

---- proposals with specific proposed text for Maintenance Release (see XreferenceProcessEdits and ProcessDocEdits drafts for details)

1. Transparency – JSR EGs must publish and respond to public comments and EC sees it before EC Ballots <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
2. Transparency - Require publication of full public spec, TCK and RI licenses starting at JSR initiation <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
3. Transparency – JSR EGs must publicly state what transparency techniques are used in JSR EG on public JSR status page <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
4. Transparency – JSR EGs may not use JCP Confidential information in their drafts or final output. <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
5. Agility - Clarify process to remove uncooperative spec lead to deal with issues like bankruptcy or other issues that stall the JSR <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
6. Agility - Clarify role of EG members during Maintenance phase. <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
7. Agility – Allow EC Members to call for a Maintenance Review Item Exception Ballot up until the end of the Maintenance Review. Current rules require any EC objections to be stated more than 7 days before the end of the review – so the last 7 days of the current review are meaningless and reviews can be functionally as short as 23 days.<status>ad hoc approved text</status>
8. Agility - Require that an updated Spec be posted after a Maintenance Review completes successfully. <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
9. Agility – Change deadline for requiring special election for EC vacancy to avoid special election occurring too close before the regular election. The current rules call for a special election to fill a vacant EC seat if the vacancy occurs more than 3 months before the next regular election, but given how long it takes to prepare and conduct elections, that could lead to a special election very soon before a regular election, causing confusion. Make that a longer time. <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
10. Transparency – Ensure transparency in Maintenance process by publishing requests for maintenance changes publicly (e.g on an archived mail list). When a Maintenance Review occurs both these requests for changes and the disposition must be publicly viewable (e.g. deferred with brief comment why, rejected, with brief comment why, included in Maintenance Review) <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
11. Agility - Final Release must be published promptly after Final Ballot Approval. (one JSR was approved nearly 5 years ago and still has not published a final spec.) <status>ad hoc approved text</status>
12. Agility - Deal with dormant JSRs that are no longer functioning to revive them or close them.

13. Transparency - Include URL for additional licensing obligations for EG members from 3rd party hosting services (for mail lists, code repositories) in Initial JSR Request. Update with EC if changed. Some 3rd party services require licensing that is different than JSPA (e.g. host site gets patent grants). <status>ad hoc approved text</status>

14. Elections - Elections voting takes place over a period of 6 weeks from when voting starts to when it completes, making it difficult to focus JCP Member attention on the election process. Change timing of ratified election and open election to improve participation. <status>ad hoc approved text</status>

15. Duties of EC - Clarify that duties of the AC in providing guidance to the PMO includes developing and publishing white papers, reports or comments if either one or both of the EC's finds that appropriate. <status>ad hoc approved text</status>

---- ideas that can be dealt with outside the Process Document, e.g. PMO action or Spec lead guide

1. Alternates for individual EC members. That's always been allowed. Nothing needs to change.
2. Changes to the template for JSR initiation. That isn't a Process document issue. It's an implementation issue. Shouldn't be in a doc that's so hard to change. PMO should work it out with EC.
3. Purge members who don't respond? (e.g. yearly they get an email that asks them to follow a link to a web page with a button that says "renew jcp membership". If they click it, they're renewed. (this topic is not a process document topic – it's PMO only). Just an idea for consideration outside the maintenance review.

---- proposals to be explored in the future. Too big for Process Doc Maintenance Release.

Note: inclusion does not imply the proposal should be acted on. This is a list of items to consider in the future.

1. **Improve TCK** quality (by requiring the publication of coverage information, and assertion lists, for example.) – deferred to later JSR or later maintenance release or PMO action
2. **Improve the quality of the TCK and RI** – EC members do not download and review the TCK and RI during final ballot. (one issue is some will not look at code due to various contamination concerns). Is there some other mechanism for ensuring quality?
3. **Maintenance Lead refuses to undertake a Maintenance Review.** What can be done if Maintenance Lead refuses to consider maintenance changes for Maintenance Review? ML is completely in charge of when a Maintenance Review occurs and what is in it. Members can file a new JSR to do the work and ML has first option to be SL, but if they refuse to lead the JSR, the new EG has to face possibly rewriting the TCK and RI. For the TCK, perhaps a

supplementary TCK could be written that requires just covering the changes and also requires passing the TCK for the pre-MR spec too. (not being able to solve problems like this is a consequence of not having open source RI and TCKs and of having a company control the spec, not an independent standards organization.). This is a problem, but it isn't obvious how to solve it given the other constraints of the JCP.

4. **New Spec or Maintenance Lead and RI and TCK.** What can be done if Maintenance or Spec Lead leaves role and does not transfer RI or TCK?
5. **Show specific changes in Maintenance Review.** In some Maintenance Reviews the actual changes to the spec are not made available for review until it is too late to allow for a meaningful review. In some cases, new APIs have been generally described in the Change log but the full description of the new classes/functions may not be included. Then if they are wrong/need improvement it takes another MR cycle or there is no accountability by the ML.
6. **Public, standard implementation license and TCK test suite licenses that apply to all future JSRs.** Currently each specification can have a different license and the required TCK test suite license is often confidential. The public (and the EC) often has no way of knowing if Spec Leads restrict specification implementations in these licenses. Every future JSR should use the same public, standard implementation license and TCK license. Spec Leads can offer other alternative licenses, but must always offer the single common standard license. Since some JCP members wish to charge for the cost of maintaining TCKs, the only allowed difference in the standard TCK license is the cost for use in claiming compatibility (always with no cost for not-for-profits). Our preference is for \$0 cost open source TCKs, but requiring that is probably not achievable now.
7. **No Field of Use restrictions limiting how specifications are used other than what the specification says.** We think the JSPA already clearly forbids this. It says other than reciprocity rules for licensing and three compatibility conditions (including passing the TCK test suite) "the Spec Lead agrees not to impose any contractual condition or covenant that would limit or restrict the right of any licensee to create or distribute such Independent Implementations." However, there has been disagreement on this that is reflected in the Apache Harmony open letter about the TCK License. JCP required test suites are intended for ensuring compatibility and must not be used by Spec Leads to prevent use of compatible implementations.
8. **TCK Guides must be public.** If there is a TCK Guide for how a TCK may be used, that guide should be posted on a public site so that the community knows all the rules required to implement a specification.
9. **JCP Community can create open source \$0 cost TCK for any JSR that does not have one, with EC approval.** If the TCK test suite for a specification is not open source and \$0 cost for official use of the TCK to claim compatibility, then JCP members should be able to file a JSR to create an open source, \$0 cost TCK for that JSR. The development work could be done wherever the Expert Group decided (including in any of the open source forums). If the EC approves, a specific version of that new open source TCK becomes the official TCK for the JSR when used without changes. Open Source TCKs solve the problem of continuing work on specifications when the Spec Lead who owns the TCK goes bankrupt or loses interest.

- 10. Future Reference Implementations (RI) licensed under OSI open source license.** Reference Implementations of future JSRs should be required to be licensed under the OSI approved open source license of the Spec Lead's choosing. With the the Spec Lead owning a proprietary RI, if the Spec Lead goes bankrupt or just loses interest, there is no RI for the community to use to create new versions of the specification. Open source RI's solve that problem.
- 11. Transparency in specification development – default should be public.** The default for all JCP business should be that it is NOT confidential. Meeting minutes, Expert Group mail list archive where technical work is done, and Expert Group specification drafts should all be publicly viewable (read only). Expert Groups can have a second mail list for non-technical private communication but that should be restricted to information like arranging phone calls and face to face meetings. Formal JCP Confidentiality, where there are legal commitments to keep information confidential for up to 3 years with use restrictions, should be eliminated. Access passwords are sufficient to guard information like meeting arrangements.
- 12. Transparency in Executive Committee – default should be public.** At times the EC has to have discussions that need to remain private (e.g. discussing past licenses that are marked confidential). However, transparency should be the default. The EC should be required to have a publicly archived email list for public feedback to the EC, where either individual EC members or the EC as a whole participate in discussion with the community.
- 13. Expert Group participation** Currently, the Spec Lead can hand pick the members of the Expert Group. There should be clear, public criteria for Expert Group membership (e.g. technical experience in the area). Up to some limit on the number of members (never less than 12 as the limit), qualified participation requests should not be refused (but can be refused if others are more qualified). Those rejected should be able to appeal to the EC if they believe the rules were not fairly applied. Expert Group members should be removed if they do not attend meetings or do not participate on the email list.
- 14. Naming a new Spec Lead for the next version of a specification when Spec Lead refuses to start a new version.** The JCP Community should be able to create the specifications it wants to create. If the Spec Lead refuses to lead a new JSR, a JSR should be able to be proposed with a new Spec Lead.
- 15. Platform JSRs should be done in the new Expert Group for the platform revision, not slipped in by Maintenance Review on the previous JSR for the previous specification version.** Currently for a new Platform Specification, there is new JSR that produces a specification that lists which other JSR specifications become part of the new platform. Traditionally, there have also been a set of Maintenance Releases on the previous version of the specification, but these are odd Maintenance Releases not meant to be implemented in the previous version at all. They are means to change the next version, not to change the version they look like they apply to. In the future, this should be done by producing the same change request document, but to have that document go through the usual review cycle in the JSR for the new platform. It is no more work and gives the community the usual review of the changes that will make up the new platform. (e.g. look at the maintenance releases for SE5 intended only to be implemented in SE6, not SE5 <http://jcp.org/en/jsr/detail?id=176>).
- 16. Direct licensing to implementers.** Current licensing rules make all patent grants flow through

the Spec Lead. Contributors license to the Spec Lead granting the Spec Lead the right to sublicense to others. In many other organizations, contributors license directly to implementers. Licensing through the Spec Lead is another instance of having specifications dependent upon one person or company.

- 17. Spec Lead cannot proceed with new revision of specification (JSR or Maintenance) while restricting competing Independent Implementation of current specification.** The principle way this would arise is through limiting or restricting implementations that would otherwise be compatible by not permitting them to test with the TCK.

- 18. JCP as a level playing field legal entity standards organization.** The JCP should evolve towards becoming a legal entity incorporated and controlled by its members to offer a level playing field for creation of Java specifications with no special role for any particular company. Being a legal entity allows the organization to own the specification copyright and ensures members control the organization. In the meantime, reforms should make JCP more like the typical member controlled standards organization. All of the following proposed changes can be implemented now, without JCP becoming an independent membership controlled organization.