

JCP-2: Process Document

Version 2.8 (MM DD, 2011)

Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

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

CONTENTS

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

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES	19
III APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	20

9

10 I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

16 Experience has shown that the best way to produce a technology specification is to gather a group of
 17 industry experts who have a deep understanding of the technology in question and then have a strong
 18 technical lead work with that group to create a first draft. Consensus around the form and content of
 19 the draft is then built using an iterative review process that allows an ever-widening audience to review
 20 and comment on the document. ~~This version of the JCP was developed through the JCP by means of~~
 21 ~~JSR 348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group.~~

22

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

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

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

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

II DEFINITIONS

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

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

~~elease. 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).~~
Change Log: An area accessible from the JSR Page that lists all changes made to the Specification, RI, TCK, and licenses since the previous

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

91	Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot: The 14-day EC ballot to reconsider an initial
92	rejection of a Final Draft, RI, and TCK.
93	Final Draft: The final draft of the Specification that will be put forward for EC approval.
94	Final Release: The final stage in the JSR development process when the Specification,
95	RI, and TCK have been completed and can be licensed by implementors.
96	First-Level TCK Appeals Process: The process defined by the Spec Lead that allows
97	implementers of the Specification to appeal one or more tests defined by the
98	Specification's TCK.
99	
100	Item Exception Ballot: The EC ballot to determine whether or not to include specific-
101	change items in a Maintenance Release. Issue: an explicit reference to an item defined in
102	an Issue Tracker.
103	Issue List: A list of Issues generated from an Issue Tracker, identifying the disposition of
104	each.
105	Issue Tracker: A mechanism to allow issues (problems, tasks, comments, or requests for
106	change) to be recorded and tracked by priority, status, owner, or other criteria. The Issue
107	Tracker should permit issues to be identified by states such as open, resolved, and closed
108	and should support the assignment of resolution types such as deferred (postponed to a
109	follow-on release,) fixed (implemented,) challenged (no satisfactory resolution,) and
110	rejected (deemed inappropriate or out of scope.)
111	Java Community Process (JCP): The formal process described in this document for
112	developing or revising Java technology Specifications.
113	Java Community Process Member (Member): A company, organization, or individual
114	that has signed the JSPA and is abiding by its terms.
115	Java Specification (Specification): A written specification for some aspect of the Java
116	technology. This includes the language, virtual machine, Platform Editions, Profiles, and
117	application programming interfaces.
118	Java Specification Request (JSR): The document submitted to the PMO by one or more
119	Members to propose the development of a new Specification or significant revision to an
120	existing Specification.
121	Java Specification Participation Agreement (JSPA): A one-year renewable agreement
122	between Oracle America and a company, organization or individual that allows the latter
123	entities to participate in the Java Community Process.
124	JCP Web Site: The web site where anyone can stay informed about JCP activities,
125	download draft and final Specifications, and follow the progress of Specifications through
126	the JCP.
127	JSR Approval Ballot: The EC ballot to determine if the JSR should be approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

152 **Member Representative:** An ~~employee~~[Agent](#) of a Member company or ~~an associate of a~~
153 ~~Member organization who~~ [has been approved by the Member to](#) represents [its interests](#)
154 within the JCP.

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

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

164 **Program Management Office (PMO):** The group within Oracle America that is

165 responsible for administering the JCP and chairing the EC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

196 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM

197 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

198 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

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

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

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

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

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

230 1.1.1 ~~Mailing-Lists~~PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

231 ~~All substantive business must be carried out on a public mailing list designated by the Spec Lead. The~~
232 ~~purpose of this list is to keep observers aware of important issues and, minor administrative issues~~
233 ~~that distract from substantive business should therefore be kept private. A private mailing list should~~
234 ~~be used for minor administrative matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or~~
235 ~~adding new features to the JSR, changes to the membership of the Expert Group, modifications to the~~
236 ~~reference implementation or the TCK, publication of the agenda, and on-going debate about JSR~~
237 ~~specifics. Non-substantive administrative matters such as notifications of meeting schedules,~~
238 ~~messages directing Expert Group members to particular documents or URLs, and reminders about~~

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

239 | ~~voting or task assignments should be excluded from the public mailing list.~~
240 | ~~If the public mailing list is writable only by Expert Group members the EG must also provide a publicly~~
241 | ~~readable and writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from the public.~~
242 | Expert Groups may choose to keep purely administrative matters private but all substantive business
243 | must be performed in a manner that allows the public to observe their work and to respond to it. All
244 | proceedings, discussions, and working documents must be published, and a mechanism must be
245 | established to allow the public to provide feedback. One common way of meeting these requirements
246 | is through the use of one or more mailing lists, but other alternatives such as blogs, Wikis, and
247 | discussion forums may be preferred. Whatever communication mechanisms are chosen, these must
248 | include an archiving function so that a record of all communications is preserved. Archives must be
249 | readable by the public.

250 | **1.1.2 Issue Tracking** **ISSUE TRACKING**

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

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

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

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

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

271 | **1.1.3 Response to Comments**

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

280 | 1.1.4 ~~Changes to Licensing Terms~~ CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS

281 | 1.1.5 ~~If the licensing terms for a JSR change from one release to the next, the changes must be~~
282 | ~~explicitly listed and explained. Changes to the licensing terms must be disclosed~~
283 | ~~during JSR submission (in the case of a new JSR) or in the Change Log for~~
284 | ~~Maintenance Releases. Subsequent changes to licensing terms during the life of the~~
285 | ~~JSR must be disclosed when the Specification is next submitted to the PMO for public~~
286 | ~~posting or review.~~

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

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

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

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

304 | 1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP

305 | 1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION

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

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

316 | 1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP

317 | An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. ~~When this happens, the Spec Lead~~
318 | ~~should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert and work with that organization to~~
319 | ~~find a replacement. If no replacement is offered, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from~~
320 | ~~another Member. If the departing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group should choose one of its~~
321 | ~~members as the new Spec Lead.~~ If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec Lead, the Expert Group, with
322 | the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and

323 request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such replacement is forthcoming, the Expert
324 Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the
325 Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member who originally contributed the Expert, if any,
326 and work with that organization to find a suitable replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not
327 otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a replacement from amongst other Members.

328 1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS

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

340 1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD

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

354 1.3 JSR DEADLINES

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

363 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to
364 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not
365 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC ~~will~~shall stand and the JSR ~~will~~shall
366 be closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO ~~will~~shall forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR
367 Renewal Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members,
368 together with their ballots ~~will~~shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the
369 JSR ~~will~~shall be closed and the Expert Group ~~will~~shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing

370 | Specification, the Spec Lead ~~will~~shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current
371 | Specification (see section 5).

372 | 1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING

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

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

382 | 1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES

383 | 1.5.1 ~~Transparency~~TRANSPARENCY

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

386 | 1.5.2 ~~Draft-Reviews~~DRAFT REVIEWS

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

393 | 1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES

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

397 | 1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS

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

407 2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION

408 2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST

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

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

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

428 2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS

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

438 2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION

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

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

446 2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS

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

450 Specification they are based upon.

451 2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION

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

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

464 2.2 JSR REVIEW

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

472 2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS ~~FOR THE RI AND TCK~~

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

482 2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

490 2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP

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

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

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

498 ~~-Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by-~~
499 ~~sending an email to the Spec Lead of the EG. The request, together with the Spec Lead's official-~~
500 ~~response, substantive deliberations within the EG about this matter, and any other official decision-~~
501 ~~related to EG composition, including decisions to remove or replace EG members, must be made-~~
502 ~~public via the EG's public alias.~~

503 3. DRAFT RELEASES

504 3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION

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

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

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

517 3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW

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

526 3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW

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

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

533 3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW

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

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

541 3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

554 4. FINAL RELEASE

555 4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT

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

560 4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK

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

568 4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS

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

574 first-level decision, and initiate a 7-day Appeal Ballot.

575 4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT

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

583 4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT

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

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

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

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

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

617 | Specification (see section 45).

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

623 | 4.3 FINAL RELEASE

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

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

638 | 5. MAINTENANCE

639 | 5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

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

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

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

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

657 | 5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP

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

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

670 5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW

671 ~~-are identified and the reasons for the objection are explained.~~

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

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

677 ~~At the end of Maintenance Review and any subsequent Item Exception Ballots, the ML will update the~~
678 ~~Specification, moving all approved revisions from the PROPOSED to the ACCEPTED section of the~~
679 ~~Change Log. Items voted down in an Item Exception Ballot must be moved to the DEFERRED section~~
680 ~~of the log. Other changes not incorporated into the Specification may be left in the PROPOSED~~
681 ~~section or moved to the DEFERRED section at the ML's discretion. Items and must indicate the~~
682 ~~disposition of each comment (e.g. deferred with a brief explanation, rejected with a brief explanation,~~
683 ~~included in the Change Log proposal.) This summary will be posted along with the Change Log on the~~
684 ~~JSR Page. The PMO will then make a public announcement and begin the review.~~

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

687 ~~At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO will initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.~~
688 ~~During this ballot EC members should vote "yes" if they agree that the Maintenance Release should~~
689 ~~go ahead as the Spec Lead has proposed, and "no" if they believe that one or more of the changes~~
690 ~~proposed by the ML is inappropriate for a Maintenance Release and should be deferred to a follow-on~~
691 ~~JSR. "No" votes must be accompanied by comments in which the offending Maintenance feedback~~
692 ~~aliasThe ML will document all proposed Specification changes in the PROPOSED section of the~~
693 ~~Change Log and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the~~
694 ~~Maintenance Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received through the~~

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

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

706 At the close of the Maintenance Review the PMO shall initiate a 7-day Maintenance Review Ballot.

707 During this ballot EC members should vote 'yes' if they agree that the Maintenance Release should
708 proceed as the Spec Lead has proposed, and 'no' if they have objections to the proposed release on
709 one of the following grounds:

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

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

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

723

724 5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE

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

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

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

741 6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

742 6.1 SCOPE

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

745 6.2 MEMBERSHIP

746 There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and
747 EE together. Each EC is composed of 16 Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.
748 has a permanent voting seat on each EC. (Oracle representatives must not be members of the PMO.)

749 The ECs are led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.
750 Should one Member on the EC acquire a majority ownership of another EC member, one of those
751 members must resign his or her seat by the effective date of the acquisition.
752 NOTE: In the near future the EC intends to merge the two ECs, and modify the number of members
753 and possibly their terms of office.

754 6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

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

778 6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM

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

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

783 6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS

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

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

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

791 6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES

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

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

799
800 In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall
801 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask
802 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also
803 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

804 6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS

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

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

815 6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS

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

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

834 7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES

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

865 IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA

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

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