

# Open Issues for Community Review

## JSR 215

### Introduction

JSR 215 is a process change JSR, which is the mechanism by which the Executive Committees of the JCP update the process – using the process to update the process. We are ready for external review and comment, and we have identified several specific areas where we need more input from you. The wording from the process document has been provided here to make it easier to review, but you are encouraged to also read through the full process document to get the bigger picture of these issues and the changes we are proposing.

### Transparency

*From section 1.1 of the JCP Process Document, version 2.6, Community Review Draft.*

JSRs must include "a transparency plan, which outlines the tools and techniques that the Spec Lead will use, during the creation and development of the specification, for communicating the progress within the EG to Community Members, EC Members and the public. The EC will expect the Spec Lead to operate the JSR in accordance with this plan."

*From section 2.1.1 of the JCP Process Document, version 2.6, Community Review Draft.*

"While the Spec Lead is free to operate the Expert Group in whatever style is most appropriate, they are encouraged to choose a style that provides maximal transparency to the community, the EC members and the public. The PMO provides Spec Leads with tools and techniques for making the actions of their Expert Group transparent, and the EC members expect Spec Leads to carefully choose which tools are best for their Expert Group and commit to using them. Transparency is valuable to everyone in the community, especially the Expert Group because it opens them to broader feedback and helps build broader support for the final spec."

- Will Spec Leads feel overly anxious about creating a transparency plan?
- Will Spec Leads stick to their plan?
- What tools do Spec Leads expect or want?
- Does this change to the process satisfactorily provide the EC and the community with enough information? Does it encourage Spec Leads to provide more transparency into their JSRs?
- Can the PMO implement enough tools for Spec Leads and Expert Groups?
- What information do spec leads feel they can make available to community members and the public? (For example – planned dates, draft specifications, correspondence, etc.)

### JSRs That Span Ecs

*From section 1.2 of the JCP Process Document, version 2.6, Community Review Draft.*

"When a JSR is received, the PMO will give it a tracking number, assign the JSR to the appropriate EC (or both ECs if so requested by the submitter), create its

JSR Page, announce the proposed JSR to the public, and begin JSR Review."

- Will Spec Leads use this as we have defined it?
- Are there any other roadblocks for Spec Leads with regards to having their JSRs overseen by both ECs?

## Changing Community Review To Early Draft Review

See section 2.3 of the process document for the definition of Early Draft Review and section 3.2 for the moving of the ballot to after public review.

- Are Spec Leads encouraged to bring their JSR to Community Review earlier and with more open issues?
- Are there any concerns from Spec Leads about moving the vote to after Public Review?
- How confusing is it to use the name Community Review for a review that goes out to the public?
- Are there any other changes that need to be made to the process document?
- Are we removing the incentive for community members to stay members?
- Would you move immediately to using this model if it were available today?

## TCK Requirements

*From section 3.4 of the JCP Process Document, version 2.6, Community Review Draft.*

"Each TCK submitted as part of the Final Draft must meet the following requirements:

- Include all TCK documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, definition and explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, and any other information needed to use the TCK (e.g. Tools documentation).
- Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and recording of results.
- Include a TCK Coverage Document for the EC members to use in evaluating the sufficiency of the TCK. This executive summary of the TCK should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, criteria used to measure TCK test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and justification for the adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the required API signatures of the spec are completely implemented."

- Is the language clear about the documentation which is expected?
- Would more guidance be appreciated about the level of TCK coverage which the EG would expect? e.g. something like one of the following
  - a) The TCK should test the semantics of the API to the extent that the specification requires implementations to be consistent
  - b) The TCK should be sufficiently detailed that applications see as consistent a behaviour as reasonably possible when running on independently developed implementations of the specification which pass the TCK.
- Will this add a significant amount of work for a Spec Lead?