

# TT-minutes-20151026



Nicholas Contino: Please move under [Tools Team Home](#)

<b>paulsher1ood</b>	== GENIVI Tools Team Meeting Starts ==	14:00
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	hi folks	14:00
<b>gmacario</b>	Hi there!	14:01
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	i've opened the webex line if folks are interested...	14:01
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	<a href="http://genivi.webex.com">http://genivi.webex.com</a> should give you a link	14:01
<b>CTtpollard</b>	;Q	14:01
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	gmacario: are you back in europe now?	14:02
* CTtpollard apologises		14:02
<b>gmacario</b>	Yes I am	14:02
<b>gunnarx</b>	calling in	14:02
* paulsher1ood hopes he dialled the right number... he seems to be alone on the call		14:02
* paulsher1ood can hear gunnarx		14:03
<b>waltminer</b>	there is a call? I thought it was still IRC only	14:03
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	waltminer: we'll document here, so you don't need to call in if you prefer not to	14:03
<b>gmacario</b>	I have troubles dialing in, will stay in IRC only	14:03
*** klausbirken has joined #automotive		14:03
<b>waltminer</b>	I am on another call	14:03
*** philrob has joined #automotive		14:04
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	that's a couple of reasons for preferring irc meetigns	14:04
<b>klausbirken</b>	Hi	14:04
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	hi klausbirken !	14:04
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	i'm sorry the F2F for tools team got completely derailed...	14:04
<b>waltminer</b>	kooltux_ are you having a problem with the audio?	14:05
<b>klausbirken</b>	why? haven't looked for minutes yet	14:05

<b>paulsher1ood</b>	i ended up in discussions about AGL at the allotted time	14:05
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	time	14:05
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	and those discussions were a bit disappointing i must say	14:05
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	anyways...	14:06
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	my pre-agenda...	14:06
<b>klausbirken</b>	should we call in on webex audio?	14:06
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	klausbirken: you are welcome to... but i'm typing as fast as i can	14:06
*** jeremiah has joined #automotive		14:06
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	== Merge of BIT and Tools Team ==	14:07
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	(no decision has been made... just discussion/thinking)	14:07
<b>gunnarx</b>	philrob says the above ^^	14:07
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood: I can help out scribing some notes from the audio call	14:08
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	philrob summarises that bit tends to increase activity at baseline release times	14:08
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	gunnarx: tvm	14:08
<b>gunnarx</b>	philrob says, BIT has in the past worked on various topics related to requirements and execution of both GDP and automated tests	14:09
*** Tarnyko has quit IRC		14:09
<b>gunnarx</b>	philrob says, AFAIK the TT does not really provide project management right now. TT is better working on requirements / sharing? It's an open question - please provide input	14:10
*** KlausUhl has joined #automotive		14:10
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, similar people attend the two team meetings	14:11
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, TT have been successful encouraging more work in the open	14:12
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, wondering is there additional BIT work that we can get in the open.	14:13
<b>gmacario</b>	paulsher1ood: Do you have specific ideas in mind? AFAIK main BIT deliverables (i.e. Baselines) are already in the open	14:14
<b>jeremiah</b>	And much of the BIT work is project management, i.e. managing the releases and point releases.	14:15
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, if we have some combination we want to make sure we can work openly	14:15
<b>jeremiah</b>	In what way is it not open?	14:16
<b>gunnarx</b>	philrob says, , there should not be that much private in BIT	14:16
<b>gunnarx</b>	jeremiah: agreed, that's the sentiment on the call right now	14:16

<b>paulsher1ood</b>	its proceedings are documented in private (more for historical reasons) and its meetings are not held in the open iuc	14: 16
<b>gunnarx</b>	gunnarx says, In my opinion key deliverable from BIT is the baseline, the rest is a bonus.	14: 17
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	the results of BIT (baselines, GDP) have been made public consistently over several years	14: 17
<b>gmacario</b>	gunnarx: +1	14: 17
<b>jeremiah</b>	gunnarx: +1	14: 17
<b>gunnarx</b>	gunnarx says, other deliverables (GDP, automated testing) need to be included in a combined group	14: 18
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, GDP is a key deliverable	14: 18
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	GDP could and should be considered a key deliverable too :)	14: 18
<b>gunnarx</b>	gunnarx says +1	14: 18
<b>jeremiah</b>	I don't think there is anything blocking the BIT from publishing its minutes on the public wiki if that was wanted.	14: 18
<b>philrob</b>	++1	14: 18
<b>jeremiah</b>	paulsher1ood: But much of that is being done *outside* of the BIT (i.e. GDP)	14: 19
<b>jeremiah</b>	GDP gets reported into PMO	14: 19
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	true	14: 19
<b>gunnarx</b>	jeremiah: we do some baseline planning related to the compliance aspect of baseline. This part is a GENIVI internal meeting. The result is published as part of meta-ivi however	14: 19
<b>jeremiah</b>	And we're not getting open minutes from there either.	14: 19
<b>philrob</b>	GDP reported to PMO because of the BIT leadership position only	14: 20
<b>jeremiah</b>	Umm, okay.	14: 20
<b>jeremiah</b>	That's a little weird to be noting after there have been two releases coordinated via PMO, but okay.	14: 20
<b>jeremiah</b>	It makes sense that the GDP comes into the BIT.	14: 21
<b>philrob</b>	no, it is not weird, it was just a countermeasure to get prepared for Seoul AMM	14: 21
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, in order to get more adoption of for example CommonAPI / Franca they should be more discussed / promoted in the context of baselines and other systems	14: 21
<b>philrob</b>	+1	14: 21
<b>klausbirken</b>	+1	14: 22
<b>jeremiah</b>	I don't think that more discussion will make a difference frankly.	14: 22
<b>jeremiah</b>	Many companies know about Common API and some choose not to use it.	14: 22
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	jeremiah: show me the code :)	14: 22

<b>jeremiah</b>	paulsher1ood: Show me the code. :-)	14: 22
<b>jeremiah</b>	Show me someone who doesn't know about CAPI and Franca	14: 23
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	noted	14: 23
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood, what's next step in discussing BIT/TT join	14: 23
<b>gunnarx</b>	discussing if there are any conflicts or problems...	14: 25
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	BIT discussion of planning for compliance could not be conducted in public, the rest could	14: 25
<b>jeremiah</b>	paulsher1ood: +1	14: 26
<b>gunnarx</b>	+1, not setting GENIVI policy here, just this is the current working model. All artifacts are open.	14: 26
<b>jeremiah</b>	Yep, and we can publish minutes publicly.	14: 26
<b>gunnarx</b>	meta-ivi input could be received, discussed and acted upon as a normal public project. meta-ivi processes for the actual code is to receive public patches.	14: 28
<b>gunnarx</b>	I am saying baseline is one thing, meta-ivi could be <u>more</u> than that (using branches), completely up to meta-ivi maintainer	14: 28
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	next step would be to propose a revised charter (not on irc)	14: 29
<b>jeremiah</b>	:-)	14: 29
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood, philrob trying to work out what next steps are...	14: 30
<b>jeremiah</b>	I think a charter that pointed to shared responsibility in the BIT would be a huge advantage for GENIVI	14: 30
<b>jeremiah</b>	Might remove potential issues should maintainers be called into production projects for example	14: 30
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	jeremiah: please could you expand on that?	14: 30
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	oh, i see what you mean...	14: 31
<b>jeremiah</b>	Well, we shouldn't have a single commiter	14: 31
<b>gunnarx</b>	I don't. Can you clarify, "shared responsibility in the BIT?"	14: 31
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	so we could avoid a repeat of the the situation where a maintainer goes AWOL	14: 31
<b>jeremiah</b>	Exactly.	14: 31
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	leaving the project screwed for a few months	14: 31
<b>jeremiah</b>	Having mutiple parties able to commit will prevent a single point of failure	14: 31
<b>gunnarx</b>	It's not clear which project you're talking about. Jeremiah said BIT, do you mean meta-ivi?	14: 31
<b>jeremiah</b>	Sorry, more meta-ivi than BIT	14: 32
<b>gunnarx</b>	ok. +1	14: 32

<b>paulsher1ood</b>	i meant individual projects, yes, not BIT	14: 32
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood says, action is on me and philrob?	14: 32
<b>gunnarx</b>	agreed	14: 32
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	ACTION: paulsher1ood and philrob to consider revised charter?	14: 32
<b>gmacario</b>	We should already have a similar requirements for Open Source Projects, right?	14: 32
<b>jeremiah</b>	gmacario: Yep	14: 32
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	can we just re-use something from there?	14: 32
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	shall we move on?	14: 33
<b>gmacario</b>	+1	14: 33
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	== TT Collaboration with AGL ==	14: 33
<b>gunnarx</b>	yes. we try to require 2 maintainers as a sign of a healthy project	14: 33
<b>gunnarx</b>	what tools are AGL envisioning?	14: 34
<b>gunnarx</b>	any needs, requirements known so far?	14: 34
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood, primarily it would be CIAT	14: 34
<b>gmacario</b>	AFAIK AGL is currently using Jenkins as CI tool	14: 34
<b>gunnarx</b>	gmacario: +1, also mentioned now in call	14: 35
* paulsher1ood has found that there is top-level resistance (from AGL) to actual collaboration between AGL and GENIVI		14: 35
<b>jeremiah</b>	I think there automated testing set up using Jenkins and Ctest is something that we ought to look at.	14: 36
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	so maybe this topic will die	14: 36
<b>gunnarx</b>	I have also asked about this but I think it's hard - AGL wants to "move fast" (own words) and integrate their things	14: 36
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	is anyone here interested to keep it alive?	14: 36
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	waltminer for example?	14: 36
<b>gunnarx</b>	I fear organizations may need/want their own infra in order to guarantee availability and focus on their strategic parts. Maybe.	14: 36
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	(and their own people :- )	14: 37
<b>gmacario</b>	If we have a way of sharing investments I believe this is a good thing to try	14: 37
<b>jeremiah</b>	gmacario: What do you see as "low hanging fruit"?	14: 37
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood showed baserock CIAT. AGL not using... Other several ideas around CIAT are brewing... so maybe come back to the topic later.	14: 38

<b>gmacario</b>	Setting up the same CI tool maybe	14: 38
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	gmacario: in theory yes, in practice not so	14: 38
<b>gmacario</b>	We as GENIVI do not have daily builds	14: 38
<b>jeremiah</b>	gmacario: No does AGL.	14: 38
*** klausbirken1 has joined #automotive		14: 38
<b>jeremiah</b>	s/No/Nor/	14: 39
<b>gmacario</b>	What about <a href="https://build.automotivelinux.org/">https://build.automotivelinux.org/</a>	14: 39
<b>gunnarx</b>	gmacario, it only matters if we have the exact same server - so that anyone can input recipes that they want into that	14: 39
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	'daily builds' is not necessarily the right way to do things	14: 39
*** klausbirken1 has quit IRC		14: 39
* paulsher1ood proposes to got to normal Tools Team business		14: 39
<b>waltminer</b>	AGL is doing Jenkins builds on every propped change and after every commit	14: 40
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	andreas has no topics for today	14: 40
<b>waltminer</b>	so it is not a "daily build".	14: 40
<b>gunnarx</b>	+1 it's more than builds - deployment, testing... Let me show you an idea at a later time. I may write up an email since we want to move on.	14: 40
<b>gunnarx</b>	waltminer, understood. I think we're trying to move on.	14: 40
<b>waltminer</b>	ok I just saw the topic.	14: 41
<b>gunnarx</b>	np walt	14: 41
<b>gunnarx</b>	klaus says, Franca presentation update in Seoul. Feedback?	14: 41
<b>gmacario</b>	k.aus: I liked it as usual	14: 41
<b>gunnarx</b>	philrob says, we're missing some people who may have feedback. can we postpone?	14: 41
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	philrob proposes to get feedback next week	14: 41
<b>gmacario</b>	+1	14: 41
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	most people have not collected their thoughts sicne the AMM	14: 42
<b>klausbirken1</b>	gmacario: thx	14: 42
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood, let's collect up the topics now, get feedback next week	14: 42
<b>gunnarx</b>	^^ paulsher1ood says	14: 42

<b>paulsher1ood</b>	AOB for today?	14: 42
<b>gunnarx</b>	gunnarx says, klaus: are you using franca_install_automation for testing, any issues?	14: 44
<b>gunnarx</b>	klausbirken1 says, will use it for testing again when next release is ready.	14: 44
<b>gunnarx</b>	paulsher1ood plugs the livecast of the baserock hands on	14: 45
<b>gunnarx</b>	klaus says, link?	14: 45
*** jeremiah has quit IRC		14: 45
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	<a href="https://t.co/V2pevEDynq">https://t.co/V2pevEDynq</a>	14: 45
*** jeremiah has joined #automotive		14: 47
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	gunnarx is proposing to show a demo of CIAT using gocd	14: 48
<b>gunnarx</b>	<a href="http://go.cd">http://go.cd</a>	14: 48
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	for interested parties (via the webex)	14: 48
<b>gunnarx</b>	It's a tool I've fallen in love with :)	14: 48
* paulsher1ood proposes to close the TT meeting		14: 48
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	== TT Meeting Ends ==	14: 49
<b>paulsher1ood</b>	gunnarx will demonstrate CIAT pipelines using <a href="#">go.cd</a> at gen	