

2019-03-14 - Fedora Tech Meeting

Time/Place

This meeting is a hybrid teleconference and slack chat. Anyone is welcome to join...here's the info:

- Time: 11:00am Eastern Daylight Time US (UTC-4)
- Audio/Video Conference Link: <https://duraspace.zoom.us/my/fedora>
 - Dial-in:
 - +1 408 638 0968
 - +1 646 876 9923
 - +1 669 900 6833
 - Meeting ID:
 - 812 835 3771
- Join fedora-project.slack.com on the "tech" channel

Attendees

- 1. [Andrew Woods](#)
- 2. [Danny Bernstein](#)
- 3. [Ben Pennell](#)
- 4. [Jared Whiklo](#)
- 5. [Aaron Birkland](#)
- 6. [Bethany Seeger](#)
- 7. [Peter Eichman](#) ★
- 8. [David Wilcox](#)

Agenda

- 1. Announcements
 - a. Fedora Leaders update
 - b. [LDP - OCFL Not-A-White paper](#)
- 2. Sprint Planning Update
- 3. Happy camel toolbox news
- 4. Import Export "mini-sprint"
- 5. For consideration: two-layer architectural approach - refactoring the persistence layer
- 6. <your discussion point here>
- 7. In Review

type	key	summary	assignee	reporter	priority	status	resolution	created	updated	due
Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.										

- 8. Please squash a bug!

key	summary	type	created	updated	due	assignee	reporter	priority	status	resolution
Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.										

- 9. Tickets resolved this week:

key	summary	type	created	updated	due	assignee	reporter	priority	status	resolution
-----	---------	------	---------	---------	-----	----------	----------	----------	--------	------------

Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.

10. Tickets created this week:

key	summary	type	created	updated	due	assignee	reporter	priority	status	resolution
-----	---------	------	---------	---------	-----	----------	----------	----------	--------	------------

Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.

Minutes

1. Fedora Leaders Update:
 - a. Document's purpose is to provide a clear description of how LDP and RDF fit into Fedora 5 and 6 respectively.
 - b. Not a debate, but an attempt to describe so that we can all be on the same page when we talk about the future of Fedora.
2. fcrepo-camel-toolbox build is failing on travis only due to excessive logic output due to a Shiro bug and one test is failing due to camel dependency update.
3. LDP and RDF in Fedora document
 - a. comes from Fedora leaders call
 - b. questions the degree of influence that RDF has on Fedora architecture
 - c. purpose of document is not to debate issues
 - d. purpose IS to describe where RDF concepts fit in the Fedora architecture
 - e. looking to come to a consensus about what is true
 - f. use for guidance for Fedora 6 implementation
 - g. hoping to clear up some basic misconceptions about impact of things like LDP
4. putting a halt on sprint planning until we get clarity and unity on Fedora 6 direction from leaders
5. camel toolbox
 - a. many dependencies, were confusing
 - b. message count expected was 2, now there are 3x messages due to versioning
 - c. upgrading to Camel 2.20 would get rid of security alerts
 - d. still failing on some seemingly basic tests
 - i. 2.18.2 would resolve all but 1 moderate severity
 - e. Travis is failing because of too many warnings from Jetty about Shiro
 - f. upgrading Vagrant shouldn't be too hard
 - g. 4.8.0 camel toolbox released
6. import-export "mini-sprint"
 - a. Danny has started working on export of versions for Fedora 5
 - b. looking for folks to join this work
 - c. objective get import/export working for Fedora 5
 - d. looking for volunteers for the next week, mostly to work on PRs
 - i. Bethany will be available for some PR review
7. two-layer architectural approach
 - a. good to see community to stating their needs
 - b. there is an opportunity to try to satisfy the various camps
 - i. current API, web standards-based, HTTP/LDP interaction
 - ii. folks that don't care about the HTTP layer, but DO care about repository and storage layer, transparent persistence, simple CRUD interaction
 1. API for this layer TBD
 - c. architecturally we are already positioned for a two-layer approach
 - d. what should an API at the bottom layer (persistence layer) look like?
 - i. no LDP
 - ii. should a low-level API be HTTP?
 - iii. or native or CLI APIs?
 - e. question of how much of the LDP relationships would get pushed into the persistence layer
 - f. bottom layer as a stateful service
 - g. support multiple simultaneous clients and be performant
 - i. horizontally scalable persistence layer
 - ii. state-token-based locking
 - h. is LDP the problem?
 - i. if we can get a performant non-Modeshape version using LDP, we could improve the perception of LDP
 - i. in Fedora 4, there was a perception that you MUST use RDF
 - j. go back to a model that actively supports storing XML
 - i. messaging, but also need more XML-based tooling to get people to accept storing XML into Fedora 6
 - ii. really looking at a model of Fedora 3 to Fedora 6
 - iii. the LDP aspect can more-or-less be ignored
 - k. use a minimalist two-level hierarchy where the top level is an object, next level is datastream
 - l. OCFL community meeting

- i. discussion about an HTTP API for OCFL
- ii. if it is possible, can LDP can be overlaid over OCFL?
- iii. OCFL subset-of LDP subset-of Fedora API
- iv. try to make this pattern (basic CRUD interactions with a repository) known and accepted
- v. Fedora 3 mode that complies with Fedora 1.0 API but that can ignore the LDP stuff
- vi. what would the ideal API for folks not interested in LDP
 - 1. folks want JSON
 - 2. better messaging around JSON-LD
 - 3. JSON merge patch for updates

- [Peter Eichman](#) is planning to work on dc
- will complete review of Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link
- configuration. when review Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.