

Node.js Foundation Modules Team Meeting 2018-09-12

* **Recording**:

* **GitHub Issue** : <https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/179>

* **Minutes Google Doc**:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1G6siAcmcpza6wyxoMv0cPWICLpoloS7duqPSXBu3AIU/edit>

Present

- Daniel Rosenwasser @DanielRosenwasser
- MylesBorins, @mylesborins
- Matt DuLeone, @mduleone
- Kevin Smith, @zenparsing
- Michael Zasso, @targos
- Jan Krems, @jkrems
- Sendil Kumar @sendilkumarn
- Geoffrey Booth @GeoffreyBooth
- Wesley Wigham, @weswigham
- Jeremiah Senkpiel @fishrock123
- Saleh Abdel Motaal @SMotaal
- Guy Bedford @guybedford
- Gus Caplan @devsnek

Agenda

Extracted from **modules-agenda** labelled issues and pull requests from the **nodejs org** prior to the meeting.

Agenda

Extracted from **modules-agenda** labelled issues and pull requests from the **nodejs org** prior to the meeting.

Update on Progress (6 minute timebox)

* Session at Collab Summit Vancouver [#177](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/177>)

* Have time on the agenda specifically to talk about modules in Node

* If you're interested in travel fund/reduced fee for entry, reach out to Myles.

* Create Terminology.md [#158](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/pull/158>)

* Would like to introduce a process for coming to consensus of well-understood terms among the group.

approving PRs (2 minute timebox)

* @rubys requesting membership [#176](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/176>)

* Welcome to the team!

Discussion (40 minute timebox)

* Thinking about deadlines [#123](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/123>)

- 5 minute timebox

- Saleh: Before moving forward with a particular idea, we want to be able to gather input from the community.

- Myles: Growing concerned around our inability to reach consensus.

- If we find ourselves unable to do so, I will step down.

- Context: we've had this working group for ~6 months and had difficulties here.

- Saleh: we have actually found consensus (e.g. the survey)

- Some part of this is due to lack of participation

- But keep in mind everyone has good intentions in this group and we can turn this around.

- Jeremiah: agree with Myles; if we don't see any progress for modules in Node 12, doesn't seem like there's much of a point here.

- Geoffrey: The tools in place for collaboration (e.g. GitHub) doesn't seem fit for what we're doing.

- Also, feel like we need some direction on responsibilities. Who is focusing on what? What are the expectations?

- Also, not sure where to contribute - to the minimal kernel? To the current implementation? And how so?

* Managing fork and agreed upon minimal kernel

[#166](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/166>)

- 25 minute timebox

- Had a hard time figuring out what a minimal kernel actually should be.

- Myles: we believe the following should be in a minimal implementation

(<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/166#issuecomment-420767222>)

- a minimal implementation needs to support bare paths (implementation TBD)

- cannot have dynamic path searching (i.e. explicit paths)

- static analysis is important here.

- With respect to CommonJS compatibility, we want to hold off on importing CommonJS modules.

- .js will eventually be able to support modules, but not

- Only support importing ESM

- Jordan: I don't necessarily disagree that this is feasible, but I would feel uncomfortable shipping without dynamic path searching.

- Saleh: Could we add a 3rd bullet list - things we're committed to actually reaching.

- Myles: I don't think we could reach consensus on that.

- Saleh: What about a list of things we acknowledge aren't actually going into this implementation so that people have a good understanding of what's missing.
- Gus: What if we flagged things outside of the minimal codebase?
- Saleh: +1
- Myles: Only difficult thing is that it makes things messier to send PRs given that you have to account for these different paths.
- Geoffrey: We're conflating "technologically minimal" and "minimal in terms of what we can all agree upon"
- For the former: there are things that we can eventually get to even if we agree it should be done.
- Maybe we could come up with lists here to distinguish
- Saleh: part of the idea with the survey is to get consensus across the group on what we want without having to delegate to a single meeting every 2 weeks.
- Jan: problem is that the survey will consist of individual questions that may not capture the whole picture, or may affect answers to other questions.
- Wesley: are we saying we want to ship options for things we're not sure we want to ship?
- Myles: Sounds like there's a misconception. We're talking entirely about the fork.
- Guy: want to summarize the process this would create going forward and get some checks on assumptions
- My understanding was that we would build a minimal implementation based on an intersection of our consensus
- The process of adding features is to build something that could actually ship, but we are not shipping the minimal kernel itself.
- Myles: do we have any objections on bringing createRequireFunction to Node?
- Someone: I don't know enough about it to be confident.
- Geoffrey: why do we need this in Node if we can land it in our fork?
- Myles: it's generally useful functionality and we'd like to bring something useful to the project.

* Survey: Initial Draft [#173](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/173>) & Developer Survey [#85](<https://github.com/nodejs/modules/issues/85>)

- 10 minute timebox to Talk about B1 (internal track)
- 5 minute timebox to Talk about C1 (developers track)
- Idea: these surveys are meant to capture consensus given that it is often difficult to participate for reasons such as noise over GitHub.
- Most important thing is that we need tools to reach the consensus we all need.
- Two tracks: B track (internal to this group) and C track (external devs)
- Wesley: what are the action items that these responses are going to drive?
- Saleh: we're getting there, but we need to have more people on the group help out here.
- Myles: if we talk about every feature individually, they may be "good" or "bad", but it's problematic to ask about each feature if they don't have the whole picture/context.
- Don't use the survey as a means of consensus. It's a lens to understand different groups.

- Saleh: hope is that each person who has a set of specific interests will contribute to the survey
- Myles: want to discourage too much process given that we need to ship before JS Interactive