

|              |  |          |
|--------------|--|----------|
| nathenharvey | *** MEETING STARTS ***   |          |
|              | Agenda for today's meeting - <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...">https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...</a> | 12:00 PM |
| jonlives     | ok, first up, updates.   | 12:01 PM |
|              | I appear to be giving an update on chef software, which I hereby delegate to adamedx :p  | 12:01 PM |
| adamedx      | appreciated :)   | 12:01 PM |
| nathenharvey | a quick reminder that Adam Jacob is still out on vacation so jonlives is project lead and running this meeting                                   | 12:01 PM |
| aspier       | oh, there's a meeting now?   | 12:01 PM |
| jonlives     | aspier: yep :)   | 12:02 PM |
| aspier       | I should probably attend and send out my slide deck then :)  | 12:02 PM |
| jonlives     | adamedx: feel free to roll in client and server updates too btw  | 12:02 PM |
| adamedx      | We've released a new chef-client 12.3 using a new release process  | 12:02 PM |
|              | thom and team tested it out for us   | 12:02 PM |
| aspier       | oh, well wrong channel maybe - I guess I was thinking of #openstack-chef ...   | 12:02 PM |
| adamedx      | there was a focus on having a longer rc period for the release   | 12:02 PM |

|            |   |       |
|------------|---|-------|
|            | which I think helped because we did catch some regressions that way                       | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | which were addressed in the 12.3 release  | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jtimberman | gotta catch em all  | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | ;)  | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
| adamedx    | so please give 12.3 a try   | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jtimberman | 12.3 resolves the package bug on OS X where it tries to use macports instead of homebrew. | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | fwiw  | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
| adamedx    | we also have a new chefdk with the non-RC version of test-kitchen                         | 12:03 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | correct jtimberman. that was a bug we fixed, then reintroduced                            | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jtimberman | then fixed again  | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
| adamedx    | yup   | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | the new release process will focus on releasing from master as much as possible           | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | to avoid situations like that   | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | that's it for my update   | 12:04 |

|            |   |       |
|------------|---|-------|
|            |   | PM    |
| thom       | (we'll also have a new chef 11 really really soon now, with an updated openssl)   | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
| ssd7       | jonlives: adamedx Mind if I give a small server update?   | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jonlives   | thanks adamedx  | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
|            | ssd7: go for it   | 12:04 |
|            |   | PM    |
| ssd7       | The previously mentioned chef-server repository merge is happening right now. There will be loose ends to chase throughout the day I'm sure   | 12:05 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jtimberman | if you use chefdk on os x and use its chef-client to converge your os x system, then you'll need to either wait for 0.5.1 (coming soon), or install chef 12.3 into your ~/.chefdk/gems (chef gem install chef), and use<br>~/.chefdk/gems/2.1.0/bin/chef-client | 12:05 |
|            |   | PM    |
| ssd7       | We plan on doing an RC for the next server release as it has some bigger changes. We know it can be harder to test the Server than the client, but we appreciate everyone who gives it a go   | 12:06 |
|            | (that's all)  | 12:06 |
|            |   | PM    |
| adamedx    | its pretty easy to get the server release from packagecloud   | 12:06 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jonlives   | thanks ssd7!  | 12:06 |
|            |   | PM    |
| ssd7       | (the new repo: <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-server">https://github.com/chef/chef-server</a> )  | 12:06 |
|            |   | PM    |
| adamedx    | thanks  | 12:06 |
|            |   | PM    |
| jonlives   | next we have ze community update from nathenharvey  | 12:06 |

|                     |   |       |
|---------------------|---|-------|
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>martinisoft_</b> | I can give server a test  | 12:07 |
|                     |   | PM    |
|                     | <i>martinisoft_ is now known as martinisoft</i>   | 12:07 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>nathenharvey</b> | A reminder to save the date for the community summit in Seattle Oct 14-15. We expect to open up registration by the end of May and expect tickets to be in the neighborhood of \$400 each | 12:07 |
|                     | We're currently scouting locations for the London summit, too. Will share details and dates as they're available  | 12:08 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>jonlives</b>     | woohoo  | 12:08 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>nathenharvey</b> | We'll also be updating the Supermarket (probably this week) with a new feature: the ability to see all cookbooks that are "up for adoption"   | 12:09 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>jonlives</b>     | oh nice   | 12:09 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>jtimberman</b>   | cool  | 12:09 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>Majost_mbl</b>   | +1  | 12:09 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>nathenharvey</b> | and, if you've not already done so, please complete the cookbook survey here - <a href="http://bit.ly/chefconf2015-cookbook-survey">http://bit.ly/chefconf2015-cookbook-survey</a>        | 12:09 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>tBunnyMan</b>    | sweet   | 12:09 |
|                     |   | PM    |
| <b>nathenharvey</b> | an awesome side note, the new supermarket feature I mentioned was built by a new contributor to chef projects! we'll share some more details in some upcoming blog posts                  | 12:10 |
|                     | that's it for the community update this week.   | 12:10 |
|                     |   | PM    |

|             |  |       |
|-------------|--|-------|
| jonlives    | thansk nathenharvey!   | 12:11 |
|             |  | PM    |
| Eeyun       | ^  | 12:11 |
|             |  | PM    |
| jonlives    | the one action item from last week relates to a PR we'll be discussing later so I'm going to do that all at once               | 12:11 |
|             |  | PM    |
|             | first new PR is from ranjib, <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/120">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/120</a> | 12:11 |
|             |  | PM    |
|             | ranjib: wanna summarise quickly for us?  | 12:12 |
|             |  | PM    |
| ranjib      | yeah, this is for chef run performance optimization  | 12:12 |
|             |  | PM    |
| coderanger  | Devils advocate: why does this need a dedicated subsystem instead of being a handler or event sink?                            | 12:13 |
|             |  | PM    |
| ranjib      | it will help folks find out where in a chef run things slow down etc   | 12:13 |
|             |  | PM    |
|             | coderanger, i thinks its common enough. and not all of it can be a report handler  | 12:13 |
|             |  | PM    |
| coderanger  | ranjib: Can you enumerate which pieces can't be?   | 12:14 |
|             |  | PM    |
| martinisoft | I'm actually a little surprised a handler can't do this.   | 12:14 |
|             |  | PM    |
| ranjib      | event handler  | 12:14 |
|             |  | PM    |
|             | like if you are using lot of time for search .. you cant detect that using report handlers                                     | 12:14 |
|             |  | PM    |
|             | as it is indicated by the time spent between run start and converge start  | 12:15 |

|                    |  |       |
|--------------------|--|-------|
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>martinisoft</b> | ranjib: Could report handlers be enhanced to include this data?  | 12:15 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>ranjib</b>      | nope.  | 12:15 |
|                    |  | PM    |
|                    | u'll need event handler as well  | 12:15 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>jonlives</b>    | martinisoft: I think ranjib is saying that report handlers won't have access to pre-converge perf info   | 12:15 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>coderanger</b>  | Presumably we'll add some kind fo search_start and search_end tracking when we implement this anyway, could we do just that part and the actual statsd shipping in the plugin? | 12:15 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>ranjib</b>      | we used 3 handler to grab all those data   | 12:15 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>kallistec</b>   | yeah, what coderanger said is possible in DSL methods  | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>ranjib</b>      | coderanger, still u'll need event handler to capture that, not report handlers   | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>coderanger</b>  | Basically "how slim can we make the core changes?"   | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>martinisoft</b> | jonlives: Ahh ok. Just trying to see if there is possibly a gap to be filled versus proposing a whole new subsystem.   | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>jonlives</b>    | martinisoft: absolutely valid question :)  | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>kallistec</b>   | not possible if you do Chef::Search::Query.new blah blah   | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
|                    | <i>martinisoft thumbs through jonlives' book a bit more</i>  | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |

|                    |  |       |
|--------------------|--|-------|
| <b>coderanger</b>  | ranjib: Yes, an event handler seems like the right thing for this  | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>kallistec</b>   | but IMO it's fine if we require you to manually run your thing in some block   | 12:16 |
|                    |  | PM    |
|                    | e.g., <code>perf_measure { custom_thing_im_doing }</code>  | 12:17 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>coderanger</b>  | +1   | 12:17 |
|                    |  | PM    |
|                    | with an associated <code>perf_timer</code> event   | 12:17 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>jonlives</b>    | on the flip side of the coin, I do like the idea of just being able to turn on this sort of info when I need it etc                                    | 12:17 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>jkeiser</b>     | I'm a fan of having automatic reporting with a standard set of useful data in core (or at least in a gem included the omnibus install for chef-client) | 12:17 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>coderanger</b>  | So the reporting stuff, which seems to be more of what this RFC covers, would still be an event handler  | 12:18 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>ranjib</b>      | yeah, basic telemetry should be baked in   | 12:18 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>coderanger</b>  | But yeah, would support bundling with omnibus and chef-dk because operability out of the box is important  | 12:18 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>martinisoft</b> | jkeiser: I like this idea. Feel it could be useful.  | 12:18 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>jkeiser</b>     | It makes a <i>*lot*</i> of sense to modify the event handlers to do it though  | 12:18 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>ranjib</b>      | reporting is proprietary right?  | 12:18 |
|                    |  | PM    |
| <b>coderanger</b>  | ranjib: The server component is, client side is now.   | 12:18 |

|            |  |       |
|------------|--|-------|
|            |  | PM    |
|            | er not   | 12:18 |
|            |  | PM    |
| kallistec  | yeah, I think we can just add whatever events are missing and add a thing like client-side reporting class   | 12:18 |
|            |  | PM    |
| jkeiser    | Like, if the event handlers can be made powerful enough to give you the data you need, let's do *that* in core and make a gem for the specific data. If that's possible  | 12:19 |
|            |  | PM    |
| kallistec  | FWIW, chef-foreman uses the built-in reporting to talk to foreman  | 12:19 |
|            |  | PM    |
| coderanger | The other advantage to doing this in an event handler externally is it will still work with older chef, just without the new event data  | 12:19 |
|            |  | PM    |
| jonlives   | that's very true   | 12:20 |
|            |  | PM    |
| kallistec  | jkeiser: personally I want it in core, and I want an option to display on the command line at the end of a run   | 12:20 |
|            |  | PM    |
| jkeiser    | The reason: it would be good if people could switch out to their own reporting / derive from this gem, which only happens if we do the event handler upgrade   | 12:20 |
|            |  | PM    |
| ranjib     | also if you want to capture someting that happens before recipe evaluation, it might be hard for an external handler   | 12:20 |
|            |  | PM    |
| coderanger | kallistec: Collecting perf data is somewhat separate from having a statsd client as a dependency of the "chef" gem   | 12:20 |
|            |  | PM    |
| jkeiser    | I'm ok with it being in core too; the main thing is that we should make sure the telemetry reporters are using public APIs from core   | 12:20 |
|            |  | PM    |
| coderanger | Thats the part I'm a little hessitant on   | 12:20 |
|            |  | pm    |
| jonlives   | it seems there might be two components here - 1) is adding extra events for profiling to the event dispatcher and 2) would be a way to tap into that in core, possibly with a formatter-type class, but for profiling. | 12:21 |
|            |  | pm    |



|            |   |             |
|------------|---|-------------|
| kallistec  | coderanger: sure, that part can be gem  | 12:21<br>pm |
| coderanger | kallistec: :+1:   | 12:21<br>pm |
|            | (but again, would only support it being in its own gem if it is included out-of-the-box in the omnibus builds)  | 12:21<br>pm |
|            |   |             |
| jkeiser    | So, this is sort of implementation detail. It actually seems like we agree that telemetry should be in core (or at the *very* least, teh chef-client that most pepole install)  | 12:21<br>pm |
| ranjib     | statsd does not need to be a gem. its a single file library iirc. also we can make that optional  | 12:22<br>pm |
| jonlives   | spitballing here, what do we think about that as an idea, profiler classes in the same way we have formatters - we could ship a minimal default with core, and then people can easily enable a statsd option just the same way as they would switch to nyan-formatter | 12:22<br>pm |
| jkeiser    | Maybe we should have the discussion of whether to also make event handlers a part of the code review  | 12:22<br>pm |
| ranjib     | jonlives, +1  | 12:23<br>pm |
| jkeiser    | Note that you could build the telemetry without making awesome event handlers, and then put event handlers in afterwards  | 12:23<br>pm |
| jonlives   | yes indeed  | 12:23<br>pm |
| ranjib     | basic metric capturing should go in core  | 12:23<br>pm |
|            |   |             |
|            | as this gives us a chance to codify community learnings..   | 12:23<br>pm |
| kallistec  | jonlives: yeah, that's what I'm in favor of, include at least a text-based one in core, users can add whatever metrics system they want   | 12:23<br>pm |

|                   |  |                            |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------|
| <b>ranjib</b>     | what metrics to grab, what stages generally choke etc  | 12:23<br>pm                |
| <b>jonlives</b>   | right  | 12:23<br>pm                |
| <b>jkeiser</b>    | The question of whether statsd should be a dependency of chef is a real one. As long as it's not much code, I'd like to see some common reporting systems like statsd in core, so that users can select them without work<br><br>Like, the ability to immediately turn on telemetry and actually have it report somewhere, is a huge operability feature | 12:24<br>pm<br>12:24<br>pm |
| <b>coderanger</b> | ranjib: I'm not as comfortable with teaching the chef gem about a new network protocol and having the stuff to write to it. but on the other hand statsd is probably the simplest protocol possible for this and it doesn't tend to change so ...  | 12:24<br>pm                |
| <b>jonlives</b>   | ok, so how about restructuring this RFC to explitley specify the creation of a profiler class, which can be enabled (and has defaults) in much the same way as formatters do, and for now we stick with a simple text option in core.  | 12:24<br>pm                |
| <b>ranjib</b>     | coderanger, we can drop statsd   | 12:24<br>pm                |
| <b>coderanger</b> | jonlives: Is there a difference between "Profiler" and a normal event handler?   | 12:25<br>pm                |
| <b>ranjib</b>     | <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LEFR3Hdr5KA">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LEFR3Hdr5KA</a> <- the presentation in which we spoke about the perf optimization, most of the work is based on this   | 12:25<br>pm                |
| <b>jonlives</b>   | coderanger: only in the same way that formatters are a special thing - I envisage a profiler containing more timing type methods   | 12:25<br>pm                |
| <b>kallistec</b>  | that ^^  | 12:25<br>pm                |
| <b>coderanger</b> | jonlives: :+1:   | 12:25<br>pm                |
| <b>jonlives</b>   | ie, the base formatter might expose timings for everything we have "start" and "stop" methods for etc.<br><br>something along those lines.   | 12:26<br>pm<br>12:26       |

all in favour of that?

12:26

jkeiser

I'd sort of like to see it. I think our event handler system could use love

12:26

coderanger

Also having the default write to the console is probably better than a default that writes to node attrs

12:26

jkeiser

Like, I don't know if a third or fourth formatter thingy is a good idea without actually thinking it through holistically

12:27

ranjib

well i felt it pretty complete whenever i used it

12:27

kallistec

jkeiser: this isn't really a new thing

12:27

jonlives

this is really only adding a new class of event dispatcher subscriber at the moment

12:27

martinisoft

jonlives: +1 to that proposal. Even as a basic start which could be extended/changed in other RFCs.

12:27

kallistec

like formatters and event handlers are the same, just formatters have methods for printing and colors

12:27

jonlives

yeah

12:27

jkeiser

Yeah. If this is just a new event handler, I'm cool with that, I must have missed it

12:28

jonlives

ok - ranjib would you be OK to strucure the RFC along those lines?

12:28

and we can re-visit next week

12:28

|             |   |       |
|-------------|---|-------|
| ranjib      | yeah..  | 12:28 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jkeiser     | If ranjib is ok restructuring that's cool, but I'm a little worried we said "yes, we like everything in your RFC, but we'd like to design it now"                                 | 12:28 |
|             |   | pm    |
| ranjib      | can someone summarize the changes needed  | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jonlives    | not really, I think we're just more explicitly defining how this information will be exposed.   | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jkeiser     | Like, if we're ok with telemetry being in core, we should say so, approve the RFC, and catch that in code review / require a separate RFC just for the event system               | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
|             | Anyway, if ranjib is ok with it that's cool   | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
| coderanger  | ranjib: Basically just add a section detailing that telemetry/profiling data will route through the event system  | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jkeiser     | But we should be careful about that line  | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
| martinisoft | Let's capture that in the RFC comments then if ranjib is cool with it.  | 12:29 |
|             |   | pm    |
| ranjib      | yeah.. it will be implemented using the event handler   | 12:30 |
|             |   | pm    |
| coderanger  | ranjib: Everything that is there on the config side would stay, and would be the config proposal for the statsd plugin  | 12:30 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jonlives    | yeah  | 12:30 |
|             |   | pm    |
| kallistec   | jkeiser: well, you can't have it both ways, we all had the same concern as you about this being a 4th type of event system, so we said we'd prefer it built on the existing thing | 12:30 |
|             |   | pm    |
| ranjib      | should i explicitly mention that  | 12:30 |

|            |  |       |
|------------|--|-------|
|            |  | pm    |
| jonlives   | ranjib: which part?  | 12:30 |
|            |  | pm    |
| ranjib     | capturing the metrics, like time, gc stats, via event handlers   | 12:31 |
|            |  | pm    |
| jonlives   | I think we just need to say in the RFC that any profiling information will be exposed via the existing event dispatch system, and a profiler class would be added to core which displays sensible default profiling stuff to the console | 12:31 |
|            | sound about right to everyone?   | 12:31 |
|            |  | pm    |
| tBunnyMan  | Yes  | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| jkeiser    | Yeah. And, kallistec, you are right. I had conveniently forgotten that an actual API was being added and focused on "yay telemetry"  | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| jonlives   | I'd def like to see us add a sensible minimal default method of getting this info if it's going in.  | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| coderanger | Yeah, and a little more fuzz around stuff like "Chef.telemetry"  | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| ranjib     | awesome  | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| jonlives   | great stuff.   | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| coderanger | That would probably be more like Chef::Profiler.add or something more namespaces   | 12:32 |
|            |  | pm    |
| jonlives   | yeah   | 12:33 |
|            |  | pm    |
|            | ok, next we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/121">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/121</a> from jkeiser's factory of wonders   | 12:33 |
|            |  | pm    |

|                     |  |       |
|---------------------|--|-------|
| <b>zts</b>          | I didn't comment on the PR, but I love this - I'll likely drop my advocacy of definitions when it's in :)  | 12:34 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jkeiser</b>      | Summary: type "action :create do ... end" in a Resource definition, and it works (you don't create a separate provider class yourself). A step towards Dan's nanolwrps | 12:34 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jonlives</b>     | so even more L LWRPs? :p   | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>nathenharvey</b> | 15 minute warning.   | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jkeiser</b>      | Nah, this is in Resource   | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
|                     | No new things  | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
|                     | Works for HWRPs, LWRPs and anything  | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
|                     | I guess you could say it turns them into HWRs and LWRs?  | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
|                     | but eh   | 12:35 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jonlives</b>     | jkeiser: would the intention be to still support lightweight providers too, and this as an addition?   | 12:36 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jkeiser</b>      | jonlives: definitely   | 12:36 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jonlives</b>     | great  | 12:36 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>jkeiser</b>      | jonlives: there is no "attribute" on Resource (yet)  | 12:36 |
|                     |  | pm    |
| <b>coderanger</b>   | jonlives: Yeah, this replaces nothing, just simpler format for people that want it   | 12:36 |

|            |   |       |
|------------|---|-------|
|            |   | pm    |
| jonlives   | gotcha  | 12:36 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jkeiser    | And also, LWRPs don't require people to type "class"  | 12:36 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jonlives   | does anybody have any feelings against this one?  | 12:37 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jtimmerman | jkeiser: does this basically write "providers" into resources?  | 12:37 |
|            |   | pm    |
| coderanger | I'll echo what I said in the PR: very +1 and I think the impl is going to be unfortunately complex and we should do it any way :)             | 12:37 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jkeiser    | Key facts about "action": it's a recipe (you can type file and execute and etc.) much like use_inline_resources                               | 12:37 |
|            |   | pm    |
|            | And second, resource attributes are in scope in the action, so if you have attribute :path you can type "path" instead of "new_resource.path" | 12:37 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jtimmerman | looks like the answer is "yes" based on paragraph on line 52  | 12:37 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jkeiser    | jtimmerman: sort of? But not really. The action actually runs in a separate class   | 12:38 |
|            |   | pm    |
|            | And probably always will  | 12:38 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jtimmerman | sure  | 12:38 |
|            |   | pm    |
| jkeiser    | This separate class may be a provider, but you don't have to worry your pretty little head about that bit                                     | 12:38 |
|            |   | pm    |
| coderanger | jtimmerman: Yes, it is a way of writing the implementation of a resource in the resource class  | 12:38 |
|            |   | pm    |

|             |   |       |
|-------------|---|-------|
| jtimberman  | i'm +1 on this change.  | 12:38 |
|             |   | pm    |
| pwm         | big +1 to this  | 12:38 |
|             |   | pm    |
| martinisoft | +1  | 12:38 |
|             |   | pm    |
| Majost      | The only concern I have is that it is another means of creating resources, which for a newcomer has a lot of learning curve and many opinions. I get the idea to make that process easier | 12:38 |
|             |   | pm    |
|             | I think some cookbooks need to be written as good examples for new comers. I can do that though.  | 12:39 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jonlives    | yeah this will definitely need to be well documented.   | 12:39 |
|             |   | pm    |
| martinisoft | Majost: There is work afoot to help greatly improve accessibility of Resource/Provider docs. Getting help from burtlo on that front.  | 12:39 |
|             |   | pm    |
| adamedx     | someone should write a book   | 12:39 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jonlives    | second edition, woohoo  | 12:40 |
|             |   | pm    |
| adamedx     | :)  | 12:40 |
|             |   | pm    |
| Majost      | adamedx: hehe   | 12:40 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jonlives    | jkeiser: and just to be clear, there aren't any backcompat issues with this other than from the cookbook POV, right?  | 12:40 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jkeiser     | Correct, zero backcompat issues   | 12:40 |
|             |   | pm    |
| jonlives    | lovely stuff.   | 12:40 |



|              |   |       |
|--------------|---|-------|
|              |   | pm    |
| jtimberman   | adamedx: it'll be outdated as soon as its published ;)                        | 12:40 |
|              |   | pm    |
| coderanger   | Well, one issue   | 12:40 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jtimberman   | (but that's every book so)  | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| coderanger   | If a resource has an attr named "action" that would potentially do odd things | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jkeiser      | "action" is on the class though, not the instance                             | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| coderanger   | Actually no, that wouldn't work already, never mind me                        | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| lamont_oc    | i'm still not wild about inline_recipe  | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jkeiser      | It's not in there anymore :)  | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| coderanger   | lamont_oc: Its how people expect it to work IME                               | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| lamont_oc    | it was a second ago   | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| nathenharvey | 10 minute warning   | 12:41 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jonlives     | would folks like another week to comment on this one?                         | 12:42 |
|              |   | pm    |
|              | feedback is broadly +1 though   | 12:42 |
|              |   | pm    |

|              |   |             |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| lamont_oc    | yeah inline_recipe resource is still there, and i still think you'd be better off with a way to wrap resources with defaults and not open up a new resource collection  | 12:42<br>pm |
| nathenharvey | I think revisiting / approving next week is prudent   | 12:43<br>pm |
| jonlives     | let's do that   | 12:43<br>pm |
|              | ok, let's move further comments to the PR and we'll revisit   | 12:43<br>pm |
| martinisoft  | jonlives: Agreed, let's move to next week's agenda  | 12:43<br>pm |
| jonlives     | on to old business  | 12:43<br>pm |
|              | we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106</a> , the rfc tracking process.   | 12:43<br>pm |
|              | the only remaining comment to resolve is whether we mandate an issue as the tracking URL for ease of reference  | 12:44<br>pm |
|              | I strongly feel we should, jkeiser you wanted to use PRs too?   | 12:44<br>pm |
| jkeiser      | jonlives as long as I can add other metadata for them, I guess I don't care ... but issues and prs are nearly the same in github  | 12:45<br>pm |
| btm          | it seemed to me it's less work to open an issue than it is to update the RFC with a subsequent PR one or more times. Also, I'm still super sad we don't have JIRA, and sad that we don't have zealotry around filing good issues that document the problems that PRs fix. | 12:45<br>pm |
| ranjib       | +1 for a tracking issue/url. not sure pr will be feasible immediately   | 12:45<br>pm |
| jonlives     | my feelings are in line with btm  | 12:46<br>pm |

|              |   |       |
|--------------|---|-------|
| jkeiser      | Like, I have some that only have a PR because I implement the whole thing alongside the RFC   | 12:46 |
|              |   | pm    |
| nathenharvey | 5 minutes   | 12:46 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jonlives     | ie, an issue is a single point of reference we can easily add PRs to etc  | 12:46 |
|              |   | pm    |
|              | ok. anybody against merging this one then?  | 12:46 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jkeiser      | Not a huge deal to me. Happy to do it so we can move on :)  | 12:47 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jonlives     | 30 seconds to -1  | 12:47 |
|              |   | pm    |
|              | ok, sold.   | 12:47 |
|              |   | pm    |
|              | we're nearly out of time, but I'd like to ask folks to have a look at <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/118">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/118</a> and kallistec's PR for a sample config gem for next week                                      | 12:48 |
|              |   | pm    |
|              | we also need to consider an iterative improvement to unblock ohai plugin config stuff prior to that being a thing   | 12:48 |
|              |   | pm    |
| btm          | so with ohai config <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/118">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/118</a> , having not been here last week, I'm not sure what to do next. Can we move this ahead as phase 1 and work on the chef-config stuff separately? | 12:49 |
|              |   | pm    |
| jonlives     | btm: right - we need to figure out what phase 1 looks like in the interim   | 12:49 |
|              |   | pm    |
|              | ok since we're kind of out of time  | 12:50 |
|              |   | pm    |
| lamont_oc    | kallistic started looking at the chef-config gem  | 12:50 |
|              |   | pm    |
| nathenharvey | I'll add 118 to the top of the list for next week   | 12:50 |

|              |  |          |
|--------------|--|----------|
|              |  | pm       |
| jonlives     | could folks please comment on #118 if they're in favour of that being approved in the interim until kallistec's PR is more developed etc   | 12:50 pm |
|              | and we can revisit next week   | 12:50 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
|              | jkeiser: there are also some remaining changes to be made to <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/117">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/117</a> , from the comments, ok to do that for next week too? | 12:51 pm |
| Majost       | I would rather it be its own config file   | 12:51 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
| nathenharvey | thanks, all, that's time   | 12:51 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
| jonlives     | Majost: let's move that to the PR :)   | 12:51 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
| nathenharvey | so we can pick-up here next week   | 12:51 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
| Majost       | oops   | 12:51 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
| nathenharvey | *** MEETING ENDS ***   | 12:51 pm |
|              |  | pm       |
|              |  | 12:51 pm |