

JCP:2 Process Document

Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)

Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

Copyright (c) 1996 - 2011 Oracle America, 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.....	9
1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	10
1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	10
2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION	10
2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	10
2.2 JSR REVIEW	11
2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT	12
2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP	12
3. DRAFT RELEASES.....	12
3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION	12
3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW	12
3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW	13
3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT	13
4. FINAL RELEASE.....	13
4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT	13
4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT	14
4.3 FINAL RELEASE	15
5. MAINTENANCE.....	15
5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	15
5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW	16
5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	16
6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	17
6.1 SCOPE	17
6.2 MEMBERSHIP	17
6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	17
6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM	17

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES	19
III APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	19

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 agreement-based ~~consensus-building~~ approach that produces a Specification, a Reference
 14 Implementation (to prove the Specification can be implemented), and a Technology Compatibility Kit (a
 15 suite of tests, tools, and documentation that is used to test implementations for compliance with the
 16 Specification).

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

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

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

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

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

50 This version of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of JSR
 51 348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group.

II 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)~~

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.

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

Elected Seat: An EC seat filled by the election process described in section ~~5.3.46.4.4~~.

Executive Committee (EC): The Members who guide the evolution of the Java technologies. The EC represents a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other Members of the Java Community. EC members are appointed in an annual election process. The EC Policies and Procedures are in the EC Standing Rules, which is a separate document.

Expert: A Member or Member Representative who has expert knowledge and is an active practitioner in the technology covered by the JSR.

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

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

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

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

Final Release: The final stage in the JSR development process when the Specification,

88 | RI, and TCK have been completed and can be licensed by implementors.

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

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

94 |

95 | **Issue:** an explicit reference to an item defined in an Issue Tracker.

96 | **Issue List:** A list of Issues generated from an Issue Tracker, identifying the disposition of
97 | each.

98 | **Issue Tracker:** A mechanism to allow issues (problems, tasks, comments, or requests for
99 | change) to be recorded and tracked by priority, status, owner, or other criteria. The Issue
100 | Tracker should permit issues to be identified by states such as open, resolved, and closed
101 | and should support the assignment of resolution types such as deferred (postponed to a
102 | follow-on release,) fixed (implemented,) challenged (no satisfactory resolution,) and
103 | rejected (deemed inappropriate or out of scope.)

104 | **Java Community Process (JCP):** The formal process described in this document for
105 | developing or revising Java technology Specifications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

123 | **JSR Page:** Each JSR has a dedicated public web page on the JCP Web Site where the

124 | JSR's history is recorded and where other relevant information about the JSR is published.

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

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

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

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

131 | **Maintenance Release:** The final stage in the JSR maintenance process when the
132 | Specification, RI, and TCK have been updated and can be licensed by implementors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

180 | **Transfer Ballot**: The EC ballot to approve transfer of ownership of a Specification, RI, and
181 | TCK from one Member to another Member. ¹

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

184 | The use of the term **day** or **days** in this document refers to calendar days unless otherwise
185 | specified.

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

¹ 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.

189 | III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM

190 | 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

191 | 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

192 | Each Expert Group is free to use the working style that it finds most productive and appropriate, so
193 | long as this is compatible with the requirements specified in this document. For example, EGs may
194 | choose to operate by seeking ~~consensus~~to advance only when there is general agreement among its
195 | members, or by voting on issues ~~where~~when there is disagreement.

196 | As specified below, Expert Groups must operate in a transparent manner, enabling the public to
197 | observe their deliberations and to provide feedback. All feedback must be taken into consideration and
198 | public responses must be provided. They must maintain a publicly-accessible document archive, from
199 | where all of their working materials such as source documents, meeting agendas and minutes, and
200 | draft documents can be downloaded.

201 | In the initial JSR submission the Spec Lead must specify the transparency mechanisms (for example,
202 | the ~~mailing-lists~~communication mechanisms and ~~l~~issue ~~T~~tracker) that the Expert Group intends to
203 | adopt, and must provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO ~~will~~shall
204 | publish this information on the public JSR Page. The Spec Lead must also provide a pointer to any
205 | Terms of Use required to use the collaboration tools so that the EC and prospective EG members can
206 | judge whether they are compatible with the JSPA.

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

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

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

223 | 1.1.1 ~~Mailing-Lists~~PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

230 | ~~If the modifications to the reference implementation or the TCK, be used for minor administrative~~

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

231 ~~matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or adding new features to the JSR,~~
232 ~~changes to the membership of the Expert Group, should~~All substantive business must be carried out
233 ~~on a public mailing list designated by the Spec Lead. The purpose of this list is to keep observers~~
234 ~~aware of important issues and, minor administrative issues that distract from substantive business~~
235 ~~should therefore be kept private. A private mailing list~~

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

244 **1.1.2 ~~Issue Tracking~~ISSUE TRACKING**

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

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

255 In order to enable EC members to judge whether Issues have been adequately addressed the Issue
256 List must make a clear distinction between Issues that are still open, that have been deferred, and
257 those that are closed, and must indicate the reason for any change of state.

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

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

265 **1.1.3 ~~Response to Comments~~**

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

274 **1.1.4 ~~Changes to Licensing Terms~~ CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**~~If the licensing~~
275 ~~terms for a JSR change from one release to the next, the changes must be explicitly~~
276 ~~listed and explained. Changes to the licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR~~
277 ~~submission (in the case of a new JSR) or in the Change Log for Maintenance Releases.~~
278 ~~Subsequent changes to licensing terms during the life of the JSR must be disclosed~~
279 ~~when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public posting or review.~~

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

282
283 As described in Section 2.2.1 below, the proposed licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR
284 submission. The Specification License must not be modified after initial submission since to do so
285 could invalidate IP grants. It may be necessary, however, to modify the proposed RI or TCK license.
286 Any such changes must be disclosed when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public
287 posting or review.

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

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

298 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

299 **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

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

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

310 **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

311 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. ~~When this happens, the Spec Lead~~
312 ~~should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to~~
313 ~~find a replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from~~
314 ~~another Member. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of its~~
315 ~~members as the new Spec Lead.~~ If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group, with
316 the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and
317 request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such replacement is forthcoming, the Expert

318 Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the
319 Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any,
320 and work with that organization to find a suitable replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not
321 otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from amongst other Members.

322 **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

323 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts
324 is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,
325 uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
326 such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot
327 be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and
328 request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec
329 Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is an
330 Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.
331 If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from
332 further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to
333 the EC by following the process outlined in Section 0-61.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

334 **1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

335 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting
336 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These
337 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be
338 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
339 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any
340 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be
341 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to
342 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is an Member Representative the PMO
343 ~~should~~shall ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead. If the Member refuses to do so, the PMO shall
344 ~~, or it may~~seek to put in place an alternative Spec Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a transfer
345 ballot as specified in section 5.1.2 of this document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the
346 EC ~~may disband the Expert Group~~shall initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot to determine whether the JSR
347 should be shut down.

348 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

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

357 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to
358 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not
359 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR ~~will~~shall
360 be closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO ~~will~~shall forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR
361 Renewal Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members,
362 together with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the
363 JSR ~~will~~shall be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing
364 Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current

365 | Specification (see section 5).

366 | 1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING

367 | The Spec Lead is responsible for defining the process whereby the TCK is used to certify
368 | implementations of the JSR as compatible. The ~~Spec~~Maintenance Lead must submit to the PMO at
369 | least quarterly, and at every Maintenance Release, a list of all implementations that have been
370 | certified as compatible and that have been released publicly or commercially. The PMO will publish
371 | this information on the JCP website. If the Spec Lead submits the information in the form of a pointer
372 | to an already published list the PMO may choose simply to reference that list rather than duplicate it.
373 | TCK license terms must permit implementors to freely and publicly discuss the testing process and
374 | detailed TCK test results with ~~their customers~~all interested parties.

375 | 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

376 | 1.5.1 ~~Transparency~~TRANSPARENCY

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

379 | 1.5.2 ~~Draft Reviews~~DRAFT REVIEWS

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

386 | 1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES

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

390 | 1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS

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

400 | 2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

401 | 2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

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

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

- 409 | • the Members making the request (the submitters), the proposed Spec Lead, and the initial
- 410 | members of the Expert Group.
- 411 | • a description of the proposed Specification.
- 412 | • the reason(s) for developing or revising it.
- 413 | • the primary Platform Edition, as well as any consideration given to other Platform Editions.
- 414 | • an estimated development schedule.
- 415 | • any preexisting documents, technology descriptions, or implementations that might be used as
- 416 | a starting point.
- 417 | • a transparency plan, which outlines the tools and techniques that the Spec Lead will use,
- 418 | during the creation and development of the Specification, and for communicating the progress
- 419 | within the Expert Group to Community Members, EC Members and the public. The EC will
- 420 | expect the Spec Lead to operate the JSR in accordance with this plan.

421 | 2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS

422 | Existing Specifications, together with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated
423 | Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 45 of this document. Maintenance Lead
424 | Members are expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK while
425 | respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. Maintenance Leads
426 | ~~will~~shall therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they
427 | ~~will~~shall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That ~~will~~shall
428 | be decided by the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community
429 | Member. Submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous
430 | Expert Group to join the revision effort.

431 | 2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION

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

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

439 | 2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS

440 | All new or revised Specifications must be compatible with the most recent versions of the targeted
441 | Platform Edition Specifications. In order to achieve this, all UJSRs to define new Profile Specifications
442 | or revise existing Profile Specifications must reference the latest version of the Platform Edition

443 | Specification they are based upon.

444 | **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

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

457 | **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

465 | **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS ~~FOR THE RI AND TCK~~**

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

475 | **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

483 | **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

484 | Within 14 days of a JSR being approved, the PMO instructs the identified Spec Lead to form the

485 Expert Group. If the Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the Community before the
486 JSR is approved, the PMO ~~will~~shall request the preliminary Expert Group to choose a replacement
487 from among themselves who is willing to take on the duties defined in this document.

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

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

495 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

496 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

509 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

518 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

525 | **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

533 | **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

546 | **4. FINAL RELEASE**

547 | **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

552 | **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

560 | **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

561 | The Spec Lead is also responsible for establishing a clearly defined First Level TCK Appeals Process
562 | to address challenges to tests contained in the TCK. This process must be described in the TCK
563 | documentation. Implementers who are not satisfied with a first level decision should appeal to the EC
564 | by documenting their concerns in an email message to the PMO. The PMO will circulate the request to
565 | the EC, together with any information received from the ML concerning the rationale for the first-level

566 | decision, and initiate a 7-day Appeal Ballot.

567 | 4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT

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

575 | 4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

- 582 | • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information
583 | needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation,) a definition and explanation of the First-
584 | level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be met in addition to
585 | passing the TCK tests, ~~and any other information needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools-~~
586 | ~~documentation)-~~
- 587 | • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations
588 | a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and
589 | b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include
590 | any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the
591 | Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being
592 | implemented.

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

- 594 | • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and
595 | recording of results.
- 596 | • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.
597 | This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a
598 | description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK
599 | test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the
600 | adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 601 | • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the ~~required~~ API
602 | signatures ~~of~~required by the spec are completely implemented and that ~~no non-specified-~~
603 | ~~APIs~~only API signatures required by the spec are included in the JSR's namespace.

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

606 | If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC ~~will~~shall stand, the PMO
607 | ~~will~~shall close the JSR, and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing
608 | Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current

609 | Specification (see section 45).

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

615 | 4.3 FINAL RELEASE

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

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

630 | 5. MAINTENANCE

631 | 5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

632 | The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,
633 | and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A
634 | Maintenance Lead ~~will~~ shall therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions
635 | to their Specification but ~~will~~ shall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will
636 | take place (see section 42.1.1).

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

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

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

649 | 5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

650 | If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work ~~fat~~ at any time (including discontinuing maintenance
651 | activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)

652 the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member
653 who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot
654 within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot
655 succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can
656 be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then ~~to find a replacement, if the ML fail~~ the PMO ~~will~~ shall
657 declare the Specification to be Dormant. ~~N~~ and no further maintenance ~~will~~ can be carried out. No
658 further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case
659 the PMO will have again a month to initiate a Transfer Ballot. ~~on it until a new ML is identified and~~
660 ~~ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK is transferred to the new ML's organization (subject to a~~
661 ~~successful Transfer ballot by the EC).~~

662 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

716 |

717 | **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

718 | ~~At any time after a Maintenance Review Ballot and possible Item Exception Ballot the Spec Lead will~~
719 | ~~update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Change Log as necessary and submit them to the PMO for~~
720 | ~~publication in a Maintenance Release.~~ After a successful Maintenance Review Ballot the Maintenance
721 | Lead will update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Issue List as necessary and submit them to the PMO
722 | for publication in a Maintenance Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have been
723 | made, and publishes the Specification, the ~~Change Log~~ Issue List, and pointers to the RI and TCK on
724 | the JSR Web Page.

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

727 | If the Maintenance Lead fails to deliver the final materials within the time-period specified at the
728 | beginning of the Maintenance Review process the PMO will inform the Maintenance Lead of an
729 | impending Maintenance Renewal Ballot, and will request the Maintenance Lead to prepare a public
730 | statement to the EC that explains the reason for the delay and provides a new deadline. 30 days after
731 | this request the PMO will initiate a Maintenance Renewal Ballot to determine whether the deadline
732 | may be extended as requested or whether the previous Maintenance Review should be rescinded and
733 | the Maintenance Lead be required to go through another Maintenance Review.

734 | **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

735 | **6.1 SCOPE**

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

738 | **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

739 | There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and
740 | EE together. Each EC is composed of 16 Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.

741 | has a permanent voting seat on each EC. (Oracle representatives must not be members of the PMO.)
742 | The ECs are led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.

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

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

747 | **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

771 | **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

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

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

776 | **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

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

784 | 6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES

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

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

792 |
793 | In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall
794 | organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask
795 | questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also
796 | organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

797 | 6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS

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

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

808 | 6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS

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

- 811 | • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO ~~will~~shall post on the public JCP site a complete
812 | description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,
813 | position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 814 | • Four weeks before the ~~voting~~ballot period the PMO ~~will~~shall accept nominations from the
815 | Community for a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that
816 | ~~employees~~Agents of JCP Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO
817 | shall reject such nominations.
- 818 | • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
819 | 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.
- 820 | • The nominees who receive the most votes ~~will~~shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 821 | • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters ~~will~~shall be given the opportunity to vote
822 | “yes” or “no” for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 823 | • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the
824 | next election.
- 825 | • Ties ~~will~~shall be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt>
826 | and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

827 | 7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES

- 828 | 1. All JSR ballots ~~will~~shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 829 | 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 830 | 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
831 | strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
832 | vote at all.
- 833 | 4. Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions
834 | for change these should be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed.
835 | "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if
836 | resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 837 | 5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 838 | 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
839 | minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 840 | 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs ~~for new~~that define the initial version of a new -Platform Edition
841 | Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least
842 | a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
843 | cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 844 | 8. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 45.1.
- 845 | 9. ~~"No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation of the changes (if any) that would-~~
846 | ~~persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".~~
- 847 | 10. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 848 | 11. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before
849 | the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 850 | 12. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
851 | two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
852 | cast.
- 853 | 13. ~~An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third-~~
854 | ~~of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.~~
- 855 | 14. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot ~~will~~shall be approved only if
856 | each EC approves it separately.

857 | IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA

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

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

