

2015-07-30 - 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](#)
- [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#)
- [Yinlin Chen](#)
- [Unknown User \(escowles@ucsd.edu\)](#) ★
- [Nick Ruest](#)
- [Bethany Seeger](#)
- [Kevin S. Clarke](#)
- [Doron Shalvi](#)

Agenda

1. 4.3.0 Release is out
 - a. Process reflections and improvements
 - b. Release candidates?
 - c. 4.4.0 Release manager?
2. 4.4.0 focus
 - a. Move projects into fcrepo-exts (see: [F4 GitHub Organizations](#))
 - i. Rename packages to "org.fcrepo.exts", or something else entirely
 - b. Decouple those projects from the fcrepo4 pom.xml parent
 - c. Plan on all extras projects starting independent versioning with 4.4.0
 - i. Therefore, 4.4.0 will represent a common ground zero
 - d. OSGi - demonstrate runtime configurability of F4?
 - e. Servlet-API version? 3.01 -> 3.1.0
 - i. Modeshape depends on 3.1.0
 - ii. This would imply a hard requirement on Tomcat 8 or Jetty 9.1 for deployment
 - iii. OSGi already requires 3.1.0 and Karaf 4 as a container
3. Move to a four-digit version number scheme?
 - a. Community comment: [Re: Fedora 4 Semantic Versioning](#)
4. ...
5. Current Priorities

a. Performance

•

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

•

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

d. Point-like

•

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

e. Camel R

•

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

f. Migration

•

wait for mike

g. Bugs

•

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

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

6. 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.

7. 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. 4.3.0 Release is out

- a. Process reflections and improvements
 - i. There were a few last-minute pull requests – having a longer code freeze might be better.
 - ii. Or maybe we should have release candidate branches that get voted on? This is the way that other projects work, e.g., Apache.
 - 1. Esme, Nick and Adam are all in favor of having release candidates
 - 2. Release candidates could be open for testing/voting for months, or just a few days
 - 3. Aaron: So we'd want to agree on process, how long to leave release candidates are open for testing and voting, etc. and update the release docs

- b. 4.4.0 Release manager?
 - i. Yinlin volunteered

2. 4.4.0 focus

- a. Timeframe is uncertain
- b. Move projects into fcrepo-exts (see: [F4 GitHub Organizations](#))
 - i. Rename packages to "org.fcrepo.exts", or something else entirely
 - 1. Adam: who is taking responsibility for the modules should decide what namespace is used
 - 2. Aaron: do we want to add "exts" to e.g., org.fcrepo.transform?
 - a. No need to make a decision right now, but we will need to resolve these
- c. Decouple those projects from the fcrepo4 pom.xml parent
 - i. Aaron: some can be decoupled (Camel, client, etc.)
 - 1. But transform, audit, and anything that interacts with the kernel will need to continue depending on fcrepo4
 - ii. Esme: So we should go through the projects and decide what can be decoupled and what needs to depend on fcrepo4
- d. Plan on all extras projects starting independent versioning with 4.4.0
 - i. Aaron: For decoupled projects, there's no compelling reason to keep the versions in sync, but the audit/transform/etc. projects might be better to keep in sync
 - ii. Adam: I would hope we could decouple the version numbers, and as the API specification goes forward, we might be able to dissolve them and make them not Fedora-specific as much as possible
 - iii. Aaron: So we'd be separating the fcrepo4-api and fcrepo4-impl into separate projects
 - iv. Adam: Absolutely
 - v. Aaron: And we could break out a number of utilities that aren't related to the Modeshape implementation
 - vi. Adam: They could go in the kernel-api (as long as they are related to the models and not any implementation)
- e. OSGi - demonstrate runtime configurability of F4?
 - i. Aaron: There's been progress here, optimistic about this
- f. Servlet-API version? 3.01 -> 3.1.0
 - i. OSGi is more strict about dependencies, so it would require 3.1.0, and Modeshape depends on 3.1.0 (we're downgrading to 3.0.1 in our Maven config)
 - ii. The downside is losing compatibility with older servlet containers like Tomcat 7 (Tomcat 6 is EOL at the end of 2016, so expect Tomcat 7 to be supported for quite some time)
 - iii. We may be able to just depend on whatever JAX-RS provides and not have this explicitly required

3. Move to a four-digit version number scheme?

- a. Community comment: [Re: Fedora 4 Semantic Versioning](#)

- i. Since the "4" is fixed, our versioning system isn't really the same as the standard semantic versioning
 - ii. Having a four-digit version number could be more clear
 - iii. Adam: Not sure anyone's confused – backward compatibility may be an issue
 - iv. Aaron: We've been focused on moving forward, not maintain backwards compatibility
 - v. Esme: Not a lot of production installations yet, so not much emphasis on version/API stability yet – but that will change as more people migrate
 - vi. Aaron: Move to 4.4.0 and new versioning schemes is probably a good time to move to a four-digit version numbering scheme
 - vii. Adam: Better to make any changes sooner rather than later
- 4. Current Priorities
 - a. FCREPO-1609: Adam: General interest in how fcrepo4 handles large RDF, not any real-world scenario
 - i. Bethany: Is this related to the OutOfMemoryError issue?
 - ii. Esme: No, that's a real practical issue, this is more of a benchmarking task
 - b. FCREPO-1474: Adam: Related to fcr:versions and fcr:metadata, I've done most of the sub-part related to fcr:metadata, but need some HTML fixes
 - i. Expecting [Benjamin Armintor](#) to chime in here
 - c. FCREPO-1590: Esme: Not sure we've really reach consensus, but this responds to a real use case, and shouldn't be too challenging to implement since we already have working containers
 - d. FCREPO-1470: Adam: This is non-container RDF sources, as requested by [Aaron Birkland](#) and others. There haven't been any developer resources dedicated to this, yet
 - i. Related to having RDF that describes non-repository subjects
 - e. FCREPO-1519: Esme: We had a call to talk about requirements, I'll revise those requirements and UCSD will take a stab at implementing it soon