

Component Maintenance Working Group

Meeting for 01/16/18

Attendees

- Trey Pendragon (Princeton University Library)
- Julie Allinson (CoSector at the U. London)
- Jon Cameron (Indiana University)
- Noah Botimer (U. Michigan)
- Tom Johnson (DCE)
- Bess Sadler (DCE)
- James Griffin (Princeton University Library)
- Ben Armintor (Columbia)

Johnson:

Regrets from Bess Sadler for missing the earlier part of the meeting due to a conflict

Review from the Last Meeting

Pendragon:

- Decisions Made
 - If priorities made around the membership of the group?
- Build a spreadsheet and evaluate projects in samvera and samvera-labs
 - Which components “hit the mark”?
 - Adhere by guidelines for samvera compliance
 - Determine what would be involved
 - Metrics: Freakout factor, scale of 1-5, if project disappeared tomorrow, how scared would we be?
 - Work-needed factor: How much work would have to go in on this group...in order to make us feel like that component was maintained?
 - Use metrics to prioritize components (high freakout factor and little work needed)

Spreadsheet

rubydora

Armintor:

- Is the freakout factor an average?

Pendragon:

- Take the highest number from members within the group

Johnson:

- Proposes a 1 for a freakout factor rating

Armintor:

- Columbia has a fork and still uses Fedora 3 compliant components
- Reserve a "5" for projects such as Hyrax, but still very important

Allinson:

- There are probably many Fedora 3 repositories in production

Johnson:

- There are many, the install base is quite large

Armintor:

- Nobody is discussing extending and actively developing for fcrepo3-based Samvera

Johnson:

- There are already real problems for fcrepo3 components (such as security bugs)

Armintor:

- Had heard that Notre Dame was looking to write a Valkyrie persister for fcrepo3 for easing the migration process
- If rubydora was a development requirement for such a project...

Pendragon:

- Priority is based upon the membership of this group
- If we think that there is someone out there who would be freaked out we can reach out at most

Allinson:

- 1 freakout factor for rubydora

Armintor:

- 3 for rubydora
- Work-needed factor is quite low for it

Johnson:

- Tempted to propose a 2

Botimer:

- Notes that there are two (non-moving) components of the Gem

Pendragon:

- 1 should be assigned given that fcrepo3 is not likely to be immediately updated (regarding the API)

solrizer

Allinson:

- Not clear if it would disappear with Hyrax 3 or not

Pendragon:

- Valkyrie doesn't use Solrizer

Armintor:

- Does Valkyrie indexer for Solr use the Solrizer field names?

Pendragon:

- It doesn't use the appropriate Solrizer method
- Valkyrie is not 1.0 and still remains in samvera-labs
- If hydra-role-management is a 5...then Solrizer should be high in freakout as well
- Votes for 5
- Work-needed?

Armintor:

- Solr 7 upgrades affects just queries

Allinson:

- It's a small code base
- Proposes a 1 or 2 for work needed

Pendragon:

- It's probably a 1

Allinson:

- Notes that there is one issue (<https://github.com/samvera/solrizer/issues/32>)

Armintor:

- Relatively recent change to caching field names
- It's a performance related change more than anything other

ldp

Johnson:

- Proposes a 2-3

Pendragon:

- If it disappears tomorrow, ActiveFedora no longer works

Allinson:

- Anything which the current Hyrax depends on is a 5

Johnson:

- Approves of a 5

Pendragon:

- Work needed?

Johnson:

- Didn't push to 1.0, but it is pretty stable
- Issue 88 addresses this (<https://github.com/samvera/ldp/issues/88>)
- Reasonably well-documented
- Proposes 1-2 for ongoing maintenance
- LDP follow-on working group might increase this
- Doesn't suspect that this would happen

active_fedora

Pendragon

- Freakout factor?

(Laughter)

Johnson:

- (Jokingly) 9
- Work-needed: Massive

Armintor:

- Many dependencies also, there is quite some work for dependency churn

Pendragon:

- Possibly 5 freakout factor and 5 work-needed

Armintor:

- More concerned about ActiveFedora going away

Johnson:

- Should call this out
- We are looking to make this go away
- Fears if this does away successfully but there are difficulties in onboarding new parties to the replacement

hydra-pcdm

Allinson:

- 5 due to Hyrax dependency

Pendragon:

- Work needed?
- Still seems to work fine after two years
- But, it has a tight dependency on active-fedora

(Bess Sadler joined the call)

sufia

Sadler:

- Many people are still running on Sufia who don't want to migrate to Hyrax
- They are in need of maintenance plan
- In this sense it is perhaps an outlier

Armintor:

- Notes that Sadler's scenario doesn't seem to render it an outlier with regards to previously evaluated Gems

Sadler:

- Can sign up to maintain hydra-role-management far more easily than sufia

Pendragon:

- Uncertain as to whether or not we should assign sufia ratings
- Maybe assign same ratings as Hyrax, with the understanding that this WG cannot maintain either Sufia or Hyrax

curation_concerns

Johnson:

- Concerned given that it's a Sufia dependency

Pendragon:

- Both the README for sufia and curation_concerns states that they are deprecated

Sadler:

- Perhaps this WG should prompt the community regarding these explicitly deprecated projects
- Maybe the role of the WG is to remind community members of this?
- Encourage interested parties to contribute as maintainers
- Otherwise, should look at these as candidates for retirement from its GitHub Organization

Armintor:

- There is a thread about this (e-mail) from the end of November
- https://groups.google.com/forum/?utm_medium=email&utm_source=footer#!msg/samvera-tech/guEUaByL8Y0/ZeNfzHZxAQAJ

Allinson:

- The Sufia EOL message is still a Pull Request (<https://github.com/samvera/sufia/pull/3181>)

Pendragon:

- Reiterates that sufia and curation_concerns are prime candidates for deprecation
- Should ask if we should deprecate these

Botimer:

- We should respectfully declare our intention with a time period for comments
- We formed a WG

Sadler:

- Thinks that it becomes lazy consensus ("it is our intention to deprecate this unless someone objects and steps up...")

Armintor:

- Addendum: We have some process for promoting a Project into samvera Org. (some partner institutions need to commit to maintaining it)
- We might be able to be a bit more specific when moving a Project into deprecated
- If less than an arbitrary number of institutions commit to this...

noid-rails

Sadler:

- What does it do?

Johnson:

- Just refactored to avoid dependencies on active_fedora
- Used to mint NOID's and persistent ID's
- (Hence, high freakout factor)

Pendragon:

- Suspects higher than 1 for work-needed

Johnson:

- Some concurrency
- Database backend potentially requires support

Pendragon:

- Proposes a 2-3 for work needed

Sadler:

- Someone has been working with it recently

Johnson:

- Hyrax/Hyku team wanted to drop this, but there was community pushback

Pendragon:

- Votes for a 2 work-needed

browse-everything

Sadler:

- Pretty concerned about losing this
- Proposes a 5 for freakout

Pendragon:

- Work needed?

Allinson:

- Poster-child for why a maintainer is needed

Pendragon:

- 4 based upon Griffin's concerns over providers from third-party API's

hydra-head

Sadler:

- Need it in order to release Gems

Pendragon:

- Hydra-Head holds hydra-access-controls and RDF Objects
- *Not* used for releasing Gems (that's "hydra")

Pendragon:

- Work needed is harder (more complex), but not a massive amount of labor
- Votes for a 2 (for now)

questioning_authority

Sadler:

- Would be scared if it disappeared (5)

Pendragon:

- Notes that we have no 4 level freakouts

Johnson:

- That's an interesting point: we have two modes (critical and what we don't care about)

Botimer:

- Perhaps we are creating a core components list

Pendragon:

- Work needed?

Allinson:

- 2-3, seems to be changed fairly regularly

Sadler:

- Votes for a 3 given the steep learning curve

Johnson:

- Agrees with a 3 for technical debt

samvera.github.io

Sadler:

- Proposes a 5 for freakout

Pendragon:

- 0-1 for work-needed (it has a dedicated WG for its maintenance)

Sadler:

- Proposes a "N/A" rating
- It's not actually a core component
- The website itself is well-maintained, but the process for documenting it is another issue

Pendragon:

- Notes that there is also a Documentation WG
- (Consensus is to simply remove the Project)

Botimer:

- If the group evolves and expands, then perhaps reconsider whether or not such Projects fall within the scope of this WG

hydra-derivatives

Sadler:

- Proposes a 5 freakout factor

- Notes that a lot of documentation is needed

Pendragon:

- There have been calls to reimplement this
- Might have implications for work-needed factor
- Believes that there is refactoring which is needed for this...but we should avoid new features

Sadler:

- Should have 1.0 compliance
- Code coverage analysis, continuous integration, an identified maintainer
- Should take into consideration how hard it would be to respond to issues

Pendragon:

- Then hydra-derivatives should be a 3

(Samvera GitHub Organization is finished)

Pendragon:

- Should we discuss the factors proposed?
- Or, move on to samvera-labs?

Sadler:

- Is there is anything we should promote from labs?

Allinson:

- iiif_manifest should be close
- Hyrax now depends on iiif_manifest

Sadler:

- If hyrax is our flagship product...wouldn't want any dependencies in labs

Pendragon:

- iiif_manifest might be the only dependency in samvera-labs

Allinson:

- Also, valkyrie (in time!)

Pendragon:

- We should also move bixby
- Nesting Indexer?

Allinson:

- Uncertain also, but it's a fork from Notre Dame

Sadler:

- Next steps?

Johnson:

- I don't think that we've finished this work realistically
- Need to account for projects which are *not* on the Spreadsheet
- DCE Projects, institutional organizations...
- Proposes a dependency tree review (for identifying these)

Pendragon:

- Also, what do we do when we find those things
- riiif (<https://github.com/curationexperts/riiif>) as an example
- If it's not a "samvera" Org., then do we maintain these?

Sadler:

- Agrees, we need a policy for addressing these cases
- Is wary of becoming too focused upon these concerns for the WG

Pendragon:

- Reviewing the Deliverables for the WG:
 - Criteria for what makes a core component
 - How we figure out product owners for each of these projects
 - Items which we wish to sunset
 - Priorities for the development sprints
- Notes that we have this binary division
 - Either components are a high priority or we don't care about them

Sadler:

- Wants a process for deprecation (to permit community members to step up and act as maintainers)

Pendragon:

- Put 1 for "hydra" Gem, but that might not be accurate with the script

Sadler:

- Could the script just be its own project?

Pendragon:

- Is it our duty to maintain this?

Sadler:

- How do we poll the larger community?
- Beyond just the mailing list, should a survey be used?
- Perhaps a representative from each institution should identify which Gems are being used?
- Feels that non-Partners should be included in this discussion
- Interested in getting tallies on metrics regarding usage and contributions
- Would prefer to have a sense for who is willing to contribute resources for maintenance

Pendragon:

- Next time, discuss how we should address prioritization
- What the role of phase 2 of this WG is

(Meeting was adjourned)