

Eclipse AsciiDoc WG Program Plan & Budget Meeting Agenda & Minutes

2020-November-20

Passcode: 530979

Agenda Topics	Moderator	Minutes
Welcome	Dan	5
Program plan and budget discussion	All	50
Schedule next meeting	Dan	5

Attendees:

Lisa Ruff
Dan Allen
Abel Salgado
Amarantha Kulkarni (Couchbase)
Jay Bryant (VMware)
Alexander Schwartz
Tammy Fox (CloudBees)
Paul Buck
Sharon Corbett
Guillaume Grossetie
Robert Kratky (Red Hat)
Alexander Schwartz

Steering Committee Representatives

Dan Allen (OpenDevise) (Committee Chair)
Amarantha Kulkarni (Couchbase)
Jay Bryant (VMWare)

Robert Kratky (Red Hat)
Tammy Fox (CloudBees)
Alexander Schwartz
Guillaume Grossetie

Initial business

There was discussion about access to documents and sharing. We are still working out how to share, but every effort will be made to have documents open to the community.

Lisa Ruff asked if the Steering Committee should be Bcc'd on email sent to the mailing list so that they get things in a timely manner. Paul Buck told us that a Steering Committee mailing list isn't archived, and Sharon Corbett reminded us that we have chosen to not have a separate list for that. Sharon made the offer to set one up. A decision will be made on that at a later time.

Welcome

Dan Allen started the meeting with a simple welcome. As we are not voting on any working-group-wide issues, there was no need to establish quorum.

Dan also reminded us that this was not a full meeting of the Steering Committee, but a meeting to discuss the program plan and budget for the AsciiDoc WG and this will be the dominant discussion.

Slide deck:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/13x9Yx1JafkqZQx7sG4BHSLJ4-N0rWOU-L72zJmrqjvw/edit?usp=sharing>

Program Plan

We started with the Program Plan slide deck as the focus of the discussion. Dan referred back to the slide deck we had used in our initial proposal for the AsciiDoc specification project. Some of the ideas for this program plan were pulled from that initial deck; some ideas had evolved.

The goal is to determine how to fund the group for the end of 2020 and through 2021.

- What do we need to accomplish?
- What is the funding needed to accomplish that agenda?

- How do we get there?

This is a large effort and difficult to envision. There is a lot of work to be done to make AsciiDoc look professional. The website is old and still has old information, making it look untouched. Dan thinks we need to spend 2021 working to upgrade these items. As well as begin the work on the specification itself.

Paul reminded us that, as per the EFSP: A specification equals an API, a TCK, and at least one compatible implementation in Open Source. Dan is concerned that this is not doable in one year, but we should be well on our way to completing these by the end of 2021, perhaps at 80% toward that goal. Robert Kratky emphasized that what Paul outlined is the goal of the effort.

Agreement was that we would use explicit language for this in the program plan and the slide was updated to that effect (see slide #3).

Dan added that another goal is to encourage tools to support AsciiDoc and assistance in order to do so. Advocacy, but not actual development. Tammy Fox added that she would like basic tool rendering to be a focus as well. She sees the need for a WYSWYG versions to smooth the learning curve as a barrier to entry (see slide# 3). Robert added his ideas on this, showing us that there is definitely a need for this. Tammy then added that perhaps there should be a set of minimum requirements for tooling and a stamp of approval so that users can feel confident that whatever tool they are using acts/reacts in a recognizable pattern. We could also have a testing suite to certify these tools that work with AsciiDoc. (see slide #4).

Dan then asked about the budget item "content creation," (as a for-instance) he asked about creating a document for AsciiDoc and then what would happen to make it look like it fit the AsciiDoc brand. Sharon and Paul both said a document like this could be created by either the WG or by EF, then it could be turned over to the EF marketing team to brand/align with other content. This is where the line-item budget lies. Robert added that the content will evolve, so the document will need to evolve. Link to an example of something marketing at EF created:

<https://openadx.eclipse.org/resources/OpenADx-Manifesto-v07-2020.pdf>.

Next we looked at the Roadmap for the project (see slide #5). These budgetary items need to have allocated resources. Amarantha Kulkarni also requested a timeline added to the roadmap, so this was added to the deck. (see slide #5)

There was discussion about a preliminary logo and then a family of logos for different areas of the project. This will fall under brand development. (see slide #5) Robert asked if the logo we have now will be eliminated and how does it affect the website development/design. We don't want the logo to hold up the website design. Paul offered a template website as a starter place, then we can build/change as we move forward.

Other items are expanded in later slides. (see slide deck)

Budget

We moved on to the budget and shared the draft version which Dan said is very preliminary.

Jay Bryant added his request from his management: don't spend a lot of money. They are supporting many working groups and it's a "hard sell" to add cost from another, as much as they want to be involved. He has heard that "if it's over \$10k, it's not doable". Dan asked for other input on this issue from other Steering Committee members. Robert echoed Jay's position. Amarantha added that she has heard within her organization that \$10k is a top number for them as well.

In the draft budget, there is a large budget item for a writer. Robert had the understanding that we would solicit assistance on this from within the project. Tammy agreed: we know the content, and it doesn't make sense to tell someone what we know, let them write it and then we edit. She added that she would solicit help from within Cloudbees on our needs. Amarantha added that she has several people in various areas that are interested in getting involved. We need to find the resources from within to get (for instance) writing and website work done.

Dan said that he is happy to hear this as it is his preference for this to evolve that way. We must pay the necessary costs for EF work, but all else will be funded with effort.

Lisa suggested that we use Amarantha's timeline tool to position the tasks and then get commitment from different WG members to work on those items during that time period. Dan suggested that the next step would be for the Steering committee members to put

their items in priority. From there, we let each take on the tasks that they have people to work on.

Jay added that his team is excited to get deeply involved and have ownership of the spec. They aren't interested in just checking a box "specs done".

Paul wants to see these items on the budget:

- Legal since we will have fees for this with trademark work
- Website with some element of content creation and publishing steps
- Branding

Lisa suggested that these items are somewhat flexible: if you need more one place and less somewhere else, we move it around. Paul agreed and added that we can increase the budget if necessary, too. This item might be based on a specific need at the time.

Dan asked if the Program Director is necessary and/or flexible across the year. Paul said that it depends on the WG and what they want to take on for the project. Other WG members could step in to manage this project. Dan pointed out that we have a lot of resources for program management assistance. Paul said that at the 20,000-foot level, there needs to be someone pushing the efforts forward. His experience is that if there isn't an outside person doing this, things tend to stagnate. There are a lot of moving parts to be sure are progressing. Dan suggested that we get members involved who will donate a person, rather than funds, for this effort. It's clear we need someone, but we don't know where this person could come from.

We got very good feedback on this, so now we need to re-do the budget based on this. We will meet if necessary. Dan will follow up on this in the mailing list, including the timeline tool from Amarantha.

Action item: Amarantha will share the timeline tool she has.

Next Meeting

We did not schedule a new meeting.

Meeting adjourned!
