

JCP: Process Document

3

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

5 Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

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

7 CONTENTS

8

I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
II	DEFINITIONS	2
III	THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM	6
0.	GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	6
0.0	EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	6
0.1	EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	8
0.2	JSR DEADLINES.....	9
0.3	COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	9
0.4	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	9
0.5	PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	9
0.6	ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	10
1.	INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION	10
1.0	INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	10
1.1	JSR REVIEW	11
1.2	JSR APPROVAL BALLOT	12
1.3	FORM THE EXPERT GROUP	12
2.	DRAFT RELEASES.....	12
2.0	WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION	12
2.1	EARLY DRAFT REVIEW	12
2.2	PUBLIC REVIEW	13
2.3	PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT	13
3.	FINAL RELEASE.....	13
3.0	PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT	13
3.1	FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT	14
3.2	FINAL RELEASE	15
4.	MAINTENANCE.....	15
4.0	MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	15
4.1	MAINTENANCE REVIEW	16
4.2	MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	16
5.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	17
5.0	SCOPE	17
5.1	MEMBERSHIP	17
5.2	EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	17
5.3	EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM	17
6.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES	19

I 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.

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.

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 5.4, "EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM"

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

1. **INITIATION:** A Specification targeted at the desktop/server or consumer/embedded space is initiated by community member(s) 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 whether the JSR should proceed to the Final Release stage.
3. **FINAL RELEASE:** The Spec Lead submits the Specification to the PMO for publication as the Proposed Final Draft. When the RI and TCK are completed, and the RI passes the TCK, the Specification, the RI, and the TCK are submitted to the PMO, who circulates them to the responsible EC for final approval.
4. **MAINTENANCE:** The Specification, Reference Implementation, and Technology Compatibility Kit are updated in response to ongoing requests for clarification, interpretation, enhancements, and revisions. The responsible EC reviews proposed changes to the Specification and indicates which can be carried out immediately and which will require the changes to be implemented in a new JSR.

II DEFINITIONS

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

Change Log: An area accessible from the JSR Page that lists all changes made to the

Specification, RI, TCK, and licenses since the previous release. A Change Log has six sections: PROPOSED (changes not yet made to the Specification), ACCEPTED (changes made to the Specification), DEFERRED (changes to be considered in a new JSR), RI (changes made to the RI), TCK (changes made to the TCK) and LICENSING (changes to the licensing terms)

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

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

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 5.3.4.

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.

88 Item Exception Ballot: The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include specific
89 change items in a Maintenance Release.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

119 **Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Maintenance
120 Release when Members and the public consider and comment on the change items listed
121 in the PROPOSED section of the Change Log.

122 **Maintenance Review Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine whether the changes proposed by

123 a Maintenance Lead are appropriate for a Maintenance Release.

124 **Member Representative:** An employee of a Member company or an associate of a
125 Member organization who has been approved by the Member to represent it within the
126 JCP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

146 **Ratified Seat:** An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in section 5.3.3.

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

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

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

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

158 **Transfer Ballot:** The EC ballot to approve transfer of ownership of a Specification, RI, and

159 TCK from one Member to another Member.¹

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

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

164 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM

165 0. GENERAL PROCEDURES

166 0.0 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

170 As specified below, Expert Groups must operate in a transparent manner, enabling the public to
171 observe their deliberations and to provide feedback. All feedback must be taken into consideration and
172 public responses must be provided. In the initial JSR submission the Spec Lead must specify the
173 transparency mechanisms (for example, the mailing lists and issue tracker) that the Expert Group
174 intends to adopt, and must provide the URLs for accessing the chosen collaboration tools. The PMO
175 will publish this information on the public JSR Page. The Spec Lead must also provide a pointer to any
176 Terms of Use required to use the collaboration tools so that the EC and prospective EG members can
177 judge whether they are compatible with the JSPA.

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

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

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

194 0.0.1 Mailing Lists

195 All substantive business must be carried out on a public mailing list designated by the Spec Lead. The

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.

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

196 purpose of this list is to keep observers aware of important issues and, minor administrative issues
197 that distract from substantive business should therefore be kept private. A private mailing list should
198 be used for minor administrative matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or
199 adding new features to the JSR, changes to the membership of the Expert Group, publication of the
200 agenda, and on-going debate about JSR specifics. Non-substantive administrative matters such as
201 notifications of meeting schedules, messages directing Expert Group members to particular
202 documents or URLs, and reminders about voting or task assignments should be excluded from the
203 public mailing list.

204 If the public mailing list is writable only by Expert Group members the EG must also provide a publicly
205 readable and writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from the public.

206 **0.0.2 Issue Tracking**

207 Issues must be tracked through a publicly readable issue tracking mechanism. Formal comments
208 must be entered into the issue-tracker, and all open issues must be responded to publicly before the
209 JSR moves to the next stage. If the EG decides to reject a suggested change then the response in the
210 issue-tracker must include a rationale for rejection. Responses stating that the suggested change will
211 be made at a later date (but before the JSR or Maintenance Release is finalized) are permissible; in
212 these cases the issue should be kept open until the change has actually been made. The issue-
213 tracking mechanism must make a clear distinction between open, responded-to, and closed issues so
214 the EC can clearly judge whether the EG has met its obligation to respond to all issues.

215 EC members, when voting to approve a JSR's advance to the next stage, should take into
216 consideration the EG's responses to comments, and may insist that a suggestion or issue the EG
217 considers resolved be re-addressed before the JSR moves on.

218

219 **0.0.3 Changes to Licensing Terms**

220

221 As described in Section 1.1.1 below, the proposed licensing terms must be disclosed during JSR
222 submission. The Specification License must not be modified after initial submission since to do so
223 could invalidate IP grants. It may be necessary, however, to modify the proposed RI or TCK license.
224 Any such changes must be disclosed when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public
225 posting or review.

226 During the lifetime of the JSR the Spec Lead must continue to offer the RI and TCK licenses that were
227 published at the time of Final Release. At subsequent Maintenance Releases alternate RI or TCK
228 licenses may also be offered so long as all changes are disclosed in the Change Log, but licensees
229 must be free to choose the original terms if they wish. For example, existing licensees who not wish to
230 accept a modified license when required to adopt a newer TCK will have the option to license the
231 updated TCK under the previous terms.

232 When a newer version of a technology is created through a follow-on JSR the original Specification,
233 RI, and TCK license terms may be changed, but any such changes must be disclosed during JSR
234 submission.

235

236 **0.1 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

237 **0.1.1 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

238 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. When this happens, the Spec Lead
239 should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to
240 find a replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from
241 another Member. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of its
242 members as the new Spec Lead.

243 **0.1.2 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

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

255 **0.1.3 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

256 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting
257 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These
258 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be
259 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any
260 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any
261 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be
262 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to
263 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is a Member Representative the PMO
264 should ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead, or it may seek to put in place an alternative Spec
265 Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a transfer ballot as specified in section 5.1.2 of this
266 document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the EC may disband the Expert Group.

267 **0.2 JSR DEADLINES**

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

276 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to
277 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not
278 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC will stand and the JSR will be
279 closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO will forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR Renewal

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

284 **0.3 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

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

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

293 **0.4 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

294 **0.4.1 Transparency**

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

297 **0.4.2 Draft Reviews**

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

304 **0.5 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**





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

308 **0.6 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

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

318 1. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

319 1.0 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

320 One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant
321 revision to an existing e, by submitting the JSR Proposal form on the JCP website, as described in
322 the Spec Lead Guide. y JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by e submitter(s) without
323 explanation at any time prior to the completion of the JSR Approval Ballot e section 1.3) upon
324 request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.



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

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

338 1.0.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS

339 Existing Specifications, together with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated
340 Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 4 of this document. Maintenance Lead
341 Members are expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK while
342 respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. Maintenance Leads
343 will therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they will not
344 have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That will be decided by
345 the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community Member.
346 Submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous Expert
347 Group to join the revision effort.

348 1.0.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION

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

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

356 1.0.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS

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

361 **1.0.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**



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

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

374 **1.1 JSR REVIEW**

375 When a JSR is received, the PMO will give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the appropriate EC
376 (or to both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its JSR Page, announce the proposed JSR to
377 the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the JSR's public feedback
378 email list. Comments will be forwarded to the EC for its consideration and will be made available from
379 the JSR Page (similar comments may be consolidated.). Members who are interested in joining the
380 Expert Group (should the JSR be approved) should identify themselves by submitting a nomination
381 form to the PMO.

382 **1.1.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

383 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for developing the Reference Implementation and Technology
384 Compatibility Kit and for licensing them as described in the JSPA.  The Spec Lead Member must
385 provide the EC with complete copies of the proposed Specification,  and TCK licenses no later than
386 the start of JSR Review. The licenses will be published on the public JSR page. EC members should
387 provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community as a whole might react to the
388 terms. If the EC Consensus is that the proposed licensing terms are not compatible with the licensing
389 guidelines established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the proposed JSR will be delayed until
390 Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter. The opinion of Oracle legal will be the final decision on
391 the matter.

392 **1.2 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

395 If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO will send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who may
396 revise the JSR and resubmi it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the original
397 EC decision will stand and the JSR will be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the PMO will post it to
398 the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC members for a JSR
399 Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR will be closed.

400 **1.3 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

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

408 Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by
409 sending an email to the Spec Lead of the EG. The request, together with the Spec Lead's official
410 response, substantive deliberations within the EG about this matter, and any other official decision
411 related to EG composition, including decisions to remove or replace EG members, must be made
412 public via the EG's public email list.

413 **2. DRAFT RELEASES**

414 **2.0 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

427 **2.1 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

436 **2.1.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

442 Public Review.

443 **2.2 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

451 **2.3 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

463 **3. FINAL RELEASE**

464 **3.0 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

469 **3.0.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

477 **3.0.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

478 The Spec Lead is also responsible for establishing a clearly defined First Level TCK Appeals Process
479 to address challenges to tests contained in the TCK. This process must be described in the TCK
480 documentation. Implementers who are not satisfied with a first level decision should appeal to the EC
481 by documenting their concerns in an email message to the PMO. The PMO will circulate the request to

482 the EC, together with any information received from the ML concerning the rationale for the first-level
483 decision, and initiate a 7-day Appeal Ballot.

484 **3.0.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

485 Depending on the nature of the problem, a successful TCK challenge will require updating one or
486 more of the TCK, the Specification, or the RI. Within one month of the close of a successful TCK
487 Appeal Ballot the Maintenance Lead must update these deliverables as necessary and record the
488 changes in the relevant sections of the Change Log. The modified Change Log, the Specification (if
489 changed,) and URLs for the updated RI and/or TCK must be delivered to the PMO, who will publish
490 them on the JCP website.

491 **3.1 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 498 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, a definition and
499 explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must
500 be met in addition to passing the TCK tests, and any other information needed to use the TCK
501 (e.g. Tools documentation).
- 502 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and
503 recording of results.
- 504 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.
505 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a
506 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK
507 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the
508 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 509 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the required API
510 signatures of the spec are completely implemented and that no non-specified APIs are
511 included in the JSR's namespace.

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

514 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC will stand, the PMO will
515 close the JSR, and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing
516 Specification, the Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification
517 (see section 4).

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

523 3.2 FINAL RELEASE

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

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

538 4. MAINTENANCE

539 4.0 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES


540 The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,
541 and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A
542 Maintenance Lead will therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions to
543 their Specification but will not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take
544 place (see section 1.1.1).

545 The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback email list through which the public
546 may submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification.

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

550 All changes proposed by the ML will make their way into the Specification by either the Maintenance
551 Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a Maintenance
552 Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the implementation of existing
553 APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Modifications to existing APIs or the addition of new
554 APIs should be deferred to a new JSR.

555 4.0.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

556 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work at any time (including discontinuing maintenance
557 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)
558 the ML should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member who is willing to take on the task.
559 The PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot within one month of a new ML being found. If the ML or the
560 PMO fail to find a replacement, the PMO will declare the Specification to be Dormant. No further
561 maintenance can be carried out. No further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO unless a
562 Member volunteers as ML, in which case the PMO will have again a month to initiate a Transfer Ballot.
563 If a Transfer Ballot is successful, the new ML must  assume his or her responsibilities no later than 14
564 days after the announcement of the ballot results.

565 **4.1 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

566 The ML will document all proposed Specification changes in the PROPOSED section of the Change
567 Log and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance
568 Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received through the Maintenance feedback email
569 list and must indicate the disposition of each comment (e.g. deferred with a brief explanation, rejected
570 with a brief explanation, included in the Change Log proposal.) This summary will be posted along
571 with the Change Log on the JSR Page. The PMO will then make a public announcement and begin
572 the review.

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

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

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

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

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

591 **4.2 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

592 At any time after a Maintenance Review Ballot and possible Item Exception Ballot the Spec Lead will
593 update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Change Log as necessary and submit them to the PMO for
594 publication in a Maintenance Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have been
595 made, and publishes the Specification, the Change Log, and pointers to the RI and TCK on the JSR
596 Web Page.

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

599 **5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

600 **5.0 SCOPE**

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

603 **5.1 MEMBERSHIP**

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

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

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

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

612 **5.2 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 613 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
 - 614 2. Approve draft Specifications for Public Review.
 - 615 3. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
 - 616 4. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
 - 617 5. Review proposed maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new
618 JSR.
 - 619 6. Approve the transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
 - 620 7. Decide when JSRs that have not made sufficient progress through the Process should be
621 withdrawn.
 - 622 8. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the
623 organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance
624 may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the
625 EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.
- 626
- 627 Members of the Executive Committee shall be dedicated to the principles of full and open competition,
628 in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United States and other
629 nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can result in criminal as well
630 as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on the jurisdiction. In particular, any
631 discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of distribution, division of markets or
632 allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be avoided.

633 **5.3 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

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

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

638 **5.3.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

641 Vacated seats will be filled for the remainder of their term by a special election ballot that will be held
642 no later than two months after the resignation (unless the resignation is less than six months before
643 the next scheduled annual election ballot).

644 **5.3.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

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

651
652 In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall
653 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask
654 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also
655 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

656 **5.3.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

- 658 • The PMO nominates Members to fill the vacant Ratified Seats with due regard for balanced
659 community and regional representation.
- 660 • Eligible Members will vote to ratify each nominee over a 14-day ballot period.
- 661 • A nominee is ratified by a simple majority of those who cast a vote.
- 662 • If one or more of the nominees are not ratified by the vote, the PMO will nominate additional
663 Members as needed and hold additional ratification ballots until the vacant seats are filled.

664 **5.3.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

- 667 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO will post on the public JCP site a complete
668 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,
669 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 670 • Four weeks before the b period the PMO will accept nominations from the Community for a
671 period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that employees of JCP
672 Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such
673 nominations.
- 674 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
675 14-day ballot period.
- 676 • The nominees who receive the most votes will fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 677 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters will be given the opportunity to vote
678 "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 679 • Ties will be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt> and
680 using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

681 **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES**

- 682 1. All JSR ballots will be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 683 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 684 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
685 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not
686 vote at all.
- 687 4. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 688 5. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
689 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 690 6. Ballots to approve UJSRs for additional Platform Edition Specifications or JSRs that propose
691 changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds majority of the votes
692 cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the
693 "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.

- 694 7. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 4.1.
- 695 8. "No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation of the changes (if any) that would
- 696 persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 697 9. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 698 10. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before
- 699 the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 700 11. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
- 701 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
- 702 cast.
- 703 12. An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third
- 704 of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.
- 705 13. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot will be approved only if each
- 706 EC approves it separately.

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

708 Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation
709 Agreement will be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

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