

Project EVE - Stage 2 - 2020-12-02

Completed by: [Erik Nordmark](#) , ZEDEDA

Submitted to TAC Mail List: 2020/12/01

Presented on TAC Weekly Call: 2020/12/02 ([Meeting Recording](#))



Below is a self-assessment submitted by TSC Chair/Maintainers of the Project. Comments/questions/feedback is welcome either a) in the Comments at the bottom of the page or b) during the TAC call when information is presented

Stage 1: At Large Projects

Stage 2 and Stage 3 Projects also requested to complete this section, as PLD acceptance criteria requires meeting current as well as prior stage requirements

Stage 1 Criteria (from the PLD)	Meets / Needs Improvement / Missing / Not Applicable	Supporting Data (if needed, include links to specific examples)
2 TAC Sponsors, if identified (Sponsors help mentor projects) - See full definition on Project Stages: Definitions and Expectations	Need second sponsor	Erik Nordmark (ZEDEDA),
The typical IP Policy for Projects under the LF Edge Foundation is Apache 2.0 for Code Contributions, Developer Certificate of Origin (DCO) for new inbound contributions, and Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License for Documentation. Projects under outside licenses may still submit for consideration, subject to review/approval of the TAC and Board.	Meets	Apache 2.0, DCO, CCA4.0 - Technical Charter
Upon acceptance, At Large projects must list their status prominently on website/readme	Meets	https://www.lfedge.org/projects/eve/

Stage 1 Projects, please skip to **Additional Information Requested from All Projects**

Stage 2: Growth Stage

Stage 3 Projects also requested to complete this section

Stage 2 Criteria (from the PLD)	Meets / Needs Improvement / Missing / Not Applicable	Supporting Data (if needed, include links to specific examples)
Development of a growth plan (to include both roadmap of projected feature sets as well as overall community growth /project maturity), to be done in conjunction with their project mentor(s) at the TAC.	Meets	See Feature Roadmap for the projected feature sets. The community growth and project maturity are discussed in the goals below.

Document that it is being used in POCs.	Meets	<p>There have been many PoCs and already some commercial deployment using EVE, however not much of them are yet stated publicly. The PoCs can be gleaned from various public commitments and event participation such as:</p> <p>https://azuremarketplace.microsoft.com/en-us/marketplace/apps/zededa.annual_enterprise_license</p> <p>https://www.supermicro.com/solutions/Solution-Brief_Zededa.pdf</p> <p>https://www.lannerinc.com/corporate/strategic-alliances/zededa</p> <p>Some of the interested parties have presented and discussed this at https://zededa.com/transform/ and a talk at RancherCON with the abstract at https://www.accelevents.com/e/edgeconference2020#agenda including:</p> <p>"Join Rancher's Mikhail Kozorovitskiy, Schlumberger's Vassilis Varveropoulos, and ZEDED's Seyi Verma to learn about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need for Kubernetes at the Edge 2. The unique requirements Kubernetes at the edge brings 3. How SLB, ZEDED, and Rancher are working together to create real-life opportunities at the edge"
Demonstrate a substantial ongoing flow of commits and merged contributions.	Meets	<p>Over the last 90 days we have 546 Commits from 30 Authors to 5 Repositories</p> <p>LFX Insights-EVE Commits</p>
Demonstrate that the current level of community participation is sufficient to meet the goals outlined in the growth plan.	Meets	<p>The above level of commits are likely to continue as we deliver the items on the roadmap</p> <p>LFX Insights- EVE Community</p>
Demonstrate evidence of, or a plan for, interoperability, compatibility or extension to other LF Edge Projects. Examples may include demonstrating modularity (ability to swap in components between projects).	Meets	<p>Joint Demo with Fledge and Akraino Blueprint family and Blueprint (s)</p> <p>Future projects: working with OH and EdgeX</p> <p>LF projects- ACRN and XEN</p> <p>outreached to LF Energy</p>

Stage 2 Projects, please skip to **Additional Information Requested from All Projects**

Stage 3: Impact Stage

Criteria	Meets / Needs Improvement / Missing / Not Applicable	Supporting Data (if needed, include links to specific examples)
Have a defined governing body of at least 5 or more members (owners and core maintainers), of which no more than 1/3 is affiliated with the same employer. In the case there are 5 governing members, 2 may be from the same employer.		
Have a documented and publicly accessible description of the project's governance, decision-making, and release processes.		
Have a healthy number of committers from at least two organizations. A committer is defined as someone with the commit bit; i.e., someone who can accept contributions to some or all of the project.		
Demonstrate evidence of interoperability, compatibility or extension to other LF Edge Projects. Examples may include demonstrating modularity (ability to swap in components between projects).		
Adopt the Foundation Code of Conduct.		
Explicitly define a project governance and committer process. This is preferably laid out in a GOVERNANCE.md file and references a CONTRIBUTING.md and OWNERS.md file showing the current and emeritus committers.		
Have a public list of project adopters for at least the primary repo (e.g., ADOPTERS.md or logos on the project website).		

Additional Information Requested from All Projects-

Additional Information Requested from All Projects	Supporting Data (if needed, include links to specific examples)
Intention for the upcoming year (Remain at current stage OR advance towards the next Stage)	Move to Stage 3
Include a link to your project's CommunityBridge Insights page. We will be looking for signs of consistent or increasing contribution activity. Please feel free to add commentary to add color to the numbers and graphs we will see on Insights.	<p>Over the last 90 days we have 546 Commits from 30 Authors to 5 Repositories</p> <p>A year earlier under the same 90 days we had 340 Commits from 20 Authors to 3 Repositories</p> <p>LFX Insights-EVE Commits</p>
<p>How many maintainers do you have, and which organizations are they from? (Feel free to link to an existing MAINTAINERS file if appropriate.)</p> <p>Note: For EVE, we do not have many branches, so for us we are using the term Maintainer as someone who is has a major part in determining our direction. Namely people who are planning features or producing architectural diagrams that will shape how we move forward.</p>	<p>Contributors: 40 over the last year</p> <p>Committers: 14 (the TSC)</p> <p>Maintainers: 7</p> <p>Erik Nordmark ZEDEDA</p> <p>Roman Shaposhnik ZEDEDA</p> <p>Avi Deitcher Atomic</p> <p>Jason Shepherd ZEDEDA</p> <p>Stefano Stabellini Xilinx</p> <p>(Petr Fedchenkov)</p> <p>V S (Vladimir Suvorov) Auriga</p>
What do you know about adoption, and how has this changed since your last review / since you joined the current Stage? If you can list companies that are end users of your project, please do so. (Feel free to link to an existing ADOPTERS file if appropriate.)	<p>There have been many PoCs and already some commercial deployment using EVE. Currently the public commitments are limited to e.g.,</p> <p>https://azuremarketplace.microsoft.com/en-us/marketplace/apps/zededa.annual_enterprise_license</p> <p>https://www.supermicro.com/solutions/Solution-Brief_Zededa.pdf</p> <p>https://www.lannerinc.com/corporate/strategic-alliances/zededa</p> <p>Some of the interested parties have presented and discussed this at https://zededa.com/transform/ and a talk at RancherCON with the abstract at https://www.accelevents.com/edgeconference2020#agenda including:</p> <p>Join Rancher's Mikhail Kozorovitskiy, Schlumberger's Vassilis Varveropoulos, and ZEDEDA's Seyi Verma to learn about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need for Kubernetes at the Edge 2. The unique requirements Kubernetes at the edge brings 3. How SLB, ZEDEDA, and Rancher are working together to create real-life opportunities at the edge
How has the project performed against its goals since the last review? (We won't penalize you if your goals changed for good reasons.)	This is the first review.

<p>What are the current goals of the project? For example, are you working on major new features? Or are you concentrating on adoption or documentation?</p>	<p>Goals for 2021</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate to Stage 3 2. Grow the number of project maintainers 3. Grow the ecosystem of qualified hardware and edge applications running on EVE 4. Provide full integration with existing LF Edge applications: EdgeX, Fledge, SDO, Open Horizon 5. Codify our relationship with existing LF Edge applications via 1-3 Akraino Blueprints (Industrial IoT Edge Blueprint in progress)
<p>How can LF Edge help you achieve your upcoming goals?</p>	<p>Upstream: Moby ecosystem, OCI, CNCF (esp. K3S), OSDU Downstream: Edge Application and Hardware Vendors</p> <p>Does LF have a relationship with the OpenGroup? EVE is starting to work with the OSDU group.</p> <p>Bringing in more edge application and hardware vendors as members in LF Edge would be helpful not only for EVE but for LF Edge as a whole.</p>
<p>Do you think that your project meets the criteria for the next Stage?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have a defined governing body of at least 5 or more members (owners and core maintainers), of which no more than 1/3 is affiliated with the same employer. In the case there are 5 governing members, 2 may be from the same employer. 2. Have a documented and publicly accessible description of the project's governance, decision-making, and release processes. 3. Have a healthy number of committers from at least two organizations. A committer is defined as someone with the commit bit; i.e., someone who can accept contributions to some or all of the project. 4. Demonstrate evidence of interoperability, compatibility or extension to other LF Edge Projects. Examples may include demonstrating modularity (ability to swap in components between projects). 5. Adopt the Foundation Code of Conduct. 6. Explicitly define a project governance and committer process. This is preferably laid out in a GOVERNANCE.md file and references a CONTRIBUTING.md and OWNERS.md file showing the current and emeritus committers. 7. Have a public list of project adopters for at least the primary repo (e.g., ADOPTERS.md or logos on the project website). 	<p>Project Stages: Definitions and Expectations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have a TSC- want more diversity of companies 2. Done 3. Need to expand diversity of companies 4. Done- Currently working with multiple projects 5. Done 6. The contributing.md file has this. Need to make sure that there is a link to the governance part 7. Need to work on public adopters
<p>Please summarize Outreach Activities in which the Project has participated in (e.g. Participation in conferences, seminars, speaking engagements, meetups, etc.)</p>	<p>Sample Project had a kiosk at IOT SWC as well as ONES NA. Also participated in the LF Edge "On the Edge" webinar series.</p> <p>Speakers at many conferences about OSS, IoT, and IIoT such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSS EU 2019 (plus presenting other LF edge projects during a half-day session) • ONES 2020 (multiple sessions) • RancherCON 2020 <p>Extensive work on the LF Edge user groups creation</p> <p>Extensive work on the LF Edge Whitepaper</p>
<p>Are you leveraging the Technical Project Getting Started Checklist? If yes, please provide link (if publicly available).</p>	<p>No, we came in before it existed</p>