

2016-07-14 - 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

Attendees

- Benjamin Amenter (traveling 7/14 and 7/21)
- [Jared Whiklo](#)
- [Longshou Situ](#)
- [Esmé Cowles](#)
- [Andrew Woods](#)
- [Nick Ruest](#)
- [A. Soroka](#)
- [Mark Jordan](#) ★
- [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#)
- [Bethany Seeger](#)
- [Yinlin Chen](#)
- [David Wilcox](#) (travelling 7/14)
- [David Chandek-Stark](#)
- [Jim Tuttle](#)
- [Elliot Metsger](#)

Agenda

1. Revisit "[Previous Versions Support](#)" policy, as well as policy for emergency patch releases
2. Fedora 4.6.0 / 4.7.0 release plan proposal
 - a. 4.6.0 Code freeze, Thurs July 21
 - i. ModeShape4
 - ii. Guarantee some flavor of LTS
 - b. 4.7.0 to be release immediately following 4.6.0 release
 - i. ModeShape5
 - c. Begin Mode4 to Mode5 migration pilots immediately
 - i.

Application Link configuration.
3. [Import/export of B](#)
4. Ready for [Performance/Scale](#) summary page/message
5. Supporting gzip compression of responses via [Jersey filters](#).
6. ...
7. Status of "in-flight" tickets

ling from:

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

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.										

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.

Minutes

1. Previous version support – at present, there is effectively no [policy](#). Now there are production deployments.
 - a. [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#): a "bug" is ambiguous in the absence of a spec.
 - b. [Andrew Woods](#): there are also unambiguous bugs even in the absence of a spec.
 - c. [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#): we should rapidly move toward publishing a spec
 - d. [David Chandek-Stark](#): If Fedora is "production ready", then what support does that imply?
 - e. [A. Soroka](#): What does "production ready" mean?
 - f. [David Chandek-Stark](#): Reality of Fedora turned out to be different from the assumptions of Fedora
 - g. [Andrew Woods](#): Expectations of behavior have not been formalized, but there is a 90-something % overlap in expectations of what Fedora does
 - h. [A. Soroka](#): there is a difference b/t creating a policy (what [Andrew Woods](#) is suggesting) and fixing a bug (what [David Chandek-Stark](#) wants), and bugs can be fixed w/o a policy. Holding [David Chandek-Stark](#)'s need to the standard of this policy may result in much unhappiness; instead, in the absence of a policy, if the bug gets fixed, this may be sufficient
 - i. [David Chandek-Stark](#): in the absence of a spec, I assume as a user that if the REST API says "X", Fedora will do "X". If that's not true, that would concern me
 - j. [A. Soroka](#): yes, the API can change, and until a spec is formalized, there is no standard for deciding when that API should or should not change; there have been cases when the documentation was wrong and there have been cases when the code was wrong and it could be a misunderstanding of the documentation.
 - k. [David Chandek-Stark](#): I would expect the rest API would change; what is the management of that change over time?
 - l. [A. Soroka](#): That is correct, change management is unclear; it is currently acted on in a case-by-case basis; the Spec should have a change management process built in.
 - m. [Andrew Woods](#): IF we had the spec and TCK, how would we approach a support policy? acknowledging that we have limited developer resources. What would be the appropriate policy.
 - n. [A. Soroka](#) if there is agreement of the spec, this would go to the implementation team. The spec change management should be different than the ref impl.
 - o. [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#): this should be a function of the developer commitments
 - p. [A. Soroka](#): [Andrew Woods](#) is asking for guarantees, and if developer time is from single individuals and institutions, supporting maintenance branches relates to real time commitments
 - q. [Andrew Woods](#): for example, in the change from MODE 4 -> 5, there is still a hurdle migrating from one backend to the other, this supports a higher need to support bug fixes in the earlier version.
 - r. [A. Soroka](#): this should be part of the semantic versioning scheme
 - s. [Andrew Woods](#): Example where the underlying backend is undergoing a major change, but the Fedora API isn't changing; all the versions now are tied to 4.x.x, which doesn't work well with semantic versioning.
2. 4.6.0 Release is ready for code freeze (next week). 4.7.0 will be released soon thereafter.
 - a. 4.6.0 will be a (informal) LTS; tooling will need to be put into place for migrating MODE 4 -> 5
 - b. [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#): why can't we do these concurrently?
 - c. [Andrew Woods](#): testing may suffer
 - d. [Elliot Metsger](#): why the rush to move to MODE 5? Does MODE provide tooling to move from 4 -> 5?
 - e. [Andrew Woods](#): MODE does provide support for migration (`/fcr:backup` and `/fcr:restore`); [Esmé Cowles](#) has tested backup and restore, though with some glitches; We don't want to tie people to particular back ends, but this is useful for migrations
 - f. [Nick Ruest](#): if we're putting out two release candidates, what are we committing ourselves to in terms of supporting two releases?
 - g. [Andrew Woods](#): this would be two supported versions
 - h. [Elliot Metsger](#): two simultaneous releases would be confusing; if there was more clarity about Modeshape 4 -> 5 and previous version support

- i. [Unknown User \(acoburn\)](#): if there are not two simultaneous releases, I could build my own MODE5-backed Fedora for our immediate institutional needs
- j. [Andrew Woods](#): we can move forward now with a 4.6.0 release; a 4.7.0 will happen at some future time
- k. What is the support strategy for mode 4.6.0?
- l. [A. Soroka](#): import/export tooling is the answer to that
- m. [Andrew Woods](#): back-porting bugs would be applied on a case-by-case basis, as discussed earlier in the meeting
- n. [A. Soroka](#): not sure about the degree to which we can guarantee back-porting bugs; there may be situations where we do back-port, but we should be clear that we may not back-port bugs to earlier released versions. This gives us a powerful incentive to bring the Spec process to a resolution.