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Hi folks,  
  
In the agenda I just published, I proposed that we might want to  
consider adopting a more up-to-date charter and process. I don’t know  
what the official route would be for changing the W3C community group  
page’s charter, and I don’t think there is a process document for  
community groups.  
  
But, informally if not formally, I think we would all benefit from  
having some ground rules in place. Mike and I chatted about it a little  
bit, and here’s something **to consider as a starting point**.  
  
QT4 CG Charter and process  
  
The group aims to agree to extensions to the XSLT 3.0 Recommendation  
published on 8 June 2017 and the XQuery and XPath 3.1 Recommendations  
published on 21 March 2017, along with supporting changes to the other  
specifications (XPath, Functions and Operators, Serialization) on  
which these depend.  
  
A preliminary proposal describing requirements for such extensions can  
be found in Michael Kay's Proposal for XSLT 4.0 published in the  
Proceedings of XML Prague 2020,  
<https://archive.xmlprague.cz/2020/files/xmlprague-2020-proceedings.pdf#page=121>  
  
This has been supplemented by a wide variety of proposed enhancements  
which are registered as issues against the GitHub repository,  
<https://github.com/qt4cg/qtspecs/issues>  
  
It is intended that the group will operate through the use of email  
and forums together with weekly conference calls. Formal progress will  
be made through minuted decisions made at the weekly conference calls.  
  
The general modus operandi of the group will be as follows:  
  
+ Technical debates should be held primarily offline; issues will only  
  be placed on the agenda for a group call if (a) there is consensus  
  behind a concrete proposal for the group to ratify, or (b) there is  
  a clear choice to be made between competing proposals, or between  
  making a well defined change or leaving the specification unchanged.  
  
+ The default decision is to preserve the status quo (the existing  
  specifications) unless there is a clear consensus to do otherwise.  
  
+ Specifications without implementations have no value. Therefore,  
  while everyone gets a voice in putting forward ideas, the group will  
  not accept proposals if implementors raise strong objections.  
  
+ There is a strong presumption in favour of retaining backwards  
  compatibility. Incompatible changes will only be made for "edge  
  cases", and only if there is clear evidence that the existing  
  specifications cause serious problems for users or implementors.  
  
+ There is a strong presumption against changes to the data model, on  
  the theory that changes to the data model tend to have many knock-on  
  effects that can take years to work through.  
  
+ Proposals for new features, at the time they are put forward for a  
  formal decision, must be sufficiently complete in their technical  
  detail that adding the new features to the specification is an  
  editorial process that does not require making technical choices.  
  
+ The editor will, as soon as practicable after each meeting, update the  
  draft specifications on GitHub and republish them, with change  
  markings. Members are expected to check that the specifications have  
  been updated correctly and to report any errors found as GitHub  
  issues.  
  
                                        Be seeing you,  
                                          norm  
  
--  
Norman Tovey-Walsh <[ndw@nwalsh.com](mailto:ndw@nwalsh.com)>  
<https://nwalsh.com/>