

JCP Process proposals to be explored in the future.

Collection of previous proposals on JCP process. Categorized by what type of change is required (Process Doc Maintenance Review, minor JSPA JSR, Process Doc JSR, major JSPA JSR).

Note: inclusion does not imply the proposal should be acted on.

Proposed:

- changes that could be done in a Process Doc Maintenance Review (clarifications and minor)

Note: as of 16 April 2009, the items in this particular section either reflect things that pretty clearly violate the Process (first 3) or else are simple corrections that don't change what's already done (last 2). So no reason not to change the Process Doc, but also doesn't seem urgent since can be dealt with by PMO/EC action.

1. **Show specific changes in Maintenance Review.** In some Maintenance Reviews the actual changes to the spec are not made available for review until it is too late to allow for a meaningful review. In some cases, new APIs have been generally described in the Change log but the full description of the new classes/functions may not be included. Then if they are wrong/need improvement it takes another MR cycle or there is no accountability by the ML. (Process doc)
2. **Platform JSRs must be done in the new Expert Group for the new version, not slipped in by Maintenance Review on the previous JSR for the previous specification version.** Currently for a new Platform Specification, there is a new JSR that produces a specification that lists which other JSR specifications become part of the new platform. Traditionally, there have also been a set of Maintenance Releases on the previous version of the specification, but these are odd Maintenance Releases not meant to be implemented in the previous version at all. They are means to change the next version, not to change the version they look like they apply to. In the future, this should be done by producing the same change request document, but to have that document go through the usual review cycle in the JSR for the new platform. It is no more work and gives the community the usual review of the changes that will make up the new platform. (e.g. look at the maintenance releases for SE5 intended only to be implemented in SE6, not ever in SE5 <http://jcp.org/en/jsr/detail?id=176>). (Process doc)
3. **Avoiding improper licensing requirements from EG infrastructure hosting services that impose licensing requirements that are more than the JSPA.** Code repositories that are open source orgs and have patent grants are OK even if they have contributor agreements – there is no “right” to be able to participate in developing the RI and TCK in JCP. That's left to the Spec Lead. However, there should be no impediment to participating in creating the spec. Add to Process Document that EG infrastructure cannot have licensing requirements for document repositories for spec contributions or drafts or Wiki's or mail lists that require any patent grants. (Process doc)

4. **Put some long standing practices explicitly in the Process doc.** SL/ML can already extend review periods, put that in Process Document just for the record. SLs can repeat Early Draft, Public Draft, Proposed Final Draft. State in Process Document that is permitted. Clarify that for repeated Public Draft whether there is another EC Ballot is at the Spec Lead's discretion.
5. **Correct minor errors in Process Doc.** J2ME, J2SE, J2EE in Process Doc (should be Java ME, etc.)

- changes that could be done in minimal JSPA JSR that did not touch intellectual property flow

1. **No Field of Use restrictions limiting how specifications are used other than what the specification says.** By near unanimous votes EC members have said they think the JSPA already forbids this. The JSPA already says that other than reciprocity rules for licensing and three compatibility conditions (including passing the TCK test suite) "the Spec Lead agrees not to impose any contractual condition or covenant that would limit or restrict the right of any licensee to create or distribute such Independent Implementations." However, there has been disagreement on this that is reflected in the Apache Harmony open letter about the TCK License. JCP required test suites are intended for ensuring compatibility and must not be used by Spec Leads to prevent use of compatible implementations. After the sentence quoted above, add in the JSPA: "For the avoidance of doubt, this means the Spec Lead may not impose additional limitations or restrictions in the Spec License or in the TCK License for Independent Implementations or in any other license required to create and distribute an Independent Implementation." The updated JSPA will apply to JSRs started under the new JSPA. (JSPA).
2. **Remove JSPA Confidentiality sections.** Formal JCP Confidentiality, where there are legal commitments to keep information confidential for up to 3 years with use restrictions, should be eliminated. It is generally not used because it is onerous. It is also at odds with open source development of developing specs and transparency. Access passwords are sufficient to guard information like meeting arrangements. The EC in the past has agreed on this, but it requires changing the JSPA (JSPA).
3. **Begin phase out of IEPA in JSPA and Process document since Individuals now participate through JSPA.** Change Process, JSPA and IEPA to wind down use of IEPA. Remove IEPA reference in JSPA. Change IEPA to say it will no longer be offered. IEPA is no longer used, but it had no termination provision so those under it remain in JCP until the JSR they joined to participate in disbands. Leave the ability to modify the IEPA in the Process document until there are no IEPA members, but note it is no longer available for new members of any EG. When the last JSR EG disbands that has an IEPA member in it, revisit this and remove IEPA references. (IEPA, JSPA – much later when there are no IEPA members, a Process doc change finishes the clean up)
4. **Correct minor errors in the JSPA.** Community Draft should change to Early Draft in the JSPA, several instances of pointing below/above in wrong direction in JSPA or referring to (a)-(c) when (a)-(b) is intended, etc.. (JSPA)

5. **Make wording for cost for Individual Membership more flexible.** The \$0 cost membership for Individual membership appears to have been added to the JSPA outside the usual rules for modifying the JSPA. The date on the JSPA is January 2005. JSR 215, the last Process JSR, ended in November 2003 and was posted May 2004. No Maintenance Release was done for the JSPA since then. Requiring a specific cost of \$0 in the JSPA (which cannot be changed for existing JSRs) is too limiting. This is not to suggest there should be any cost to individuals, just whether that belongs in what effectively the Constitution for the JCP. Suggestion is to put in the JSPA that the cost for Individual Members may not be more than a nominal value like \$100, with the exact cost set by Sun and posted on the Website. Sun can change the cost after notifying the EC. This would allow the JCP to react if free memberships caused problems (e.g. pranks) in the future. (this isn't a big deal, but since it never seems to have gone through the normal review process to get into the JSPA we should decide if what went in is best) (JSPA).
6. **Remove the ambiguity in the Process Document for when Spec Lead means the Member and when it means the person chosen by the Member to lead the Expert Group. The JSPA definition of Spec Lead explicitly says that depending on context it can be one or the other.** Create a new definition in the JSPA for "Spec Chair" and change the Spec Lead definition to mean just the Member, not their representative running the group. Repeat that definitions in the Process Document. Go through the Process Document and anywhere "Spec Lead" means the person, change it to "Spec Chair". It appears in the JSPA, it always means member so it looks like the only changes in the JSPA is in the definitions.

- changes that require a Process Doc JSR

1. **Create JCP recommended standard template License for Creating Independent Implementations and License for using the TCK to Test Implementations.** Currently each specification can have a different license and TCK test suite license. This causes confusion over what it takes to implement and test JCP specifications. This proposal is to add as external appendices to the Process Document that contain template licenses for: 1) Implementing Independent Implementations; and 2) Using the TCK to test for JCP compatibility. The TCK License described here is for use of the TCK to make claims about JCP compatibility and to meet the requirements for JCP related licensing of implementations. It does not in any way restrict the license the TCK source or binaries are made available under. That is, the TCK may be open source code under an open source license, but that does not grant permission to use it as the official TCK of the JCP and to claim JCP compatibility. So, two completely separate licenses. This is only about the license that says when you can claim compatibility with a JCP spec and benefit from JCP related licensing. If Spec Leads chose to use the template licenses, they could also offer other alternative licenses, but the common standard licenses would be one available choice. Since some JCP members wish to charge for the cost of maintaining TCKs, the only allowed difference in the standard TCK license is the cost for use in claiming compatibility (always with no cost for not-for-profits). Additionally, for the License for creating Independent Implementations, some Spec Leads offer licensing for non-essential patents not covered by JCP licensing requirements or various service contracts. They could do that in an optional, additional license or an alternative license. The Process document would recommend use of the template licenses and would require that the initial Java Specification Request the EC votes on includes information on whether the template licenses are used. (Process Doc)

2. **JCP Community can create open source \$0 cost TCK for any JSR that does not have one, with EC approval.** If the TCK test suite for a specification is not open source and \$0 cost for official use of the TCK to claim compatibility, then JCP members should be able to file a JSR to create an open source, \$0 cost TCK for that JSR. The development work could be done wherever the Expert Group decided (including in any of the open source forums). If the EC approves, a specific version of that new open source TCK becomes the official TCK for the JSR when used without changes. Open Source TCKs solve the problem of continuing work on specifications when the Spec Lead who owns the TCK goes bankrupt or loses interest. (Process doc, good if also JSPA as well)
3. **JCP Community can create open source \$0 cost RI for any JSR that does not have one, with EC approval.** If the RI for a specification is not open source and \$0 cost, then JCP members should be able to file a JSR to create an open source, \$0 cost RI. The development work could be done wherever the Expert Group decided (including in any of the open source forums). If the EC approves, a specific version of that new open source RI becomes the official RI for the JSR when used without changes. Open Source RIs solve the problem of continuing work on specifications when the Spec Lead who owns the RI goes bankrupt or loses interest. (Process doc, good if JSPA as well)
4. **Expert Group participation** Currently, the Spec Lead can hand pick the members of the Expert Group. There should be clear, public criteria for Expert Group membership (e.g. technical experience in the area). Up to some limit on the number of members (never less than 12 as the limit), qualified participation requests should not be refused (but can be refused if others are more qualified). Those rejected should be able to appeal to the EC if they believe the rules were not fairly applied. Expert Group members should be removed if they do not attend meetings or do not participate on the email list. (Process doc)
5. **Transparency in specification development – default should be public.** The default for all JCP business should be that it is NOT confidential. Meeting minutes, Expert Group mail list archive where technical work is done, and Expert Group specification drafts should all be publicly viewable (read only). Expert Groups can have a second mail list for non-technical private communication but that should be restricted to information like arranging phone calls and face to face meetings. (Process doc? Some EC members claim the JSPA somehow requires that Spec Leads be able to use confidential information in their JSRs so for EC members who believe that this would require a JSPA change.)
6. **Transparency in Executive Committee – default should be public.** At times the EC has to have discussions that need to remain private (e.g. discussing past licenses that are marked confidential). However, transparency should be the default. The EC should be required to have a publicly archived email list for public feedback to the EC, where either individual EC members or the EC as a whole participate in discussion with the community. Since the EC must at times discuss sensitive and confidential information, a non-public mail list will be maintained and EC calls and meetings will remain open only to EC members. (Process doc)
7. **Remove Sun veto on platform and language specifications.** (Process doc)
8. **Remove Process Doc section 1.1.4 J2ME building blocks.** This section describes a process that is ignored. JSR 68 J2ME Platform Specification formed in 2000, produced a Community Draft in 2002 and nothing else for 7 years. It is marked inactive. J2ME developed platforms in a

different way, not using this section at all. Leaving it in, ignored, creates another point of single control. This type of thing should be decided in JSRs, not in the Process document. (Process doc)

9. **Naming a new Spec Lead for the next version of a specification when Spec Lead refuses to start a new version.** The JCP Community should be able to create the specifications it wants to create. If the Spec Lead refuses to lead a new JSR, a JSR should be able to be proposed with a new Spec Lead. That's already the rule but it should be clearer. (Process doc)
10. **TCK Guides must be public.** If there is a TCK Guide for how a TCK may be used, that guide should be posted on a public site so that the community knows all the rules required to implement a specification. (Process doc)

- changes that require a JSPA JSR and impact intellectual property flow (or possibly controversial)

1. **Require JCP recommended standard template License for Creating Independent Implementations and License for using the TCK to Test Implementations be used in all future JSRs. Please see the proposal for creating standard template licenses.** This would build on the proposal template licenses to change the JSPA to require that those template licenses be used in all JSRs. As in the template license proposal, Spec Leads could offer other alternative licenses in addition to offering the required licenses, but the required licenses must always be an option. All of the text on requirements of the license in the JSPA remains in the JSPA. (JSPA – doesn't change IP flow, but is a big change so in this category)
2. **Future Reference Implementations (RI) licensed under OSI open source license.** Reference Implementations of future JSRs should be required to be licensed under the OSI approved open source license of the Spec Lead's choosing. For a revision of an existing specification, source for new capabilities must be available under the BSD License since that license is compatible with a wide variety of open source licenses, but the entire RI does not have to be open source. With the the Spec Lead owning a proprietary RI, if the Spec Lead goes bankrupt or just loses interest, there is no RI for the community to use to create new versions of the specification. Open source RI's solve that problem. An issue in using multiple licenses, especially copyleft licenses is that different JSRs may not be able to be combined in a single platform, but given the JCP is not an open source development organization, we likely have to take whatever open source license contributors are willing to work under. (encouragement to do it in Process doc; requiring to do it in JSPA)
3. **Future TCKs (TCK) licensed under OSI open source license.** JCP specifies which version must be passed to claim compatibility with modifications only as permitted in the TCK Guide (w.g changes to get the TCK to run, not changes in the tests). For a revision of an existing specification, source for testing new capabilities must be available under the BSD License since that license is compatible with a wide variety of open source licenses, but the entire TCK does not have to be open source. With a proprietary TCK, if the Spec Lead goes bankrupt or just loses interest, there is no TCK for the community to use to create new versions of the specification. Open source TCK's solve that problem. (encouragement to do it in Process doc; requiring to do it in JSPA)

4. **Future Contributions to RIs and TCKs under BSD license to make compatible with a variety of implementations.** Change the JSPA to require new code contributions to the RI and TCK to be made under the BSD license to allow for inclusion in a wide variety of implementations. (encouragement to do it in Process doc; requiring to do it in JSPA)
5. **Spec Lead cannot proceed with new revision of specification (JSR or Maintenance) while restricting competing Independent Implementation of current specification.** The principle way this would arise is through limiting or restricting implementations that would otherwise be compatible by not permitting them to test with the TCK. (JSPA or Process Doc)
6. **Direct licensing to implementers.** Current licensing rules make all patent grants flow through the Spec Lead. Contributors license to the Spec Lead granting the Spec Lead the right to sublicense to others. In many other organizations, contributors license directly to implementers. Licensing through the Spec Lead is another instance of having specifications dependent upon one person or company. (JSPA – major change in IP flow)
7. **JCP as a level playing field legal entity standards organization.** The JCP should evolve towards becoming a legal entity incorporated and controlled by its members to offer a level playing field for creation of Java specifications with no special role for any particular company. Being a legal entity allows the organization to own the specification copyright and ensures members control the organization. In the meantime, reforms should make JCP more like the typical member controlled standards organization. (replacement of JSPA)

- changes that can be done outside the Process doc or JSPA

1. See first 3 of MR section above. Could also create the license templates.

- unclassified – solution not developed enough to know what doc changes

1. **Improve TCK quality** by requiring the publication of coverage information, and assertion lists, for example. Needs more work for a specific proposal. Previous discussions had some people wanting assertion lists and others saying there would be an assertion for every parameter in the spec and it would duplicate the spec.
2. **Improve the quality of the TCK and RI** – EC members do not download and review the TCK and RI during final ballot. (one issue is some will not look at code due to various contamination concerns and license concerns). Is there some other mechanism for ensuring quality? Needs more work for a specific proposal.
3. **Maintenance Lead refuses to undertake a Maintenance Review.** What can be done if Maintenance Lead refuses to consider maintenance changes for Maintenance Review? ML is completely in charge of when a Maintenance Review occurs and what is in it. Members can file a new JSR to do the work and ML has first option to be SL, but if they refuse to lead the JSR, the new EG has to face possibly rewriting the TCK and RI. For the TCK, perhaps a supplementary TCK could be written that requires just covering the changes and also requires passing the TCK for the pre-MR spec too. Other items below address open source TCK and RIs.

4. **New Spec or Maintenance Lead and RI and TCK.** What can be done if Maintenance or Spec Lead leaves role and does not transfer RI or TCK? This is a consequence of one member owning the RI and TCK which is a consequence of JCP not being a legal entity so it can't own anything. This may be addressed through other proposals on open source RI and TCKs. Otherwise, there aren't proposals for how to fix it.
5. **Encourage EC voting on JSRs and meeting attendance.** It comes up periodically that some penalty should be imposed for EC members missing too many votes on JSR ballots (not voting does not mean abstaining - it means casting no ballot at all). No specific proposals. The counter argument is that we can't force people to vote carefully so may be better to at least know EC reps are missing votes. And at times meeting may not have enough on the agenda to warrant round the world trips (since no JSR ballots ever take place at meetings). JCP Members see voting and attendance statistics in elections and can choose to not re-elect members who do not participate.

Work Items being developed by EC process ad hoc group:

Deferred by EC process ad hoc group – not to be considered in current work:

Rejected by EC process ad hoc group – not to be considered in current work: