Core Working Group Meeting Notes (5-Mar-2020)

TC	Trevor Conn (Me)	
RH	Rodney Hess	
	Akram Ahmad (Dell)	
	André Srinivasan | Redis Labs	
AB	Anthony Bonafide	
	Brandon Forster	
EC	Eric Cotter	
JB	Jason Bonafide	
JP	Jeremy Phelps	
JW	Jim Wang	
LG	Lenny Goodell (Intel)	
	Michael Estrin	
M	Mike	
	Tingyu zeng	
T	tonyespy	
W(	Walt (Intel)	
JW	Jim White	

1.) Demo of rogue device "blacklist" handling via Kuiper (Jason Bonafide @ DELL)
   a. *Create ADR including links to code samples (holding) and diagram*
   b. *Initial community approval to utilize this mechanism for blacklist capabilities in Device Discovery (Geneva)*
2.) Config-seed removal dependency chain
   - Approve Jim's ADR
   - Go-mod-bootstrap ability to self seed config (Lenny)
       o *This is a pending capability for DS and App SDKs to adopt go-mod-bootstrap*
   - Integrate go-mod-bootstrap into all services
       o *More than just consuming the latest rev of the module, code changes required*
       o *Lenny has an example for App SDK*

- Changes to core/support services to self seed
  - *Lenny also has a example branch here for how to accomplish this*
  - *Edit all Dockerfiles to remove –profile cmd line*
    - *Remove res/docker directories*
- Update docker-compose file
  - *Includes environment variable overrides previously set in docker profile*
  - *Remove config-seed entry*
  - *Remove config-seed entry from SNAP*
- Remove config-seed

** Current rules engine will not work in current form after the above b/c it won't self-seed **

Discussion items:

- *Is Kuiper the replacement?*
  - *Level of confidence? HIGH*
- *Backward incompatibility?*
  - *Leave config-seed in place to just seed existing RulesEngine? -OR-*
  - *Include configuration in RulesEngine container, set process to always use local configuration and not Consul*
    - *What about configuration variance during deployment?*
    - *JIM WHITE – Audit Rules Engine configuration on viability of always using local config in the Docker image.*

3.) Error Handling Improvement Suggestions
   a. https://github.com/edgexfoundry/edgex-go/issues/2403
   b. Timing of incorporating suggestions? V1 or V2?
      i. Trevor's preference is V2.
4.) Discuss whether configuration changes included in PR 2401 constitute backward incompatibility.
   a. Time permitting this week
   b. The question is whether or not a change of this kind breaks backward compatibility for Device Services / App Functions and, if so, does this PR set a bad precedent. I think there's agreement it's fine for the Core Services.
   c. *Trevor to refresh memory on actual code context of usage*
      i. *Proposal from the community is to support both, not real enthusiastic about that*
      ii. *Community also seems to feel this should be considered a backward breaking change*