The fourth meeting of the Eclipse Board was held from 9:30 AM to 4:30 PM CDT on Thursday, September 05, 2002. The location was The Hyatt Regency O'Hare at the Consular Room room, Chicago, Illinois.

The following are the minutes of this meeting.

Stewards in Attendance

Borland Thornhill, Simon

ETRI * Kim, Heung-Nam (delegate for Kim, Chae-Kyu)

Fujitsu Alepin, Ronald HP* Rank, Mike Hitachi Takanuki, Ryuji IBM Nackman, Lee

Instantiations Johnson, Mark (delegate for Taylor, Mike)

MKS * Martin, Dave
MontaVista Software Ready, Jim
QNX Dodge, Dan
Rational Bernstein, Dave
Red Hat Tiemann, Michael
Scapa Technologies Norman, Michael
Serena Software Kapitanski, Boris

SlickEdit * Hintz, Ed
Sybase Reti, Karl
Telelogic Chang, Tony
TogetherSoft Olson, Todd
Trans-Enterprise Integration Ricker, Jeffrey

Stewards who voted electronically

MERANT Pease, Dave Instantiations Taylor, Mike

Associate Members in Attendance

Academic Barry, Brian

Eclipse Staff in Attendance

Eclipse Platform PMC Wiegand, John
Eclipse Platform PMC Thomson, Dave
Eclipse Tools PMC Duimovich, John
Eclipse Technology PMC Barry, Brian
Eclipse communications Erickson, Marc
Eclipse Chairperson McGaughey, Skip

sept2002.doc Page 1 of 8

^{*} New Stewards elected at the June 5, 2002 Board Meeting

Agenda

- 1) Introductions
- 2) Individual Steward Update (quick discussion by each Steward about their experience of Eclipse and Critical Issues and focus items)
- 3) New Member Applications and Decisions
- 4) Current Eclipse Update and Status
 - --- Review, modifications, approval of June 5 Eclipse Board Minutes
- 5) Technology
 - 5.1) Platform PMC status and review of Eclipse 2.0
 - 5.2) Tools PMC update, status, and approval of new tools projects

Demo C/C++ Dan Dodge Demo COBOL Ronald Alepin

- 5.3) Testing discussion
- 5,4) Technology PMC Update
- 5.5) Compliance and Certification discussion
- 6) Scaling Sub Committee
- 7) Marketing
 - 7.1) Marketing Update on visual imagery, Communication Plan, and Web Proposal

Business & Organizational Section

Selection of new Eclipse Member Organizations

The following organizations were approved for membership in the Eclipse Board: SlickEdit Inc., MKS Inc., ETRI (Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute), HP Company. The list of Eclipse Member Organizations is provided at www.eclipse.org.

Selection of new voting members of the Eclipse Board (Stewards)

The following individuals were approved as Stewards and voting members of Eclipse Board:

Member OrganizationStewardSlickEdit Inc.Hintz, EdMKS Inc.Martin, DaveETRIKim, Chae-KyuHP CompanyRank, Mike

The Board unanimously agreed to extend an invitation to Oracle to join the Board. This is the same type of invitation that the Board extended to SUN and BEA after the March Board Meeting. Under this invitation, Oracle would be pre-approved to join the Board with the agreement that Oracle would meet the same selection criteria as any other Member Company and would sign the same Membership Agreement that all Eclipse Member Companies sign.

sept2002.doc Page 2 of 8

Scaling Subcommittee Report

The following is a summary of the Scaling subcommittee presented to the Board for discussion: Lee Nackman reported the deliberations and recommendations of the scaling subcommittee. The subcommittee members included: Lee Nackman (chair), Dan Dodge, Karl Reti, Dave Thomson, David Pease, Dave Bernstein, Jeffrey Ricker, Todd Olson. Michael Tiemann and Skip McGaughey were added to the Scaling committee.

The problem statement for the subcommittee included: The Eclipse Board has grown from 9 members to 21. The membership crosses many time zones in Europe, North America, and Asia. The requests for board memberships are continuing. There are request and inquiries from analysts and vertical industry groups to join the board. The Board is facing a critical stage where the issues of size, criteria for membership, membership application process and manageability of the Board affects the ability to communicate, coordinate, and control the Board activities needs to be successful. At the June Board meeting, the Stewards began to address these issues by forming a Scaling Subcommittee. Lee Nackman reported that there were 2 different kinds of scaling that the subcommittee is addressing. The first is how to scale the size of the Board; the second is to determine "how to get the work done."

Each Steward defined the 3 highest-priority objectives for the eclipse.org Board. The summary and synthesis of this poll as presented to the Board included:

- Enable multiple tool providers to deliver Eclipse-based products
- Provide reliable core platform technology
 - Support large-scale, mission-critical, localizable development environments
 - Transparent integration from multiple vendors
- Balance platform functionality vs. commercial opportunities
- Establish critical mass
 - Eclipse legitimacy and ubiquity
 - Dominant (non-MS) tools platform for enterprise software development
 - Vibrant developer community contributing to the platform
- Enable company contributions to enhance reputation and visibility in enterprise software development market

The subcommittee identified two key enablers to the Stewards objectives. These included: 1) a healthy open source project with diverse participation, and 2) successful Eclipse-based commercial products, which, in turn, promote "Eclipse inside". These two enablers are both complementary and conflicting. The business desires to promote commercialization must be achieved without "tainting" the open source project. The two enablers require different skills and serve different communities/cultures. The subcommittee reaffirmed the need and importance of separating the consortium from the open source project.

These two enablers define Eclipse to be composed of 2 communities. The Eclipse Open Source Project and the Eclipse Consortium. The Open Source Community is composed of the PMC projects, which builds the technology and is run by a contribution-based meritocracy of developers and project leaders. The Eclipse Consortium is a community of companies shipping or planning to ship Eclipse-based products, which promotes Eclipse, and coordinates the commercial activities with the Open Source Project.

The operational model of the Consortium would be

sept2002.doc Page 3 of 8

- Board Membership requires declaring support and intent
- Subcommittees do the real work
- Focus is on commercialization, joint marketing/advertising coordination, interoperability, promotion of eclipse technology in the commercial community
- Maintains supportive but arms length relationship to open source project
- Consortium speaks "about" the open source project not "for" it.

The operational model of the Open Source Project would be:

- All contributors welcome commercial, academic, open source, free software, large companies, individuals
- Consortium members influence by contributing and the influence is proportional to contribution
- Focused on making the technology better for all users and promoting Eclipse in the technical community
- Open Source Project speaks for itself
- Contributors may be a different group than consortium members

The Key question that the subcommittee identified was: "What is the organizational structure that will help us achieve the key enablers without limiting growth?"

The recommendations include:

- •Reaffirm separation of open source project and consortium and the purpose of each
- •Scale by establishing working subcommittees
 - -Chaired by a board member
 - -Participants can be delegates appointed by board members
 - -Membership subject to active participation
- •Current executive committee doesn't scale: transform into one or more working subcommittees

The discussion at the Board included:

The Board needs to be flexible as the transition occurs from a project that is primarily based upon technology to one with a larger scope. As Eclipse evolves, there need to be processes defined including as examples, technology submission, new member education and involvement, definition of organization structure, and creation of a legal entity. The roles of the subcommittees will change as Eclipse evolves and as the industry evolves. As Eclipse organically grows and develops, Eclipse needs to foster synergy across the communities and collaborative teams need to evolve to solve tangible problems that affect the success of Eclipse.

In the discussion there was consensus that the business of the Board needs to be defined. There was strong consensus that Eclipse needs a clear vision, goals, objectives, strategy, strategic direction, and Roadmap for Eclipse, which includes both the consortium, and the Open Source Project. The Board needs to think through how to construct the vision, "What does Eclipse want to accomplish." The discussion reaffirmed the fundamental desire to keep the barriers to entry low to bring people into the Eclipse community.

This roadmap on the Open Source Project would include the R3 for the Project PMC, the Tools roadmap, and the desired technological, academic initiatives, as well as a clear discussion of

sept2002.doc Page 4 of 8

interoperability. The roadmap needs more than features and dates. It needs to describe the level and nature of interoperability. Topics need to have their categories and goals. The roadmap needs to serve the needs of the individual member organizations and goes beyond particular subprojects of the next month or next Board meeting.

On the consortium side, Eclipse needs to assure that the current members and new members understand Eclipse direction, strategy, and how it plans to execute to achieve the vision. This includes all facets of Eclipse from membership, marketing, and organization, including legal, subcommittee structure, participation model, contribution models, and organizational structure.

There was agreement the Board needed to define their control mechanism. In general, the Board expressed a need to have control over what is done under the Eclipse auspices. For example the Board has approval rights over new projects, it can replace Eclipse staff. Board members can control Open Source Projects by investing in people to do the work. The control mechanisms need to be clearly articulated and agreed to by the Board.

On specific ideas for subcommittees:

There needs to be a clear definition of what the Board as a whole needs to do versus the authority and responsibilities of the subcommittees. Each subcommittee could be very different in constitution. There could be standing and temporary subcommittees. Each subcommittee needs to have a specific charter that is agreed to by the Board that defines the role, function, vision, and authority and time duration of the subcommittee . The Board and the subcommittees need to address the need to have the subcommittees be composed of active participants. The general recommendation is for the subcommittee chairperson to be pro active, to limit the participation to only active members or their delegates.

The scaling subcommittee suggested there would be a model with a larger number of subcommittees that are smaller in size and topical in focus. There was discussion that the Board could establish a technical subcommittee that would interact with the open source project. There needs to be a coordination mechanism to get the PMCs working together.

There was consensus that the current Executive Committee, with each company having one representative, was not working and did not scale to provide efficient or effective communication or management across the Eclipse communities.

The Board appointed the following Subcommittees and Chairpersons Marketing --- Dan Dodge of QNX Legal --- Mike Rank of HP Scaling / Organization --- Lee Nackman of IBM

The formal election of each of the Subcommittee Chairpersons and the approval of the Subcommittee Charter will be discussed and decided at the December Board. In particular, it is envisioned that a formal process for nominating and electing Subcommittee Chairpersons will be developed and adopted at the December Board.

sept2002.doc Page 5 of 8

Approval of Minutes from June 2002 Board Minutes

The Stewards unanimously approved the minutes of the June 2002 Eclipse Board Meeting.

Open Source Project Section:

<u>Update on Platform / Project PMC--- John Wiegand & Dave Thomson.</u>

The R2.0.1 Maintenance release has been shipped. The team is working to make this the sustainable platform for the next 12 months. The current view is this will represent a 12 to 18 month release cycle. John Wiegand provided a high level overview of the architecture, which is available on www.eclipse.org.

Update on Tools PMC.

Update on Tools PMC: C/C++ Project--- John Duimovich

The teams are working together and the expectations are being met. Sebastian Marineau of QNX is providing the leadership. QNX, Rational, MontaVista, Red Hat, and IBM support the project. The project is up and running on http://www.eclipse.org/cdt/

Update on Tools PMC: GEF Project--- John Duimovich

The project is becoming close to product quality; it is intended to be shipped in products. There are plan synchronization issues between the platform and GEF that are being worked. There are many users in the newsgroups. Details of the project are on http://www.eclipse.org/gef/

Update on Tools PMC: Server Tooling --- John Duimovich

Many companies are interested in server based tooling. The activity level is low and the present developers are not as active in the project due to the other obligations.

Authorization of Tools PMC: Create New Project for COBOL

The Eclipse Tools PMC Leader, **John Duimovich**, recommended approval of the creation and starting of the COBOL Project. The Board approved. Fujitsu has assumed the leadership role and has defined the project including roadmap on the www.eclipse.org site.

Authorization of Tools PMC: Create New Project for Collaboration Server

The Eclipse Tools PMC Leader, **John Duimovich**, recommended approval of the creation and starting of the Collaboration Server Project. The Board reaffirmed the importance of collaboration. The Board referred this to the Technology PMC and asked Brian Barry to work with Instantiations to clarify this project.

sept2002.doc Page 6 of 8

Authorization Tools PMC: Create New Project Eclipse Modeling Framework (EMF)

The Eclipse Tools PMC Leader, **John Duimovich**, recommended approval of the creation and starting of the EMF Project. The Board approved.

EMF is an Eclipse Modeling Framework

- Java/XML mechanism for model-driven tool development
- Generate tools and apps from XML models
- EMF provides:
 - A uniform programming model. A suite of tools/products that share a model can integrate through the Java interfaces to that model. This allows much tighter integration and better developer feedback than file interchange.
 - Uniform XML interchange of objects among the tools.
 - Reduced learning curve to add new tools to the suite.

Details of project are on www.eclipse.org

Authorization of Tools PMC: Pursue new Project for Testing and Trace

Mike Norman led discussion of this Testing Framework . It is a collaborative effort between Scapa, IBM, Rational, and Telelogic. The project addresses the issue that today, Eclipse is currently primarily used as an IDE . Eclipse can become an Integrated Test and Trace Environment (ITTE) supporting:

- Application trace capture
- Trace to test conversion
- Automated functional tests
- Automated load/stress tests
- Non-automated test activity definitions
- Test management tools
- Trace and test analysis tools

The Eclipse Tools PMC Leader, John Duimovich, recommended the PMC pursue the creation and starting of the Test and Trace project. The Board approved. Details of project will be on www.eclipse.org shortly.

<u>Update on Technology PMC: Eclipse Research Fellowship and University Programs.</u>

The Eclipse Technology PMC leader, **Brian Barry**, lead the discussion of this project. This project is starting with an initial funding by IBM. There are 12 projects from all over the world. The hope and expectation is other companies will also provide funding as we move forward. Because it is a technology project no Board approval is necessary.

Update on Technology PMC: Creation XML Schema Project

The Eclipse Technology PMC leader, **Brian Barry**, lead the discussion of this project. The project is primarily lead by IBM. This project is:

- --- Java model for XML Schema edit, modify
- --- Uses EMF runtime components
- --- Uses common API's for all XML tooling

Because it is a technology project no Board approval is necessary.

sept2002.doc Page 7 of 8

Compliance and Certification discussion

Tony Chang of Telelogic presented and lead discussion of issues relating to the need for certification programs for skills and product compatibility. This discussion included proposed goals for a certification program, the limits of Eclipse participation (as a program enabler rather than implementer), and issues relating to the interoperation of plug-ins running on an installed developer platform. There was no action on this proposal at the board meeting.

The Marketing Team presented a summary of recommendations for establishing an identity to associate commercial Eclipse based offerings. This included both a graphic symbol and word marks.

The objective is to provide a consistent way for Eclipse based offerings to identify their association with Eclipse in the marketplace. They differ from the multiple versions of artwork used by the open source community in that they are: consistent, easy to reproduce in a variety of monochrome and color media, used to identify commercial rather than open-source activities of our consortium.

The symbol was received well by the board, Members confirmed the need for separate word marks for products that are created from Eclipse distributions, and for products that plug-in to Eclipse platforms.

Michael Tiemann raised concerns about the establishment of formal use rules for the symbol and word marks. He indicated the need to carefully protect symbols and their meaning, as well as the need to avoid interfering with member brand establishment and equity. Michael agreed to assist the marketing committee by reviewing rules for proposal at the next board meeting.

Adjournment:

The next Board meeting will be Dec 4, 2002 in Dallas, Texas. The meeting ended at 5:45PM CDT.

sept2002.doc Page 8 of 8