CCMWG - 06/11/18

Attending

Time: 12:00PM PDT/03:00PM EDT - 01:00PM PDT/04:00PM EDT

Zoom: https://princeton.zoom.us/j/397525264

Participants

- Trey Pendragon (Princeton University Library)
- Tom Johnson (Data Curation Experts)
- Benjamin Armintor (Columbia University Libraries)
- Noah Botimer (University of Michigan Library)

Agenda

- Additional Agenda Items?
- Identify priorities
- Analyze spreadsheet and order projects by importance.
- Scheduling of Sprints?

Notes

Deliverables

- Scheduled for 2018
  - Deprecate relevant projects from samvera to samvera-deprecated
  - Ensure samvera Projects belong there
  - Promote samvera-labs
  - Respond to security alerts
  - Review successes and failures (recharter if appropriate)

Prioritization

- How should we handle deprecation?
  - Johnson: Reach out to product owners and discuss the possibility of scheduling sprints
  - Product Owners should have a model for sprints which allows them to assign work
  - Asking if we should deprecate
    - Do we need to further identify projects which have a Product Owner but don't meet standards
    - That's every Gem identified (i.e. none meet the requirements)
     - Maybe some small percentage does (example: hydra-derivatives)
  - Sprint Structure
    - This group should decline to schedule sprints for projects which don't meet the minimum requirements
    - Getting all of the projects classified as Core Components up to minimum requirements should be the highest priority
  - Phase 2
    - Pendragon:
      - Understood Phase 2 to be less focused upon generating sprints and demand to product owner requests for features
      - Instead, getting Core Components up to spec consistently
      - Following this, then scheduling sprints for future features would be possible
    - Johnson:
      - Understood Phase 2 to be a more general call for availability for Core Component development sprints
      - Has work ready on Active Fedora, but no mechanism to schedule a sprint using this Working Group
    - Botimer:
      - Where there is more ambiguity, push these off to gain more momentum later
    - Pendragon:
      - Taking Active Fedora as an example
        - Cannot perform maintenance as it does not have a code coverage measure for testing
        - Need to address this first (as well as for all Core Components)
    - Johnson:
      - Then, an initial sprint should be scheduled with addressing code coverage as the initial tickets for the sprint
      - How would I proceed in doing this?
    - Pendragon:
• Contact product owners instead, and then look to schedule sprints
• Otherwise, if we wait for product owners to contact us, the work might not be taken

• Armintor:
  • Perhaps start with ActiveFedora, document where we find the gaps, and then proceed to reach out to less related projects?

• Pendragon:
  • Looking at the spreadsheet...ActiveFedora just needs Coveralls (15 minutes)

• Johnson:
  • Assumed that we follow the Product Owner's lead
  • If no one shows up to own it, we propose deprecation at a later date

• Botimer:
  • This could be dangerous...adversarial
  • We've got volunteers for Product Owners
  • But, this becomes a threat, "if you don't ask us", we don't act to assist to these volunteers

• Armintor:
  • Assess what the gaps are in the project
  • Send the report to the Product Owner
  • We are chartered with assessing whether or not a project is supported any longer

• Johnson:
  • We aren't here to deprecate projects
  • We are here to perform maintenance work
  • Not looking to threaten deprecation...but to line up productive work
    • Then punt the question of deprecation down the road
    • Definitely opposed to needless bureaucracy
  • Set up project in GitHub, generate a backlog of issues, and organize a sprint to iterate over those issues in the backlog

• Pendragon:
  • Concerned that we would pick up maintenance issues for projects which don't prioritize making it meet the minimum standards

### GitHub Projects

• Waffle seems to be comfortable for project management
  • Pendragon
    • Create a Waffle project
    • CCMWG label
    • Communicate that this exists to the Product Owners
  • No one objects to this
    • https://waffle.io/samvera-labs/maintenance
  • Waffle Labels
    • CCMWG, backlog, and ready
    • Alternative is to have a Core Components Project in samvera-labs
    • There, have a cross-repository Waffle board there
  • Could do it in the "hydra" Gem
    • ...but it does have a Product Owner
  • Created in samvera-labs
  • samvera-labs/maintenance

• Johnson needed to leave at 12:35PM PDT/03:35PM EDT

### Split Projects up for each of us

• Add to the board, add the necessary labels in the GitHub repository
• Reference the Google Sheet
  • https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1IICaXpwzzxSFPB_G7k4jzUj1PMTmT5OiUQK9F0jSYqV/edit#gid=0

• Projects without Product Owners
  • om
  • jetty-wrapper
  • hydra-jetty
  • Delay further discussion, but perhaps call for deprecation for these?
  • hyrax, curation_concerns, sufia
    • samvera Repositories should have maintenance plans
    • Hyrax has a maintenance plan, but it does not fall upon this WG
    • curation_concerns and sufia should be discussed during the next meeting

• Sprint availability
  • Pendragon will send a Doodle Poll in order to determine the availability of those involved in the WG to dedicate time to sprinting

### Homework

• Go through repositories assigned to us
• Review documentation for minimum requirements
  • http://samvera.github.io/samvera_labs.html
• Create issues where there is a gap
  • Where coverage is low, create an issue "Is coverage high enough for you to be comfortable?"
  • Documentation requirements
    • This WG hasn't evaluated documentation requirements
    • Use requirements (e. g. used in the last 6 months) also will not be considered