Eclipse Tools PMC Status Report

John Duimovich
Tools PMC Lead

Ahem

Logistics info for the board meeting
Mike Milinkovich to: 'Philippe P Mulet', John Duimovich
Please respond to <mike.milinkovich@eclipse.org>
Default custom expiration date: 03/14/2009

Philippe, John,

Thanks for taking the time to prepare the reports and present them to the board. They certainly exceeded my expectations!

Location: Great America Meeting Room #3, Santa Clara Convention Centre

Time:

- 1345 - Tools PMC report
- 1415 - Eclipse PMC report

Feel free to join for each other's talks. If you have slides, that would be great as they would likely help focus the conversation, but don't feel obligated.

Mike Milinkovich
Office: +1.613.224.9461 x228
Mobile: +1.613.220.3223
mike.milinkovich@eclipse.org

The request …

1. Review of project scope and charter, and a description of where within the defined scope work is actually taking place. The PMC should also provide some guidance as to whether the scope and charter documents should be revised. Things may have changed since the charter was approved by the Board.
2. A high-level review of technical progress, strategy and release plans.
3. Self-assessment of the performance of the project under the following headings (inspired by the Three Communities section of the Development Process):

    Performance as an Eclipse open source project, with specific self assessments on the following:

    1. Openness
    2. Transparency
    3. Meritocracy
    4. Diversity
    5. Compliance with the Purposes (e.g. are they successfully "…supplying frameworks and exemplary extensible tools.."?)
    6. End user community and adoption. E.g. are there lots of downloads, bugs, contributors, newsgroup postings, …? Note that I believe that while the absolute numbers are interesting, the more important data-point is the project's assessment of how those numbers compare to their own expectations for the project.
4. Commercial community and adoption. E.g. is the technology from the project showing up in products.
5. Compliance with the Roadmap
6. Board Assistance: What are the areas where the Board could be helping the PMC be more effective? E.g. Explain the "top three" problems that the Board needs to solve for the Project in the next year? (e.g., IP backlog, improving diversity, whatever).
7. The Board will provide a written response to the issues raised.
8. Noteworthy: What are the things about the project not covered above which the Board should know?

Tools PMC Status Report

- Who in the room read the report ?

- Questions ?

Project Charter Review

- **Is the project doing what it's supposed to be doing within the Tools Charter and the Eclipse Roadmap ?**
  - yes (primarily)

- **Tools Charter Review**
  - "foster the creation of a wide variety of exemplary, extensible tools for the Eclipse Platform"
  - primarily developer focused tools
    - computer programming language tools (compilers, editors, debuggers), performance tools, and test tools.

- **Updates Required (minor nits)**
  - "performance tools, and test tools" now part of other top level project
  - Clarification of "common components" for Orbit

Tools Project Categories

- Language IDE's
    - CDT, PTP, AJDT, PDT, COBOL and Hibatchi
- Language Compilers
    - Aspect/J
- Graphical Tools and Frameworks
    - VE, GEF
- Common Components
    - Orbit
- Development Automation
    - Buckminster

Projects (1)

- AJDT/AspectJ
  - Fairly well run - open, transparent, weak diversity
  - Suffers from lack of resources – one major active committer
  - Expect these projects to increase in importance if Spring Framework continues to grow in enterprise
- CDT
  - One of the best run projects at Eclipse - open, diverse, transparent
  - Significant contributions from a wide range of companies
  - Significant adoption in embedded community and Linux, weaker in Windows market

Projects (2)

- COBOL
  - not well run – not open, not transparent, no diversity
    - Internal commercial development with periodic open releases
  - Growing interest in the community in fixing this – patches, new committers
- GEF
  - Small project - open, transparent but poor diversity
  - Widely adopted and some exciting new features
- Orbit
  - Packaging third part components for reuse
  - Not a classic development project but it is open, diverse and useful to the Eclipse community

Projects (3)

- PDT
  - weakly open, transparent and poor diversity
  - Project transparency is improving with new project lead
  - Broad interest and adoption but difficult to take users and upgrade them to contributors/committers due to skills mismatch
- PTP
  - Well run, open, transparent and diverse
  - Some adoption issues but expect this to change as multicore counts rise and parallel tools more applicable to broader set of developers.
- VE
  - Open, transparency good but lack of resources means project is not progressing
  - Ability to attract new developers with energy and skills

Projects (4)

- Buckminster
    - Open, transparency, meritocracy all good
    - Technology adoption increasing
- Mylyn
    - Also one of the better run projects - open, transparent, diverse
    - Large contributor populations
    - Focus on users (almost to the detriment of the project)
- Hibatchi
    - In progress formation of Ada IDE

Recommendations

- Incubator IP Process
    - Allowing projects to incubate components (to benefit from parallel IP) without creating new project incubators for the component would be more inline with the diverse projects in the Tools Project
    - "Work arounds" like having a general incubator

- Eclipse Projects Gateway is a good idea however evolving requirements means every tools project has an out of date or non-existent plan link.
    - Points to issue in PMC and projects not "paying attention" or not getting the information in time
    - Good news, incomplete project meta data is not a fatal offense.