

# 2017-08-29 - Fedora Leadership Group Meeting

## Time/Place

- Time: 11:30am Eastern Daylight Time US (UTC-4)
- Dial-in Number: (712) 775-7035
  - Participant Code: 479307#
  - International numbers: [Conference Call Information](#)

## Attendees

- ~~Chris Awre~~
- Doug Blair
- Ginny Boyer
- ~~Robert Cartolano~~
- Aaron Choate
- ~~Sayed Choudhury~~
- Stefano Cossu
- Tom Cramer
- Joanna DiPasquale
- Jon Dunn
- Karen Estlund
- Declan Fleming
- Maude Francis
- Mike Giarlo
- Neil Jefferies
- Debra Kurtz
- Susan Lafferty
- Steve Marks ★
- Rosalyn Metz
- ~~Tom Murphy~~
- Este Pope
- Nick Ruest
- Robin Ruggaber
- Tim Shearer
- Jon Stroop
- Jennifer Vinopal
- Evviva Weinraub
- Jared Whiklo
- David Wilcox
- Andrew Woods
- Maurice York
- Jim Tuttle

## Agenda

Topic	Lead
<a href="#">Strategic plan draft</a> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Finalize list of stakeholders</li><li>2. Gather feedback so far</li><li>3. Decide whether to have a separate vision and strategic plan or both in the same document</li></ol>	Stefano
<a href="#">Code of Conduct</a> , suggestions for moving forward: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. the Fedora Project adopt the DuraSpace COC, almost verbatim, and<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. the one change being sending <a href="#">notifications to a Fedora-specific CoC</a></li></ol></li><li>2. that Fedora establish a CoC committee to field such issues, including<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. membership &amp; rotation</li><li>b. incident response procedures</li><li>c. alternative paths for handling issues if a member of the CoC committee is implicated in an incident</li></ol></li></ol>	
<a href="#">4.7 as long-term-support (LTS) release</a>	Andrew
Samvera / Fedora technical alignment discussions	<a href="#">Michael J. Giarlo</a> (or Andrew, if Giarlo is out)
Successful <a href="#">Texas/Oklahoma Fedora User Group meeting last week</a>	No discussion needed

Fedora at the <a href="#">IFLA WLIC</a> last week	David and Evviva
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two conference papers <a href="#">published</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Fedora and Digital Preservation presentation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Stewarding Research Data with Fedora presentation</a></li> </ul>	
Roundtable	All

## Previous Actions

## Minutes

- Stefano due to take over as chair September 1.
- 1) Strategic Plan
  - Draft is <https://docs.google.com/document/d/12Nu5mFFqtrUg5J4MpuNzTVtqaVwEApqfQVQ0y3SxRw/edit#>
  - Came from a discussion at OR about long-term vision for Fedora
  - Goals today: finalize list of stakeholders, discuss structure/content of document as it stands
  - One struggle has always been defining the need that Fedora meets. Need a concise statement of the niche FC fills.
    - SC: does Inward Facing | Target Audience address this?
    - Maybe, but it doesn't help answer questions about concrete decisions in development direction.
  - Would be really useful for this to be the canonical version of the Fedora Elevator Speech
  - Could we discuss this fruitfully at CNI, with an eye toward presenting it at the next CNI?
  - How much is this a Strategic Directions document vs. a Strategic Plan?
  - Stefano will send out a Doodle poll to schedule a meeting of the stakeholders group.
- 2) Code of Conduct
  - Recap: General support for Duraspace CoC but changing notification to Fedora specific group. Some policy documentation - e.g. membership, process, issue handling paths - needed..
  - Need to formalize this group before the latter work can begin.
  - Folks who are interested in participating should contact Rosalyn.
- 3) 4.7 as LTS release
  - Is there agreement that selecting certain versions of Fedora as LTS releases is a good thing?
    - Does this include upstream developments - e.g. new versions of Modeshape?
      - AW: There's a bit of discussion to be had here. Another example of this issue is Java version.
    - Important that the statement of what the LTS provides is API stability.
  - Do we have an idea of the adoption rate?
    - refer to Fedora 4 deployments page on the wiki
  - What are the implications for other non-LTS versions of Fedora?
    - There exists a policy of support for major releases, incl. critical bug fixes.
      - not release more than 1 major release/year
      - critical fixes to latest major release
  - Does the creation of LTS carry certain expectations about ease of migration?
  - Why 4.7 as candidate for LTS?
    - two upcoming dev sprints to align core functionality with API specs
  - Concern to address: if developments in upstream applications necessitate premature (i.e. less than 3 years) change to the LTS
  - General support for this idea, if taking into account the above issues.
  - AW will bring back to LG before this goes more public.
- 4) Samvera/Fedora technical alignment discussions
  - Discussion spawned by OR2017 conversation re: Valkyrie - a new, proof-of-concept component that will allow Samvera-based applications to more easily swap out persistence back-ends for metadata and files. Provides Samvera community flexibility, so folks can use the back-end that best fits their needs in a way that does not preclude a shared UI. In the Fedora Leadership context, this means that Samvera applications **could** be based on a back-end other than Fedora.
    - Held two calls between Samvera community, Fedora API editors, and Islandora Tech Lead two weeks ago and ultimately decided on the following next steps
      - Begin specifying query requirements in a sidecar Fedora API Specification
      - Put cycles towards Modeshape implementing the Fedora API Specification
      - Put cycles towards Cavendish implementing the Fedora API Specification, and other bits Samvera would need from Cavendish
      - Continue Valkyriizing Hyrax
      - Create Valkyrie adapter that relies on the Fedora API Specification (including the query sidecar)
    - There are pressures from institutions to switch to different backends for performance reasons, even if it's a short-term change while work on performance in Fedora implementations continues.
  - How do things depend then?
    - Hard to say now because it's early days. It seems reasonable to say that some Samvera applications will depend on Fedora and some won't.
    - Note that much upcoming Samvera work is Fedora-centric, so this is a commitment to Fedora but allows Samvera users flexibility in how to persist their backend data stores.
  - General agreement that this conversation should continue here.
    - Will be a continuing topic for next call.
- 5 & 6) Everything went great!

Adjourned at 12:31pm.

Actions