. The ML  
1122 | will place all proposed changes that were disapproved into the DEFERRED section. The ML will need  
1123 | to initiate a JSR to carry out any of those changes. The ML must post an updated version of the  
1124 | Specification within one month of the completion of the Review and any Item Exception Ballot.

1125 | **10.2.3 4.2.3 KEEPING THE RI AND TCK SYNCHRONIZED WITH THE SPECIFICATION**

1126 | Whenever the Specification is updated, the ML is responsible for reviewing the current RI and TCK to  
1127 | determine what revisions (if any) are needed to keep the RI and TCK synchronized with the  
1128 | Specification. The maintenance changes will be considered final when the RI and TCK are  
1129 | synchronized with the Specification.

1130 | **10.3 4.3 THE TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

1131 | As noted in section 3.2.2, the TCK documentation must identify and specify a First-Level TCK Appeals  
1132 | Process by which challenges to the TCK will be addressed. An implementer of a Specification can



1133 | challenge a TCK test using the First-Level TCK Appeals Process. Implementers who are not satisfied  
1134 | with a first-level decision can appeal it to the EC.

### 1135 | **10.3.1 4.3.1 APPEALING A FIRST-LEVEL DECISION TO THE EC**

1136 | **definition – Appeal Ballot** : The EC ballot to override a first-level decision on a TCK test  
1137 | challenge.

1138 | Implementers appeal a first-level decision to the EC by filing a written request with the PMO using the  
1139 | online form available at the TCK section of the JCP Web Site. The PMO will circulate the request to  
1140 | the EC, along with any information received from the ML concerning the rationale for the first-level  
1141 | decision, and initiate an Appeal Ballot.

### 1142 | **10.4 4.3.2 UPDATE THE RI TO MATCH THE TCK AND THE SPECIFICATION**

1143 | If the Appeal Ballot is successful, the ML will update the TCK and/or the Specification in accordance  
1144 | with the EC decision and update the RI if necessary.

### 1145 | **III**

1146 | The ML will document all proposed Specification changes in the PROPOSED section of the Change  
1147 | Log and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance  
1148 | Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received through the Maintenance feedback alias  
1149 | and must indicate the disposition of each comment (e.g. deferred with a brief explanation, rejected  
1150 | with a brief explanation, included in the Change Log proposal.) This summary will be posted along  
1151 | with the Change Log on the JSR Page. The PMO will then make a public announcement and begin  
1152 | the review.

1153 | The ML may choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received  
1154 | during the review.

1155 | At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO will initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.  
1156 | During this ballot EC members should vote "yes" if they agree that the Maintenance Release should  
1157 | go ahead as the Spec Lead has proposed, and "no" if they believe that one or more of the changes  
1158 | proposed by the ML is inappropriate for a Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on  
1159 | JSR. "No" votes must be accompanied by comments in which the offending items are identified and  
1160 | the reasons for the objection are explained.

1161 | If there are any "no" votes the PMO will within two weeks initiate an Item Exception Ballot for each  
1162 | change that EC members have objected to.

1163 | NOTE: there is no minimum number of "yes" votes required to move forward with the proposed  
1164 | Maintenance Release, and "no" votes cannot prevent a release unless the ML is unwilling to defer  
1165 | items subsequently disallowed in an Item Exception Ballot.

1166 | At the end of Maintenance Review and any subsequent Item Exception Ballots, the ML will update the  
1167 | Specification, moving all approved revisions from the PROPOSED to the ACCEPTED section of the  
1168 | Change Log. Items voted down in an Item Exception Ballot must be moved to the DEFERRED section  
1169 | of the log. Other changes not incorporated into the Specification may be left in the PROPOSED  
1170 | section or moved to the DEFERRED section at the ML's discretion.

1171 | The Maintenance Lead shall document all proposed Specification changes through the Issue Tracker  
1172 | and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. This request must be  
1173 | accompanied by an Issue List that summarizes all formal comments that have been received and that  
1174 | indicates the disposition of each Issue. The Maintenance Lead should also supply a summary of the  
1175 | proposed Specification changes, ideally in the form of a *diff* between the proposed and the current



1176 Specification. The Maintenance Lead must also provide an estimate of when the final materials shall  
1177 be delivered for the Maintenance Release. If no estimate is provided the deadline will default to 30  
1178 days.

1179 The PMO shall post the materials on the JCP website for public review. The Maintenance Lead may  
1180 choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received during the  
1181 review.

1182 At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO shall initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.  
1183 During this ballot EC members should vote 'yes' if they agree that the Maintenance Release should  
1184 proceed as the Spec Lead has proposed, and 'no' if they have objections to the proposed release on  
1185 one of the following grounds:

- 1186 • One or more of the changes proposed by the Maintenance Lead is inappropriate for a  
1187 Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on JSR
- 1188 • An issue that was referenced in a "conditional yes" vote during an earlier development stage  
1189 has not been addressed.
- 1190 • The proposed Maintenance Release date too far in the future. (EC members should bear in  
1191 mind that many Maintenance Releases need to be synchronized with updates to a Platform,  
1192 and that a Maintenance Review may therefore need to be carried out significantly in advance  
1193 of the proposed Platform release.)
- 1194 • Unreasonable changes have been made to the RI or TCK licensing terms.

1195 'No' votes on other grounds shall be rejected by the PMO and shall be considered as abstentions. All  
1196 'no' votes must be accompanied by comments explaining the reason for the vote.

1197 If the ballot fails, the Maintenance Lead may make any necessary corrections before requesting  
1198 another Maintenance Review and ballot. The process may be repeated any number of times.

1199

## 1200 **1.1 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

1201 ~~At any time after a Maintenance Review Ballot and possible Item Exception Ballot the Spec Lead will~~  
1202 ~~update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Change Log as necessary and submit them to the PMO for~~  
1203 ~~publication in a Maintenance Release.~~ After a successful Maintenance Review Ballot the Maintenance  
1204 Lead shall update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Issue List as necessary and submit them to the  
1205 PMO for publication in a Maintenance Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have  
1206 been made, and publishes the Specification, the ~~Change Log~~ Issue List, and pointers to the RI and  
1207 TCK on the JSR Web Page.

1208 NOTE: until the Maintenance Release stage is reached any proposed changes should be considered  
1209 preliminary and subject to change, and therefore should not be implemented in shipping products.

1210 If the Maintenance Lead fails to deliver the final materials within the time-period specified at the  
1211 beginning of the Maintenance Review process the PMO shall inform the Maintenance Lead of an  
1212 impending Maintenance Renewal Ballot, and shall request the Maintenance Lead to prepare a public  
1213 statement to the EC that explains the reason for the delay and provides a new deadline. 30 days after  
1214 this request the PMO shall initiate a Maintenance Renewal Ballot to determine whether the deadline  
1215 may be extended as requested or whether the previous Maintenance Review should be rescinded and  
1216 the Maintenance Lead be required to go through another Maintenance Review.

## 1217 | 2. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

### 1218 | 2.1 SCOPE

1219 | The Executive Committee (EC) oversees the development and evolution of the Java technologies  
1220 | within the JCP.

### 1221 | 2.2 MEMBERSHIP

1222 | There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and  
1223 | EE together. Each EC is composed of 16 Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.  
1224 | has a permanent voting seat on each EC. (Oracle representatives must not be members of the PMO.)  
1225 | The ECs are led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.

1226 | Should one Member on the EC acquire a majority ownership of another EC member, one of those  
1227 | members must resign his or her seat by the effective date of the acquisition.

1228 | NOTE: In the near future the EC intends to merge the two ECs, and modify the number of members  
1229 | and possibly their terms of office.

### 1230 | 2.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1231 | 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 1232 | 2. Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.
- 1233 | 3. Approve draft Specifications ~~for~~after Public Review.
- 1234 | 4. Ensure that publicly expressed issues/concerns with a JSR are addressed by the Expert  
1235 | Group.
- 1236 | 5. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
- 1237 | 6. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
- 1238 | 7. Review proposed maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new  
1239 | JSR.
- 1240 | 8. Approve the transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
- 1241 | 9. Decide when JSRs that have not made sufficient progress through the Process should be  
1242 | withdrawn.
- 1243 | 10. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the  
1244 | organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance  
1245 | may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the  
1246 | EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.
- 1247 | 11. Members of the Executive Committee shall be dedicated to the principles of full and open  
1248 | competition, in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United  
1249 | States and other nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can  
1250 | result in criminal as well as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on  
1251 | the jurisdiction. In particular, any discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of  
1252 | distribution, division of markets or allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be  
1253 | avoided.

### 1254 | 2.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM

1255 | EC members serve three-year terms, which are staggered so that a third of the seats are up for  
1256 | election each year.

1257 | On each EC there are two Ratified Seats for every Elected Seat (currently 10 Ratified Seats and 5  
1258 | Elected Seats) plus one permanent seat held by Oracle America, Inc.

#### 1259 | **2.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

1260 | EC Members may resign their seats at any time during their term.

1261 | EC members who fail to remain Java Community Members forfeit their EC seat.

1262 | Vacated seats ~~will~~are normally ~~be~~ filled for the remainder of their term by a special election ballot that  
1263 ~~will~~shall be held no later than two months after the resignation (unless the resignation is less than six  
1264 months before the next scheduled annual election ballot). However, EC members may choose not to  
1265 fill a vacated seat in order to facilitate a reduction in the size of the ECs in anticipation of a future  
1266 merge into a single EC.

#### 1267 | **2.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

1268 | All JCP Members are eligible to vote in ballots for Ratified and Elected Seats subject to the provision  
1269 that if a Member has majority-ownership of, ~~or is the employer of,~~ one or more other Members, or if  
1270 one or more Members are Agents of another Member, then that group of Members ~~will~~shall collectively  
1271 have ~~4~~ one vote, which ~~will~~shall be cast by the person they designate to be their representative for the  
1272 ballot in question.

1273 | Annual elections for Ratified and Elected Seats ~~will~~shall be held simultaneously. Voting in these  
1274 elections will start in the third week of October.

1275 |  
1276 | In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall  
1277 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask  
1278 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also  
1279 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

#### 1280 | **2.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

1281 | Members are selected for the Ratified Seats using a ratification ballot which is carried out as follows:

- 1282 | • The PMO nominates Members to fill the vacant Ratified Seats with due regard for balanced  
1283 community and regional representation.
- 1284 | • At its discretion the PMO may choose not to nominate any candidate for a ratified seat, in order  
1285 to facilitate a reduction in the size of the ECs in anticipation of a future merge into a single EC.
- 1286 | • Eligible Members ~~will~~shall vote to ratify each nominee over a 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.
- 1287 | • A nominee is ratified by a simple majority of those who cast a vote.
- 1288 | • If one or more of the nominees are not ratified by the vote, the PMO ~~will~~shall nominate  
1289 additional Members as needed and hold additional ratification ballots until the vacant seats are  
1290 filled.

#### 1291 | **2.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

1292 | Members are selected for the Elected Seats using an open election process that is carried out as  
1293 follows:

- 1294 | • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO ~~will~~shall post on the public JCP site a complete  
1295 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,  
1296 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 1297 | • Four weeks before the ~~voting~~ballot period the PMO ~~will~~shall accept nominations from the  
1298 Community for a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that  
1299 ~~employees~~Agents of JCP Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO  
1300 shall reject such nominations.
- 1301 | • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a  
1302 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.

- 1303 • The nominees who receive the most votes ~~will~~shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 1304 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters ~~will~~shall be given the opportunity to vote
- 1305 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 1306 • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the
- 1307 next election.
- 1308 • Ties ~~will~~shall be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt>
- 1309 and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

### 1310 3. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES

- 1311 1. All JSR ballots ~~will~~shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 1312 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 1313 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
- 1314 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
- 1315 vote at all.
- 1316 4. Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions
- 1317 for change these should be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed.
- 1318 "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if
- 1319 resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 1320 5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 1321 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
- 1322 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 1323 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs ~~for new~~that define the initial version of a new -Platform Edition
- 1324 Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least
- 1325 a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
- 1326 cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 1327 8. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 45.1.
- 1328 9. ~~"No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation of the changes (if any) that would-~~
- 1329 ~~persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".~~
- 1330 10. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 1331 11. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before
- 1332 the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 1333 12. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
- 1334 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
- 1335 cast. ~~be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third of the EC Members cast "no" votes for-~~
- 1336 ~~that item. will~~
- 1337 13. ~~An item listed in an Item-Exception-Ballot-~~
- 1338 14. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot ~~will~~shall be approved only if
- 1339 each EC approves it separately.

### 1340 IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA

1341 Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation  
1342 Agreement ~~will~~shall be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

### 1343 ~~V APPENDIX B: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA~~

1344 ~~Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation-~~  
1345 ~~Agreement be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:-~~

1346 | **VI Only EC members can initiate a JSR to revise one of these**  
1347 **documents.**

- 1348 1. Each EC must approve the JSR.  
1349 | 2. The Expert Group consists of both ECs with a member of the PMO as Specification Lead.  
1350 3. There is no Reference Implementation or Technology Compatibility Kit to be delivered and no  
1351 TCK appeals process to be defined.

1352