

2018-02-08 - 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)
- Dial-in Number: (712) 775-7035
 - Participant Code: 479307#
 - International numbers: [Conference Call Information](#)
 - Web Access: <https://www.freeconferencecallhd.com/wp-content/themes/responsive/flashphone/flash-phone.php>
- 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
 - ? add slack channel info here?

Attendees

- [Danny Bernstein](#)
- [Andrew Woods](#)
- [Peter Eichman](#) ★
- [Bethany Seeger](#)
- [Jared Whiklo](#)
- [Yinlin Chen](#)
- [Doron Shalvi](#)
- [Esmé Cowles](#)

Agenda

1. [4.7.5 release testing](#) - discussion of where things stand
2. [Sign up](#) for API Alignment sprints by adding your name
3. [Delta Document](#), Sprint Optimization, and due dates
4. [Compatibility Test Suite](#)
5. [Pairtree/Appletree options](#)
 - a. Proposal (based on group discussion)
 - i.

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

Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.
 - b. As yet
 - i. when pair tree node creation is enabled should performing a GET or HEAD
 1. return non-pair tree children as they do now?
 2. return a 400 series message (404 or 405)?
 - ii. If both 1 and 2, what should the default behavior be?
6.

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

ALSO MOVE FORWARD WITH [creation side resolution](#):
7. [External Content: Redirect or Proxy?](#) on fedora-tech
 - a. (TBD only is appropriate people are on the line)
8. Java release schedule and compatibility planning
 - a. See <http://blog.joda.org/2018/02/java-9-has-six-weeks-to-live.html>
 - i. "With a release every six months, it is important to decide on an approach to the release train."

Ticket Summaries

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

Action Items

- -
 -
 -
- Unable to locate Jira server for this macro. It may be due to Application Link configuration.
- [Danny Bernstein](#) add the Java version support topic to the committers call agenda

Minutes

- 4.7.5 release testing on track
 - 1-2 tests for Danny Bernstein to complete
 - Esme: will do RC-2 testing with ActiveFedora/Hyrax, or find someone to delegate to
 - [Andrew Woods](#): contacted [Carrick Rogers](#) about testing on their custom fedora with RC-2
 - release is slated for next week (Feb 12)
- API Alignment Sprint: if you haven't signed up for API alignment sprint, please do so
- delta document for documenting the differences between 4.7.5 and 5.0
 - make it a goal to fill out each section by next week's call
 - identify items that are out of alignment
 - Peter: authz
 - Danny will ping Aaron Birkland about notifications
 - Danny: versioning
 - Jared & Yinlin: resource management
 - keep in mind the spec may have been updated; make sure section numbers match up
- compatibility test suite: needs work
 - try running the compatibility suite
 - add git issues as feedback
 - code review would be extra helpful
 - mainly covers section 3 (resource management)
 - cross-check test suite report to manual test results
 - "trust but verify"
 - Yinlin: Python vs. Java test suite?
 - Andrew: we will focus on the Java version as the official test suite
- close to landing pairtree issue
 - remaining question: what is the behavior of the pairtree nodes?
 - Esme: we need to support the current behavior
 - Aaron Birkland feels strongly that pairtree nodes should not resolve
 - Andrew: concerned about complexity of code and introducing bugs
 - Bethany: could we only have 1 setting?
 - Andrew: need to support migration of existing pairtrees, so generation needs to be separate from retrieval
 - Esme: minting behavior is easy and tidy; UUID-only minter should be very easy to write
- MIME type validation
 - Bethany: putting in a check of object values in PUT/PATCH requests that mime types are syntactically correct
 - ebucore:hasMimeType is treated as a special case since it is used as the content-type of a binary resource on GET

7. external content design: send over to spec team for further work
 - a. Peter, Esme, Doran agree
 - b. Peter: start from the draft Prefer header spec that Ben Pennell created
 - c. Doran: NLM has a particular interest of this
 - d. Doran: there could be interplay between this and the Oxford Common File Layout
 - e. Andrew: need to make sure we capture real uses cases
8. changes in the Java release schedule
 - a. new major versions every 6 months
 - b. LTS releases
 - c. Oracle seems to be expecting folks to start paying for Java releases that last longer than 6 months that aren't LTS releases
 - d. we need to prepare for supporting new Java releases more quickly
 - e. Java 8 will be LTS
 - f. Java 11 will be LTS
 - g. Andrew: do we support LTS releases only? or short-term releases as well?
 - h. Esme: LTS versions seem like a better bet
 - i. transition times between LTS will be smaller
 - j. need to prepare for new Java versions farther in advance
 - k. Danny: what is the history of Java updates?
 - l. Andrew: [Policy - Supported JVM](#)
 - m. Esme: several issues
 - i. many repos set up once and then not update to maintain stability as long as they can
 - ii. desire for compatibility with new versions of Java
 - iii. new language features that implementors might want to use
 - n. Andrew: users tend to stability, developers tend to latest
 - o. Esme: supporting the most stable/predictable Java makes the most sense for the user base
 - p. Esme: keeping up with latest release is a nice-to-have, but user needs are prioritized
 - q. Danny: may be able to compile Java 9 code to target a Java 8 JVM
 - r. Andrew: start with consensus-building on tech call and the committers call
 - s. Danny: next steps: clarify the different pathways and get feedback from committers and community