Architecture Monthly Meeting

Dec 16, 2019

Organizer/host: Jim White (IOTech)

Attendees: James, Lisa, Bryon, Lenny, Mike (Intel), Rodney (Beechwoods), Iain (IOTech), Michael, Trevor (Dell), Tony (Canonical), Ike. Others may have attended that were not captured at the beginning of the meeting.

Topics discussed

- API Changes vs. Test changes (per Trevor's message)
 - Added last minute due to impending deadlines
 - Discussion
 - API changes seem more defined at this time and should probably have priority
 - Doing API changes may mean double the work in testing based on different test framework in the future
 - There may be a programmatic way to avoid or minimize double work in testing (but we need a plan)
 - Maybe we just get rid of black box tests going forward do side by side work of API changes and new testing
 - Need to scope both API and Test changes before decision can be made
 - We need definition of service level tests from TestQA will be done by WG's so we need definition to know impact to other efforts
 - Under TestQA group, more discussion starts tomorrow (12/17) on proposals for service level testing
 - API tests are done better by Newman/Postman style tools; but these tools don't integrate well with CI
 - Decision was to allow Trevor to put forth his API scope and effort document and work within the TestQA group to create their test plan for moving to TAF and then hold a discussion to make a decision about timing and priority at that time (hopefully January).
- Architecture Decision Records discussion on template, when to use, where to put them and generally how to incorporate them in our project.
 - Discussion
 - We need a separate repo vs. edgex-docs
 - Required v optional common format, common location, but make it optional
 - We need a table of contents (maybe top level readme)
 - We need a common naming structure with date / timestamp
 - ADR ~= RFC
 - Decision
 - Put the ADRs in a separate folder in edgex-docs)
 - Organized by working group (each with a separate folder)
 - We'll need one cross-cutting concern area in a root folder
 - We'll revisit this structure at next face-to-face

- Template Michael Estrin provided Nygard template which we'll follow to start (to be referenced in READme)
- We'll revisit format at F2F too
- Maintenance history use what Github provides (vs put in documents)
- Documents should be name according to RFC format (assigned by WG lead for their folder). RFC format will be referenced in the READme, but it uses a sequentially increasing integer
- Ownership: WG leads own their group folder and documents in it
- Chair/Vice owns the cross cutting concerned root and documents in it
- For legacy documents these should be put in a separate folder for legacy designs and legacy requirements (two additional folders)
- WG leads take responsibility for what (from Wiki or other sources) moves to the legacy folders or gets turned into new ADR
- Jim to set up the initial folders and READMe with references.
- Projects management process (Bryan N, Lisa, security WG)
 - o Discussion
 - Milestone field is a single select
 - Set once we commit/close an issue
 - When planning it can/should be set
 - There is nothing in the system that says what release something was done in
 - A label can have multiple release tags in it
 - Bryon to send out new process management doc that will include suggestion on how to use Milestone property
 - Hope to bring the document to the TSC for a discussion/vote by January
- Future meeting topics (in order of priority)
 - Revisiting holding and when work needs to enter holding (and what it takes to get out)
 - Acceptance of DS and testing needs how to bring a new device service from holding to the EdgeX repos (presented by DS WG – lain, Tony)
 - Release checkpoints when and what (Lisa R); regularly revisiting the dependencies for the release
 - PR Template (presented by Mike J when ready)
 - Feature Flag implementation and flag (presented by Mike J when ready)
 - Bound checking issue (presented by Tony)