# 2015-07-16 - Fedora Tech Meeting

## Time/Place

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

- Time: 11:00am Eastern Daylight Time US (UTC-4)
- U.S.A/Canada toll free: 866-740-1260, participant code: 2257295
- International toll free:  http://www.readytalk.com/intl
  - Use the above link and input 2257295 and the country you are calling from to get your country's toll-free dial-in number
  - Once on the call, enter participant code 2257295
- IRC:
  - Join the #fcrepo chat room via Freenode Web IRC (enter a unique nick)
  - Or point your IRC client to #fcrepo on irc.freenode.net

## Attendees

- A. Soroka
- David Wilcox
- James R. Griffin III
- Andrew Woods
- Yinlin Chen ⭐
- Jared Whiklo
- Doron Shalvi
- Nick Ruest

## Agenda

1. OSGi:

```
fcrepo-kernel -> fcrepo-kernel-api
fcrepo-kernel-impl -> fcrepo-kernel-modeshape
```

   Standard practice with OSGi bundles is that any package with "impl" or "internal" is not exported.
2. 4.3.0 Release planning

   a. Outstand

   i. 

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

   ii. 

3. NonRdfSource pro

   - 2015-06-08 - Open Repositories Committers Meeting
   - https://jira.duraspace.org/browse/FCREPO-1540
   - https://jira.duraspace.org/browse/FCREPO-1590
   - https://jira.duraspace.org/browse/FCREPO-1411
4. F4 core, extras, and labs (mailing list thread)

   a. What are the "core" Fedora capabilities/projects?
   b. Which projects are always included in any given release?
   c. Should we decouple the version number schemes of optional projects from core releases?
      i. A. Soroka: Yes, there is no advantage to locking them.
   d. Should optional projects share the same "org.fcrepo" package namespace?
      i. A. Soroka: Only if the responsibility for them is the same as the responsibilities for core (that is, owned by the same people and accompanied by the same promises)
   e. What are the criteria for graduating from (1c)? - Practices from Islandora? Hydra?
   f. What is the policy for deprecating a project from (1a) or (1b)?
   g. What should the name of a third GitHub organization be, if such an organization is needed?
      i. fcrepo-extras
      ii. fcrepo-ext
      iii. fcrepo-flaky
      iv. fcrepo-chum-bucket
5. ...
6. Current Priorities

   a. Performa

   - 

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

   b. Single su

   - 

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

- 
- 
- 

c. fcr:metac

- 

d. Point-like

- 

e. Camel Rl

- 

f. Migration

- Wait for Mike

g. Bugs

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

7. Tickets resolved this week:

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

8. Tickets created this week:

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

# Minutes

1. OSGi:
   a. The decision is made on the changing Fedora package names. Fedora users/clients should not be impacted on it. However, software built around Fedora will be impacted.
2. 4.3.0 Release planning
   a. Release 4.3.0 next week. Nick is the release manager. Andrew and Nick will meet on next Friday and proceed 4.3.0 release. People who want to do future Fedora release can contact Andrew.
3. NonRdfSource properties
   a. After discussion, decide to internally store the properties presented as triples in fcr:metadata on the NonRDFSource being described (as opposed to on the fcr:metadata-backing resource).
   b. [IRC discussion]
      i. ajs6f: I claim that this won't prevent us from doing whatever we want with fcr:metadata later (making it a container, making it have a special lifecycle, filling it with peanut butter and Valvoline and baking it for several hours in a turtle shell, whatever we want).
      ii. escowles: i'm fine with storing the properties on the nonRDFsource -- that makes sense since they are about that resource and i'm actually fine with retrieving fcr:metadata and getting triples about the nonRDFsource -- I think it was barmintor who was most concerned with the repository URL and the subject URI being the same
      iii. awoods: I think there is good reason for concern about a mismatch between the repository URL (binary/fcr:metadata) and the subject URI (binary)... but there does not appear to be a better solution at the moment.
      iv. escowles: i agree -- too many operations required by the binary and its description for them to peacefully coexist at the same rest api URL
4. F4 core, extras, and labs
   - F4 GitHub Organizations
   a. F4 core capabilities: Repository CRUD, Transactions, Versioning, Authorization, and Fixity.
   b. Included in any given release: Fedora reference impl.

- i. Could be accompanied by a compatibility matrix for non-core modules along the lines of: http://docs.sonarqube.org/display/PLUG/Plugin+Version+Matrix
- c. Decouple module versioning?
  - i. yes. seems everyone agrees with it.
- d. Continue discuss 4.d in next week meeting.