

MXCuBE Developers Meeting

30.10.2019

Berlin-Schmöckwitz

AB Antonia Beteva
MS Martin Savko
IK Ivars Karpics
RF Rasmus Fogh
VR Vicente Rey
MO Marcus Oskarsson
LC Lais Pessine do Carmo

Open decision: Python version check for import statements, issue #410

(AB) two options: try ... except, or sys.version_info
please make up your mind

(AB) String formatting syntax

- two syntaxes possible a) version > 3.7 (?) b) else

(MS) transition to Python 3 not possible now (IK, MS) -> maybe in 6 months time

(MO) proposes new face-to-face meeting, Location: Grenoble, time: December or February.

(MS) concurs. The proposal is carried, unanimously. Organisers must ensure remote access for those who cannot attend (e.g. LC)

(MO) will set up Doodle poll. ACTION

(IK) additional documentation camp useful

(MO) Further proposes documentation/testing meeting shortly before the next regular meeting.

(IK) concurs. Proposal carried unanimously.

(IK) establish conventions on naming: stricter/more formal proposal for accepting changes?

Merging of pull requests without peer-review

(RF) merged because other people were not answering. We already have rules, and more formality will slow down the process.

(AB) if changes are relevant for other collaborators address people directly to ensure feedback, request answer within 3 weeks

(MO) decision about sample-view related objects inside beamline object is still pending: graphics vs microscope

(RF) organization different between MXCuBE version 2 and 3

(MO) organization of graphics inside microscope?

(RF) Beamline object: decide open questions soon

(IK) no objections against current proposal

(MO) no objections, it worked with a few changes

subclassing yes/no:

- if subclassing will be used not all people are using the same object

(RF) cannot change types in subclass otherwise incompatible, normally used for extensions

(MO) subclassing better than customization in configuration files
(VR) subclassing a bit heavy for smaller site-specific changes?
(RF) everything except BeamlineObject is still configured with xml files
Consensus: keep subclassable BeamlineObject

(MO) slowly move to yaml configuration file
(AB) every new HardwareObject should be implemented with a yaml configuration file
(VR) we should be ambitious in functionality
- only one place for specific data inside one session
- inline documentation should act as a contract
(RF) changes towards abstract classes enforce this
(VR) meaning and scope of objects should be defined in the abstract classes. Also units of parameters being passed.
(MO) to be ambitious or to be compatible may be conflicting goals
(VR) implementation of new functionality should not be restricted by constraints of the BlissFramework anymore
(RF) HardwareObjects containing other HardwareObject should be in yaml, but moving to yaml configuration is not enforced
(VR) both types of configuration methods should be supported: xml and yaml
(RF) functionality is not a matter of file type, xml or yaml

(MO) general remarks concerning pull requests:
- after milestone 2 (M2) was reached, things cleared up.
- after abstract classes will be finalized development process will stabilize

(RF) remarks concerning pull requests regarding abstract classes:
- transition from camel_case to snake_case will break many things
- proposal to change naming now!
- people must adapt xml configuration files as a consequence
- We should look at stabilising the code **after** implementation of the new abstract classes.

(VR) remarks concerning GUI implementation:
- We need to review and standardise data communication via signals, and centralise signals in the Session.
- communication should go through hardware object instead of direct communication between GUI objects
- GUI objects should be revisited
- any reference to hardware objects other than new beamline object should be removed
- BeamlineObject should be developed to act as a "state machine" to ensure valid application state
- These matters are for Phase 3, and should be considered at the next meeting.