

JCP Process Document

Version 2.89 (October August 1815, 20142)

Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

Copyright (c) 1996 - 20142 Oracle America, Inc.

CONTENTS

I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
II	DEFINITIONS	2
III	THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESSSM PROGRAM	7
1.	GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	7
1.1	EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	7
1.2	EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	8
1.3	JSR DEADLINES.....	10
1.4	COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	10
1.5	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	10
1.6	PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	10
1.7	ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	11
2.	INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION	11
2.1	INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	11
2.2	JSR REVIEW	12
2.3	JSR APPROVAL BALLOT	12
2.4	FORM THE EXPERT GROUP	13
3.	DRAFT RELEASES.....	13
3.1	WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION	13
3.2	EARLY DRAFT REVIEW	13
3.3	PUBLIC REVIEW	14
3.4	PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT	14
4.	FINAL RELEASE.....	14
4.1	PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT	14
4.2	FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT	15
4.3	FINAL RELEASE	16
5.	MAINTENANCE.....	16
5.1	MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	16
5.2	MAINTENANCE REVIEW	17
5.3	MAINTENANCE RELEASE.....	17
6.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	18
6.1	SCOPE	18
6.2	MEMBERSHIP	18
6.3	EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	18
6.4	EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM	18
7.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR BALLOT RULES	20
IV	APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	20
V	APPENDIX B: TRANSITIONING TO A MERGED EC.....	21

8 I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

14 Experience has shown that the best way to produce a technology specification is to gather a group of
15 industry experts who have a deep understanding of the technology in question and for a strong
16 technical lead [to](#) work with that group to create a first draft. Agreement on the form and content of the
17 draft is then built using an iterative process that allows an ever-widening audience to review and
18 comment on the document.

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

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

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

43 This version [\(2.9\)](#) of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of
44 JSR 34855, led by Oracle with ~~combinedthe-all~~ Executive Committee ~~members~~ forming the Expert
45 Group.

46 II DEFINITIONS

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

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

50 **Ballot:** See Appeal Ballot, Final Approval Ballot, Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot,
51 JSR Approval Ballot, JSR Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Renewal Ballot, JSR Renewal

52 Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Withdrawal Ballot, Maintenance Review Ballot, Maintenance
53 Renewal Ballot, Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot, Public Draft Specification
54 Approval Ballot, Public Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot, Transfer Ballot.

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

58 **Dormant Specification (Dormant):** A Specification that the PMO has determined has no
59 assigned Specification Lead or Maintenance Lead, or that is not being actively developed
60 and on which no further development is anticipated.

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

63 **Elected Seat:** An EC seat filled by the election process described in section 6.4.4.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

86 **Issue Tracker:** A mechanism to allow issues (problems, tasks, comments, or requests for

change) to be recorded and tracked by priority, status, owner, or other criteria. The Issue Tracker should permit issues to be identified by states such as open, resolved, and closed and should support the assignment of resolution types such as deferred (postponed to a follow-on release,) fixed (implemented,) challenged (no satisfactory resolution,) and rejected (deemed inappropriate or out of scope.)

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

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

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

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

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

JCP Website: The website where the public can stay informed about JCP activities, download draft and final Specifications, and follow the progress of Specifications through the JCP.

JSR Approval Ballot: A two-week EC ballot to determine if the initial JSR submission should be approved

JSR Reconsideration Ballot: The EC ballot to determine if a revision of an initial JSR submission should be approved.

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

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

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

JSR Review: A two- to four-week period (the length to be set at the discretion of the submitter) during which the public can review and comment on a proposed new JSR before the JSR Approval Ballot.

JSR Withdrawal Ballot: An EC ballot to confirm that a completed JSR that appears to have been abandoned should be withdrawn.

Licensors Name Space: The public class or interface declarations whose names begin with "java", "javax", "com.sun" (or "com.Your name" if You are the Specification Lead) or

124 their equivalents in any subsequent naming convention adopted by Oracle.

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

126 **Maintenance Lead Member:** The individual JCP member who is a Maintenance Lead, or
127 the company or organization that is represented by the Maintenance Lead.

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

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

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

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

140 **Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot:** An EC ballot to confirm that a completed
141 Maintenance Release that appears to have been abandoned should be withdrawn.

142 **Member:** See Agent, Java Community Process Member, Member Associate, Member
143 Representative.

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

146 **Member Representative:** An Agent of a Member company or a Member organization who
147 represents its interests 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 6.4.3.

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

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

171 **Specification**: See Java Specification.

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

176 **Specification Lead Member (Spec Lead Member)**: The individual JCP member who is a
177 Spec Lead, or otherwise the company or organization that is represented by the Spec
178 Lead.

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

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

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

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

188 The use of the words "must", "must not", "required", "shall", "shall not", "should", "should
189 not", "recommended", "may" and "optional" in this document is done in accordance with the
190 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.

191 **III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESSSM PROGRAM**

192 **1. GENERAL PROCEDURES**

193 **1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY**

194 Each Expert Group is free to use the working style that it finds most productive and appropriate, so
195 long as this is compatible with the requirements specified in this document. For example, an EG may
196 choose to move forward only when there is general agreement among its members, or by voting on
197 issues when there is disagreement.

198 As specified below, Expert Groups must operate in a transparent manner, enabling the public to
199 observe their deliberations and to provide feedback. All feedback must be taken into consideration and
200 public responses to such feedback must be provided. EGs must maintain a publicly-accessible
201 document archive from which all of their working materials such as source documents, meeting
202 agendas and minutes, and draft documents can be downloaded. The EC should take the Expert
203 Group's transparency record into consideration when voting on its JSR.

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

210 If the EG changes its collaboration tools during the life of the JSR these changes must be reported to
211 the PMO, which shall update the relevant information on the JSR Page. Any such changes must
212 ensure that previously-published information is incorporated into the new tools.

213 When voting to approve a JSR's transition to the next stage, EC members are expected to take into
214 consideration the extent to which the Spec Lead is meeting the transparency requirements.

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

220 The use of *Confidential Information* (as defined in the JSPA) by Expert Groups limits transparency, is
221 strongly discouraged, and will be prohibited in a future version of the Process. If the Spec Lead
222 intends to permit the use of Confidential Information (such as emails, drafts, or submissions marked
223 as *Confidential*) this must be specified in the initial Java Specification Request.²

224 **1.1.1 PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

225 Expert Groups may choose to keep purely administrative matters private, but all substantive business
226 must be performed in a manner that allows the public to observe their work and to respond to it. All
227 proceedings, discussions, and working documents must be published, and a mechanism must be
228 established to allow the public to provide feedback. One common way of meeting these requirements
229 is through the use of mailing lists, but other alternatives such as blogs, Wikis, and discussion forums
230 may be preferred. Whatever communication mechanisms are chosen, these must include an archiving
231 function so that a record of all communications is preserved. Archives must be readable by the public.³

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

3 This should not be interpreted as a requirement that Expert Groups create or maintain audio or video recordings of their

232 **1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING**

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

238 Whenever a Spec Lead or a Maintenance Lead submits materials to the PMO for review or ballot they
239 must also provide an Issue List indicating the disposition of all of the Issues that have been logged
240 against the JSR. Issues logged late in the review cycle may be deferred for later consideration, and
241 Issues that are blatantly off-topic or that appear to have been submitted maliciously or erroneously
242 may be ignored.

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

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

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

253 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

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

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

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

271 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

272 **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

273 There is no size limit on the Expert Group. The Spec Lead may add additional Experts at any time so

meetings.

274 long as existing EG members are consulted. New members may be added, for example, to increase
275 diversity of opinion.

276 Any JCP Member, Member Representative, or Member Associate may request to join an Expert Group
277 at any time by submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page. Member
278 Associates, since they are not covered by the JSPA of their organization, must sign the JSPA in their
279 own right before they will be permitted to join an Expert Group.

280 Details of such requests, including the organizational affiliation of the requester, together with the Spec
281 Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about the matter, and any other
282 official decisions related to EG membership must be published through the EG's public communication
283 channel. The PMO will ensure that the JSR Page lists the Members who are members of the EG
284 together with the names of individual Member Representatives or Member Associates where
285 appropriate.

286 **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

287 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec
288 Lead, the Expert Group, with the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally
289 contributed the Expert, if any, and request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such
290 replacement is forthcoming, the Expert Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec
291 Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member
292 who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and work with that organization to find a suitable
293 replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a
294 replacement from amongst other Members.

295 **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

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

307 **1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

308 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting
309 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. The EG is
310 expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any such issues in a timely manner. However, if the
311 situation cannot be resolved these concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as
312 possible so they may be proactively addressed and resolved.

313 If the problems cannot be resolved informally, any three members of the EG may request the EC to
314 replace the Spec Lead. All such requests must clearly state the cause of the concern and provide all
315 necessary evidence. If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to replace the Spec
316 Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is a Member Representative the PMO shall ask the Member to
317 replace the Spec Lead. If the Member refuses to do so, the PMO shall seek to put in place an
318 alternative Spec Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a transfer ballot as specified in section
319 5.1.2 of this document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the EC shall initiate a JSR

320 Renewal Ballot to determine whether the JSR should be shut down.

321 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

322 If a JSR does not begin Early Draft Review within 9 months of completing its JSR Approval Ballot, or
323 does not begin Public Review within 12 months of first submitting an Early Draft, or does not reach
324 Final Release within 12 months of commencing Public Review, then the EC should initiate a JSR
325 Renewal Ballot unless it is agreed that there are extraordinary circumstances that justify the delay. The
326 PMO shall inform the Spec Lead and Expert Group of this decision and will request the Spec Lead
327 and Expert Group to prepare a public statement to the EC. The JSR Renewal Ballot shall start 30 days
328 after the request. If the JSR Renewal Ballot is approved by the EC, then another renewal ballot cannot
329 be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

330 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to
331 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not
332 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC shall stand and the JSR shall be
333 closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO shall forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR Renewal
334 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members, together
335 with their ballots shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR shall
336 be closed and the Expert Group shall disband.

337 If a JSR that is closed through these processes was a revision to an existing Specification, the Spec
338 Lead shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification.

339 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

340 The Spec Lead is responsible for defining the process whereby the TCK is used to certify
341 implementations of the JSR as compatible. The Maintenance Lead must submit to the PMO at least
342 quarterly a list of all implementations that have been certified as compatible and that have been
343 released publicly or commercially. The PMO will publish this information on the JCP Website. If the
344 Spec Lead submits the information in the form of a pointer to an already published list the PMO may
345 choose simply to reference that list rather than duplicate it.

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

348 **1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

349 **1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY**

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

352 **1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS**

353 During JSR reviews EC members are strongly encouraged to ensure that one or more technical
354 members of their organizations review the draft and provide feedback using the mechanism specified
355 by the Spec Lead. EC feedback is particularly important to the Expert Group, and EC members are
356 encouraged not to wait until ballot periods to raise concerns and issues.

357 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

358 Materials to be posted on the JCP Website for review, comment, or any other official EG or EC
359 business should be submitted to the PMO, which shall post them on the JCP Website and announce

360 their availability to Members and the public within seven days of receipt (holiday closures excepted.)

361 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

362 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any EG member can appeal to the EC regarding a
363 decision, an action, or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that affects EG
364 participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means. An appeal
365 must be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO (pmo@jcp.org) in all cases, even if it
366 affects the PMO itself. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely, with
367 a short and relevant *subject* line, and must provide all relevant documentation to support the appeal.
368 The PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than seven days after receipt. The EC shall
369 then respond to the appellant within 30 days, either with a resolution or with a request for clarification
370 and/or further documentation.

371 **2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION**

372 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

373 One or more Members may initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant
374 revision to an existing one, by submitting a JSR proposal through the JCP Website, as described in
375 the [Spec Lead Guide](#). Upon request to the PMO any JSR proposal may be withdrawn by the
376 submitter(s) without explanation prior to the completion of the JSR Approval Ballot.

377 The following information must be provided with each JSR:

- 378 • the Members making the request (the submitters,) the proposed Spec Lead, and the initial
379 members of the Expert Group,
- 380 • a description of the proposed Specification,
- 381 • the reason(s) for developing or revising it,
- 382 • the primary Platform Edition, as well as any consideration given to other Platform Editions,
- 383 • an estimated development schedule,
- 384 • any preexisting documents, technology descriptions, or implementations that might be used as
385 a starting point,
- 386 • a transparency plan, which outlines the tools and techniques that the Spec Lead will use during
387 the development of the Specification to communicate with and seek feedback from JCP
388 Members and the public.

389 **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

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

398 **2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION**

399 Changes to the Java programming language, the Java virtual machine (JVM,) the Java Native
400 Interface (JNI,) packages in the "java.*" space, or other packages delivered only as part of Java SE,

401 have the potential to seriously disrupt the installed base if carried out inconsistently across the
402 Platform Editions. In order to protect the installed base, any such changes can only be accepted and
403 carried out within a UJSR for Java SE.

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

406 **2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS**

407 All new or revised Specifications must be compatible with the most recent versions of the targeted
408 Platform Edition Specifications. In order to achieve this, all UJSRs to define new Profile Specifications
409 or revise existing Profile Specifications must reference either the most recent Release version of the
410 Platform Edition Specification they are based upon or a newer version of that Specification that is
411 under development via an active UJSR.

412 **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

413 The JSR submission form requires the submitter to state whether the JSR's RI and TCK should be
414 delivered as part of a Profile or Platform Edition, in standalone manner, or both. The final decision as
415 to whether a specific JSR is included in a Profile or a Platform Edition is made by the Spec Lead and
416 Expert Group of the Platform Edition or Profile JSR, and is confirmed by the EC ballots on the relevant
417 JSR. If the Spec Lead for the Platform Edition or Profile JSR turns down a request for inclusion then
418 the JSR must deliver a standalone RI and TCK.

419 Technologies may be incorporated into a Profile or Platform Edition after having been initially delivered
420 standalone. A JSR for a new version of an API that proposes to become part of a Profile or Platform
421 Edition and is considering discontinuing standalone availability must state the rationale for this change
422 and must inform the public of the intention to discontinue the availability of the standalone RI, and TCK
423 one JSR submission in advance.

424 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

432 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

433 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for developing the Reference Implementation and Technology
434 Compatibility Kit and for licensing them as described in the JSPA. The Spec Lead Member must
435 provide the EC with complete copies of the proposed Specification, RI, and TCK licenses no later than
436 the start of JSR Review. The licenses shall be published on the JSR page. EC members should
437 provide feedback on the terms as an indication of how the community as a whole might react to the
438 terms. If EC members believe that the proposed licensing terms are not compatible with the licensing
439 guidelines established for use within the JCP, then balloting on the proposed JSR shall be delayed
440 until Oracle legal provides an opinion on the matter.

441 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

442 After the JSR Review, EC members shall review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their

443 ballot to decide if the JSR should be approved.

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

449 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

450 When a JSR is approved the PMO instructs the identified Spec Lead to form the Expert Group. If the
451 Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the JCP before the JSR is approved, the PMO
452 shall request the preliminary Expert Group to choose a replacement from among themselves who is
453 willing to take on the duties defined in this document.

454 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

455 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

456 The Expert Group should begin work by considering the requirements set forth in the JSR, any
457 contributed documents or technology descriptions, comments received during JSR Review and, if this
458 is a revision of an existing Specification, the Issue List maintained by the Maintenance Lead (see
459 section 5.) Additional input can be obtained from discussions with other Members, industry groups,
460 software developers, end-users, and academics. The goal is to define requirements and then write a
461 draft Specification suitable for review by the community and the public.

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

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

468 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

469 Refinement of the draft Specification begins when the PMO posts it to the JCP Website and
470 announces the start of Early Draft Review. The goal of Early Draft Review is to get the draft
471 Specification into a form suitable for Public Review as quickly as possible by uncovering and
472 correcting major problems with the draft. Early Draft Review is an early-access review, and should
473 ideally take place when the Specification still has some unresolved issues. The public's participation in
474 Early Draft Review is an important part of the process since in the past, comments from the public
475 have raised fundamental architectural and technological issues that have considerably improved some
476 Specifications.

477 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

484 3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW

485 Public Review begins when the PMO posts a new draft Specification on the JCP Website and
486 announces its availability for public review and comment.

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

492 3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT

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

496 If the Public Draft Specification Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the draft in
497 response to the concerns raised by the EC and to submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised
498 draft is not received within 30 days, the original decision by the EC shall stand and the JSR shall be
499 closed. If a revision is received, the PMO shall forward it to the EC and initiate a Public Draft
500 Specification Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members
501 with their ballots shall be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR shall
502 be closed and the Expert Group shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification,
503 the Spec Lead shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 5.)

504 4. FINAL RELEASE

505 4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT

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

510 4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK

511 The Spec Lead Member is responsible for the completion of both the RI and the TCK. JSRs that are
512 assigned to both ECs targeted at more than one platform are required to support both each
513 environments, which may require a separate RI and TCK for each environment. If the RI and TCK
514 uncover areas of the Specification that were under-defined, incomplete, or ambiguous, the Spec Lead
515 shall work with the Expert Group to correct those deficiencies and then send a revised Specification
516 together with a summary of the changes to the PMO. Information shall be posted to the JCP Website.
517 The Expert Group shall continue to consider any further comments received during this time.

518 4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS

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

525 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

526 Depending on the nature of the problem, a successful TCK challenge will require updating one or
527 more of the TCK, the Specification, and the RI. Within 30 days of the close of a successful TCK
528 Appeal Ballot the Maintenance Lead must update these deliverables as necessary and report the
529 changes to the PMO when the Specification (if changed) and URLs for the updated RI and/or TCK are
530 delivered for publication on the JCP Website.

531 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 538 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information
539 needed to use the TCK (e.g. documentation for any supplied tools,) a definition and
540 explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, and the compatibility requirements that
541 must be met in addition to passing the TCK tests
- 542 • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations
543 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and
544 b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include
545 any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the
546 Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Specification or
547 Specifications being implemented.

548 These requirements must apply unless the Specification or TCK explicitly allows exceptions.

- 549 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and
550 recording of results.
- 551 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.
552 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a
553 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK
554 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the
555 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 556 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the API signatures
557 required by the Specification are completely implemented and that only API signatures required
558 by the Specification are included in the JSR's namespace.

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

561 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC shall stand, the PMO shall
562 close the JSR, and the Expert Group shall disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing
563 Specification, the Spec Lead shall resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification
564 (see section 5.)

565 If a response is received, the PMO shall circulate it to all EC members for a Final Approval
566 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all ballot comments submitted by EC members shall
567 be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If the reconsideration ballot fails, the JSR will be closed
568 and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the Spec

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

570 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

571 Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot or Reconsideration Ballot, the PMO shall publish
572 on the JCP Website the Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK, and
573 shall announce the availability of these materials to both Members and the public. The published TCK
574 information must include a means for any interested party to obtain a copy of the TCK documentation
575 at no charge. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The
576 Spec Lead will typically become the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and
577 others for aid in that role.

578 The Maintenance Lead must ensure that the links to the RI and TCK remain valid. If the links become
579 broken or non-functional the Maintenance Lead will have 30 days following notification from the PMO
580 to correct them. If the problems are not corrected the PMO will initiate a JSR Withdrawal Ballot (if no
581 Maintenance Release has been completed) or a Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot (if a
582 Maintenance Release has been made) to determine whether the Maintenance Lead shall be judged to
583 have abandoned the JSR. If the ballot passes the JSR itself or the relevant Maintenance Release will
584 be marked as *withdrawn*.

585 **5. MAINTENANCE**

586 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

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

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

597 All changes proposed by the ML shall make their way into the Specification either through the
598 Maintenance Release process (described below) or through a new JSR. Changes appropriate for a
599 Maintenance Release include bug-fixes, clarifications of the Specification, changes to the
600 implementation of existing APIs, and implementation-specific enhancements. Changes introduced in
601 Maintenance Releases – for example, modifications to existing APIs or the addition of new APIs - must
602 not break binary compatibility as defined by the Java Language Specification. Changes that would
603 break binary compatibility should therefore be deferred to a new JSR.

604 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

605 If the Maintenance Lead decides to discontinue his or her work at any time (including discontinuing
606 maintenance activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision
607 initiated by a new JSR) the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to
608 locate another Member who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified the PMO must
609 initiate a Transfer Ballot within 30 days to enable EC members to approve the transfer of
610 responsibilities. If the ballot succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30
611 days.

612 If no replacement can be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then the PMO shall declare the
613 Specification to be Dormant and no further maintenance can be carried out. No further Transfer Ballots
614 will be initiated by the PMO unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case the PMO will again
615 have 30 days to initiate a Transfer Ballot.

616 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

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

624 The PMO shall post the materials on the JCP Website for public review. The Maintenance Lead may
625 choose to modify one or more of the proposed changes based on comments received during the
626 review.

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

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

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

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

644 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

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

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

651 If the Maintenance Lead fails to deliver the final materials within the time-period specified at the
652 beginning of the Maintenance Review process the PMO shall inform the Maintenance Lead of an
653 impending Maintenance Renewal Ballot, and shall request the Maintenance Lead to prepare a public
654 statement to the EC that explains the reason for the delay and provides a new deadline. 30 days after
655 this request the PMO shall initiate a Maintenance Renewal Ballot to determine whether the deadline
656 may be extended as requested or whether the previous Maintenance Review should be rescinded and

657 the Maintenance Lead be required to go through another Maintenance Review.

658 **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

659 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

662 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

663 ~~There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and~~
664 ~~EE together. Each~~ EC is composed of ~~46~~²⁵ Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.
665 has a permanent voting seat on ~~each the~~ EC. (Oracle's representatives must not be ~~a~~ members of the
666 PMO.) The ECs ~~are~~^{is} led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.-

667 ~~No Member may hold more than one seat on the EC. Therefore, S~~should ~~one~~^a Member on the EC
668 acquire a majority ownership of another EC member, one of those members must resign his or her
669 seat by the effective date of the acquisition.

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

672 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

696 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

697 EC members serve ~~three~~^{two}-year terms, which are staggered so that ~~a third~~^{half} of the seats are up for
698 election each year.

699 On ~~each~~the EC there are two Ratified Seats for every Elected Seat ~~(currently 10 Ratified Seats and 5~~
700 ~~Elected Seats)~~ (hence 16 Ratified Seats and 8 Elected Seats) plus one permanent seat held by
701 Oracle America, Inc.

702 **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

703 EC members may resign their seats at any time during their term.

704 EC members who fail to remain JCP Members forfeit their EC seat.

705 Seats may also be forfeited due to non-attendance at EC meetings, as specified in the EC Standing
706 Rules.

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

712 **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

717 If the PMO has reason to believe that an organization is attempting to influence the outcome of an
718 election by instructing its Agents how to vote the PMO should take all necessary corrective actions
719 and then report the matter to the EC for approval.

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

722 In the interest of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall
723 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask
724 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also
725 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

726 **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

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

736 **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

- 739 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO shall post on the public JCP site a complete

- description of all materials that candidates will be expected to provide (e.g. any candidate statements, position papers, etc. that will be posted during the election.)
- Four weeks before the ballot period the PMO shall accept nominations for a period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that Agents of JCP Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such nominations.
 - Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a 14-day ballot period.
 - The nominees who receive the most votes shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
 - If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters shall be given the opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
 - If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the next election.
 - Ties shall 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 BALLOT RULES

1. All JSR ballots shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
2. JSR ballots 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. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
5. Any vote may be accompanied by comments (which are particularly encouraged in the case of abstentions.) 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".
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 that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition Specification 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. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 30 days must pass before the JSR can be re-initiated.
9. 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.
10. ~~When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot shall 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 shall 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~~ The EC must approve the JSR.
3. The Expert Group consists of ~~both all~~ ECs ~~members~~ 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.

787 **V APPENDIX B: TRANSITIONING TO A MERGED EC**

788 In the previous version (2.8) of this Process Document there were two separate Executive
789 Committees, one for Java ME and one for Java SE and Java EE combined. The single Executive
790 Committee described in this version of the Process Document will be implemented through the
791 following process:

- 792 • The 2012 annual elections will be held as defined in JCP 2.8, but candidates will be informed
793 that if they are elected their term will be for only a single year, since all candidates must stand
794 for re-election in 2013.
- 795 • Immediately after the 2012 election the two ECs will be merged. Oracle and IBM's second
796 seats will be eliminated, resulting in a single EC with 30 members.
- 797 • All subsequent JSR ballots (even for in-progress JSRs) will then be voted on by the merged
798 EC.
- 799 • For the 2013 annual elections three Ratified and two Elected Seats will be eliminated, thereby
800 reducing the EC to 25 members. All 25 seats will be up for re-election in 2013.
- 801 • Members elected in 2013 will be ranked to determine whether their initial term will be one or
802 two years. The 50% of Ratified and 50% of Elected members who receive the most votes will
803 serve an initial two-year term, while all others will serve an initial one year term.
- 804 • All members elected in 2014 and subsequently will serve a two-year term.

805 For clarity, note that the provisions specified in this version of the Process Document regarding a
806 merged EC will apply to subsequent ballots on all existing JSRs, whether or not the Spec Leads of
807 those JSRs chose to adopt this version of the Process Document in its entirety.