

JCP 2: Process Document

Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)

Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

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

CONTENTS

I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
II	GENERAL DEFINITIONS	3
III	THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM	4
0.	GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	4
0.0	EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	4
0.1	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	5
0.2	ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	5
0.3	TURNAROUND TIMES.....	6
1.	INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION	6
1.0	DEFINITIONS.....	6
1.1	INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	7
1.2	JSR REVIEW	8
1.3	JSR APPROVAL BALLOT	9
2.	CREATE THE EARLY DRAFT	9
2.0	DEFINITIONS.....	9
2.1	FORM THE EXPERT GROUP	9
2.2	WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION	11
2.3	EARLY DRAFT REVIEW	11
3.	PUBLIC REVIEW.....	12
3.0	DEFINITIONS.....	12
3.1	PUBLIC REVIEW	12
3.2	PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT	13
4.	FINAL RELEASE.....	13
4.0	DEFINITIONS.....	13
4.1	PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT	13
4.2	FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT	14
4.3	FINAL RELEASE	15
4.4	COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	15
4.5	JSR RENEWAL BALLOT.....	15
5.	MAINTENANCE	16
5.0	DEFINITIONS.....	16
5.1	KEEP THE SPECIFICATION UP TO DATE	16
5.2	THE MAINTENANCE CYCLE	17
6.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	18
6.0	DEFINITIONS.....	18

6.1 SCOPE	18
6.2 MEMBERSHIP	18
6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	19
6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM	19
7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES	20
IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	21

9

10 I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

21 This version of the JCP was developed through the JCP by means of JSR 348, led by Oracle and the
 22 combined Executive Committees as the expert group.

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

32 There are five major steps in this version of the JCP:

- 33 1. **INITIATION:** A specification targeted at the desktop/server or consumer/embedded space is
 34 initiated by community member(s) and approved for development by the responsible EC.
- 35 2. **EARLY DRAFT:** A group of experts is formed to develop a preliminary draft of the specification
 36 that Members, the community and the public can then read, review and comment on. The
 37 expert group uses feedback from the review to revise and refine the draft.
- 38 3. **PUBLIC DRAFT:** The Expert Group submits a draft of the specification to the PMO, who
 39 publish it for public review. The EG revises the document on the basis of feedback received
 40 from the public. At the end of the review period the EC votes on whether the JSR should
 41 proceed to the Final Release stage.
- 42 4. **FINAL RELEASE:** The Spec Lead finalizes the Specification and submits it to the PMO for
 43 publication as the Proposed Final Draft. When the RI and TCK are completed, and the RI
 44 passes the TCK, all three deliverables are submitted to the PMO, who circulate them to the
 45 responsible EC for final approval.
- 46 5. **MAINTENANCE:** The completed specification, reference implementation, and technology
 47 compatibility kit are updated in response to ongoing requests for clarification, interpretation,
 48 enhancements, and revisions. The responsible EC can review all proposed changes to the

specification and indicate which ones can be carried out immediately and which will require the specification to be revised by an expert group. Challenges to one or more tests in a specification's technology compatibility kit are ultimately decided by the responsible EC if they cannot be otherwise resolved.

II GENERAL DEFINITIONS

Change Log: And 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).

Executive Committee (EC): The Members who guide the evolution of the Java technologies. The EC represents a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other Members of the Java Community. Members must have signed the EC acceptance letter in order to serve on the EC. The EC Policies and Procedures are in the EC Standing Rules, which is a separate document.

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

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

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

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

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

JSR Page: Each JSR 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.

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

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

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

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

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

94 The use of the term “day” or “days” in this document refers to calendar days unless otherwise
95 specified.

96 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM

97 0. GENERAL PROCEDURES

98 0.0 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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


102 As specified below, Expert Groups must operate in a transparent manner, enabling the public to
103 observe their deliberations and to provide feedback, which must be taken into consideration, and to
104 which public responses must be provided. In the initial JSR submission the Spec Lead must specify
105 the transparency mechanisms (for example, the mailing lists and issue trackers) that the Expert Group
106 intends to adopt, and provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO will
107 publish this information on the public JSR Page.

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

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

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


124 0.0.1 Mailing Lists

125 All substantive business must be carried out on official public mailing lists designated by the Spec
126 Lead. The purpose of the official mailing lists is to keep observers aware of important issues and,
127 therefore, minor administrative issues that distract from substantive business should be kept private.
128 The expert group private mailing list should be used for minor administrative matters. Significant
129 business includes (a) eliminating or adding new features to the JSR, (b) changes to the membership
130 of the expert group, (c) changes to the reference implementation, (d) changes to the TCK, (e)
131 publication of the agenda and (f) on-going debate about JSR specifics. Non-substantive administrative
132 matters such as (a) back and forth details of meeting schedules, (b) messages directing expert group
133 members to particular documents or URLs, and  reminders about voting or task assignments should
134 be excluded from the official public mailing lists.


135 If the official EG public mailing list is writable by the EG members only, the Expert Group must also

136 provide a publicly readable and writable email list, or a forum, for feedback and comments from the
137 public.


138 **0.0.2 Issue Tracking**

139 Issues must be tracked through a publicly viewable issue tracking mechanism. A formalized issue
140 tracking mechanism will help ensure that all issues raised by the Java community are documented
141 and responded to before the JSR moves to the next stage. ~~The specific issue tracking mechanism will~~
142 ~~be proposed as part of the Working Group Style by the specific expert group prior to the JSR~~
143 ~~Specification Review process. The main JSR page will explicitly describe the issue tracking~~
144 ~~mechanism including the URL for all issues. The issue tracking mechanism can be changed through a~~
145 ~~majority vote of the expert group as long as all issues are incorporated into the new system.~~ 

146 **0.0.3 Comments Response**

147 Expert Groups must respond publicly to all comments before JSRs can move to the next stage. All
148 comments regarding a JSR deserve a well-crafted response. Expert groups should review responses
149 prior to release to ensure that the response addresses the specific comment. Comments that are
150 substantively the same as previously responded to comments (duplicate comments) can be answered
151 through reference to the previous comment. Comments that are off-topic do not require a comment
152 but should be denoted as such. The executive committee reserves the right  require that a comment
153 deemed by the expert group as off-topic be addressed prior to JSR review.

154 **0.0.4 Licensing Terms Changes**


155 If the licensing terms for a JSR change substantially from one release to the next, the changes must
156 be listed explicitly and explained. Such changes to the licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR
157 submission (in the case of a new JSR) or in the Change Log for Maintenance Releases. Additional
158 changes to licensing terms during the life of the JSR  must be disclosed when the Specification is next
159 submitted to the PMO for public posting or review.

160 **0.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

161 **0.1.1 Transparency**

162 All Executive Committee substantive business is expected to be conducted in the most transparent
163 manner possible. This is spelled out in a separate document, <name of standing rules document>.

164 **0.1.2 Draft Reviews**


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

172 **0.2 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

173 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any one EG member can initiate an appeal to the EC
174 regarding a decision, an action or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that

175 affects EG participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means.
176 Such appeal shall be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO (pmo@jcp.org) in all cases,
177 even if it affects the PMO. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely,
178 with a short and relevant Subject: line, and provide all relevant documentation in support of the
179 appeal, either by copy or by reference. The PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than
180 seven days of receipt. The EC shall then respond to the appellant within 30 days, either with a
181 resolution or with a request for clarification and/or further documentation.

182 **0.3 TURNAROUND TIMES**

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

186 **1. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION**

187 **1.0 DEFINITIONS**


188 **Expert:** A Member representative who has expert knowledge and is an active practitioner
189 in the technology covered by the JSR.

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


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

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

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

198 **JSR Review:** A 4 week period when anyone  review and comment on a new JSR.

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

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

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

207 1.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

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

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

- 214 • the Members making the request (the submitters), a Spec Lead, and the initial members of the
215 Expert Group.
- 216 • a description of the proposed specification.
- 217 • the reason(s) for developing or revising it.
- 218 • the primary Platform Edition, as well as any consideration given to other Platform Editions.
- 219 • an estimated development schedule.
- 220 • any preexisting documents, technology descriptions, or implementations that might be used as
221 a starting point.
- 222 • a transparency plan, which outlines the tools and techniques that the Spec Lead will use,
223 during the creation and development of the specification, and for communicating the progress
224 within the Expert Group to Community Members, EC Members and the public. The EC will
225 expect the Spec Lead to operate the JSR in accordance with this plan.

226 1.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS

227 Existing Specifications, along with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated
228 Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 5 of this document. Maintenance Lead
229 Members are expected to assume long term ownership of their Specifications, RIs, and TCKs with
230 due respect of the will of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. This means that
231 Maintenance Leads will automatically be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their
232 Specifications going forward but they will not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant
233 revision will take place. That will be decided by the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be
234 initiated by any Java Community Member (or Members). The only provision is that the submitter(s)
235 should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous Expert Group to join the
236 revision effort.

237 1.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION

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

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

245 1.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS

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

250 **1.1.4 CONTINUED AVAILABILITY**

251 The technology that a JSR defines can be delivered as part of a Profile or Platform Edition, it can be
252 delivered stand-alone or both. Future versions of the technology may be integrated into a Profile or a
253 Platform Edition while previous versions were not. The submitter of a JSR will be required, via the JSR
254 submission form, to indicate if it is the submitter's goal to deliver the JSR's RI and TCK as part of a
255 Profile or Platform Edition, stand-alone or both. When delivering the JSR's RI and TCK integrated into
256 a Profile or Platform Edition and not delivering these separately and where the RI and TCK of previous
257 versions were available separately, the submitter must state the rationale. Also in this case the JSR
258 Review (see section 1.2) will be 4 weeks instead of 14 days.

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

262 **1.1.5 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

269 **1.2 JSR REVIEW**



271 When a JSR is received, the PMO will give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the appropriate EC
272 (or both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its JSR Page, announce the proposed JSR to
273 the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the e-mail address listed
274 on the JSR Page. All comments received will be made available from the JSR Page (similar comments
275 may be consolidated) and forwarded to the EC for its consideration. Members who are interested in
276 joining the Expert Group (should the JSR be approved) should identify themselves by submitting a
277 nomination form to the PMO.

278 **1.2.1 EARLY WARNING AND FEEDBACK ON LICENSING TERMS FOR THE RI AND TCK**

279 The Spec Lead Member responsible for the Reference Implementation (RI) and Technology
280 Compatibility Kit (TCK) and its licensing under terms compatible with the licensing guidelines
281 established for use within the JCP. The Spec Lead Member will provide the EC with the terms under
282 which the RI and TCK will be licensed no later than the start of JSR Review. The Spec Lead Member
283 must provide complete copies of the licenses that they intend to use, not simply a summary of some of
284 the terms. The licenses must be offered in perpetuity. The licenses will be published for public access
285 with links on the public JSR page. If the Spec Lead Member subsequently determines that
286 circumstances require a change to one or more of the licenses it provided, the Spec Lead Member
287 shall provide both the revised licenses and the reasons for the changes to the EC. EC members will
288 provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community might react as a whole to the
289 terms. Existing licensees who not wish to accept the modified license when required to adopt a newer
290 TCK will have the option to accept the updated TCK under the previous licensing terms. The EC
291 consensus is that the proposed licensing terms are not compatible with the licensing guidelines
292 established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the proposed JSR will be delayed until Oracle
293 legal provides an opinion on the matter. The opinion of Oracle legal will be the final decision on the
294 matter.

295 If Expert Group members are required to enter into an agreement (other than the JSPA) for access to
296 Expert Group infrastructure (such as Expert Group mail lists, document or code repositories, etc.), the
297 Spec Lead must include references to the licenses for use of these services in the Java Specification
298 Request. Since hosting services may impose licensing requirements on Expert Group members, this
299 information may be considered by the EC during the JSR Approval Ballot. If the Expert Group switches
300 to a different hosting service after the JSR Approval Ballot, the Spec Lead must obtain EC approval
301 and update the public JSR Page on the JCP Web site. If the EC consensus is that the proposed
302 revised terms are not compatible with the licensing guidelines established for use within the JCP, then
303 balloting on the proposed JSR will be delayed until Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter. The
304 opinion of Oracle legal will be the final decision on the matter.

305 1.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT

306 After the JSR Review, EC members will review the JSR (with its proposed Spec Lead and initial
307 Expert Group), any comments and nominations received, and cast their ballot as per Section 6. below
308 to decide if the JSR should be approved.

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

314 2. CREATE THE EARLY DRAFT

315 2.0 DEFINITIONS

316 **Early Draft Review:** A 30 to 90 day period when the public review and comment
317 on the draft Specification.

318 2.1 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP


319 Within 14 days of a JSR being approved, the PMO will notify the identified Spec Lead to form the
320 Expert Group. If the Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the Community before the
321 JSR is approved, the PMO will request the initial Expert Group to choose a replacement from among
322 themselves who is willing to take on the duties defined in this document (including taking responsibility
323 for the RI and TCK, working towards the estimated schedule given in the JSR, and assuming the
324 position of Maintenance Lead as described in section 5).

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

329 Any JCP member or employee of a JCP member can request to join an Expert Group at any time by
330 sending an email to the Spec Lead of such EG. The request, together with the Spec Lead's official
331 response, substantive deliberations within the EG about this matter, and any other official decision
332 related to EG composition, including decisions to remove or replace EG members, must be made
333 public via a publicly readable (and publicly archived) email list.

334 2.1.1 FREEDOM OF WORKING STYLE

335 Each Expert Group is free to define and follow whatever working style it finds most productive and

336 appropriate as long as it is compatible with the JCP. Electronic and phone communication is
337 encouraged. In-person group meetings are useful but they  to slow down work considerably due
338 to travel restrictions and the need to coordinate schedules.

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

347 The use of JSPA Confidential materials (as defined in the JSPA) by Expert Groups limits transparency
348 and is strongly discouraged. If the Spec Lead intends to permit the use of JSPA Confidential materials
349 (such as emails, drafts or submissions marked as Confidential), this must be specified in the initial
350 Java Specification Request before the JSR Approval Ballot. ¹

351 **2.1.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

358 **2.1.3**

359 **2.1.4 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

360 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts
361 is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,
362 uncooperative or unresponsive. The Expert Group members are expected to make a reasonable effort
363 to resolve any such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the
364 situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec
365 Lead and request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If
366 the Spec Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG member in
367 question is an employee of a JCP member company or organization, the Spec Lead must first
368 request that the company or organization replace its representative. If that does not happen in a timely
369 manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the company or organization itself from further EG participation.
370 The Spec Lead's decision as to whether to exclude or not can be appealed to the EC by following the
371 process outlined in Section 0.2, "Escalation and Appeals"

372 **2.1.5 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

373 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting
374 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These
375 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be
376 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
377 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any
378 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause(which should be


1 The EC intends to remove the confidentiality language from the JSPA in the near future.

379 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to
380 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is an employee of a company or
381 organization, the PMO should ask the company or organization to replace the Spec Lead, or it may
382 seek to put in place an alternative Spec Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a transfer ballot as
383 specified in section 5.1.2 of this document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the EC may
384 disband the Expert Group.


385 **2.2 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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



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

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

398 **2.2.1 CONFIRMATION OF LICENSING TERMS FOR RI AND TCK**

399 The Spec Lead Member  responsible for the Reference Implementation (RI) and Technology
400 Compatibility Kit (TCK) and its licensing under terms compatible with the licensing guidelines
401 established for use within the JCP. The Spec Lead Member will provide the EC with confirmation of the
402 terms under which the RI and TCK will be licensed at each review period. EC members will provide
403 feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community might react as a whole to the terms. The
404 Spec Lead Member must provide complete copies of the licenses that they intend to use, not simply a
405 summary of some of the terms. The licenses will be published for public access with links on the public
406 JSR page. If the Spec Lead Member subsequently determines that circumstances require a change to
407 one or more of the licenses it provided, the Spec Lead shall provide both the revised licenses and the
408 reasons for the changes to the EC.

409 **2.3 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

418 All comments from Members and the public should be sent to the e-mail feedback address listed in the
419 draft. The Spec Lead is responsible for ensuring that all comments are read and considered.
420 Commenters have a right to receive a response to their comments within 30 [or 60?] days after the
421 close of the Early Draft Review period. For simplicity, similar comments may be combined and
422 responded to as one. All comments received must be made available from the JSR Page . Before the
423 Public Review, a brief Expert Group response to each of the Early Draft Review comments must be

424 made available from the JSR page.²

425 2.3.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW

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

430 

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

434 3. PUBLIC REVIEW

435 3.0 DEFINITIONS


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


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


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

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

444 3.1 PUBLIC REVIEW

445 Public Review begins when the PMO posts a new draft Specification on the JCP Web Site and
446 announces it to both Members and the public. Anyone  download and comment on the draft.

447 All comments from Members and the public should be sent to the e-mail feedback address listed in the
448 draft. The Spec Lead is responsible for ensuring that all comments are read and considered. If those
449 comments result in revisions to the draft, and those revisions result in major changes (in the opinion of
450 the Expert Group), then the Spec Lead  will send an updated draft (with synopsis of the changes) to
451 the PMO at any time up until the last day of the review period. The PMO will post both the new draft
452 and the change synopsis to the JCP Web Site and notify both Members and the public. All comments
453 received must be made available from the JSR Page before the end of the Review so that they can be
454 considered by the EC during the ballot (similar comments may be consolidated). Before the Proposed
455 Final Draft, a brief Expert Group response to each of the Public Review comments must be made
456 available from the JSR page.

457 

² The requirement to respond publicly to comments will be tightened up in a future draft of this document, via a new *General Requirements* section

458 3.2 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

470 4. FINAL RELEASE

471 4.0 DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

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

481 4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT

482

483 If the Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot (or Reconsideration Ballot) is successful, the Expert
484 Group will prepare the Proposed Final Draft of the Specification by completing any revisions it deems
485 necessary in response to comments received. The Spec Lead will then send the Proposed Final Draft
486 to the PMO, who will announce it to both Members and the public and post it on the JCP Web Site for
487 public download within seven days of receipt.

488 4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK

489 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for the completion of both the Reference Implementation (RI)
490 and Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK). JSRs which are assigned to both ECs are required to deliver
491 an RI and TCK that are applicable to the Java ME environment and to the Java SE or Java EE
492 environment. This may require a separate RI and TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK
493 uncover areas of the Specification that were under-defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead

494 will work with the Expert Group to correct those deficiencies and then send a revised Specification
495 (with synopsis of the changes) to the PMO. All such revisions and change synopses received will be
496 posted to the JCP Web Site and announced to both Members and the public. The Expert Group will
497 continue to consider any further comments received during this time.

498 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**


499

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

506 ~~**4.1.3 4.3.2 UPDATE THE RI TO MATCH THE TCK AND THE SPECIFICATION**~~

507 ~~If the Appeal Ballot is successful, the ML will, within one month of the close of Ballot, update the TCK~~
508 ~~and/or the Specification in accordance with the EC decision, update the RI if necessary, and record~~
509 ~~the changes in the RI and TCK Change Logs.~~


510 **4.1.4 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

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

517 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 524 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, a definition and
525 explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, the Compatibility Requirements that must
526 be met in addition to passing the TCK tests, and any other information needed to use the TCK
527 (e.g. Tools documentation). 
- 528 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and
529 recording of results.
- 530 • Include a TCK Coverage Document for the EC members to use in evaluating the sufficiency of
531 the TCK. This executive summary of the TCK should include an overview of the documentation
532 included in the TCK, description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, criteria used
533 to measure TCK test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and
534 justification for the adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 535 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the required API


536 signatures of the spec are completely implemented.


537 If the Final Approval Ballot fails, the Spec Lead will have 30 days to revise the RI and/or TCK in
538 response to any EC concerns. At the same time, the Expert Group will have 30 days to revise the
539 Final Draft in response to any EC concerns and send it to the PMO.

540 If no responses are received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision of the EC will stand, the
541 PMO will close the JSR, and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing
542 Specification, the Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification
543 (see section 4).

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

549 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

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


557 The Maintenance Lead must ensure the links to the RI and TCK remain valid through the lifetime of
558 the Specification. If the links become broken or non-functional, the Maintenance Lead will have 30
559 days following notification from the PMO of the invalid links to correct them. If the problems are not
560 corrected within the 30 days, the Specification must reenter the Process at the Proposed Final Draft
561 stage and complete the Final Approval process again. 

562 **4.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

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


569 **4.5 JSR RENEWAL BALLOT**

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

571 If a JSR does not begin Early Draft Review within the first 12 months following the completion of its
572 initial JSR Approval Ballot (JSR Approval), or does not begin Public Review within 2 years of JSR
573 Approval or has not achieved Final Release within 3 years of JSR Approval, then a JSR Renewal
574 Ballot may be initiated at the request of a majority of the EC. The PMO will inform the Spec Lead and
575 Expert Group of the decision of the EC to hold this ballot and request that the Spec Lead and Expert
576 Group prepare a public statement to the EC. The JSR Renewal Ballot will start 30 days following the
577 majority request.  The JSR Renewal Ballot is carried out for 7 days. If the JSR Renewal Ballot is
578 approved by the EC, then another renewal ballot cannot be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

579 **definition - JSR Renewal Reconsideration Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine if a revised JSR should

580 continue its work.

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

589

590 **5. MAINTENANCE**

591 **5.0 DEFINITIONS**

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

594 **Item Exception Ballot** : The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include specific
595 change items in a Minor Revision.

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

597 **Maintenance Review** : A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Minor
598 Revision when Members and the public consider and comment on the change items listed
599 in the PROPOSED section of the Change Log.

600 **Minor Revision**: Minor changes made to a Specification by the ML.

601 **Transfer Ballot**: The EC ballot to approve transfer of ownership of a Specification, RI, and
602 TCK from one Member to another Member. ³

603 **5.1 KEEP THE SPECIFICATION UP TO DATE**

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

611 **5.1.1 THE MAINTENANCE LEAD MAKES A LONG TERM COMMITMENT**

612 The Maintenance Lead (and his or her host company or organization) is expected to assume long
613 term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK with due respect of the will of the Java Community

³ 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.

614 Members with regard to evolution. This means that a Maintenance Lead will automatically be the Spec
615 Lead for all significant revisions to their Specification going forward but he or she will not have the
616 exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place (see section 1.1.1).

617 **5.1.2 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

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

625 **5.2 THE MAINTENANCE CYCLE**

626 The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback email address for requests for
627 Specification clarifications, corrections or changes from the public. The ML will review all comments,
628 identify common themes, and arrange with the PMO to make a list of frequently raised issues
629 available from the document's JSR Page. The ML is free to consult with the former members of the
630 Expert Group, or any other sources, for advice on how to revise the Specification. All change items
631 proposed by the ML will make their way into the Specification by either the Minor Revision process
632 (described in section 5.2.1) or by a JSR.


633 **5.2.1 MINOR REVISION PROCESS**

634



635

636

637 The ML will document all suggested changes in the  PROPOSED section of the Change Log and then
638 send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance Review begins,
639 the ML must summarize comments received at the Maintenance feedback email address (similar
640 comments may be consolidated) and indicate the disposition for each comment (e.g. deferred with a
641 brief explanation, rejected with a brief explanation, included in Change Log proposal). This will be
642 posted along with the Change Log on the JSR Page. The PMO will make a public announcement and
643 begin the review within 14 days of receipt of the request.

644 The ML may choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received
645 during review. All comments will be available from the JSR Page. At the end of Maintenance Review,
646 the ML will update the Specification, document all revisions in the ACCEPTED section of the Change
647 Log, and delete the corresponding entries in the PROPOSED section. All changes not incorporated
648 into the Specification may be either left in the PROPOSED section or moved to the DEFERRED
649 section.


650 **5.2.2 THE EC MAY DEFER MINOR REVISION ITEMS**

651

652 During Maintenance Review an EC member may request that specific proposed change items be
653 deferred to the next JSR. Any such request must be made to the PMO no later than the close of

654 Maintenance Review. If requests are received, the PMO will circulate the requests to all EC members
655 and initiate a 7 day Item Exception Ballot within 2 weeks after the close of the Maintenance Review. At
656 the close of the Item Exception Ballot, the PMO will post the ballot results to the Change Log. The ML
657 will place all proposed changes that were disapproved into the DEFERRED section. The ML will need
658 to initiate a JSR to carry out any of those changes. The ML must post an updated version of the
659 Specification within one month of the completion of the Review and any Item Exception Ballot.

660 **5.2.3 KEEPING THE RI AND TCK SYNCHRONIZED WITH THE SPECIFICATION**

661 Whenever the Specification is updated, the ML is responsible for reviewing the current RI and TCK to
662 determine what revisions (if any) are needed to keep the RI and TCK synchronized with the
663 Specification. The ML must record all RI and TCK updates in the Change Log.  The maintenance
664 changes will be considered final when the RI and TCK are synchronized with the Specification.

665 **5.3**

666 **5.3.1**

667

668 

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

670 **6.0 DEFINITIONS**



671 **definition - Ratified Seat** : An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in
672 section 6.4.2.



673 **definition - Elected Seat** : An EC seat filled by the election process described in section
674 6.4.3.


675 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

678 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

679 The Executive Committee is currently  composed of 16 Java Community Process Members plus a non-
680 voting Chair. The Chair of the EC is  a member of the Process Management Office. The 16 voting
681 members are selected from Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc. has a
682 permanent voting seat on the EC. That Oracle representative is not be a member of the PMO.

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

685 

6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
2. Approve draft Specifications for Public Review.
3. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
4. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
5. Review maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new JSR.
6. Approve transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
7. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.
8. Members of the Executive Committee will be dedicated to the principles of full and open competition, in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United States and other nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can result in criminal as well as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on the jurisdiction. In particular, any discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of distribution, division of markets or allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be avoided.

6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM

Voting Members on the EC serve three year terms. There are 2 Ratified Seats for every Elected Seat, (currently 10 Ratified Seats and 5 Elected Seats) plus one permanent seat held by Oracle America, Inc. The terms are staggered so that a third of the Voting seats are normally up for election each year. Ratified or Elected Seats that are vacated prior to completion of the term will be filled as described in sections 6.4.2 and 6.4.3.

6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS

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

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

6.4.2 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS

Members are selected for the Ratified Seats using a ratification ballot.

A Ratified Seat that was vacated by resignation will be filled for the remainder of its term by a ratification ballot that will be held no later than two months after the resignation (unless the resignation is less than six months before the next scheduled ratification ballot).


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

The ratification ballot is carried out as follows:

- The PMO nominates Members to fill the vacant Ratified Seats with due regard for balanced

- 728 community and regional representation.
- 729 • Voting begins starting in the third week of October each year.
- 730 • Eligible Members will vote to ratify each nominee over a 14-day voting period.
- 731 • A nominee is ratified by a simple majority of those who cast a vote.
- 732 • If one or more of the nominees are not ratified by the vote, the PMO will nominate additional
- 733 Members as needed and hold additional ratification ballots until the vacant seats are filled.

734 6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS

735 Members are selected for the Elected Seats using an open election process. 


736 An Elected Seat that was vacated by resignation will be filled for the remainder of its term by an

737 election ballot that will be held no later than two months after the resignation (unless the resignation is

738 less than six months before the next yearly election).


739 All JCP Members are eligible to vote in an election ballot subject to the provision that if a Member has

740 majority-ownership of, or is the employer of, one or more other Members, then that group of Members

741 will collectively have 1 vote, which  will be cast by the person they designate to be their representative

742 for the ratification ballot in question.

743 The election ballot is carried out as follows:

- 744 • Four weeks before the voting period, the PMO will post on the public JCP site a complete
- 745 description of all materials that will be provided to voters from the JCP election pages and
- 746 ballot (e.g. any candidate statements, position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be
- 747 posted during the election).
- 748 • Starting four weeks before the voting period, the PMO will accept nominations from the
- 749 Community for a period of 14 days. Any Member may be nominated. However, employees of 
- 750 EC members cannot run for election as individuals and the PMO shall reject such nominations.
- 751 • Voting begins in the fourth week of October each year.
- 752 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
- 753 14-day voting period.
- 754 • The nominees who receive the most votes will fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 755 • Ties will be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt> and
- 756 using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

757

758 7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES

759


- 760 1. All EC JSR votes will be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 761 2. EC JSR balloting periods last 7 days except where noted in this document.
- 762 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
- 763 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
- 764 vote at all.
- 765 4. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of an EC ballot.
- 766 5. EC JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
- 767 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 768 6. EC ballots to approve UJSRs for new Platform Edition Specifications or JSRs that propose
- 769 changes to the Java language, are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds majority of the votes
- 770 cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the
- 771 "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 772 7. "No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation along with changes (if any) that are

- 773 necessary to change the vote to "yes".
- 774 8. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 775 9. When a failed EC JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass
- 776 before the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 777 10. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
- 778 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
- 779 cast.
- 780 11. An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third
- 781 of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.
- 782 12. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot will be approved only if each
- 783 EC approves it separately.

784 **IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA**

785 Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation

786 Agreement will be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

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

792