

JCP Process Document

Version 2.89 (OctoberMonth 18dd, 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 PROCESS 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 | 13 |
| 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 | 19 |
| 7. | EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR BALLOT RULES | 20 |
| 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-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 of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of JSR
44 [34855](#), led by Oracle with ~~the combined all~~ Executive Committee ~~members~~ forming the Expert Group.

45 II DEFINITIONS

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

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

49 **Ballot:** See Appeal Ballot, Final Approval Ballot, Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot,
50 JSR Approval Ballot, JSR Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Renewal Ballot, JSR Renewal
51 Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Withdrawal Ballot, Maintenance Review Ballot, Maintenance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

85 **Issue Tracker:** A mechanism to allow issues (problems, tasks, comments, or requests for
86 change) to be recorded and tracked by priority, status, owner, or other criteria. The Issue

87 Tracker should permit issues to be identified by states such as open, resolved, and closed
88 and should support the assignment of resolution types such as deferred (postponed to a
89 follow-on release,) fixed (implemented,) challenged (no satisfactory resolution,) and
90 rejected (deemed inappropriate or out of scope.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

121 **Licensors Name Space:** The public class or interface declarations whose names begin
122 with "java", "javax", "com.sun" (or "com.Your name" if You are the Specification Lead) or
123 their equivalents in any subsequent naming convention adopted by Oracle.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

145 **Member Representative:** An Agent of a Member company or a Member organization who
146 represents its interests within the JCP.

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

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

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

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

160 **Public Draft Specification Approval Ballot :** The EC ballot to determine if a draft should

161 proceed after Public Review.

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

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

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

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

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

170 **Specification**: See Java Specification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

190 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESSSM PROGRAM

191 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

192 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

223 1.1.1 PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

231 **1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING**

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

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

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

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

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

252 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

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

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

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

270 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

271 **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

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

meetings.

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

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

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

285 **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

294 **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

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

306 **1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

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

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

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

320 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

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

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

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

338 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

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

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

347 **1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

348 **1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY**

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

351 **1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS**

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

356 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

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

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

360 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

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

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

371 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

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

376 The following information must be provided with each JSR:

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

388 **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

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

397 **2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION**

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

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

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

405 **2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS**

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

411 **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

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

423 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

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

431 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

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

440 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

442 ballot to decide if the JSR should be approved.

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

448 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

453 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

454 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

467 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

476 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

483 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

491 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

503 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

504 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

509 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

517 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

524 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

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

530 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

- 537 • Include documentation covering configuration and execution of the TCK, any other information
538 needed to use the TCK (e.g. documentation for any supplied tools,) a definition and
539 explanation of the First-level TCK Appeals Process, and the compatibility requirements that
540 must be met in addition to passing the TCK tests
 - 541 • The compatibility requirements at a minimum must specify that all compatible implementations
542 a) fully implement the Spec(s) including all required interfaces and functionality, and
543 b) do not modify, subset, superset, or otherwise extend the Licensor Name Space, or include
544 any public or protected packages, classes, Java interfaces, fields or methods within the
545 Licensor Name Space other than those required/authorized by the Specification or
546 Specifications being implemented.
- 547 These requirements must apply unless the Specification or TCK explicitly allows exceptions.
- 548 • Be accompanied by a test harness, scripts or other means to automate the test execution and
549 recording of results.
 - 550 • Include a TCK coverage document that will help EC members to evaluate the TCK's quality.
551 This document should include an overview of the documentation included in the TCK, a
552 description of means used to validate the quality of the TCK, the criteria used to measure TCK
553 test coverage of the Specification, test coverage numbers achieved, and a justification for the
554 adequacy of TCK quality and its test coverage.
 - 555 • Provide 100% signature test coverage. These tests must ensure that all of the API signatures
556 required by the Specification are completely implemented and that only API signatures required
557 by the Specification are included in the JSR's namespace.

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

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

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

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

569 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

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

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

584 **5. MAINTENANCE**

585 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

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

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

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

603 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

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

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

615 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

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

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

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

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

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

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

643 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

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

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

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

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

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

658 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

661 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

662 ~~There are currently two Executive Committees: one responsible for Java ME and one for Java SE and~~
663 ~~EE together. Each~~ EC is composed of ~~4625~~ Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc.
664 has a permanent voting seat on ~~each~~the EC. (Oracle's representatives must not be ~~a~~ members of the
665 PMO.) The ECs ~~are~~is led by a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.-

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

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

671 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

695 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

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

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

701 | **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

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

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

711 | **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

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

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

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

725 | **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

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

735 | **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

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

- 739 description of all materials that candidates will be expected to provide (e.g. any candidate
740 statements, position papers, etc. that will be posted during the election.)
- 741 • Four weeks before the ballot period the PMO shall accept nominations for a period of 14 days.
742 Any Member may nominate themselves except that Agents of JCP Members cannot run for
743 Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such nominations.
 - 744 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
745 14-day ballot period.
 - 746 • The nominees who receive the most votes shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
 - 747 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters shall be given the opportunity to vote
748 “yes” or “no” for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
 - 749 • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the
750 next election.
 - 751 • Ties shall be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt>
752 and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

753 7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR BALLOT RULES

- 754 1. All JSR ballots shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
- 755 2. JSR ballots last 14 days except where noted in this document.
- 756 3. EC members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and “abstain”. Explicit abstentions are
757 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC member may not
758 vote at all.
- 759 4. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
- 760 5. Any vote may be accompanied by comments (which are particularly encouraged in the
761 case of abstentions.) When comments include specific suggestions for change these should
762 be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed. "No" votes must be
763 accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if resolved would
764 persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
- 765 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
766 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 767 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition Specification
768 or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds
769 majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast, and (c)
770 Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
- 771 8. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 30 days must pass before
772 the JSR can be re-initiated.
- 773 9. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
774 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
775 cast.
- 776 10. ~~When more than one EC is voting on any JSR ballot, the ballot shall be approved only if each~~
777 ~~EC approves it separately.~~

778 IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA

779 Revisions to the Java Community Process (this document) and the Java Specification Participation
780 Agreement shall be carried out using the Java Community Process with the following changes:

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

786 | **V APPENDIX B: TRANSITIONING TO A MERGED EC**

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

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