OpenWIS Association AISBL

Association Internationale Sans But Lucratif
Ringlaan 3, Avenue Circulaire, B1180, Brussels, Belgium

Support for multiple concurrent projects within the OpenWIS governance framework

ATT-OWIS-SC-2016-6

Executive Summary

Assessment of existing open, community driven organisations (Apache Software Foundation, Eclipse Foundation, Mozilla Foundation, Open Knowledge Foundation, Ubuntu Community and World Wide Web Consortium) indicates a common pattern that can be used within a framework organisation to support multiple, concurrent projects.

Subject to changes to the Internal Rules, the OpenWIS Association can adopt this pattern to support multiple concurrent open source software projects (“OpenWIS Projects”).

The Internal Rules should be amended to:

- recognise the role of Contributor within the OpenWIS community; a person contributing to code and non-code activities within OpenWIS®;
- specify a Code of Conduct that sets expectations for Contributor behaviour within the OpenWIS community;
- for each OpenWIS Project, require the creation of a Project Management Committee (as a sub-committee of the Steering Committee) with named Project Leader(s) and mentor(s) from the Technical Committee;
- amend the function of the Technical Committee to operate as a cross-project technical architecture / design authority body that provides technical oversight; and
- specify the mechanism to establish new OpenWIS Projects, execute Project delivery, and to release deliverables.

Governance in other open source organisations

Apache Software Foundation (ASF)

http://www.apache.org

http://www.apache.org/foundation/how-it-works.html

The Apache Software Foundation (ASF) provides a foundation for open, collaborative software development projects by supplying hardware, communication and business infrastructure. It is an independent legal entity to which companies and individuals can donate resources and be assured that those resources will be used for public good.

Importantly, ASF provides a means for individual volunteers to be sheltered from legal suits directed at the Foundation's projects.

The ASF does not pay for software development on any Apache projects; it relies on volunteers. The ASF focuses on providing the technical, legal, and community infrastructure.

The ASF comprises of several separate communities, each focused on a different aspect of the the "web serving" problem, but all united by a common set of goals and a respected set of cultural traditions in both etiquette and process. Each community is referred to as a **Project** and while similar, each exhibits differences. To reduce friction and allow for diversity to emerge, rather than forcing monoculture from the top, the Projects are designated the central decision-making organisations of the Apache world. Each project is delegated authority over development of its software, and is given a great deal of latitude in designing its own technical charter and its own governing rules.

The **Board of Directors** governs the Foundation and is composed of elected Members of the Foundation. The Board is responsible for management and oversight of the business and affairs of the corporation in accordance with the ASF Bylaws. This includes management of corporate assets (funds, intellectual property, trademarks, and support equipment). The Board website has more information, including the list of current directors, schedule of meetings, and past minutes. The Board elects a Chairman and appoints the usual executive officers, including President, Secretary, Treasurer etc. All executive officers are unpaid volunteers and serve at the direction of the Board in their areas of expertise.

Project Management Committees (PMC) govern and provide technical direction to the projects. PMCs are composed of **Committers** and are established by resolution of the Board. They are responsible for the active management of one or more communities. Those communities are also identified by resolution of the Board. Each PMC consists of at least one Officer of the ASF, who shall be designated as the Chairperson. The chair has primary responsibility to the Board, and has the power to establish rules and procedures for the day to day management of the communities for which the PMC is responsible, including the composition of the PMC itself. From the ASF perspective, the role of the PMC is oversight (not code or coding) - to ensure that all legal issues are addressed, that procedure is followed and that every release is the product of the community as a whole. The PMC is also tasked with long term development and health of the community, and to

ensure that balanced and wide scale peer review and collaboration does happen. The PMC as a whole is the entity that controls the project. The PMC must vote on any formal release of their project's software projects. The Board may terminate a PMC at any time.

Foundation-wide policies for specific areas (e.g. legal, brand, fundraising etc.) are set by the various **Officers** of the corporation, designated Vice President, who are appointed by the Board.

Apache defines the following roles:

- **User** - Someone who uses the software and may contribute feedback to developers in the form of bug reports and feature suggestions. Users participate in the Apache community by helping other Users on mailing lists and user support forums.
- **Developer** - A User who contributes to a project in the form of code or documentation. They take extra steps to participate in a project, are active on the developer mailing list, participate in discussion, provide patches, documentation, suggestions, and criticism. Developers are also known as **Contributors**.
- **Committer** - A Developer who has been given write-access to the code repository and, therefore, is able to make short-term decisions for the project. All Committers have an apache.org email address.
- **PMC Member** - A Developer or Committer who is elected due to merit. They have the right to vote for the community-related decisions and the right to propose an active User as a Committer.
- **PMC Chair** - A PMC Member that is appointed by the Board; the Chair is the interface between the Board and the project.
- **ASF Member** - A person who was nominated by current Members and elected due to merit; they care for the ASF itself. Legally, a Member is a 'shareholder' of the Foundation. They have the right to elect the Board, to stand as a candidate of the Board election, and to propose a Committer for Membership. The also have the right to propose a new project for **incubation**.
- **Sponsor** - An organisation that pledges [annual] donations to the ASF. To ensure project and corporate independence, Sponsors are not part of corporate governance at the ASF.

Apache asserts rules regarding project management and collaboration that apply to all Projects; on topics such as communication, documentation (each Project is responsible for its own website; ASF provide the supporting infrastructure), decision making and philosophy (six core beliefs of the philosophy behind the foundation - "the Apache Way"; merit, consensus, community, charity).

Apache operates a **Foundation Incubator** to help new efforts join the foundation. The Incubator does not perform filtering on the basis of technical issues because the Foundation respects and suggests variety in technical approach. Instead, it filters projects on the basis of likelihood of them becoming successful meritocratic communities with the ability to increase the diversity of its committer base. The Incubator is responsible for:

- filtering the proposals about the creation of a new project or sub-project;
- helping the creation of the project and the infrastructure that it needs to operate;

- supervising and mentoring the incubated community in order for them to reach a meritocratic environment; and
- evaluating the maturity of the incubated project, either promoting it to official project / sub-project status or by retiring it in case of failure.

The basic requirements for incubation are:

- a working codebase;
- the intention to donate copyright of the software and the IP that it may contain to the Foundation; and
- a sponsoring ASF Member or Officer who acts as the mentor, giving direction to the project, helping out in day-to-day details, and keeping contact with the Incubator PMC.

In addition to the Incubator, the Foundation has several other cross-foundation projects; for example the Infrastructure Team operates the technical infrastructure required for the ASF to operate.

Eclipse Foundation

https://www.eclipse.org/

https://www.eclipse.org/org/foundation/

The Eclipse Foundation aims to advance the creation, evolution, promotion, and support of the Eclipse Platform (a vendor-neutral, open development platform) and to cultivate both an open source community and an ecosystem of complementary products, capabilities and services. The Foundation is a non-profit trade association.

The Foundation is comprised of **Members**. The **Membership Agreement** describes the rights and responsibilities for each class of member. There are multiple levels of membership:

- **Strategic Members** are organisations that view Eclipse as a strategic platform and are investing developer and other resources to further develop the Eclipse technology. Strategic developers will have at least 8 full-time developers assigned to developing Eclipse technology and contribute 0.12% of their revenue (to a max of $250k per annum). In lieu of committing developer time, the revenue contribution increases to 0.2% to a maximum of $500k per annum. Strategic Members have a representative on the Board of Directors.
- **Enterprise Members** are organisations that rely heavily on Eclipse technology as a platform for their internal development projects and/or act strategically building products and services built on, or with, Eclipse. These organisations want to influence and participate in the development of the Eclipse ecosystem. The annual membership fee is $125k.
- **Solutions Members** are organisations that view Eclipse as an important part of their corporate and product strategy and offer products and services based on, or with, Eclipse. These organisations want to participate in the development of the Eclipse ecosystem. Based on revenue, the annual membership fee is up to $20k.

- **Associate Members** are organisations that participate in, and want to show support for, the Eclipse ecosystem. Associate Membership is non-voting, but as members, Associates can submit requirements, participate in all project reviews and participate fully in meetings of the Membership. The annual membership fee is $5k.
- **Committer Members** are individuals that are the core developers of the Eclipse projects and can commit changes to project source code. There is no fee.

The **Board of Directors** oversees the policies and strategic direction of the Eclipse Foundation in accordance with the Bylaws. The Board specify a number of Directives and Resolutions, including definition of a **Code of Conduct** for contributors.

Eclipse Management Organisation (EMO) is a full-time body which engages with the community constituents and coordinates Open Source projects. It is described in Article VII of the Bylaws. The EMO reports to the Executive Directors and has responsibilities including: organising and selecting chairs of the Eclipse Councils, leading the Eclipse Platform development, including execution and maintenance of the Eclipse Development Process, nominating **Project Management Committees** (PMC) and their leaders, establishing working groups, resolving conflicts, interacting with standards organisations, enforcing Eclipse Foundation policies and provisions etc.

The open source **Projects** in Eclipse are co-ordinated by two **Eclipse Councils**:

- The **Planning Council** is responsible for establishing a coordinated Platform Release Plan that supports the Roadmap, balances the many competing requirements, and orchestrates the dependencies among Project Plans.
- The **Architecture Council** is responsible for (i) monitoring, guiding, and influencing the software architectures used by Projects, (ii) new Project mentoring, and (iii) maintaining and revising the **Eclipse Development Process** subject to approval of the Board.

One further council, the **Requirements Council**, is used to review and categorise incoming requirements and propose a coherent set of themes and priorities. The membership of the Requirements Council is comprised of delegates from each Strategic Developer Member.

The Eclipse Foundation hosts a large community of active open source **projects**. Projects, their governance, and their operation are described in detail in the **Eclipse Project Handbook**. Each Project is a meritocracy; the more you contribute, the more responsibility you earn. Projects are run by **Project Management Committees** who organise requirements, contributions and deliverables in accordance with their **Project Charter**.

New open source Projects start with a proposal that is made available to the community for review. It must include a description of the project, a declaration of scope, and a list of prospective members (project leads and committers). The **Eclipse Management Organisation** (EMO) ensures that proposals include the necessary information before publishing the proposal and opening a record in the Eclipse Foundation Issue Tracker (Bugzilla) to track the progress of the Proposal. A Proposal will be open for community review for a minimum of two weeks. As the Eclipse Foundation holds the *trademark* for all Eclipse Projects, pre-existing trademarks must be transferred to the Eclipse Foundation. Following community review and assessment of trademarks, two mentors from the Eclipse

Architecture Council must be identified. The EMO will identify mentors from the Architecture Council as necessary. When the project name trademark has been secured, mentors identified, and the proposal contents are finalised, the EMO conducts a creation review which run for a minimum of 1-week. Finally, the EMO will initiate the provisioning process to establish the infrastructure required to operate the project.

All new Projects start in the **Incubation Phase**. Classification of "incubation" is less a statement about the quality of the Project's code; rather it is about assessing the Project Team's progress in practicing the open and public processes necessary to establish the three communities (developers, adopters, and users) around the project. When a the Project code is ready (e.g. stable APIs) and the project team has learned to operate as an open source project, the project may opt to *graduate* into the **Mature Phase**. A mature project is one that is a good open source citizen with open, transparent, and meritocratic behaviour. The project is regularly and predictably releasing IP clean extensible frameworks and exemplary tools. The project is actively nurturing the three communities: developers, adopters, and users.

Collaborative Working Groups are used to foster open industry collaboration in the development of new industry platforms through "open innovation". Eclipse Working Groups provide a vendor-neutral governance structure that allow organisations to freely collaborate on new technology development. Participation drawn from Eclipse Foundation Members. The Eclipse Foundation manages the IT infrastructure for Eclipse Working Groups, including Git code repositories, Bugzilla databases, Hudson CI servers, development-oriented mailing lists and newsgroups, download sites and websites.

Each Eclipse Working Group is governed by a Steering Committee.

Mozilla Foundation

Mozilla is a global community of people who are committed to creating a better internet.

The Mozilla Foundation is a California not-for-profit corporation dedicated to the public benefit. It is governed by the **Board of Directors** according to its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (also see amendment 1 and amendment 2 of the Bylaws). As specified in Article II of the Bylaws, the Mozilla Foundation has no members. The Foundation supports the existing Mozilla community and oversees Mozilla's governance structure.

The Mozilla Corporation is a wholly owned taxable subsidiary of the Mozilla Foundation which is governed by a **Board of Directors** and managed by the **Steering Committee**. The Mozilla Corporation works with the community to develop software that advances Mozilla's principles.

The **Mozilla Manifesto** asserts 10 principles that guide the mission of Mozilla to promote opens, innovation and opportunity on the Web.

The Mozilla leadership team is made up of both paid staff and volunteers who represent a breadth of experience and expertise in building products and empowering communities.

The Mozilla project is too big for one person - or even a small group - to make decisions. Instead, decision-making is distributed to a range of participants through the project being split into Modules. A module is, in the case of code, a piece of functionality, or in the case

of non-code, an activity, with reasonably well-defined boundaries. Larger modules (Firefox, Thunderbird, SeaMonkey etc.) have sub-modules subordinate to them. The ability to create, alter ownership of and destroy sub-modules has been delegated to the owner of the module whose broad scope covers that area. This is true for Firefox, Thunderbird, and all other areas except for Core, Activities (non-code) and Other where queries should be directed to the Mozilla Governance newsgroup. The system is overseen by the owner and peers of the Module Ownership module. For more information about Modules and Module Owners see here and on the Mozilla wiki.

The Mozilla project is governed by a virtual management team made up of experts from various parts of the community. Leadership roles are granted based on how active an individual is within the community as well as the quality and nature of their contributions. This meritocracy provides a resilient and effective way to guide the global community. The different community leadership roles include:

- **Module Owners** and **Peers**: are responsible for leading the development of a module of code or a community activity. Peers are developers to whom the module owner has delegated the rights to commit code or other changes.
- **Super-Reviewers**: are a designated group of strong hackers who review code for its effects on the overall codebase and adherence to Mozilla coding guidelines. Approval of a super-review is generally required to check in code.
- **Release Drivers**: provide project management for milestone releases, providing guidance to developers as to which bug fixes are important for a given release.
- **Bugzilla Component Owners**: are the default recipient of bugs filed against that component. They are expected to review bug reports regularly, reassign bugs to correct owners, ensure test cases exist, track the progress toward resolution of important fixes etc.
- **Former Module Owners / Emeritus Owners**: were responsible for development of a module and have passed the leadership and authority onto others. Referring to them as former module owners allows us to continue to acknowledge their contributions. Mentoring new leadership and passing on authority to new leaders is an important part of maintaining a healthy project.
- **Mozilla Reps**: are deeply passionate Mozillians who represent Mozilla in their country or region and are committed to educating and empowering people to support the Mozilla mission and contribute to the project. The are the eyes, ears and voice of Mozilla on the ground.
- **Mozilla Reps Mentors**: provide mentorship and guidance to ensure that Reps are successful in fulfilling their responsibilities.
- **Mozilla Reps Council**: is composed of volunteer Mozillians who function as official representatives of Mozilla in their region or locale. The Council provides the general vision for the Mozilla Reps Programme and oversees day-to-day operations, governance, and finances of the programme. The Council also serves as an advisory body within the Mozilla organisation.
- **Stewards**: are responsible for the growth and health of the community around functional and regional areas. They maintain contribution pathways that connect

potential contributors to teams that have contribution opportunities, running metrics and education projects that keep those pathways functioning well.

- **Ultimate Decision-Maker(s)**: are trusted members of the community who have the final say in the case of disputes; the 'benevolent dictator'. Brendan Eich and Mitchell Baker have the final say in technical and non-technical matters respectively.

Mozilla provides Community Participation Guidelines to ensure that the behaviour of contributors meets the expectations of the community. The guidelines cover inclusion and diversity, and interaction style.

Open Knowledge Foundation (OKFN)

https://okfn.org

https://okfn.org/about/

OKFN is a worldwide non-profit network of people passionate about open knowledge; using advocacy, technology and training to unlock information and enable people to work with information to create and share knowledge. OKFN believes that open knowledge can empower everyone, enabling people to work together to tackle local and global challenges, understand our world, expose inefficiency and challenge inequality and hold governments and companies to account.

The Board of Directors provides the formal governance of OFKN as a whole in accordance with the Memorandum and Articles of Association.

The Advisory Council is an informal group who are consulted on various matters to do with OKFN activities, strategy and operations, but hold no legal responsibility for the organisation. The Advisory Council exists to advise OKFN team members as appropriate, and individual members may get involved with specific projects or challenges.

OKFN activities include:

- support, encouragement and coordination of an international network of individuals passionate about openness and active in making, training and advocating;
- advocating and campaigning for open release of key information resources;
- educating people about openness and data
- stewardship by providing a home for projects and communities; helping nurture and support efforts to open up data and see it used for positive change
- offering commercial technology services, consultancy and training

OFKN central team operates several units: Leadership, Operations, Project Delivery and Technical Product.

OFKN offers an institutional and fiscal home for innovative open knowledge projects,so called '**Network Projects**', across a diverse number of domains. Network Project applications are reviewed by the Network Projects Council based on the following criteria: (i) all the data and content produced be openly licensed, (ii) software created must be openly licensed, (iii) the project must run in a public facing way and must encourage participating from outsides, and (iv) interaction both within the project and the wider

network will be governed by basic principles of tolerance, respect and politeness. OFKN offers technical infrastructure, 'amplification' in publicising the project's story, governance and best practice, and participation within an international community.

Working Groups are domain-specific groups that focus on discussion and activity around a given area of open knowledge. They provide an opportunity for people with similar interests to gather online (and sometimes in person) to hack, discuss, lobby, promote and explore particular areas of open knowledge and data. New Working Groups begin as Incubating Groups while the necessary community and technical infrastructure is established. An informal process is operated by OKFN to help kick-start new groups.

OKFN also operate the Open Knowledge Foundation Labs: making "tools and insights using open data, open content and open code". The Labs are a very decentralised activity, hosting many Projects which are considered to fit with the set of general Labs community principles. To propose a new Project one must already be recognised as a Contributor to one or more existing Labs Projects. Starting a new Lab Project requires a short brief to be published to the Labs GitHub repo and engage in the community run process.

Ubuntu Community

http://community.ubuntu.com

http://community.ubuntu.com/community-structure/governance/

The Ubuntu **Code of Conduct** asserts the expectations that the Community has of those who participate, represent or engage with the project.

The governance structures of Ubuntu ensure that:

1. there is a defined process that helps people contribute to decisions regarding the Ubuntu community and distribution;
2. decisions regarding the Ubuntu distribution and community are taken in a fair and transparent fashion; and
3. necessary decisions are actually taken, even when there is no clear consensus among the community, and there is a clear path of the appeal or escalation of a decision when necessary.

The **structures** [of the community] and the **community processes** of Ubuntu are supervised by the **Ubuntu Community Council**. It approves the creation of a new team or project, along with team leader appointments and specification of delegated authority, is responsible for the **Code of Conduct** and is tasked with ensuring that **community members** follow its guidelines. The Community Council is ultimately responsible for dispute resolution. The Community Council meets every two weeks on IRC. Community members can propose an item for discussion on the Community Council Agenda.

The **Ubuntu Technical Board** is responsible for the technical direction that Ubuntu takes; deciding on package selection, packaging policy, installation systems and processes, library versions and dependencies. The Technical Board works with the relevant team to try to establish consensus. The Technical Board meets every two weeks on IRC. Community members can propose an item for discussion on the Technical Board Agenda.

As a meritocracy, Ubuntu aims to operate more on consensus than votes, seeking agreement from the people who will have to do the work. Mark Shuttleworth, as self-appointed benevolent dictator for life (**SABDFL**) for the Ubuntu project, provides a point of arbitration and can direct the tasking of both Canonical employees and members. He has the casting vote on the Technical Board and Community Council. Mark, as project sponsor, is responsible for nominating candidates for both Community Council and Technical Board.

The Community Council and Technical Board delegate their responsibilities through a large, growing and complex web of geographically and technically diverse teams. These teams may conduct polls within the community to test elect participants but they can also act unilaterally to ensure that the best people are recognised a leaders, decision makers and experts to get the job done.

Local Community (LoCo) teams work with local Linux User Groups, schools, municipalities and governments to raise awareness of free software. LoCo teams are a great way to gather free software exponents together for beer, open discussion, talks, hackathons etc.

The Ubuntu Community Council may choose to delegate some of its powers and responsibilities to **Team Councils**.

World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)

https://www.w3.org

W3C develops standards rather than open source software. However, its mode of operation is still relevant to our discussion as it operates multiple concurrent activities that are driven by the needs of the **Members**. Members are categorised as "**Affiliate**" and "**Full**". Affiliate Members must be either a non-profit organisation or a government department or agency. The category affects only the Membership fee and does not impact on the rights afforded. Individuals may join W3C as Members but W3C does not distinguish between individuals and organisations. Members have the following rights:

1. A seat on the Advisory Committee
2. Access to Member-only resources
3. The Member Submission process
4. Use of the W3C Member logo

Leadership is provided by the **Director** and the **CEO**.

A small **management team** is responsible for resource allocation and strategic planning.

Roles and responsibilities are defined via the **W3C Process Document**, **Member Agreement** and **Patent Policy**.

The **Advisory Committee** (AC), composed of one representative from each W3C Member (the "AC rep") and has a number of review roles in the W3C Process and elects the Advisory Board and the Technical Architecture Group (TAG). The AC votes to recommend establishment of a new Activity or Working Group and publication of new Web standards. The Director has final approval, delegated to the W3C Management Team. The AC has two face-to-face meetings each year.

The **Advisory Board** is an advisory body elected by the AC to provide ongoing guidance to the Team on issues of strategy, management, legal matters, process and conflict resolution. The Advisory Board also serves Members by tracking issues raised between AC meetings, soliciting Member comments on such issues and proposing actions to resolve these issues. The Advisory Board manages the evolution of the W3C Process [Document] and provides arbitration on Member Submissions unrelated to technical issues. The Advisory Board has no decision-making authority; its role is purely advisory.

Note that the Advisory Board is necessary because the Advisory Committee is too large; it constitutes an elected subset of AC-Representatives who work on behalf of the AC. Within OpenWIS, the number of Members and Partners is small enough that a subset is neither needed nor practical.

The **Technical Architecture Group** (TAG) primarily seek to document Web Architecture principles. Their scope is limited to the technical issues about Web architecture. The TAG provides arbitration on Member Submissions rejected due to technical issues. There are three aspects to TAG responsibilities:

1. to document and build consensus around the principles of the Web architecture and to interpret and clarify these principles when necessary;
2. to resolve issues involving general Web architecture brought to the TAG;
3. to help coordinate cross-technology architecture developments inside and outside W3C.

The **Chartered Groups**, populated by Member representatives and invited experts, produce most of the W3C's deliverables according to the steps in the W3C Process.

Chartered Groups include:

- **Working Groups**.
- **Community and Business Groups** - which operate using a lighter-weight process to promote innovation.

The work of Chartered Groups is facilitated by a dedicated **full-time staff** of technical experts; **W3C Team**.

The **W3C Process** governs the work of the W3C; the standardisation of Web technologies. The process is based on **consensus**. The W3C Process includes a **Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct**.

The Patent Policy includes a **Community Contributor License Agreement** with royalty-free patent licensing terms and permissive copyright for W3C Community and Business Groups.

Overview of W3C Process:

1. Interest in particular topics is identified via **Member Submissions**, discussion within the Advisory Committee and assessment by the **Team** who may organise **Workshops** to elaborate those interests.
2. When there is sufficient interest in a topic, the Director announces the development of a **proposal for a new Activity** or a **Working Group Charter**, depending on the breadth of the topic of interest. Activity Proposals and Working Group Charters

describe the scope, duration and other characteristics of the intended work. Support for a new Activity or Working Group, which will result in the investment of W3C resources- notably staff time, is determined by vote of the **Advisory Committee**. The Director has final approval. Activities may include multiple Working Groups.

3. There are three types of Working Group participants: **Member representatives**, **Invited Experts** and **Team representatives**. Team representatives both contribute the technical work and help ensure the group's proper integration with the rest of W3C. The Working Group Charter set the expectations about each group's deliverables.
4. Working Groups generally create specifications and guidelines that undergo cycles of revision and review as the advance to W3C Recommendation status (REC), incorporating significant review from Members and public plus requirements that the Working Group be able to show implementation and interoperability experience.

Summary of roles and responsibilities from different open and participatory organisations

Board:

- Apache Board of Directors - governance and oversight of corporate affairs, including management of corporate assets (funds, IP, trademarks and equipment)
- Eclipse Foundation Board of Directors
- Mozilla Board of Directors
- Open Knowledge Board of Directors
- Ubuntu 'SABFDL'
- W3C [Management] Team - including Director - approvals for new work and release of deliverables

Steering Committee:

- Apache does not have an equivalent body as it delegates governance of the Projects to the Project Management Committees
- Eclipse Management Organisation - organising and selecting chairs of the Eclipse Councils, leading the Eclipse Platform development, including execution and maintenance of the Eclipse Development Process, nominating Project Management Committees (PMC) and their leaders, establishing working groups, resolving conflicts, interacting with standards organisations, enforcing Eclipse Foundation policies and provisions etc.
- Open Knowledge Advisory Council
- Ubuntu Community Council - approval of new projects or teams, maintenance of and compliance with the Code of Conduct, dispute resolution
- W3C Advisory Committee / Advisory Board - recommendations for new work and release of deliverables, maintenance of W3C Process, resolution of non-technical issues arising from Working Groups

Technical Committee:

- Apache does not have an equivalent body as it delegates governance of the Projects to the Project Management Committees
- Eclipse Architecture Council - responsible for (i) monitoring, guiding, and influencing the software architectures used by Projects, (ii) new Project mentoring, and (iii) maintaining and revising the **Eclipse Development Process**
- Ubuntu Technical Board - technical direction; including deciding on package selection, packaging policy (e.g. the standards to which packages must comply), installation systems and processes, library versions and dependencies

- W3C Technical Architecture Group - definition of [architecture] Principles and interpret how these are applied, resolution of technical issues arising from Working Groups, coordinate cross-technology architecture developments (e.g. drive a consistent approach)

Project (Management) Committee(s):

- Apache Project Management Committee - PMCs are self-governed and are given significant latitude in the technical approach and design of their governing rules; the coherence is maintained because the Chairperson must be an Officer of the ASF … the main role of the PMC is oversight (not code or coding) - but to ensure that all legal issues are addressed, that procedure is followed (particularly ensuring balanced and wide scale peer review) and that every release is the product of the community as a whole. The PMC must vote on any formal release of their project's software products.
- Eclipse Project Management Committee - organise requirements, contributions and deliverables in accordance with their **Project Charter**
- Open Knowledge Network Projects and Working Groups operate largely autonomously under the basic principles of tolerance, respect and politeness. Best practice and governance is provided by the OKFN central team.
- W3C Working Group

Governance in OpenWIS

Current governance relating to the management structure and activities of the OpenWIS Association

Article 2 states the purpose of the OpenWIS Association and of any engagement between the OpenWIS Association and any third parties:

- (A2.1): "The Organization, which does not seek financial gain, aims to work in the collective interest of its Members and Partners […] to facilitate collaboration on the development, promotion and sharing of open source software for the exchange of global meteorological information."
- (A2.2) provides further details:
  - "(i) Coordinating, managing and undertaking development of software for the exchange of global meteorological information by […] interested persons;"
  - "(ii) Licensing and promoting software for the exchange of global meteorological information;"
  - "(iii) Fostering cooperation and coordination within the meteorological community on the exchange of global meteorological information."
- (A2.3): "The Organization shall also represent its Members, collectively, vis-à-vis […] third parties […]. Within its mission, the Organization shall, inter alia, act as an interface between Members, Partners and other third parties to enable in areas of collective interest of the Members and Partners (i) enhancement of coordination and cooperation among Members and Partners, (ii) management of open source software development; (iii) participation in calls for proposals in respect of externally funded projects; and (iv) the signing of agreements or contracts with the relevant third parties."

Article 11 defines the management structure of the OpenWIS Association, with Articles 12, 13, and 14 describing the **Board**, **Steering Committee** and **Technical Committee** respectively.

Propose that Internal Rule **TITLE 2 PURPOSE** be amended to ~~explicitly~~ state that:

-"~~t~~The OpenWIS Association may host multiple concurrent open source software development projects ("**Projects**") and foster community around each of those projects."

Recommendation ATT-6#1

Note that the Articles of Association and Internal Rules are somewhat inconsistent regarding 'OpenWIS® software'; e.g. 'OpenWIS®', 'OpenWIS® software', 'OpenWIS® project', 'OpenWIS® system', 'OpenWIS® software development projects', OpenWIS software etc. The term 'OpenWIS® software' (and its variants) should be taken to mean the software deliverables produced by the Projects of the OpenWIS Association.

Membership levels

Propose that Internal Rule **TITLE 6 MEMBERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP** be amended to create the **Contributor** role[1]; "Persons contributing to code and non-code activities within OpenWIS®".

Recommendation ATT-6#2 - a new role "Contributor" shall be added to TITLE 6 as outlined above. Further amendments to the Internal Rules are pending finalisation of the description of 'Contributor', their rights and privileges (see below).

Member. Strategic Partner rights and privileges plus- Appoints a Representative to the Board.

Strategic Partner. Associate Partner rights and privileges plus- Appoints voting Delegate to the SC[2].

Associate Partner. Can participate in SC as an observer (non-voting). Can propose new OpenWIS Projects. Appoints a Member to the Project Management Committee of ~~Can propose new Projects and Sponsor new work packages in~~ projects that they are *participating* in.

Contributor. This is a new level of membership within the OpenWIS Association. Contributors are individuals that contribute to code and/or non-code activities within the OpenWIS Association- either by way of working for a Member or Partner organisation or through voluntary contribution (aka 'volunteer developers'). By mutual consent of the PMC, a Contributor with no affiliation to a participating Member or Partner organisation may be elected as a PMC Member. All Contributors must sign the pertinent CLA for the project(s) that they contribute to. Contributor membership **does not incur an annual fee**.

Each OpenWIS® Project operates as a meritocracy; the more that one contributes, the more responsibility they are given. A Contributor must demonstrate their credentials, or be vouched for by another Contributor in good standing, before roles of responsibility are allocated. Contributors are expected to comply with the OpenWIS® **Code of Conduct** that sets the expectations about how Contributors shall operate within the OpenWIS community.

Propose that the Internal Rules be amended to require Contributors to comply with the *OpenWIS® Code of Conduct.*

Note that the OpenWIS® **Code of Conduct** needs to be defined.

Note that the following Internal Rules do not apply to Contributors. Contributors are *not* Partners.

- Rule 5.4; requiring that those wishing to become Partners of the OpenWIS Association submit a written request to the Chair of the SC

- Rules 5.5 and 5.6; defining criteria for granting Partner status to persons or organisations wishing to contribute to OpenWIS

We must also consider whether the Articles of Association and Internal Rules effectively shelter Contributors from legal suits directed at OpenWIS® software. Article (21.2) states that "No Member may lay claim on the assets of the Organization, nor will any Member be held personally liable for the liabilities contracted by or action brought against the Organization." What about Contributors - and Partners for that matter too?

[1] *Article 9 specifies the categorisation of Partners. Whilst there is no explicit mention of Contributors, (A9.7) states "Persons or organisations wishing to contribute code to OpenWIS® must sign a Contributor License Agreement […]". These 'Persons' can be inferred as Contributors, hence avoiding the need to amend the Articles of Association.*

[2] *Note that the SC operates largely as an advisory body for the Board; its recommendations, such as establishing a new Project, are passed to the Board for formal vote. However, the role of the Board in voting on the recommendations from the SC should relate purely to ensuring compliance with the Articles and Internal Rules of the OpenWIS Association; a governance role (e.g. ensuring that a newly proposed Project does fit within the Purpose of the OpenWIS Association). Representatives to the Board should not use their votes to support a strategic direction of activities operating within the OpenWIS Association. Rather, the Board should focus on ensuring that the OpenWIS Association remains healthy and complies with necessary [corporate] governance.*

Project Management Committee

Each OpenWIS Project shall be lead by a body responsible for the operation and delivery of the Project: the **Project Management Committee** (PMC). The PMC shall be accountable to the Steering Committee.

Propose amendment to the Internal Rules to require the creation of a **Project Management Committee** (as a sub-committee of the Steering Committee) for each OpenWIS Project.

Note that the Steering Committee has the right to create or dissolve sub-committees as needed (see Article A13.2vi).

Furthermore, the Steering Committee shall delegate accountability for governing the technical delivery of the Project to the Technical Committee.

Propose amendment to the Internal Rules to state that the function of the Technical Committee is to operate as a cross-project technical architecture / design authority body that provides technical oversight; (i) monitoring, guiding, and influencing the software architectures used by Projects, (ii) new Project mentoring, and (iii) including maintaining and revising the OpenWIS® Development Process.

Note that given that there is only one OpenWIS® Project at present, the Technical Committee currently operates as a hybrid of technical oversight and project delivery team.

We must consider whether the responsibilities of the Technical Committee, as defined in Article (A14.1) need to be modified to enable it to operate in the mode of cross-project Technical / Architecture board? ref. points #2 "*collect OpenWIS® software requirements*" and #4 "*communicate with individual developers*".

The Steering Committee shall appoint the Project Leader.

Each Project must operate as a **meritocracy**; managed using a collaborative, consensus-based process. Rather than define hierarchical structures within the Project, roles should be assigned, each with different rights and responsibilities, to participating Contributors.

The roles and responsibilities within the development process need to be clarified. What roles do we need e.g. integration / build manager. What rights and responsibilities do they have (e.g. merging Pull Requests and write-access to the code repository). How are these roles assigned? What criteria do we use to determine if an individual is able to perform a given role? (see Apache model of electing Committers from the Project's Developers) How do we ensure balanced and wide scale peer review? How should support [for OpenWIS® software] work (e.g. via a self-help community from the user base, supplemented with expert input from the Project teams)? Once these questions are resolved, the '**OpenWIS Development Policy**' needs to be written and published.

We must also consider how openness and transparency is achieved in Projects? For example, should the agenda, timing and access details must be publicly available for every meeting; with full transcripts of every meeting must be made publicly available? Is this sufficient to encourage participation from outside the Project?

Project governance

Propose amendment to the Internal Rules to document Project governance as outlined in the following sections.

Initiation of new Projects

- A Member or Partner organisation may submit a proposal for a new Project; '**Project Proposal**'; for example, for the development of a new software package or as part of a contribution to an externally funded initiative.
- When the SC deem that there is *sufficient* interest in a given Project Proposal, the SC Chair will announce the development of a new **Project Charter**[1].
- A Project Charter must define the scope, anticipated duration of **Incubation Phase** and other characteristics of the intended work.
- Member and Partner organisations wishing to participate should register their interest their interest in the proposed Project, indicating, without binding commitment, what level resource they may be able to contribute[2].

- Subject to review by the SC, the Project Charter shall be assessed for (i) compatibility with the purpose and objective of the OpenWIS Association, (ii) sufficient commitment from Member and Partner organisations to operate a core project team, (iii) clarity of objective, (iv) timescale. (etc.)
- Based on the assessment, the SC shall vote to recommend establishment of a new Project.
- The Board must approve the SC recommendation before the Project can be established[3].
- Once approved, the SC shall:
  - establish the **Project Management Committee**[4] (PMC) ~~as a new sub-committee of the SC~~ (the PMC shall comprise one delegate, "**PMC Member**", from each *participating* Member or Partner organisation)~~,~~ and appoint the **Project Leader(s)**[5] from amongst the PMC Members;
  - assign a **mentor** from the Technical Committee if a member of the Technical Committee is not already participating in the Project;
  - work with the PMC to agree the open source **License** under which the project deliverables will be made available and develop a suitable **Contributor License Agreement** (CLA)[6]; and
  - request the necessary environment for the project to be provisioned- "Project Provisioning"; e.g. hosting space for Project websites, wikis, mailing lists, source code repositories, etc.[7].
- New Projects shall begin in the **Incubation Phase**. Classification of "incubation" is less a statement about the quality of the Project's code; rather it is about assessing the Project Team's progress in practicing the open and public processes necessary to establish the ~~three~~two communities (developers, ~~adopters~~, and users) around the Project. When a the Project code is ready (e.g. stable APIs) and the project team has learned to operate as an open source project, the project may opt to *graduate* into the **Mature Phase**.

[1] *development of the Project Charter will likely be assigned to the Member or Partner organisation from which the proposal originated; however, the SC must determine which organisation(s) will develop the Project Charter.*

[2] *commitment of resource may be financial or in-kind.*

[3] *is there an escalation path to challenge the decision of the Board; if so what?*

[4] *according to Article A13.2(vi), the SC is responsible for creating (or dissolving) sub-committees*

[5] *Project Leaders are accountable for the delivery of the Project as specified in the Charter. Should these individuals be appointed by the SC?*

[6] *see documents **ATT-OWIS-SC-2016-4** and **ATT-OWIS-SC-2016-5** regarding proposed changes to the Internal Rules to support flexibility in choice of open source license and improved management of CLA*

[7] *should the provision for a project also include [cloud-based] hardware; e.g. for test and integration purposes? … if so then the costs of these facilities may be non-trivial. The SC must include details of which resources are to be made available for the project in their recommendation to the Board.*

Amendments to existing Projects

- Members and Partner organisations may become additional 'participants' in a given Project (and thus assign a representative to the PMC~~able to sponsor new work packages~~) via mutual consent from the existing participating Member and Partner organisations[1]. A Participation may be subject to assessment of the level of contribution that the new organisation is willing to commit and/or previous contribution(s) from the organisation[2]. Member or Partner organisations may escalation requests to the SC.
- A ~~project team~~PMC may request an amendment or extension to their Charter. Amendments and extensions are subject to Board approval following recommendation from the SC.
- A PMC may, by mutual [and unanimous] consent, choose to elect additional PMC Members from amongst the Project's active Contributors.

[1] *any individual or organisation may contribute to a Project, subject to completion of a CLA and their good standing within the OpenWIS community. 'Participation' requires an organisational commitment to provide resources to the Project and, therefore, bestows the right to participate in the PMC and influence the operation of the Project~~Sponsor new work items~~.*

[2] *such commitment is not contractually binding; but persistent failure to meet commitment may impact the standing within which a given organisation is held*

Project delivery

- Anyone can Contribute to the Project delivery; subject to completion of a CLA and their good standing within the OpenWIS community.
- A simple KANBAN approach to agile delivery is recommended; using a '**notice board**' to manage the flow of work within each Project.
- New **work packages** must be approved by the PMC before they are added to the Project Notice Board~~must have a **Sponsor**; only *participating* Member and Partner organisations can act as Sponsor~~[1].
- Each work package will define the **features** to be delivered (rathe than the [technical] "*how*"). Work packages will be simply defined as 'S', 'M' and 'L' … "T-shirt sizing".
- Delivery criteria for the work package will include elements such as [unit] test coverage and documentation[2].
- Contributors and Participants in the Project take work packages according to their priority[3].

- Progress on each work package must be visible. This will help show which features may be included in the next release.
- Replace feature-based roadmap with regular scheduled delivery of '**Feature Releases**' (e.g. 8-9 months) of new release containing the implemented features. Each project should provide only a single release path[4].
- **Patch Releases** will be made as necessary in response to urgent bug-fixes and other stimuli.
- Release numbering: x.y.z … '**x**' = major version number (3 or 4), '**y**' = feature release number, '**z**' = patch release number. Even number 'Feature Releases' (e.g. 4.**2**.0) will be stable releases intended for operational deployment; odd number 'Feature Releases' (e.g. 4.**1**.7) will be developer releases. The developer release allows new and experimental features to be exposed prior to their incorporation in a stable release.

[1] any project participant may propose a new work item, e.g. [a set of] new feature(s), including individual Contributors that have no affiliation with Member or Partner organisations; the PMC must approve proposed work packages - this enables 'participating' Member and Partner organisations (who, by definition, have a representative on the PMC) to influence the direction and deliverables of the Project~~however, they must persuade a Sponsor that such a proposal should be added to the project notice board~~

[2] should work packages adopt a phased delivery approach; e.g. discovery, alpha, beta, final … with each of those phases being a discrete work package on the notice board?

[3] while contributions from Members and Partners may equal out over the medium- to long-term, we don't anticipate that even contributions in a given release cycle as contribution will be impacted by domestic priorities and resource constraints of each Member or Partner.

[4] managing concurrent releases of 3.14.x and 4.0 has proved challenging during 2015/16

Governance for Project deliverables; software releases

- With guidance from the Technical Committee, the Project Management Committee will define the release mechanism, quality criteria and schedule pertinent to the project.
- The Project Management Committee must agree the release quality criteria with the SC.
- SC will hold Project Management Committee to account with respect to the release quality criteria. A release cannot be made without SC approval.

Issues and Concerns

Do all Members and Partners need to participate in every Project? No. Members and Partners are encouraged to provide a non-binding commitment to support a given Project. These commitments are used to support the assessment of viability for the Project prior to SC vote to recommend establishment of that Project.

What does 'equal contribution' refer to with regard to Members and Partners? Equal contribution refers to the resources required to operate the OpenWIS Association itself, including provision of the resources required to support the operation of the Projects; e.g. hosting space for Project websites, wikis, mailing lists, source code repositories. The resources required to deliver the Projects themselves are agreed by mutual consent between the Member and Partner organisations participating in each of the Projects.

How do we make sure that OpenWIS Association funds are used for the benefit of *all* Members and Partners? OpenWIS Association funds shall be used only to support those activities and tasks required to operate the OpenWIS Association itself, including provision of the resources required to support the operation of the Projects. Furthermore, given that the SC must *recommend* a budget for approval by the Board, no expenditure can occur without Board approval.

Is there any meaningful difference between Strategic and Associate Partners? The key difference is that Strategic Partners get an SC vote. So what are the benefits of being an Associate Partner over and above a Contributor? All Member and Partner organisations, including Associate Partners, can propose new OpenWIS Projects and can appoint a delegate on a Project's PMC to influence the direction and deliverables of a Project that they committed to participate in~~can Propose new Projects and Sponsor new work packages in existing Projects~~.