

1 **JCP Process Document**

2

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

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

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

6 **CONTENTS**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
I DEFINITIONS .....	2
II THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM .....	6
1. GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	6
1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	6
1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	8
1.3 JSR DEADLINES.....	9
1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	9
1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	10
1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	10
1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	10
2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION .....	10
2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	10
2.2 JSR REVIEW .....	12
2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT .....	12
2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP .....	12
3. DRAFT RELEASES.....	12
3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION .....	12
3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW .....	13
3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW .....	13
3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT .....	13
4. FINAL RELEASE.....	14
4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT .....	14
4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT .....	14
4.3 FINAL RELEASE .....	15
5. MAINTENANCE.....	16
5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	16
5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW .....	16
5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	17
6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES .....	17
6.1 SCOPE .....	17
6.2 MEMBERSHIP .....	17
6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	18
6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM .....	18
7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES .....	19
III APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	20

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

## I DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

**Dormant Specification (Dormant):** A Specification that 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 6.4.4.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Final Release:** The final stage in the JSR development process when the Specification, RI, and TCK have been completed and can be licensed by implementors.

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

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

87 **Issue List:** A list of Issues generated from an Issue Tracker, identifying the disposition of  
88 each.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

114 **JSR Page:** Each JSR has a dedicated public web page on the JCP Web Site where the  
115 JSR's history is recorded and where other relevant information about the JSR is published.

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

117 **JSR Renewal Reconsideration Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine if a revised JSR should  
118 continue its work.

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

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

122 **Maintenance Release:** The final stage in the JSR maintenance process when the

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

124 **Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Maintenance  
125 Release when Members and the public consider and comment on the change the Spec  
126 Lead proposes to include in the release, as identified in the associated Issue List.

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

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

133 **Member Associate:** An individual who is associated with a Member organization but is not  
134 an Agent of that organization.

135 **Member Representative:** An Agent of a Member company or a Member organization who  
136 represents its interests within the JCP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

175       The use of the words “must”, “must not”, “required”, “shall”, “shall not”, “should”, “should  
176       not”, “recommended”, “may” and “optional” in this document is done in accordance with the  
177       IETF's [RFC 2119](#).

## 178    **II THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS <sup>SM</sup> PROGRAM**

### 179    **1. GENERAL PROCEDURES**

#### 180    **1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY**

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

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

189    In the initial JSR submission the Spec Lead must specify the transparency mechanisms (for example,  
190    the communication mechanisms and Issue Tracker) that the Expert Group intends to adopt, and must  
191    provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO shall publish this information  
192    on the public JSR Page. The Spec Lead must also provide a pointer to any Terms of Use required to  
193    use the collaboration tools so that the EC and prospective EG members can judge whether they are

---

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.

194 compatible with the JSPA.

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

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

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

### 211 **1.1.1 PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

212

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

### 221 **1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING**

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

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

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

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

236 EC members should review the supplied Issue List and take it into consideration when casting their  
237 ballot. If they have any reservations or concerns about a 'yes' vote, or if they wish to vote 'no,' they

---

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

238 should accompany their ballot with comments which reference one or more Issues (perhaps logged by  
239 them) that they would like to see addressed in the future. EC members should vote 'no' if they believe  
240 that the Spec Lead or Maintenance Lead has not adequately addressed all Issues including those that  
241 have been rejected or otherwise closed by the Expert Group.

### 242 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

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

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

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

## 258 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

### 259 **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

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

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

### 270 **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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



### 279 **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

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

### 291 **1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

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

## 304 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

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

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

## 321 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

322 The Spec Lead is responsible for defining the process whereby the TCK is used to certify  
323 implementations of the JSR as compatible. The Maintenance Lead must submit to the PMO at least  
324 quarterly, and at every Maintenance Release, a list of all implementations that have been certified as

325 compatible and that have been released publicly or commercially. The PMO shall publish this  
326 information on the JCP website. If the Spec Lead submits the information in the form of a pointer to an  
327 already published list the PMO may choose simply to reference that list rather than duplicate it.

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

## 330 **1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

### 331 **1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY**

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

### 334 **1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS**

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

## 341 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

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

## 345 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

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

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

### 356 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

357 One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant  
358 revision to an existing one, by submitting the JSR Proposal through the JCP website, as described in  
359 the [Spec Lead Guide](#). Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without  
360 explanation at any time prior to the completion of the JSR Approval Ballot (see section 2.3) upon  
361 request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.

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

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

### **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

Existing Specifications, together with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 5 of this document. Maintenance Lead Members are expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. Maintenance Leads shall therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they shall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That shall be decided by the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community Member. Submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous Expert Group to join the revision effort.

### **2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION**

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

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

### **2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS**

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

### **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

Technologies may be incorporated into a Profile or Platform Edition after having been initially delivered

407 standalone. A JSR for a new version of an API that proposes to become part of a Profile or Platform  
408 Edition and is considering discontinuing stand-alone availability must state the rationale for this  
409 change. The public must be informed of the intention to discontinue the availability of the standalone  
410 RI and TCK one JSR submission in advance.

## 411 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

### 419 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

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

## 429 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

430 After the JSR Review, EC members shall review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their  
431 ballot to decide if the JSR should be approved.

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

## 437 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

442

## 443 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

### 444 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

445 The Expert Group should begin work by considering the requirements set forth in the JSR, any  
446 contributed documents or technology descriptions, comments received during JSR Review and, if this

447 is a revision of an existing Specification, the Issue List kept by the Maintenance Lead (see section 5).  
448 Additional input can be obtained from discussions with other Members, industry groups, software  
449 developers, end-users, and academics. The goal is to define requirements and then write a draft  
450 Specification suitable for review by the Community and the public.

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

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

## 457 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

### 466 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

470 After the Early Draft Review period has ended, the Expert Group can make any additional changes to  
471 the draft it deems necessary in response to comments before submitting the draft to the PMO for the  
472 next review.

## 473 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

## 481 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

485 If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in  
486 response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised  
487 draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC shall stand and the JSR shall be  
488 closed. If a revision is received, the PMO shall forward it to the EC and initiate a Public Draft

489 Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members  
490 with their ballots shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR shall  
491 be closed and the Expert Group shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification,  
492 the Spec Lead shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 5).

## 493 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

### 494 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

#### 499 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

#### 507 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

#### 514 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

515 Depending on the nature of the problem, a successful TCK challenge shall require updating one or  
516 more of the TCK, the Specification, or the RI. Within one month of the close of a successful TCK  
517 Appeal Ballot the Maintenance Lead must update these deliverables as necessary and report the  
518 changes to the PMO when the Specification (if changed) and URLs for the updated RI and/or TCK are  
519 delivered for publication on the JCP website.

### 520 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 527 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information  
528 needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation,) a definition and explanation of the First-

529 level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be met in addition to  
530 passing the TCK tests

531 • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations

532 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and

533 b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include

534 any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the

535 Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being

536 implemented.

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

538 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and

539 recording of results.

540 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.

541 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a

542 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK

543 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the

544 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.

545 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the API signatures

546 required by the spec are completely implemented and that only API signatures required by the

547 spec are included in the JSR's namespace.

548 If the Final Approval Ballot fails, the Spec Lead will have 30 days to revise the Specification, RI, and

549 TCK in response to EC concerns and to resubmit modified materials to the PMO.

550 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC shall stand, the PMO shall

551 close the JSR, and the Expert Group shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing

552 Specification, the Spec Lead shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification

553 (see section 5).

554 If a response is received, the PMO shall circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval

555 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members shall

556 be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will be closed

557 and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the Spec

558 Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification.

## 559 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

560 Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot or Reconsideration Ballot, the PMO will publish on

561 the JCP website the Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK and will

562 announce the availability of these materials to both Members and the public. The published TCK

563 information must include a means for any interested party to obtain a copy of the TCK documentation

564 at no charge. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The

565 Spec Lead will typically be the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and

566 others for aid in that role.

567 The Maintenance Lead must ensure that the links to the RI and TCK remain valid through the lifetime

568 of the Specification. If the links become broken or non-functional, the Maintenance Lead will have 30

569 days following notification from the PMO of the invalid links to correct them. If the problems are not

570 corrected within 30 days, the Specification must reenter the Process at the Proposed Final Draft or

571 Maintenance Review stage as appropriate, and complete the Release process again. NOTE: IP rights

572 granted when the JSR made any previous Releases are not affected by such a change in status.

## 573 **5. MAINTENANCE**

### 574 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

575 The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,  
576 and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A  
577 Maintenance Lead shall therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions to  
578 their Specification but shall not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take  
579 place (see section 2.1.1).

580 The public may submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification  
581 by logging issues through the JSR's Issue Tracker.

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

585 All changes proposed by the ML shall make their way into the Specification by either the Maintenance  
586 Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a Maintenance  
587 Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the implementation of existing  
588 APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Modifications to existing APIs or the addition of new  
589 APIs should be deferred to a new JSR.

#### 590 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

591 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work at any time (including discontinuing maintenance  
592 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)  
593 the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member  
594 who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot  
595 within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot  
596 succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can  
597 be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then the PMO shall declare the Specification to be Dormant  
598 and no further maintenance can be carried out. No further Transfer Ballots shall be initiated by the  
599 PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case the PMO will have again a month to initiate a  
600 Transfer Ballot.

### 601 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

602

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

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

614 At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO shall initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.  
615 During this ballot EC members should vote 'yes' if they agree that the Maintenance Release should  
616 proceed as the Spec Lead has proposed, and 'no' if they have objections to the proposed release on



617 one of the following grounds:

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

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

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

631

## 632 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

633 After a successful Maintenance Review Ballot the Maintenance Lead shall update the Specification,  
634 RI, TCK, and Issue List as necessary and submit them to the PMO for publication in a Maintenance  
635 Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have been made, and publishes the  
636 Specification, the Issue List, and pointers to the RI and TCK on the JSR Web Page.

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

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

## 646 **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

### 647 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

### 650 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

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

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

657 NOTE: In the near future the EC intends to merge the two ECs, and modify the number of members

658 and possibly their terms of office.

## 659 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 660 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 661 2. Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.
- 662 3. Approve draft Specifications after Public Review.
- 663 4. Ensure that publicly expressed issues/concerns with a JSR are addressed by the Expert
- 664 Group.
- 665 5. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
- 666 6. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
- 667 7. Review proposed maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new
- 668 JSR.
- 669 8. Approve the transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
- 670 9. Decide when JSRs that have not made sufficient progress through the Process should be
- 671 withdrawn.
- 672 10. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the
- 673 organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance
- 674 may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the
- 675 EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.
- 676 11. Members of the Executive Committee shall be dedicated to the principles of full and open
- 677 competition, in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United
- 678 States and other nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can
- 679 result in criminal as well as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on
- 680 the jurisdiction. In particular, any discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of
- 681 distribution, division of markets or allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be
- 682 avoided.

## 683 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

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

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

### 688 **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

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

### 696 **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

697 All JCP Members are eligible to vote in ballots for Ratified and Elected Seats subject to the provision  
698 that if a Member has majority-ownership of one or more other Members, or if one or more Members  
699 are Agents of another Member, then that group of Members shall collectively have one vote, which  
700 shall be cast by the person they designate to be their representative for the ballot in question.

701 Annual elections for Ratified and Elected Seats shall be held simultaneously. Voting in these elections  
702 will start in the third week of October.

703  
704 In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall  
705 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask  
706 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also  
707 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

#### 708 **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

- 710 • The PMO nominates Members to fill the vacant Ratified Seats with due regard for balanced  
711 community and regional representation.
- 712 • At its discretion the PMO may choose not to nominate any candidate for a ratified seat, in order  
713 to facilitate a reduction in the size of the ECs in anticipation of a future merge into a single EC.
- 714 • Eligible Members shall vote to ratify each nominee over a 14-day ballot period.
- 715 • A nominee is ratified by a simple majority of those who cast a vote.
- 716 • If one or more of the nominees are not ratified by the vote, the PMO shall nominate additional  
717 Members as needed and hold additional ratification ballots until the vacant seats are filled.

#### 718 **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

- 721 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO shall post on the public JCP site a complete  
722 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,  
723 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 724 • Four weeks before the ballot period the PMO shall accept nominations from the Community for  
725 a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that Agents of JCP  
726 Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such  
727 nominations.
- 728 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a  
729 14-day ballot period.
- 730 • The nominees who receive the most votes shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 731 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters shall be given the opportunity to vote  
732 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 733 • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the  
734 next election.
- 735 • Ties shall be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt>  
736 and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

### 737 **7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES**

- 738 1. All JSR ballots shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 739 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 740 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are  
741 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not  
742 vote at all.
- 743 4. Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions  
744 for change these should be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed.  
745 "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if

- 746 resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 747 5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 748 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
- 749 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 750 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition
- 751 Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least
- 752 a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
- 753 cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 754 8. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 5.1.
- 755 9. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 756 10. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before
- 757 the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 758 11. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
- 759 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
- 760 cast.
- 761 12. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot shall be approved only if each
- 762 EC approves it separately.

### 763 **III APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA**

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

765 Agreement shall be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

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