

JCP Process Document

Version 2.9 (August 15, 2012)

Comments to: pmo@jcp.org

Copyright (c) 1996 - 2012 Oracle America, Inc.

CONTENTS

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

8 I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

19 An Executive Committee (EC) representing a cross-section of both major stakeholders and other
20 members of the Java community is responsible for approving the passage of Specifications through
21 the JCP's various stages and for reconciling discrepancies between Specifications and their
22 associated test suites.

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

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

38 This version (2.9) of the JCP was developed using the Java Community Process itself by means of
39 JSR 355, led by Oracle with all Executive Committee members forming the Expert Group.

40 II DEFINITIONS

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

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

44 **Ballot:** See Appeal Ballot, Final Approval Ballot, Final Approval Reconsideration Ballot,
45 JSR Approval Ballot, JSR Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Renewal Ballot, JSR Renewal
46 Reconsideration Ballot, JSR Withdrawal Ballot, Maintenance Review Ballot, Maintenance
47 Renewal Ballot, Maintenance Release Withdrawal Ballot, Public Draft Specification
48 Approval Ballot, Public Draft Specification Reconsideration Ballot, Transfer Ballot.

49 **Contribution Agreement:** A legal agreement defining the terms, particularly those
50 concerning the grant of intellectual property rights, under which contributions are made to

51 a project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

80 **Issue Tracker:** A mechanism to allow issues (problems, tasks, comments, or requests for
81 change) to be recorded and tracked by priority, status, owner, or other criteria. The Issue
82 Tracker should permit issues to be identified by states such as open, resolved, and closed
83 and should support the assignment of resolution types such as deferred (postponed to a
84 follow-on release,) fixed (implemented,) challenged (no satisfactory resolution,) and
85 rejected (deemed inappropriate or out of scope.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 the
126 Maintenance Lead proposes to include in the release, as identified in the associated Issue
127 List.

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

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

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

136 **Member:** See Agent, Java Community Process Member, Member Associate, Member
137 Representative.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

165 **Specification:** See Java Specification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

182 The use of the words "must", "must not", "required", "shall", "shall not", "should", "should
183 not", "recommended", "may" and "optional" in this document is done in accordance with the
184 IETF's [RFC 2119](#).

185 III THE JAVA COMMUNITY PROCESSSM PROGRAM

186 1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

187 1.1 EXPERT GROUP TRANSPARENCY

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

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

191 issues when there is disagreement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

218 **1.1.1 PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

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

226 **1.1.2 ISSUE TRACKING**

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

232 Whenever a Spec Lead or a Maintenance Lead submits materials to the PMO for review or ballot they
233 must also provide an Issue List indicating the disposition of all of the Issues that have been logged

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 meetings.

234 against the JSR. Issues logged late in the review cycle may be deferred for later consideration, and
235 Issues that are blatantly off-topic or that appear to have been submitted maliciously or erroneously
236 may be ignored.

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

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

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

247 **1.1.3 CHANGES TO LICENSING TERMS**

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

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

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

265 **1.2 EXPERT GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

266 **1.2.1 EXPERT GROUP COMPOSITION**

267 There is no size limit on the Expert Group. The Spec Lead may add additional Experts at any time so
268 long as existing EG members are consulted. New members may be added, for example, to increase
269 diversity of opinion.

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

274 Details of such requests, including the organizational affiliation of the requester, together with the Spec
275 Lead's official response, substantive deliberations within the EG about the matter, and any other
276 official decisions related to EG membership must be published through the EG's public communication
277 channel. The PMO will ensure that the JSR Page lists the Members who are members of the EG

278 together with the names of individual Member Representatives or Member Associates where
279 appropriate.

280 **1.2.2 WITHDRAWAL OF AN EXPERT FROM THE EXPERT GROUP**

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

289 **1.2.3 DISRUPTIVE, UNCOOPERATIVE OR UNRESPONSIVE EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS**

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

301 **1.2.4 UNRESPONSIVE OR INACTIVE SPEC LEAD**

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

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

315 **1.3 JSR DEADLINES**

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

323 be initiated for that JSR for an additional year.

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

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

333 **1.4 COMPATIBILITY TESTING**

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

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

342 **1.5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DUTIES**

343 **1.5.1 TRANSPARENCY**

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

346 **1.5.2 DRAFT REVIEWS**

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

351 **1.6 PMO RESPONSE TIMES**

352 Materials to be posted on the JCP Website for review, comment, or any other official EG or EC
353 business should be submitted to the PMO, which shall post them on the JCP Website and announce
354 their availability to Members and the public within seven days of receipt (holiday closures excepted.)

355 **1.7 ESCALATION AND APPEALS**

356 Unless otherwise specified in this document, any EG member can appeal to the EC regarding a
357 decision, an action, or inaction by the PMO, a Spec Lead, or a Maintenance Lead that affects EG
358 participation or issue-resolution and which cannot be resolved by other reasonable means. An appeal
359 must be initiated by sending an email message to the PMO (pmo@jcp.org) in all cases, even if it
360 affects the PMO itself. The message must describe the issue under appeal clearly and concisely, with
361 a short and relevant *subject* line, and must provide all relevant documentation to support the appeal.
362 The PMO shall transmit the message to the EC no later than seven days after receipt. The EC shall

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

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

366 **2.1 INITIATE A JAVA SPECIFICATION REQUEST**

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

371 The following information must be provided with each JSR:

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

383 **2.1.1 REVISE EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS**

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

392 **2.1.2 PROTECT THE INSTALLED BASE AND GUARD AGAINST FRAGMENTATION**

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

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

400 **2.1.3 PROFILES AND API SPECIFICATIONS TARGET CURRENT PLATFORM EDITIONS**

401 All new or revised Specifications must be compatible with the most recent versions of the targeted
402 Platform Edition Specifications. In order to achieve this, all UJSRs to define new Profile Specifications
403 or revise existing Profile Specifications must reference either the most recent Release version of the

404 Platform Edition Specification they are based upon or a newer version of that Specification that is
405 under development via an active UJSR.

406 **2.1.4 PLATFORM INCLUSION**

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

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

418 **2.2 JSR REVIEW**

419 When a JSR is received, the PMO shall give it a tracking number, create its JSR Page, announce the
420 proposed JSR to the public, and begin JSR Review. Comments on the JSR should be sent to the
421 JSR's public feedback communication mechanism. Comments shall be forwarded to the EC for its
422 consideration and shall be made available from the JSR Page (similar comments may be
423 consolidated.) Members who are interested in joining the Expert Group (should the JSR be approved)
424 should identify themselves by submitting a nomination form to the PMO.

425 **2.2.1 DISCLOSURE OF LICENSING TERMS**

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

434 **2.3 JSR APPROVAL BALLOT**

435 After the JSR Review, EC members shall review the JSR and any comments received, and cast their
436 ballot to decide if the JSR should be approved.

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

442 **2.4 FORM THE EXPERT GROUP**

443 When a JSR is approved the PMO instructs the identified Spec Lead to form the Expert Group. If the
444 Member contributing the Spec Lead withdraws from the JCP before the JSR is approved, the PMO
445 shall request the preliminary Expert Group to choose a replacement from among themselves who is

446 willing to take on the duties defined in this document.

447 **3. DRAFT RELEASES**

448 **3.1 WRITE THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE SPECIFICATION**

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

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

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

461 **3.2 EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

470 **3.2.1 UPDATING THE DRAFT DURING EARLY DRAFT REVIEW**

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

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

477 **3.3 PUBLIC REVIEW**

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

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

485 **3.4 PUBLIC DRAFT SPECIFICATION APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

497 **4. FINAL RELEASE**

498 **4.1 PROPOSED FINAL DRAFT**

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

503 **4.1.1 COMPLETE THE RI AND TCK**

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

511 **4.1.2 ESTABLISH A FIRST-LEVEL TCK APPEALS PROCESS**

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

518 **4.1.3 UPDATE THE DELIVERABLES IN RESPONSE TO THE APPEAL BALLOT**

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

524 **4.2 FINAL APPROVAL BALLOT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

563 **4.3 FINAL RELEASE**

564 Within 14 days of a successful Final Approval Ballot or Reconsideration Ballot, the PMO shall publish
565 on the JCP Website the Specification and links to information on how to obtain the RI and TCK, and
566 shall announce the availability of these materials to both Members and the public. The published TCK
567 information must include a means for any interested party to obtain a copy of the TCK documentation

568 at no charge. Upon Final Release, the Expert Group will have completed its work and disbands. The
569 Spec Lead will typically become the Maintenance Lead and may call upon Expert Group members and
570 others for aid in that role.

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

578 **5. MAINTENANCE**

579 **5.1 MAINTENANCE LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

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

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

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

597 **5.1.1 RELINQUISHING OWNERSHIP**

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

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

609 **5.2 MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

610 The Maintenance Lead shall document all proposed Specification changes through the Issue Tracker

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

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

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

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

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

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

637 **5.3 MAINTENANCE RELEASE**

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

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

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

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

652 **6.1 SCOPE**

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

655 **6.2 MEMBERSHIP**

656 The EC is composed of 25 Java Community Process Members. Oracle America, Inc. has a permanent
657 voting seat on the EC. (Oracle's representative must not be a member of the PMO.) The EC is led by
658 a non-voting Chair from the Program Management Office.

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

662 **6.3 EC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

686 **6.4 EC SELECTION PROCESS AND LENGTH OF TERM**

687 EC members serve two-year terms, which are staggered so that half of the seats are up for election
688 each year.

689 On the EC there are two Ratified Seats for every Elected Seat (hence 16 Ratified Seats and 8 Elected
690 Seats) plus one permanent seat held by Oracle America, Inc.

691 **6.4.1 RESIGNATION OF EC SEATS**

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

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

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

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

699 **6.4.2 ELECTION PROCESSES**

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

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

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

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

713 **6.4.3 SELECTION PROCESS FOR RATIFIED SEATS**

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

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

721 **6.4.4 SELECTION PROCESS FOR ELECTED SEATS**

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

- 724 • Four weeks before the voting period the PMO shall post on the public JCP site a complete
725 description of all materials that candidates will be expected to provide (e.g. any candidate
726 statements, position papers, etc. that will be posted during the election.)
- 727 • Four weeks before the ballot period the PMO shall accept nominations for a period of 14 days.
728 Any Member may nominate themselves except that Agents of JCP Members cannot run for
729 Elected Seats as individuals and the PMO shall reject such nominations.
- 730 • Eligible Members may vote for as many nominees as there are vacant Elected Seats over a
731 14-day ballot period.
- 732 • The nominees who receive the most votes shall fill the vacant Elected Seats.
- 733 • If there is only one nominee for an Elected Seat voters shall be given the opportunity to vote

- 734 “yes” or “no” for that candidate. To be elected, the candidate must obtain a simple majority.
735 • If there is no candidate for an elected seat, the ECs may choose to hold this seat open until the
736 next election.
737 • Ties shall be decided by following the procedure defined in <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2777.txt>
738 and using the calculator provided by W3C in <http://www.w3.org/2001/05/rfc2777>.

739 **7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JSR BALLOT RULES**

- 740 1. All JSR ballots shall be conducted electronically and the results made public.
741 2. JSR ballots last 14 days except where noted in this document.
742 3. EC members may cast three types of votes: "yes", "no" and "abstain". Explicit abstentions are
743 strongly discouraged. In the extreme and most undesirable case, an EC member may not
744 vote at all.
745 4. Only "yes" and "no" votes count in determining the result of a JSR ballot.
746 5. Any vote may be accompanied by comments (which are particularly encouraged in the
747 case of abstentions.) When comments include specific suggestions for change these should
748 be logged in the Issue Tracker to ensure that they are addressed. "No" votes must be
749 accompanied by references to the Issue Tracker items (if any) that if resolved would
750 persuade the member to change the vote to "yes".
751 6. JSR ballots are approved if (a) a majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a
752 minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
753 7. Ballots to approve UJSRs that define the initial version of a new Platform Edition Specification
754 or JSRs that propose changes to the Java language are approved if (a) at least a two-thirds
755 majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are cast, and (c)
756 Oracle casts one of the "yes" votes. Ballots are otherwise rejected.
757 8. When a failed JSR ballot results in the closing of a JSR, at least 30 days must pass before
758 the JSR can be re-initiated.
759 9. EC ballots to override a first-level decision on a TCK challenge are approved if (a) at least a
760 two-thirds majority of the votes cast are "yes" votes, and (b) a minimum of 5 "yes" votes are
761 cast.

762 **IV APPENDIX A: REVISING THE JCP AND THE JSPA**

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

- 765 1. Only EC members can initiate a JSR to revise one of these documents.
766 2. The EC must approve the JSR.
767 3. The Expert Group consists of all EC members with a member of the PMO as Spec Lead.
768 4. There is no Reference Implementation or Technology Compatibility Kit to be delivered and no
769 TCK appeals process to be defined.

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

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

- 775 • The 2012 annual elections will be held as defined in JCP 2.8, but candidates will be informed
776 that if they are elected their term will be for only a single year, since all candidates must stand
777 for re-election in 2013.
778 • Immediately after the 2012 election the two ECs will be merged. Oracle and IBM's second

779 seats will be eliminated, resulting in a single EC with 30 members.

780 • All subsequent JSR ballots (even for in-progress JSRs) will then be voted on by the merged
781 EC.

782 • For the 2013 annual elections three Ratified and two Elected Seats will be eliminated, thereby
783 reducing the EC to 25 members. All 25 seats will be up for re-election in 2013.

784 • Members elected in 2013 will be ranked to determine whether their initial term will be one or
785 two years. The 50% of Ratified and 50% of Elected members who receive the most votes will
786 serve an initial two-year term, while all others will serve an initial one year term.

787 • All members elected in 2014 and subsequently will serve a two-year term.

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