

Date: Monday 17th December 2012

Time: 14:00-15:00 CET, 13:00-14:00 GMT

Online meeting: Google+ Hangout: [https://plus.google.com/hangouts/\\_/3926da304e46fb33d8510ac270014cdadc00670d?authuser=0&hl=en](https://plus.google.com/hangouts/_/3926da304e46fb33d8510ac270014cdadc00670d?authuser=0&hl=en)

Present: Sara, Sion, Jerry, Matthijs, Yuri

Jabber: <xmpp:opendssec@conference.kirei.se>

1. Who will write minutes?

[Sara](#)

2. Agree on the agenda

[Agreed.](#)

3. Project action points

<b>Sara</b>	Plan how we tackle the regression testing backlog. Mailed around <a href="#">proposal</a> for renaming current regression tests and using formatted comments in the scripts to track what is tested.  <a href="#">Matthijs asks for a way to track what bugs are covered by a test and then realises the script will do this already. Sara says she plans to do the rename on the tests later this week since there is little work going on in the regression tests right now.</a>	IN PROGRESS	...
<b>Sara/Jerry</b>	Work on initial draft for benchmarking setups based on feedback from developer workshop and board. <a href="#">There is some confusion here over who is doing what. Sara will write an email to kick start this action again now that the servers are available.</a>	OPEN	...
<b>Sara</b>	JIRA: 1 - Take a pass through JIRA to tidy up duplicates/unassigned issues. Send changes for review if required. Split the future release into a backlog and an icebox. Make sure all features have subtasks to track developer testing and documentation. <a href="#">No progress.</a>  2 - <a href="#">Write up a process for how we use JIRA to track issue</a> <a href="#">After various email discussions this process is now agreed.</a>	OPEN	...
<b>Jerry</b>	Look at opening up the OpenDNSSEC project up to all users if we can restrict the privileges for 'external' users correctly. Then we could stop using the SUPPORT project. Need a test environment to work on this. <a href="#">This is not being worked on as there is no test environment available and it is low priority. Sara points out that the documented process of always opening a linked OPENDNSSEC issue for every SUPPORT issue that needs a code fix is not always followed and this makes tracking bugs a problem since a query across both projects is needed to get a view of everything that can affect a release. She suggests that the process is either followed or changed and will email a link to the current process.</a>	OPEN	...
<b>Sara</b>	Follow up with SURFNet on hosting of Sun servers. Sara tries to ship Sun hardware to SURFnet, where Roland has offered rackspace for them. <a href="#">No progress.</a>	IN PROGRESS	...

4. OpenDNSSEC

- Unassigned issues

- [All unassigned open issues](#)  
[No issues to review](#)

- Support issues

- [All unresolved Support issues](#)
  - [SUPPORT-44 and SUPPORT-45 need follow up](#)

- **OpenDNSSEC 1.3.13**

- *Nominate any issues for 1.3.13?*
- *All issues for 1.3.13*
- *Should we release?*
  - *No code changes have been made since the last release so no release needed.*

- **OpenDNSSEC 1.4.0**

- *Actions*

<b>Matthijs</b>	Manual testing of DNS Adapter tests. <a href="#">Matthijs investigated the regression tests that were failing intermittently and found a bug due to a race condition that has now been fixed. He is continueing to investigate a handful of smaller issues (including some reported by CIRA) manually but feels we should go ahead with the beta 2 release.</a>	IN PROGRESS	1.4.0rc1
<b>Sion</b>	Check sightings of duplicate RR sigs - test fix from <a href="#">Matthijs</a> . <a href="#">Duplicate RRs have not been sighted in weeks - this can be closed.</a>	IN PROGRESS	
<b>Matthijs</b>	OPENDNSSEC-346: BIND interop test <a href="#">BIND is now installed on one of the test machines. Jerry points out that the current test has some specific config in it that means it won't run on the test machine. Matthijs will look into this. Matthijs asks how to make the test run only on one platform and Jerry refers him to an email he sent last week.</a>	OPEN	
<b>Nick</b>	Investigate validns and how we could use it (OPENDNSSEC-143) <a href="#">No update.</a>	OPEN	

- *Updates?*

- *All issues for 1.4.0*

- [332 & 350 are minor](#)
- [346 - in progress](#)
- [349 - can be closed](#)
- [292 - documentation still needed. Jerry agrees to try to do it this week to support the 1.4.0b2 release where the functionality will be available.](#)
- [172 - can be closed](#)

- *Planned Release date:*

- [1.4.0rc1 Jan 2013](#)
- [1.4.0 ?](#)

- **OpenDNSSEC 2.0.0b1**

- *Actions*

<b>Yuri</b>	Use existing test script as the basis of new jenkins regression tests for Enforcer-NG specific functionality.	OPEN	
<b>Yuri</b>	Review Ricks email of 1.4 vs 2.0 differences <a href="#">Sara and Yuri agree to review this before Xmas if possible.</a>	OPEN	

- *Updates?*

- [Yuri has completed the implementation of the logic to support <RequireBackup>. However he has hit an issue where he cannot access the value for the repository defined in the conf.xml files since the enforcer-ng does not parse this section. Sara asks how this is done now. Sion agrees to work with Yuri to see if the current solution offers any ideas as to how it could be done in 2.0.](#)

- *Open issues for 2.0.0b1*

- Regression & System testing coverage
- Planned Release date:
- **Testing**
  - No updates
- **General updates**
  - Release process: should we start doing release candidate for all releases from now?
    - We review that there was agreement to start doing release candidates for all releases from now on. We discuss the process for this i.e. should the branch be frozen or should we create a tag that is manually updated if changes are needed. Sara favours freezing but Jerry and Matthijs favour tagging/updating. We reach agreement to use tagging on the basis that updates to release candidates should be very rare and freezing the branch is inconvenient.

**ACTION** (Sara) : Update the release process to remove freezing the branch when an RC is released. **DONE**

**ACTION** (Jerry) : Document the process behind creating an updated release candidate so it is clear for others (e.g. Jakob) who may need to do it if he is on leave.
  - What versions of Idns should we test against in jenkins (OPENDNSSEC-351)
    - We all agree that we should test against the latest version and Jerry points out that he does update jenkins when a new Idns release is available
    - Matthijs raises the question of whether we should run our jenkins tests against release candidates (or even trunk) of Idns to help with the early detection of problems. He thinks this would be good for the user community for there to be a closer link between the library and the application. There is some support for thinking of using release candidates but we eventually decide we should not do this with our jenkins tests and while it would be a good thing to support the testing of Idns the solution should have a different form.
    - We also talk it being possible for a developer to manually run the jenkins tests against any version of Idns. Matthijs also talks about making it easier for a library to run the tests associated with an application that depends on it e.g. by having a 'make test' option. Idns does not use jenkins so it is not easy for them to run the OpenDNSSEC test suite without a lot of setup. Sion mentions an old script that emulated the test server and Matthijs says he will look into this.
  - Can we be more open to user input (such as Casper Gielen's lessons from recovery)
    - **ACTION** Sara: Investigate a good way of opening up the Wiki to users for sharing what they have learnt; however, do it in such a way that we stay in full control over the primary documentation. **DONE**
  - Call with CIRA
    - They have no issues with OpenDNSSEC at the moment.
    - Actions

Sara	Compose an email to propose this (and ask feedback) from developers and architecture board; possibly raise it on the user's list as well. Also consider the versioning convention currently used. Email sent to developers list on 26 Nov. Awaiting more feedback.	IN PROGRESS	...
------	--	-------------	-----

## 5. SoftHSM

### Actions

Who	What	Status	When
-----	------	--------	------

- Updates?
- Releases:
  - SoftHSM 1.3.5
  - SoftHSM 2.0.0

## 6. Next meeting

Propose Tuesday 8th January, 14:00 CET [Time agreed](#).

#### 7. AOB

- Please fill in Christmas leave on the availability page
- **ACTION** Rick: Document how to get a disrupted signer back at work, as a multi-stage rocket.
- [Happy Holidays everyone!](#)