

# JCP:2 Process Document

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

Revision date: September 21 2011

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

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

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
I DEFINITIONS .....	2
II THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM .....	6
1. GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	6
1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	6
1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	8
1.3 JSR DEADLINES.....	9
1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	9
1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	9
1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	10
1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	10
2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION .....	10
2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	10
2.2 JSR REVIEW .....	11
2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT .....	12
2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP .....	12
3. DRAFT RELEASES.....	12
3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION .....	12
3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW .....	12
3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW .....	13
3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT .....	13
4. FINAL RELEASE.....	13
4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT .....	13
4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT .....	14
4.3 FINAL RELEASE .....	15
5. MAINTENANCE.....	15
5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	15
5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW .....	16
5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	16
6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES .....	17
6.1 SCOPE .....	17
6.2 MEMBERSHIP .....	17
6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	17

6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM .....	17
7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES .....	19
III APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	19

10

## 11 I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

25 An Executive Committee (EC) representing a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other  
 26 members of the Java community is responsible for approving the passage of Specifications through  
 27 the JCP's various stages and for reconciling discrepancies between Specifications and their  
 28 associated test suites. There are two ECs: one to oversee the Java technologies for the  
 29 desktop/server space (with responsibility for the Java SE™ and Java EE™ Specifications) and the  
 30 other to oversee the Java technologies for the consumer/embedded space (with responsibility for the  
 31 Java ME™ Specification). The EC's are considering merging the two bodies into a single one in the  
 32 near future, so newly elected EC members should be aware that their terms may vary from what is  
 33 specified in section ~~6~~5.4, "EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM"

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

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

51 This version of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of JSR

52 | [348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group.](#)

## 53 | II DEFINITIONS

54 | [Agent: an individual - for example an employee, a contractor, or an officer - who is](#)  
55 | [authorized to act on behalf of a company or organization.](#)

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

57 | ~~**Change Log:** An area accessible from the JSR Page that lists all changes made to the~~  
58 | ~~Specification, RI, TCK, and licenses since the previous release. A Change Log has six sections:~~  
59 | ~~PROPOSED (changes not yet made to the Specification), ACCEPTED (changes made to the~~  
60 | ~~Specification), DEFERRED (changes to be considered in a new JSR), RI (changes made to the~~  
61 | ~~RI), TCK (changes made to the TCK) and LICENSING (changes to the licensing terms)~~

62 | [Contribution Agreement:](#) A legal agreement defining the terms, particularly those  
63 | [concerning the grant of intellectual property rights, under which contributions are made to](#)  
64 | [a project.](#)

65 | ~~**Dormant Specification (Dormant):** A Specification that does not have an identified~~  
66 | ~~Maintenance Lead. All Specifications become Dormant at the end of their life cycles. A~~  
67 | ~~Specification that the PMO has determined has no assigned Specification Lead or~~  
68 | ~~Maintenance Lead, or that is not being actively developed and on which no further~~  
69 | ~~development is anticipated.~~

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

72 | **Elected Seat:** An EC seat filled by the election process described in section [5.3.46.4.4](#).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

89 **First-Level TCK Appeals Process:** The process defined by the Spec Lead that allows  
90 implementers of the Specification to appeal one or more tests defined by the  
91 Specification's TCK. ~~**Item Exception Ballot:** The EC ballot to determine whether or not to~~  
92 ~~include specific change items in a Maintenance Release.~~

93  
94  
95 **Issue:** an explicit reference to an item defined in an Issue Tracker.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

143 **Member Associate:** [An individual who is associated with a Member organization but is not](#)  
144 [an Agent of that organization.](#)

145 **Member Representative:** An [employeeAgent](#) of a Member company or ~~an associate of a~~  
146 Member organization who ~~has been approved by the Member to~~ represents [its interests](#)  
147 within the JCP.

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

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

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

159 **Proposed Final Draft:** The version of the draft Specification that will be used as the basis

160 for the RI and TCK.

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

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

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

167 | **Ratified Seat**: An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in section [5.3.36.4.3](#).

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

170 | [Release: A Final Release or a Maintenance Release](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Transfer of ownership does not mean transfer of IP rights, only transfer of the right to start again. The new Spec Lead can, however, negotiate a transfer of IP with the old Spec Lead.



# 189 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS <sup>SM</sup> PROGRAM

## 190 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

### 191 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

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

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

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

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

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

223 **1.1.1 ~~Mailing Lists~~PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS ~~the EG must also provide a publicly-~~**  
224 **~~readable and writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from the~~**  
225 **~~public. public mailing list is writable only by Expert Group members~~**  
226 **~~publication of the~~**  
227 **~~agenda, and on-going debate about JSR specifics. Non-substantive administrative~~**  
228 **~~matters such as notifications of meeting schedules, messages directing Expert Group~~**  
229 **~~members to particular documents or URLs, and reminders about voting or task~~**  
**~~assignments should be excluded from the public mailing list.~~**

230 ~~If the modifications to the reference implementation or the TCK, be used for minor administrative~~  
231 ~~matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or adding new features to the JSR,~~

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

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

236

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

### 245 **1.1.2 ~~Issue Tracking~~ISSUE TRACKING**

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

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

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

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

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

### 266 **1.1.3 ~~Response to Comments~~**

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



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

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

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

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

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

## **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

### **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

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

-Any JCP Member, Member Representative, or Member Associate may request to join an Expert Group at any time by submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page. Member Associates, since they are not covered by the JSPA of their organization, must sign the JSPA in their own right before they can will be permitted to join an Expert Group. Details of such requests, including the organizational affiliation of the requester, together with the Spec Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about the matter, and any other official decisions related to EG membership must be published through the EG's public communication channel. The The PMO will ensure that the JSR Page lists the Members who are members of the EG together with the names of individual Member Representatives or Member Associates where appropriate.

## 321 1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP

322 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. ~~When this happens, the Spec Lead~~  
323 ~~should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to~~  
324 ~~find a replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from~~  
325 ~~another Member. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of its~~  
326 ~~members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group, with~~  
327 ~~the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and~~  
328 ~~request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such replacement is forthcoming, the Expert~~  
329 ~~Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the~~  
330 ~~Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any,~~  
331 ~~and work with that organization to find a suitable replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not~~  
332 ~~otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from amongst other Members.~~

## 333 1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS

334 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that one of their fellow Experts  
335 is not acting in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group, and is being disruptive,  
336 uncooperative or unresponsive. EG members are expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
337 such issues among themselves, with the active help of the Spec Lead. However, if the situation cannot  
338 be resolved in a timely manner, any three members of the EG can approach the Spec Lead and  
339 request that the EG member in question be excluded from further participation in the EG. If the Spec  
340 Lead agrees to the request he can then do so. In the case where the EG Member in question is an  
341 Member Representative, the Spec Lead must first request that the Member replace its representative.  
342 If the Member does not do so in a timely manner, the Spec Lead can exclude the Member itself from  
343 further EG participation. The Spec Lead's decision as to whether or not to exclude can be appealed to  
344 the EC by following the process outlined in Section ~~0-6~~1.7, "Escalation and Appeals"

## 345 1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD

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

## 359 1.3 JSR DEADLINES

360 If a JSR does not begin Early Draft Review within the first 12 months following the completion of its  
361 initial JSR Approval Ballot (JSR Approval), or does not begin Public Review within 2 years of JSR  
362 Approval, or has not achieved Final Release within 3 years of JSR Approval, then ~~a majority of~~ the EC  
363 ~~may~~should initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot unless it is agreed that there are extraordinary circumstances  
364 that justify the delay. The PMO ~~will~~shall inform the Spec Lead and Expert Group of this decision and  
365 will request the Spec Lead and Expert Group to prepare a public statement to the EC. The JSR  
366 Renewal Ballot ~~will~~shall start 30 days after the request. If the JSR Renewal Ballot is approved by the

367 EC, then another renewal ballot cannot be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

368 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to  
369 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not  
370 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR ~~will~~shall  
371 be closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO ~~will~~shall forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR  
372 Renewal Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members,  
373 together with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the  
374 JSR ~~will~~shall be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall disband~~ed~~ed, ~~and~~ ~~if~~ the JSR was a revision to  
375 an existing Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current  
376 Specification ~~(see section 5)~~.

## 377 1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING

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

384 TCK license terms must permit implementors to freely and publicly discuss the testing process and  
385 detailed TCK test results with ~~their customers~~all interested parties.

## 386 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

### 387 1.5.1 ~~Transparency~~TRANSPARENCY

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

### 390 1.5.2 ~~Draft Reviews~~DRAFT REVIEWS

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

## 397 1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES

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

## 401 1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS

402 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any EG member can appeal to the EC regarding a  
403 decision, an action or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that affects EG  
404 participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means. An appeal  
405 must be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO (pmo@jcp.org) in all cases, even if it  
406 affects the PMO. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely, with a

407 short and relevant Subject: line, and provide all relevant documentation to support the appeal. The  
408 PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than seven days ~~of~~[after](#) receipt. The EC shall then  
409 respond to the appellant within 30 days, either with a resolution or with a request for clarification  
410 and/or further documentation.

## 411 2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

### 412 2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

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

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

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

#### 432 2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS

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

#### 442 2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION

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

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



### 450 2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS

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

### 455 2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION

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

463 Technologies may be incorporated into a Profile or Platform Edition after having been initially delivered  
464 standalone. A JSR for a new version of an API that proposes to become part of a Profile or Platform  
465 Edition and is considering discontinuing stand-alone availability must state the rationale for this  
466 change. The public must be informed of the intention to discontinue the availability of the standalone  
467 RI and TCK one [releaseJSR submission](#) in advance.

## 468 2.2 JSR REVIEW

469 When a JSR is received, the PMO [willshall](#) give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the  
470 appropriate EC (or to both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its JSR Page, announce the  
471 proposed JSR to the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the  
472 JSR's public feedback [aliascommunication mechanism](#). Comments [willshall](#) be forwarded to the EC  
473 for its consideration and [willshall](#) be made available from the JSR Page (similar comments may be  
474 consolidated.). Members who are interested in joining the Expert Group (should the JSR be approved)  
475 should identify themselves by submitting a nomination form to the PMO.

### 476 2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS ~~FOR THE RI AND TCK~~

477 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for developing the Reference Implementation and Technology  
478 Compatibility Kit and for licensing them as described in the JSPA. The Spec Lead Member must  
479 provide the EC with complete copies of the proposed [Specification](#), RI and TCK licenses no later than  
480 the start of JSR Review. The licenses [willshall](#) be published on the public JSR page. EC members  
481 should provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community as a whole might react to  
482 the terms. If the EC ~~consensus~~[Members believe is](#) that the proposed licensing terms are not  
483 compatible with the licensing guidelines established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the  
484 proposed JSR [willshall](#) be delayed until Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter. The opinion of  
485 Oracle legal [willshall](#) be the final decision on the matter.

## 486 2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT

487 After the JSR Review, EC members [willshall](#) review the JSR and any comments received, and cast  
488 their ballot ~~below 5as specified in Section~~ to decide if the JSR should be approved.

489 If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO [willshall](#) send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who  
490 may revise the JSR and resubmit it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the  
491 original EC decision [willshall](#) stand and the JSR [willshall](#) be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the  
492 PMO [willshall](#) post it to the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC

493 | members for a JSR Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR ~~will~~shall be closed.

## 494 | **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

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

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

## 506 | **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

### 507 | **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

### 520 | **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

#### 529 | **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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



533 After the Early Draft Review period has ended, the Expert Group can make any additional changes to  
534 the draft it deems necessary in response to comments before submitting the draft to the PMO for  
535 ~~Public Review~~[the next review](#).

### 536 3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW

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

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

### 544 3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT

545 The Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot starts when the Public Review closes. At the close of  
546 balloting, all comments submitted by EC members with their ballots ~~will~~[shall](#) be circulated to the Expert  
547 Group by the PMO.

548 If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in  
549 response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised  
550 draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~[shall](#) stand and the JSR  
551 ~~will~~[shall](#) be closed. If a revision is received, the PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) forward it to the EC and initiate a Public  
552 Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC  
553 members with their ballots ~~will~~[shall](#) be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails,  
554 the JSR ~~will~~[shall](#) be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~[shall](#) disband. If the JSR was a revision to an  
555 existing Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current  
556 Specification (see section [4.5](#)).

## 557 4. FINAL RELEASE

### 558 4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT

559 If the Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot (or Reconsideration Ballot) is successful, the Expert  
560 Group ~~will~~[shall](#) prepare the Proposed Final Draft of the Specification by completing any revisions it  
561 deems necessary in response to comments received. The Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) then send the Proposed  
562 Final Draft to the PMO, ~~where~~[which](#) ~~will~~[shall](#) post it on the JCP Web Site for public download.

#### 563 4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK

564 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for the completion of both the RI and the TCK. JSRs that are  
565 assigned to both ECs are required to support both environments, which may require a separate RI and  
566 TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK uncover areas of the Specification that were under-  
567 defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) work with the Expert Group to correct  
568 those deficiencies and then send a revised Specification together with a summary of the changes to  
569 the PMO. Information ~~will~~[shall](#) be posted to the JCP Web Site. The Expert Group ~~will~~[shall](#) continue to  
570 consider any further comments received during this time.

#### 571 4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS

572 The Spec Lead is also responsible for establishing a clearly defined First Level TCK Appeals Process

573 to address challenges to tests contained in the TCK. This process must be described in the TCK  
574 documentation. Implementers who are not satisfied with a first level decision should appeal to the EC  
575 by documenting their concerns in an email message to the PMO. The PMO will circulate the request to  
576 the EC, together with any information received from the ML concerning the rationale for the first-level  
577 decision, and initiate a 7-day Appeal Ballot.

### 578 4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT

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

## 586 4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

- 593 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information  
594 needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation,) a definition and explanation of the First-  
595 level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be met in addition to  
596 passing the TCK tests, ~~and any other information needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools~~  
597 ~~documentation)-~~
- 598 • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations  
599 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and  
600 b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include  
601 any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the  
602 Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being  
603 implemented.  
604 These requirements must apply unless the Spec or TCK explicitly allows exceptions.
- 605 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and  
606 recording of results.
- 607 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.  
608 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a  
609 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK  
610 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the  
611 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 612 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the ~~required~~ API  
613 signatures ~~of~~required by the spec are completely implemented and that ~~no non-specified-~~  
614 ~~APIs~~only API signatures required by the spec are included in the JSR's namespace.

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

616 TCK in response to EC concerns and to resubmit modified materials to the PMO.  
617 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC ~~will~~[shall](#) stand, the PMO  
618 ~~will~~[shall](#) close the JSR, and the Expert Group ~~will~~[shall](#) disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing  
619 Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current  
620 Specification (see section [4.5](#)).  
621 If a response is received, the PMO ~~will~~[shall](#) circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval  
622 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members  
623 ~~will~~[shall](#) be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will  
624 be closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the  
625 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification.

## 626 4.3 FINAL RELEASE

627 Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot or Reconsideration Ballot, the PMO will publish on  
628 the JCP website the Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK and will  
629 announce the availability of these materials to both Members and the public. The published TCK  
630 information must include a means for any interested party to obtain a copy of the TCK documentation  
631 at no charge. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The  
632 Spec Lead will typically be the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and  
633 others for aid in that role.  
634 The Maintenance Lead must ensure that the links to the RI and TCK remain valid through the lifetime  
635 of the Specification. If the links become broken or non-functional, the Maintenance Lead will have 30  
636 days following notification from the PMO of the invalid links to correct them. If the problems are not  
637 corrected within 30 days, the Specification must reenter the Process at the Proposed Final Draft or  
638 Maintenance Review stage as appropriate, and complete the ~~Final Release or Maintenance-~~  
639 ~~Release~~[Release](#) process again. NOTE: IP rights granted when the JSR made any previous [R](#)eleases  
640 are not affected by such a change in status.

## 641 5. MAINTENANCE

### 642 5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

643 The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,  
644 and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A  
645 Maintenance Lead ~~will~~[shall](#) therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions  
646 to their Specification but ~~will~~[shall](#) not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will  
647 take place (see section [4.2.1.1](#)).

648 ~~The PMO will provide a publicly archived Maintenance feedback alias through which the public may~~  
649 ~~submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification. The public may~~  
650 ~~submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification by logging~~  
651 ~~issues through the JSR's Issue Tracker.~~

652 The ML ~~will~~[shall](#) consider all requests and ~~will~~[shall](#) decide how and if the Specification should be  
653 updated in response. The ML is not required to do all these tasks alone, but is free to consult with the  
654 former members of the Expert Group, or any other sources, to assist with the Maintenance duties.

655 All changes proposed by the ML ~~will~~[shall](#) make their way into the Specification by either the  
656 Maintenance Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a  
657 Maintenance Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the  
658 implementation of existing APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Modifications to existing  
659 APIs or the addition of new APIs must not break binary compatibility as defined by the Java Language

660 | Specification, and should be deferred to a new JSR. ~~should be deferred to a new JSR.~~

### 661 | 5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

662 | If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work ~~fat~~ at any time (including discontinuing maintenance  
663 | activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)  
664 | the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member  
665 | who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot  
666 | within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot  
667 | succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can  
668 | be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then ~~to find a replacement, sif the ML fail~~ the PMO ~~will~~ shall  
669 | declare the Specification to be Dormant. ~~N and no~~ further maintenance ~~will~~ can be carried out. ~~No~~  
670 | further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case  
671 | the PMO will have again a month to initiate a Transfer Ballot. on it until a new ML is identified and  
672 | ~~ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK is transferred to the new ML's organization (subject to a~~  
673 | ~~successful Transfer ballot by the EC).~~

### 674 | 5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW

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

682 | ~~The ML may choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received-~~  
683 | ~~during the review.~~

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

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

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

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

700 | The Maintenance Lead shall document all proposed Specification changes through the Issue Tracker  
701 | and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. This request must be  
702 | accompanied by an Issue List that summarizes all formal comments that have been received and that  
703 | indicates the disposition of each Issue. The Maintenance Lead ~~should~~ must also supply a summary of  
704 | the proposed Specification changes, ideally in the form of a *diff* between the proposed and the current  
705 | Specification. The Maintenance Lead must also provide an estimate of when the final materials shall

706 be delivered for the Maintenance Release. If no estimate is provided the deadline will default to 30  
707 days.

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

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

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

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

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

728

## 729 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

730 ~~At any time after a Maintenance Review Ballot and possible Item Exception Ballot the Spec Lead will~~  
731 ~~update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Change Log as necessary and submit them to the PMO for~~  
732 ~~publication in a Maintenance Release.~~ After a successful Maintenance Review Ballot the Maintenance  
733 Lead will update the Specification, RI, TCK, and Issue List as necessary and submit them to the PMO  
734 for publication in a Maintenance Release. The PMO verifies that the necessary changes have been  
735 made, and publishes the Specification, the ~~Change Log~~ Issue List, and pointers to the RI and TCK on  
736 the JSR Web Page.

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

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

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

### 747 **6.1 SCOPE**

748 The Executive Committee (EC) oversees the development and evolution of the Java technologies



749 within the JCP.

## 750 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

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

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

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

## 759 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

## 783 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

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

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

### 788 **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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



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

## 796 | **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

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

804 |  
805 | In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall  
806 | organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask  
807 | questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also  
808 | organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

## 809 | **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

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

## 820 | **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

- 823 | • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO ~~will~~shall post on the public JCP site a complete  
824 | description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,  
825 | position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 826 | • Four weeks before the ~~voting~~ballot period the PMO ~~will~~shall accept nominations from the  
827 | Community for a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that  
828 | ~~employees~~Agents of JCP Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO  
829 | shall reject such nominations.
- 830 | • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a  
831 | 14-day ~~voting~~ballot period.
- 832 | • The nominees who receive the most votes ~~will~~shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 833 | • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters ~~will~~shall be given the opportunity to vote  
834 | “yes” or “no” for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 835 | • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the

[next election.](#)

- Ties [willshall](#) be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt> and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

## 7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES

1. All JSR ballots [willshall](#) be conducted electronically and the results made public.
2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not vote at all.
4. [Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions for change these should be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed. "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items \(if any\) that if resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".](#)
5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
7. Ballots to approve UJSRs ~~for new~~[that define the initial version of a new](#) -Platform Edition Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
8. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 4.5.1.
9. ~~"No" votes must be accompanied by an explanation of the changes (if any) that would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".~~
10. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
11. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before the JSR can be reinitiated.
12. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast.
13. ~~An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.~~
14. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot [willshall](#) be approved only if each EC approves it separately.

## IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA

Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation Agreement [willshall](#) be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

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