

# 2014-09-03 - Fedora Technical WG Meeting

## Time/Place

- Time: [12:00pm Eastern Daylight Time US \(UTC-4\)](#)
- Place: Google-hangout, [https://plus.google.com/hangouts/\\_/event/c1glu6soq43r1rr6ou17qtobug8](https://plus.google.com/hangouts/_/event/c1glu6soq43r1rr6ou17qtobug8)

## Attendees

- Andrew Woods
- Esme Cowles \*
- Chris Beer \*
- Daniel Davis \* ★
- ~~Declan Fleming~~
- A. Soroka
- Benjamin Armintor
- ~~Zhiwu Xie~~
- ~~Neil Jefferies~~

Note-taker = ★

Previous note-taker = \*

## Agenda

- Thought exercise: "What would be the technical "risks" of releasing 4.0 Production \*now\*"?
  - Or another way, "Where do we want to put next sprint's dev energy"?
- 1. Review of previous actions
  - a. [REST API spec plan](#): Agreement on approach? Next steps?
  - b. Performance scenarios: Focus on use case numbers from [Oxford](#) and [Stanford](#)?
  - c. Strawman for Grinder scenarios: [Assessment Plan - Performance](#)
- 2. Third highest team priority from [survey](#): "Preservation-worthiness"

## Previous Actions

From [2014-08-20](#)

- ~~Neil to define initial set of system CI tests~~

From [2014-08-27](#)

1. ✓ Ben and Adam: Begin drafting [REST API spec and what a TCK should cover](#). Incremental deliverable for next week: what LDP is, how F4 extends it, and bytestreams
2. ✓ Dan: Review existing performance work and put together [some scenarios](#)
3. ✓ Esme: Report on status of filesystem serialization once UCSD beta pilot has progressed - [Beta Pilot page](#) has been updated with deliverables

## Discussion

Adam begins with API:

Base specification LDP plus base ontology but bytestreams

Possibly add transactions (suitable for web scale, not XA, JCR spec)

Thoughts about container:

- Objects plus datastreams (fedora)
- External to repo
- Esme: other objects in repo
- Andrew: question do we want to support
- Adam: has different guarantees if outside
- Adam: Need to think out ramifications for different kinds of outside items
- Dan: Could have some overlap with issues about tiered storage
- Adam: Not absolutely required for LDP
- Andrew: Member, Reference, Indirect Container (need definitions)

- Dan: Considerations of asynchronous responses (overlaps burden for remote operations)
- Andrew: Need to define proposal for tiers
- Adam: Keep core simplest possible
- Andrew: We need to review what we have, LDP, is the interaction model logical, clean, does it represent what we expect out of the repository
- Adam: Did we make a good guess for the implementation? Test on real world usage.
- Adam, Andrew: Specification with dependencies for transactions, versioning, locking, etc.
- Andrew to Adam: Can you flesh out all the tiers?
- Adam: Will try for week from today
- Esme: Should conversation be on Fedora tech list




- All: yes

#### Performance Scenarios (Dan)

- Fixity checking
- Real-world scenarios
- Cache and no-Cache
- Look at direct REST client for Python
- Setting up environment (Scott Prater may have done [some work](#))
- Many folks could contribute tests

RDF and Sparql Update well underway for next period (Esme)

## Actions

-  Adam and Ben to detail proposed [partitioning of API](#)
-  All to review "[Preservation Worthiness](#)" description for next week's discussion
-  Dan to create matrix of performance test payloads (probably [here](#))