

# ***Interface Review Board Proposal***

***November 18, 2014***

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Unless otherwise noted, any and all source code included in this work is licensed under the ISC License per the AllSeen Alliance IP Policy. <https://allseenalliance.org/allseen/ip-policy>

Other products and brand names may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners.

# 1. Purpose

Over time, the various work groups within the AllSeen Alliance will produce a great amount of standardized Interface definitions that model different entities and services found within the Internet of Things. The purpose of the Interface Review Board is to act as an oversight committee for the definition and standardization of all these Interfaces, ensuring a minimal quality, stylistic homogeneity and well-defined taxonomy for the defined Interfaces.

# 2. Scope

The Interface Review Board has the following main tasks:

1. *Define the guidelines for standardized Interface design.* The guidelines in question range from the cosmetic (spelling, language, capitalization, ...) to the semantic (when to use properties versus methods, when to use the different types of signals, ...). These guidelines will be used as an objective yardstick for the review of Interfaces. The guidelines (pending approval by the TSC) will be published as part of the overall AllSeen documentation, and developers will be encouraged to follow them, even if they do not have the intention to have their interfaces standardized by the Alliance.
2. *Provide practical guidance to Interface designers.* To define a good AllSeen Interface, the input of both data model experts and domain experts is needed. The Interface Review Board can offer, on request, the data model expertise part of this equation. It is important for the various Work Groups to involve the Interface Review Board early on in the design process, to avoid situations where man weeks or man years of reference code implementation effort is wasted because it is based on an Interface definition that is ultimately deemed unsatisfactory by the Interface Review Board.
3. *Review Interface definitions and approve them for standardization* before they move into the Certification & Compliance review process. This step needs to be taken for each new version of a standardized interface.
4. *Manage the overall Interface taxonomy.* It is important to maintain a clear taxonomy in the standardized Interfaces. Functional or semantic overlap between different Interfaces should be avoided as much as possible. The Interface Review Board must identify common functionality and propose for it to be factored out into a separate Interface definition. In addition, evolutions of existing Interfaces must be reviewed for scope creep: it is often better to split new functionality off into a separate Interface rather than pile more and more features onto an existing Interface.

### 3. Position within the Alliance

The Interface Review Board is a subcommittee of the Technical Steering Committee. Similar to the various subcommittees of the Board of Directors (e.g. the Marketing Committee), the Interface Review Board operates autonomously, but the TSC can overrule any decision made by the Interface Review Board. Regular reporting ensures that the TSC is in the loop with all decisions taken by the Interface Review Board.

The chairperson of the Interface Review Board must be a TSC member. All other positions within the Interface Review Board are open to the community at large, but Interface Review Board members must be approved by a TSC vote.

### 4. Size

The initial incarnation of the Interface Review Board will be limited in size. The current proposal is to limit it to five or six members. After the Interface Review Board has been in function for a year, an evaluation of its functioning and workload will be done. At this point, the TSC can vote to change the composition and size of the Interface Review Board as needed.

### 5. Modus Operandi

#### 1.1. Service Guarantee

The Interface Review Board will respond to any formal Interface review request within two weeks.

#### 1.2. Voting Procedure

Any Interface offered up for review to the Interface Review Board must be reviewed by at least two members. More members can review the Interface if they so desire. If there is disagreement within the Interface Review Board about the advice to be given to the TSC, the majority vote decides on the final advice. In case of a tie, the Interface Review Board Chairperson has the deciding vote.

### 6. Initial Roadmap

These are the initial steps in the formation and instatement of the Interface Review Board:

- *Call for volunteers.* The initial call for volunteers was done during the TSC meeting of November 17, 2014. Volunteers are requested to send an email to the TSC mailing list announcing their candidacy.

- *TSC vote for the instatement of the Interface Review Board.* Scheduled for the TSC meeting of November 25, 2014. If more prior discussion is needed, the vote can be postponed to the TSC meeting of December 1, 2014.
- *TSC approval of Interface Review Board members, election of chairperson.* Ideally, this is done at the same time as the vote for instatement of the Interface Review Board.
- *Drafting the first version of the Interface Design Guidelines.* This work can start as soon as the Interface Review Board is formally approved by the TSC, and at least two members are on staff. The goal is to have a first version of the guidelines ready by the end of 2014. The guidelines will be presented to the TSC for a formal vote of approval.
- *Official start of the review activities.* As soon as the initial version of the Interface Design Guidelines is approved by the TSC, and five members Interface Review Board members are identified, the Interface Review Board can start its review activities in full capacity.

## 7. Known Volunteers

The following Interface Review Board volunteers are known at time of writing:

Name	Affiliation	Email address	TSC member?
Dominique Chanut	Technicolor / Qeo LLC	dominique.chanut@qeo.org	yes