

# 2 JCP Process Document

3

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

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

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

## 7 **CONTENTS**

I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
II DEFINITIONS .....	2
III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESS SM PROGRAM .....	6
1. GENERAL PROCEDURES.....	6
1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY.....	6
1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	8
1.3 JSR DEADLINES.....	9
1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING.....	9
1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES.....	9
1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES.....	10
1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS.....	10
2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION .....	10
2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST.....	10
2.2 JSR REVIEW .....	12
2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT .....	12
2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP .....	12
3. DRAFT RELEASES.....	13
3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION .....	13
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 .....	17
6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM .....	18
7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES .....	19
IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA.....	20

## 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 building 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 then have a strong  
16 technical lead work with that group to create a first draft. Consensus around the form and content of  
17 the draft is then built using an iterative review process that allows an ever-widening audience to review  
18 and comment on the document.

19 This version of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of JSR  
20 348, led by Oracle and the combined Executive Committees as the Expert Group.

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

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

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

## 46 II DEFINITIONS

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

48 **Change Log:** An area accessible from the JSR Page that lists all changes made to the  
49 Specification, RI, TCK, and licenses since the previous Release. A Change Log has six  
50 sections: PROPOSED (changes not yet made to the Specification), ACCEPTED (changes  
51 made to the Specification), DEFERRED (changes to be considered in a new JSR), RI  
52 (changes made to the RI), TCK (changes made to the TCK) and LICENSING (changes to

53 the licensing terms)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

87 **First-Level TCK Appeals Process:** The process defined by the Spec Lead that allows  
88 implementers of the Specification to appeal one or more tests defined by the  
89 Specification's TCK.

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

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

94 **Java Community Process Member (Member):** A company, organization, or individual  
95 that has signed the JSPA and is abiding by its terms. In the case of an individual, that  
96 person may represent himself/herself, or may represent or be otherwise empowered to act  
97 on behalf of a company or organization. No more than five **individual Members** are  
98 permitted at any one time as representatives of a company or organization.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

124 **Maintenance Review:** A period of at least 30 days prior to finalization of a Maintenance  
125 Release when Members and the public consider and comment on the change items listed

126 in the PROPOSED section of the Change Log.

127 **Maintenance Review Ballot:** An EC ballot to determine whether the changes proposed by  
128 a Maintenance Lead are appropriate for a Maintenance Release.

129 **Member Representative:** A person who is an employee or agent of a Member company  
130 or a Member organization and who has been authorized by that Member to represent its  
131 interests within the JCP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

151 **Ratified Seat:** An EC seat filled by the ratification process described in section 6.4.3.

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

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

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

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

161 **Technology Compatibility Kit (TCK):** The suite of tests, tools, and documentation that

162 allows an organization to determine if its implementation is compliant with the  
163 Specification.

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

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

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

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

### 171 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

#### 172 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

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

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

189 Spec Leads should be aware of their obligations under the JSPA to license the output of their JSR on  
190 Fair, Reasonable, and Non Discriminatory terms, and to make certain patent grants. Incorporating  
191 feedback provided through public email lists or forums without ensuring that the provider has signed  
192 the JSPA or an equivalent Contribution Agreement (the JSPA is preferable, and sufficient) may make it  
193 impossible to meet these requirements or may expose the Spec Lead Member to legal liability.

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

---

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

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

### 200 **1.1.1 MAILING LISTS**

201 All substantive business must be carried out on a public mailing list designated by the Spec Lead. The  
202 purpose of this list is to keep observers aware of important issues and, minor administrative issues  
203 that distract from substantive business should therefore be kept private. A private mailing list should  
204 be used for minor administrative matters. Significant business includes, for example, eliminating or  
205 adding new features to the JSR, changes to the membership of the Expert Group, publication of the  
206 agenda, and on-going debate about JSR specifics. Non-substantive administrative matters such as  
207 notifications of meeting schedules, messages directing Expert Group members to particular  
208 documents or URLs, and reminders about voting or task assignments should be excluded from the  
209 public mailing list.

210 If the Expert Group uses a mailing list writable only by Expert Group members, then the EG must also  
211 provide a publicly readable and writable email list or a forum to enable feedback and comments from  
212 the public.

### 213 **1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING**

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

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

### 225 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

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

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

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

## 242 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

### 243 **1.2.1 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

244 An Expert may withdraw from the Expert Group at any time. If the withdrawing Expert is the Spec  
245 Lead, the Expert Group, with the help of the PMO, should approach the Member who originally  
246 contributed the Expert, if any, and request them to provide a suitable replacement; if no such  
247 replacement is forthcoming, the Expert Group should choose one of its members as the new Spec  
248 Lead. If the withdrawing Expert is not the Spec Lead, the Spec Lead should approach the Member  
249 who originally contributed the Expert, if any, and work with that organization to find a suitable  
250 replacement. If no replacement is offered or is not otherwise available, the Spec Lead may recruit a  
251 replacement from amongst other Members.

### 252 **1.2.2 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

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

### 264 **1.2.3 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

265 There may be rare instances when members of the Expert Group feel that the Spec Lead is not acting  
266 in ways that advance the work of the Expert Group and is being unresponsive or inactive. These  
267 concerns should be brought to the attention of the EC as quickly as possible so they may be  
268 proactively addressed and resolved. The EC is expected to make a reasonable effort to resolve any  
269 such issues in a timely manner. However, if the situation cannot be resolved in a timely manner, any  
270 three members of the EG may request the EC to replace the Spec Lead for cause (which should be  
271 made clear and documented to the EC). If the EC agrees that there is cause, it may ask the PMO to  
272 replace the Spec Lead. In the case where the Spec Lead is a Member Representative the PMO  
273 should ask the Member to replace the Spec Lead, or it may seek to put in place an alternative Spec  
274 Lead, in which case the EC must conduct a Transfer Ballot as specified in section 5.1.1 of this  
275 document. If no Spec Lead replacement can be found, the EC will initiate a JSR Renewal Ballot to  
276 determine whether the JSR should be shut down.

## 277 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

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



286 If the JSR Renewal Ballot fails, the Expert Group will have 30 days to update the JSR in response to  
287 the concerns raised by the EC, and may submit a revised version to the PMO. If a revised JSR is not  
288 received by the end of the 30 days, the original decision by the EC will stand and the JSR will be  
289 closed. If a revision is received, then the PMO will forward it to the EC and initiate a JSR Renewal  
290 Reconsideration Ballot. At the close of balloting, all comments submitted by EC members, together  
291 with their ballots will be circulated to the Expert Group by the PMO. If this ballot fails, the JSR will be  
292 closed and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing Specification, the  
293 Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification (see section 5).

## 294 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

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

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

## 303 **1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

### 304 **1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY**

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

### 307 **1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS**

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

## 314 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

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

## 318 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

319 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any EG member can appeal to the EC regarding a  
320 decision, an action or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that affects EG  
321 participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means. An appeal  
322 must be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO ([pmo@jcp.org](mailto:pmo@jcp.org)) in all cases, even if it  
323 affects the PMO. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely, with a  
324 short and relevant Subject: line, and provide all relevant documentation to support the appeal. The  
325 PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than seven days after receipt. The EC shall then

326 respond to the appellant within 30 days, either with a resolution or with a request for clarification  
327 and/or further documentation.

## 328 **2. INITIATE A NEW OR REVISED SPECIFICATION**

### 329 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

330 One or more Members can initiate a request to develop a new Specification, or carry out a significant  
331 revision to an existing one, by submitting the JSR Proposal through the JCP website, as described in  
332 the [Spec Lead Guide](#). Any JSR under consideration can be withdrawn by its submitter(s) without  
333 explanation at any time prior to the completion of the JSR Approval Ballot (see section 2.3) upon  
334 request by the submitter(s) to the PMO.

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

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

#### 348 **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

349 Existing Specifications, together with their associated RIs and TCKs, are maintained by a designated  
350 Maintenance Lead using the processes described in section 5 of this document. Maintenance Lead  
351 Members are expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI, and TCK while  
352 respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. Maintenance Leads  
353 will therefore be the Spec Leads for all significant revisions to their Specifications, but they will not  
354 have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take place. That will be decided by  
355 the EC in response to a revision JSR that can be initiated by any Java Community Member.  
356 Submitter(s) should make a reasonable effort to get some of the members of the previous Expert  
357 Group to join the revision effort.

#### 358 **2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION**

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

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

### 366 **2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS**

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

### 371 **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

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

## 384 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

### 392 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

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

## 402 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

403 After the JSR Review, EC members will review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their  
404 ballot to decide if the JSR should be approved.

405 If the JSR Approval Ballot fails, the PMO will send all EC comments to the JSR submitter(s) who may  
406 revise the JSR and resubmit it within 14 days. If a revised JSR is not received in that time, the original  
407 EC decision will stand and the JSR will be closed. If a revised JSR is received, the PMO will post it to  
408 the JSR Page, announce the revised JSR to the public, and send it to all EC members for a JSR

409 Reconsideration Ballot. If that ballot fails, the JSR will be closed.

## 410 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

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

418 Any JCP Member or Member Representative can request to join an Expert Group at any time by  
419 submitting their nomination via the online form provided on the JSR Page. The nomination, together  
420 with the Spec Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about this matter, and  
421 any other official decision related to EG composition, including decisions to remove or replace EG  
422 members, must be made public via the EG's public mailing list.

## 423 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

### 424 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

### 437 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

#### 446 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

### 453 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

### 461 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

## 473 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

### 474 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

#### 479 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

#### 487 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

488 The Spec Lead is also responsible for establishing a clearly defined First Level TCK Appeals Process  
489 to address challenges to tests contained in the TCK. This process must be described in the TCK

490 documentation. Implementers who are not satisfied with a first level decision should appeal to the EC  
491 by documenting their concerns in an email message to the PMO. The PMO will circulate the request to  
492 the EC, together with any information received from the ML concerning the rationale for the first-level  
493 decision, and initiate a 7-day Appeal Ballot.

#### 494 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

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

#### 501 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 508 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, a definition and  
509 explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, the compatibility requirements that must be  
510 met in addition to passing the TCK tests, and any other information needed to use the TCK  
511 (e.g. Tools documentation).
- 512 • Include requirements that all compatible implementations
  - 513 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and
  - 514 b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include  
515 any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the  
516 Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Spec or Specs being  
517 implemented.
- 518 These requirements must apply unless the Spec or TCK explicitly allows exceptions.
- 519 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and  
520 recording of results.
- 521 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.  
522 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a  
523 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK  
524 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the  
525 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
- 526 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the required API  
527 signatures of the spec are completely implemented and that no non-specified APIs are  
528 included in the JSR's namespace.

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

531 If no responses are received within 30 days the original decision of the EC will stand, the PMO will  
532 close the JSR, and the Expert Group will disband. If the JSR was a revision to an existing

533 Specification, the Spec Lead will resume the role of Maintenance Lead of the current Specification  
534 (see section 5).

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

## 540 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

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

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

## 555 **5. MAINTENANCE**

### 556 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

557 The Maintenance Lead Member is expected to assume long term ownership of the Specification, RI,  
558 and TCK while respecting the wishes of the Java Community Members with regard to evolution. A  
559 Maintenance Lead will therefore automatically be the Spec Lead for all significant future revisions to  
560 their Specification but will not have the exclusive right to decide when a significant revision will take  
561 place (see section 2.1.1).

562 The public may submit requests for clarification, interpretation, and enhancements to the Specification  
563 by logging issues through the JSR's issue-tracking mechanism.

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

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

#### 572 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

573 If the ML decides to discontinue his or her work at any time (including discontinuing maintenance  
574 activities or declining to take on the role of Spec Lead during a significant revision initiated by a JSR)  
575 the ML, with the assistance of the PMO, should make a reasonable effort to locate another Member

576 who is willing to take on the task. If a replacement is identified, the PMO must initiate a Transfer Ballot  
577 within one month to enable EC members to approve the transfer of responsibilities. If the ballot  
578 succeeds, the new ML must assume his or her responsibilities within 30 days. If no replacement can  
579 be found, or if the Transfer Ballot fails, then the PMO will declare the Specification to be Dormant and  
580 no further maintenance can be carried out. No further Transfer Ballots will be initiated by the PMO  
581 unless a Member volunteers as ML, in which case the PMO will have again a month to initiate a  
582 Transfer Ballot.

## 583 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

584 The ML will document all proposed Specification changes in the PROPOSED section of the Change  
585 Log and then send a request to the PMO to initiate a Maintenance Review. Before the Maintenance  
586 Review begins, the ML must summarize comments received through the issue tracker and must  
587 indicate the disposition of each comment (e.g. deferred with a brief explanation, rejected with a brief  
588 explanation, included in the Change Log proposal.) This summary will be posted along with the  
589 Change Log on the JSR Page. The PMO will then make a public announcement and begin the review.

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

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

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

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

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

## 608 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

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

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



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

### 617 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

### 620 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

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

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

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

### 629 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 630 1. Select JSRs for development within the JCP.
- 631 2. Review and provide guidance on proposed licensing terms of proposed JSRs.
- 632 3. Approve draft Specifications after Public Review.
- 633 4. Ensure that publicly expressed issues/concerns with a JSR are addressed by the Expert  
634 Group.
- 635 5. Give final approval to completed Specifications and their associated RIs and TCKs.
- 636 6. Decide appeals of first-level TCK test challenges.
- 637 7. Review proposed maintenance revisions and possibly require some to be carried out in a new  
638 JSR.
- 639 8. Approve the transfer of maintenance duties between Members.
- 640 9. Decide when JSRs that have not made sufficient progress through the Process should be  
641 withdrawn.
- 642 10. Provide guidance to the PMO and JCP Community to promote the efficient operations of the  
643 organization and to guide the evolution of Java platforms and technologies. Such guidance  
644 may be provided by mechanisms such as publishing white papers, reports, or comments as the  
645 EC deems appropriate to express the opinions of one or both Executive Committees.

647 11. Members of the Executive Committee shall be dedicated to the principles of full and open competition,  
648 in full compliance with all applicable laws, including all antitrust laws of the United States and other  
649 nations and governmental bodies as appropriate. Violations of such laws can result in criminal as well  
650 as civil penalties for individuals as well as employers, depending on the jurisdiction. In particular, any  
651 discussion related to product pricing, methods or channels of distribution, division of markets or  
652 allocation of customers, among other subjects, should be avoided.

### 653 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

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

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

#### 658 **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

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

#### 664 **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

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

671  
672 In the interests of promoting transparency and participation in the election process the PMO shall  
673 organize teleconferences at which the Members have an opportunity to hear from and to ask  
674 questions of the candidates. If a suitable venue such as JavaOne is available the PMO shall also  
675 organize a public meeting with the same purpose.

#### 676 **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

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

#### 684 **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

- 687 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO will post on the public JCP site a complete  
688 description of all materials that will be provided to voters (e.g. any candidate statements,  
689 position papers, candidate forums, etc. that will be posted during the election).
- 690 • Four weeks before the ballot period the PMO will accept nominations from the Community for a  
691 period of 14 days. Any Member may nominate themselves except that employees of JCP  
692 Members cannot run for Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such  
693 nominations.
- 694 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a  
695 14-day ballot period.
- 696 • The nominees who receive the most votes will fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 697 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters will be given the opportunity to vote  
698 “yes” or “no” for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
- 699 • Ties will be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt> and  
700 using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

## 701 **7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR VOTING RULES**

- 702 1. All JSR ballots will be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 703 2. JSR balloting periods last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 704 3. EC Members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are  
705 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC Member may not  
706 vote at all.
- 707 4. Any vote may be accompanied by comments. When comments include specific suggestions  
708 for change these should be logged in the issue-tracking mechanism to ensure that they are  
709 addressed.
- 710 5. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 711 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a  
712 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 713 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition  
714 Specifications or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least  
715 a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are  
716 cast, and (c) Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 717 8. Maintenance Review ballots are advisory only, as indicated in section 5.1.
- 718 9. "No" votes must be accompanied by references to the issue tracker items (if any) that if  
719 resolved would persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 720 10. It is highly recommended that abstentions be accompanied by comments.
- 721 11. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 1 month must pass before  
722 the JSR can be reinitiated.
- 723 12. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a  
724 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are  
725 cast.
- 726 13. An item listed in an Item Exception Ballot will be deferred to the next JSR if at least one-third  
727 of the EC Members cast "no" votes for that item.
- 728 14. When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot will be approved only if each  
729 EC approves it separately.

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

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

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