XMILE Specification Update
Report to the 2016 Winter Meeting of the Policy Council
Submitted by Bob Eberlein, Feburary 22, 2016

Summary

Last year XMILE version 1.0 was approved as an OASIS Standard. Going forward the standard development will not be done with OASIS, and the Society has the potential to take on this role. We need to figure out how and I recommend a committee be formed to do that.

Detail

Last year XMILE version 1.0 was approved as an OASIS standard. Though this is a significant achievement, the structure of OASIS made it difficult for many people to participate in the creation of the standard. The biggest obstacle was money; OASIS is an expensive organization to maintain membership in. The next biggest obstacle was time; OASIS has very strict standards for meeting attendance which makes it difficult to contribute on a time available basis.

In order to continue moving the XMILE standard forward with participation from the broader System Dynamics community the XMILE technical committee will be reaching out to others in the community. The intent is to publish version 2.0 of the standard under the authority of the System Dynamics Society.

While this is a fine plan, the Society does not have any real structure to enable to workings of a Technical Committee. Under current policies the Technical Committee would need to bring a draft standard to the Policy Council which could then vote on it. While this will achieve the desired outcome, it is not obvious that it is the best way to proceed since, while the work is being done on the specification, the people doing the work receive no recognition by the Society.

It would be good for the Policy Council to come up with a structure and course of action that would recognize and encourage further development on the XMILE specification. To this end I am recommending that the President, appoint an Ad-Hoc committee to come up with a good recommendation on how to do this. One possibility would be to recognize the Technical Committee as a SIG with a very specific mandate. The Publications Committee should perhaps take a role in the approval process for the standard, though that warrants further discussion.

I would be happy to talk further on this subject with anyone who is interested.