

M2.3b Guidelines for revision of Common Specifications and Content

E-ARK4ALL REPORT



EARK4ALL: AGREEMENT No LC-00921441 CEF-TC-2018-15 eArchiving

Cover Sheet

Document Status:

Status
Final

Document Approver(s)

Name	Role
Fulgencio Sanmartin	DG CNECT Business Owner

Document Reviewer(s)

Name	Role
DILCIS Board	Reviewers of the guideline

Summary of Changes:

Version	Date	Created by	Short Description of Changes
V0.1	2019-05-02	Karin Bredenberg	First version created
V0.2	2019-05-14	Jaime Kaminski, Miguel Ferreira	Updates in the text.
V0.3	2019-05-20	Jaime Kaminski	Finalisation of draft
V1.0	2019-05-31	Karin Bredenberg	Release of version 1.0.

Glossaries of terms

E-ARK vocabs: <http://evoc.dlmforum.eu/E-ARK/group/5568370c3448e76821b3942f/list>

CEF Glossary <https://ec.europa.eu/cefdigital/wiki/display/CEFDIGITAL/CEF+Glossary>

M2.3b Guidelines for revision of Common Specifications and Content Information Type Specifications

Contents

Cover Sheet	2
Guidelines for revision of Common Specifications and Content Information Type Specifications (version 1.0)	4
Summary	4
Connections	4
DILCIS Board	4

Guidelines for revision of Common Specifications and Content Information Type Specifications (version 1.0)

Summary

This guideline describes the revision cycle process and work related to the revision cycle for Common Specifications and Content Information Type Specifications (CITS).

Connections

The revision cycle of the specifications is closely connected with the release management in the eArchiving Building Block (<https://ec.europa.eu/cefdigital/wiki/display/CEFDIGITAL/eArchiving>). There also are revision cycles that run independently for specifications that are endorsed by the DILCIS Board.

DILCIS Board

The DILCIS Board has these pre-set rules for revision.

The board commits to carrying out reviews of all its products every two years. The procedure for a review is as follows:

- after the release of a product, feedback will be gathered on an ongoing basis through appropriate mailing lists, GitHub and (if deemed necessary by the Board member(s)) responsible other methods;
- at least 6 months before the next revision is due, a specific call for feedback will be issued on the board website, circulated through the public Board-maintained mailing list, orally at the nearest DLM Forum members meeting, and at the discretion of the Board member responsible also on external mailing lists and social media channels;
- the feedback period shall be a minimum of two and a maximum of three months;
- the Board member responsible will carry out a review of all change requests together with the product working group and decide if a new revision of the product is required. The decision has to be clearly explained;
- if a revision is deemed to be reasonable, the Board member responsible will prepare an updated version of the product and a clear change list. Both will be made available for external review at least two months before the revision is due;
- the Board member responsible will set up and announce (on the website and appropriate mailing lists) virtual discussions or workshops immediately after the release of the proposed revision of the product which provide additional comments by and discuss any open items with the general community;
- the revision resulting from these discussions will be presented at the next Board meeting but at least one month before the revision is due by the Board member responsible;
- following a majority vote of the Board the revised product will either be published on the Board website and announced on appropriate communication channels, or sent back to the working group for additional updates;
- In the latter case the Board will agree on a strict timeline and a further meeting for a re-vote. This might also mean that the revision deadline is reviewed and extended.

The review has to cover all the components of a product (the specification text, XML Schemas, sample packages or files, revision change lists, training and marketing resources, and any other components deemed necessary for a given product). The Board member responsible will ensure that all these components are revised and updated.

If deemed necessary by the responsible Board member a review process might also be initiated earlier than two years after the release of the previous revision.