

# The Overture Community Process

Miguel Ferreira and John Fitzgerald

Release 1  
Adopted April 2009

## Preface

The OML is a formal language for the modelling of computing systems. The OCP governs the management of the OML definition documents and hence has an effect on the conformance of the emerging tools that support modelling and analysis in OML. In particular, the OCP balances the need to encourage experimentation and sound extension of the language against the imperative for rigour in the definition of its syntax and semantics. As a result, the process involves two review stages. During the first stage, the modification request is managed by a trusted closed group. The second phase of review is open to the whole community.

## Acronyms

LB	Language Board
OCP	Overture Community Process
OML	Overture Modelling Language
RM	Request for Modification

## 1 Target

The OCP targets the management of the definition documents for the OML and hence for the emerging set of tools that support modelling and analysis in OML. The process is therefore relevant to all those who are working on the language itself and the tools to support its use.

## 2 Membership

1. The Overture Community shall consist of persons called *members*. The members are those persons who subscribe to the Overture Core mailing list.
2. There shall be a committee of not more than **five** Overture Community members called the *Language Board*.
3. The LB shall step down on a specified date **annually**.
4. If more than five candidates present themselves for LB membership, an election shall take place (Section 5).

### 3 Operation of the Language Board

1. The LB shall appoint the following from among its members:
  - A Convener** who organises and chairs LB meetings. The Convener may not be the same person as the Secretary.
  - A Secretary** who manages the business, recording LB decisions and reporting them to the community.
2. The LB is responsible for the timely consideration of all RMs.

### 4 Workflow of a Request for Modification

In the following workflow, members have rights and responsibilities as follows:

1. Any Overture Community member may submit an RM at any time. The member submitting an RM is termed the RM's *Originator*.
2. The LB must process all RMs equally and in timely manner.
3. The Originator may withdraw a submitted RM at any time prior to termination of the process by informing the Convener and Secretary.
4. The LB may change the status of an RM to **rejected** at any time after submission and terminate the process, giving its reasons to the Originator.

#### 4.1 Definition of Request for Modification

The LB shall specify the required content of RMs. As a minimum, the following shall be required:

1. Identification of the Originator.
2. Target of the request: defining the affected components of the language definition.
3. Motivation for the request.
4. Description of the request, including:
  - (a) description of the modification;
  - (b) benefits from the modification;
  - (c) possible side effects.
5. If appropriate, a test suite for validation of the modification in the executable models.

#### 4.2 Submission

1. The submission of an RM shall be done through a form on the Overture web site (possibly using an issue tracking system), that causes a notification email to be sent to the members of the LB only.
2. Submissions requiring privacy or limited circulation during initial consideration shall be discussed between the Originator and the Convener prior to submission, to ensure that these requirements are, so far as possible, respected.

### 4.3 Initial Consideration

1. After submission the RM is evaluated by the LB. The LB may request expert opinions from named members, subject to the agreement of the Originator.
2. The LB may return one of three verdicts:
  - (a) The RM may be **rejected**. The Secretary shall communicate the verdict to the Originator with explanation. The process terminates.
  - (b) The RM may be **approved unmodified**. The Secretary shall communicate the verdict to the Originator, giving a date when the RM will be moved to the Discussion phase.
  - (c) The RM may be **approved subject to revision**. The Secretary shall communicate the verdict to the Originator. The Originator may revise the RM in accordance with the changes suggested by the LB and pass it back to the Secretary for final approval. The Convener may approve such an RM independently or by reference to the full LB.

### 4.4 Discussion

1. An RM that enters Discussion phase shall be made public through the Overture web site and a discussion mailing list, according to the component(s) that it affects. The mailing lists for discussion can be subscribed by any member.
2. The LB Secretary shall start the discussion of an RM by publishing the following to all Overture Community members:
  - (a) the RM as approved;
  - (b) reasons for the approval of the RM;
  - (c) any technical issues identified during the initial consideration phase; and
  - (d) a date for the conclusion of discussion.
3. The discussion shall then be carried out in a constructive manner by the Overture Community members, terminating at the specified date.

### 4.5 Deliberation

The LB shall consider the RM, taking into account the content of the Discussion phase. The LB may return one of three verdicts:

1. The RM may be **rejected**. The process terminates.
2. The RM may be **accepted unmodified**. The RM passes to the Execution phase.
3. The RM may be **accepted subject to revision**. The Secretary shall communicate the verdict to the Originator, giving required revisions. The Originator may revise the RM in accordance with the changes suggested by the LB and pass it back to the Secretary for final acceptance. The Convener may accept such an RM independently or by reference to the full LB. After this point, the RM is treated as **accepted unmodified**.

## 4.6 Execution

The LB shall appoint a team of members (including the Originator) to carry out the RM and validate its successful completion. The team reports to the LB. The team may report **completion**, including the performance of validation tests as required in the RM. In this case, a new version (tag in svn terms) of the Overture repository is released. The process terminates. The team may report that it is **not able to complete the RM successfully**. In this case, the RM shall be referred back to the LB for a decision on how to proceed.

## 5 Voting

**Election of the LB** shall be by Single Transferable Vote. All members shall have one vote. The election process shall be managed by a member not standing for election who is nominated and approved by simple majority voting in public open to all Overture Community members.

**Decisions within the LB** shall be by simple majority voting.

**Changes to this process** shall be agreed by simple majority vote open to all Overture Community members.