**Agenda for call 2022-01-10**

\* SWG needs to go public: what do we need to do? *(Advertise the group and its charter in the usual social media channels, especially Discourse and Reddit, with the charter in a GitHub repo. CD to do.)*

\* We agreed in the last meeting that we should be tracking upcoming breaking changes to the

ecosystem. How do we go about doing this? *(Gentle pushback from a limited discussion of this proposal, contrary to opinion expressed on previous call in December.)*

\* Do we need a better definition of breaking change than that provided by the PVP?

*(This does not appear to be a priority issue.)*

\* Discussion of /Adapting to a new version of GHC, way faster/ (see below for link):

+ Do we want to do it? *(Probably, but starting with a simpler scheme that focuses on making the patches available as an overlay – what this space.)*

+ How much do we do? *(To be discussed on the next call.)*

**Discussion points from the meeting:**

* “Fellow Jitster”/Bodigrim says that he’d prefer GHC to break stuff less often. Acknowledges that 100% back-compat is not desirable. SPJ asks for a dozen concrete examples to illustrate what Bodigrim has in mind.
* Pepe thinks we’ll always have such changes. More predictable schedule would be helpful.
* Syd suggested a one-version back-compat policy. (SPJ: not sure what this means.)
* Keeping up with GHC proposals is work. (All agree.)
* Better *signalling* of breaking changes might be helpful.
* GHC.X.hackage enables volunteers to contribute; this is good.
* Another idea:
  + Annual LTS release -- lower the cost on library authors by expecting them mainly to update to the LTS release
  + Plus six-monthly bleeding-edge release? Supported principally by GHC.X.hackage. Some participants saw no point in this.
  + Who might dislike a slower release cadence?
    - Users waiting for critical fixes [but should they not be backported?]
    - GHC authors wanting to get their latest feature in

Idea: the Stability Working Group could conduct some kind of opinion gathering to discover what release cadence the community would like.

* Andrew. If we could have a yearly **dependable rhythm** where you know the target dates well ahead of time, it means you can trim back the scope of the release to make the dates with the quality level you want, rather than trying to stabilize whatever can get into the main branch before you fork.
* Maybe GHC could prioritise *predictability* (timing wise) more highly, even if it means making releases with known bugs.
* Chris: should the stability working group gather a record of breaking changes? And maybe guidance about how to adapt. SPJ: danger of over-reach here, and doing something we’ll find it hard to sustain; need to start with something modest and achievable.