Core Working Group Agenda (28-June-2018)

Attendees:

- Trevor Conn (Host, me)
- Rodney Hess
- Akram Ahmad (Dell)
- Andrew Foster
- Brad Kemp
- David Chang
- Fede (Cavium)
- ijohnson
- Steve Osselton
- tonyespy
- Stella Yu

Old Business

- Readiness of export connectors (Janko / Mainflux)
  - Sent email to Keith /Janko. Needed to wait for Brett to return.
  - Brett is back, needs an estimate on required services.
  - Pending items below, waiting on account setup
    - Needs more testing / verification – Andy / Keith?
      - Requesting tools / accounts for public cloud vendors to enable testing
      - Approval has been obtained from the Board.
    - Platforms
• Google IoT
• Azure IoT
• Janko to make full list and submit to Keith
  - Janko on vacation until July 9.
  - Trevor to send email to Keith and Drasko ask for IoT specs for Brett.
• Structured log format
  - I personally haven’t had time to follow-up on this (Trevor)
  - Post-California
• California branch cutting
  - All core/device services have been included
  - New docker-compose file v0.6.0.
    - Action item for Jim currently
  - Dot release (July)
    - support-notifications (possibly scheduler)
      - Agenda item for Device Service meeting on Monday
    - Consul upgrade (may go in w/California)
  - DevOps meeting to be re-activated
    - Analysis and learnings from California
  - Discussion related to docker-compose EdgeX / EdgeX + security **
    - Mgmt of Docker / Snap files
    - Tony’s preference to have one file for all containers
      - Trevor suggested two files – one for EdgeX, one for security in case user wanted to only deploy EdgeX w/o security features
      - Rodney said for California, strategy is to have two files – one for EdgeX only, one for EdgeX + security
      - In Tony’s case, turning off security would constitute commenting out the relevant entries
    - Handling this in a more stream-lined fashion is topic for resurrected DevOps meeting.
    - Steve’s point to ensure compose files are easy to use for manual/dev purposes as well as automation
      - What about compose files for deployment targets having different footprints? (other service discovery, security providers, etc)
  - Timing of the branch cutting **
    - Tony’s suggestion to not create release branch ahead of time
    - Onus of putting changes into both release and master
    - Release branch should be created at time of release / tagging?
    - Possible additional topic for DevOps
      - Are we paying the price for landing features late?
- If we only cut release branch at the last minute, then permissions around PR merge becomes much more restrictive (release manager role)
  - Snap PRs to be included in v0.6.1
- Binary Serialization
  - CBOR / Protobuf – decision is TBD
    - Steve did a quick proof of concept to compare the two
    - Not much of a size difference.
    - Steve’s (et al) requirements posted to the wiki for feedback
  - Received some good requirements input on use cases from Stella
    - If anyone hasn’t seen that and would like to, I can forward.
  - Either format requires schema change for the Reading object to contain the binary data (result bytes[])