

Date: 14-15th May 2013

Location: Applan room, RIPE 66

Present: Sara, Sion, Matthijs, Jakob (Tues only), Patrik (Tues only), Yuri by Google+ (Tues only)

Tuesday 14th

10:00-12:00

- Welcome
- High level development review
 - Roadmap
 - No comments
 - Move to git?
 - Proposal is we move SoftHSM v2 to git as a test case. Rene will do a test conversion locally and see what it looks like. This is a big job and shouldn't be considered for OpenDNSSEC until the next RIPE meeting. Could we move to git for the 2.0 beta? Jerry knows lots about git and could do us a workshop on it if needed.
 - Versioning discussion - did we get it right?
 - We discuss the problem of having 5-10 developments that are considered very useful but require an extension to the command line interface and would therefore require a minor version bump (to 1.5) under the current policy. We discuss that we don't want the overhead of having to support another version just to deliver these small features and we don't want them to wait till 2.0 and so the current policy isn't delivering what we need. A small update is proposed to versioning policy - allow extensions to the command line utilities in patch releases
Note that we agree no xml changes or database schema changes are allowed in patch releases, only isolated, low risk extensions to the command line interface. **ACTION:** This will be proposed to the board. We also agree that bug fixes should drive the 1.4.X releases and the small features currently marked as 1.5 will be done as an when there is time.

We also discuss that we should review the support policy when a minor release is actually made and make a clear statement in the release notes as to how long we intend to release it. We should not be tied to the 1 year rule and should make the judgement based on the release content. As long as this is clearly communicated to the users when the release is made we believe this is OK.
- 2.0 review
 - Merging into trunk
 - We agree that we will keep enforcer-ng on its own branch for now since it can't run any regression tests yet.
 - Regression & user testing
 - Yuri will concentrate on 'functional' improvements. Other resources (sara, matthjish, nick?, jerry?) will work on improving compatibility and porting regression tests. Policy on reg test is to change enforcer-ng not the test unless there are good reasons. **ACTION:** Sara will add a compatibility label to relevant issues in jira. Sara will check with nick and jerry on availability and also raise resourcing with the board.
 - Development resources and timescales
 - We discuss the outstanding development work and think we are 6 months away from a beta rather than weeks.
 - Scope (pure enforcer-ng?)
 - We agree that the signer developments will be kept to a minimum - no new adapters in 2.0 but some minor enhancements.
 - Databases
 - Postponed till Wed.

(13:00-16:00 OAB meeting)

Wednesday 15th

16:00-18:00

- Updates from the board meeting
- 2.0 Databases
 - Consider email to user list, possibly as part of larger survey understand users priorities. Postgres seems like a possibility as we have had specific requests for it from users but we haven't been asked about LDAP (apart from proposal from Rick) and the initial thought is it seems too different. But we think we should ask Rick to talk about it in a team meeting.
- Review of some key JIRA issues assigned to specific issues
 - [OPENDNSSEC-232](#) Handle DNS views
 - We consider the support for views. We think this is a very big change. We need to understand if the enforcer-ng uses the zone name internally as that might make the change easier there. We think about a solution where the zone name directly contains the reference separated by some special character... this might be possible. The uniqueness of the zone name is a very low level assumption in the code so we don't know how much work this would be until it has been investigated (and possibly implemented...). **ACTION:** Agree we should include it in the list of long term developments and in any user survey on priorities.
 - *All issues for 1.4.1*
 - Need to review 2.0 issues to pull into 1.4. We talk about use priority better or have a backlog against 1.4.X??? **ACTION:** Sara takes an action update the issue versions as needed.
 - *Open issues for 2.0.0b1 (OPENDNSSEC-404: Idempotent interaction Not Found).* *We don't understand quite how big retrofitting this request would be....we suspect it is again a lot of work. Technically we can see the merit but how to prioritise it is again a problem. We agree it should definitely be part of planning the new API for the future. Are there a handful of commands in 1.3/1.4 that really need? Need to get input from Yuri to understand how close the enforcer-ng is to behaving like this already. Should we think about this when we do the porting of the regression tests too.* **ACTION:** Add to list of features to survey users on.
 - *Open issues for 2.1.0rc1*
- Memory usage
 - Matthijs reports that he is looking into how to use a different memory allocation mechanism within OpenDNSSEC as a task and is also talking to the .CZ guys about what they are doing.
- Wiki - backup docs
 - Sara asks if the developers can review the backup docs page as it is still marked as under construction: High availability
- Benchmarking
 - We discuss Sara's recent benchmarking efforts and agree it is harder to compare apples with apples than originally thought. The tests need to separate out key allocation and should maybe compare the time taken to do a key rollover for zones sharing keys.
- AOB
 - There was a comment that the developers would like to have more information about the training sessions that the company does as we feel quite disconnected from that

18:00 - 'Meet the team' informal session