

11:00 AM <stevenmurawski> **** Meeting Starts ****

11:00 AM <stevenmurawski> Good morning.. I'll be playing the role of nathenharvey today and thom will be our decider and run the meeting

11:00 AM <@btm> yay secretary steven!

11:00 AM <stevenmurawski> thom, want to start us out?

11:01 AM <@thom> our agenda for the day is <https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meetings/blob/master/2015-11-19-agenda.md>

11:01 AM <stevenmurawski> For our community update,

11:01 AM <stevenmurawski> Voting is now open for the CBGB and will remain open until November 30. Vote at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/cbgbvoting>

11:02 AM <stevenmurawski> So get out and vote!

11:02 AM <stevenmurawski> And that's all for community this week

11:02 AM <@thom> I don't have anything to add for Chef Software, so let's hand over to adamedx for client/server updates

11:02 AM <adamedx> Thanks thom

11:03 AM <adamedx> first thing: Today we announced a preview release of a native 64-bit Windows chef-client

11:03 AM <stevenmurawski> Yay!

11:03 AM <@btm> [#nanoserver](#)

11:03 AM <clairem> woo!!

11:03 AM <adamedx> This post goes into details about why this is interesting: <https://www.chef.io/blog/2015/11/19/pre-release-announcement-native-64-bit-windows-chef-client/>

11:04 AM <github-bawt> [chef-zero] randomcamel pushed 1 new commit to jk/chef-fs-tests: <http://git.io/v4SzK>

11:04 AM <github-bawt> chef-zero/jk/chef-fs-tests 37f174e Chris Doherty: Add rspec support for policies.

11:04 AM <adamedx> tl;dr for those not steeped in Windows idiosyncrasies is that for some historical reasons chef-client runs in a 32-bit process today

11:04 AM <adamedx> and that complicates management of the OS as 32-bit processes are run in a sort of 32-bit "container-like" environment

11:05 AM <@btm> and [#nanoserver](#) is 64-bit only! yay yay yay!

11:05 AM <adamedx> and you have to jump through some hoops at times to get outside the container to manage the real OS (though in most cases chef-client jumps through this transparently)

11:06 AM <adamedx> there will be some minor compat issues which is why this is a preview at the moment and we're not making it the default until we've had this out in the field for a while

11:06 AM <adamedx> and as btm says

11:06 AM <adamedx> this is also a step on the road to a GA Windows nanoserver chef-client

11:06 AM <adamedx> since nanoserver does not allow 32-bit processes to run

11:07 AM <adamedx> here is the direct link from the blog post to download the client and play with it -- definitely file github issues on the chef project for anything you run across: <https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/yakyakyak/chef-client-12.5.1%2B20151116085110-1-x64.msi>

11:07 AM <adamedx> Second thing related to that release

11:07 AM <adamedx> Is that as the blog post states it is the first iteration of installation speed improvements

11:07 AM <adamedx> that will go into chef-client and chef-dk for Windows

11:08 AM <adamedx> so you should notice that it is much faster to install, particularly on Server OS (rather than desktop windows) where no a/v scanner is involved

11:08 AM <adamedx> last thing

11:08 AM <adamedx> We plan on chef-dk, chef-client releases in first half of December

11:08 AM <adamedx> in advance of Force Awakens Release

11:08 AM <adamedx> that's it for me

11:09 AM <stevenmurawski> Thanks adamedx

11:09 AM <@thom> thanks Adam. it's good to see we're celebrating star wars in the proper fashion

11:09 AM <jmickle> :-)

11:09 AM <adamedx> :)

11:09 AM <@thom> ok, so our first RFC for the day is <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/164> , courtesy of j^2 and martinisoft_

11:09 AM <j^2> :D
11:09 AM <@thom> let's talk about hugs
11:09 AM <j^2> it seems btm has put some comments on it this morning too
11:10 AM <j^2> i havent had a chance to answer them though
11:10 AM <@thom> (to the tune of salt'n'pepa)
11:10 AM <martinb3> thom: that's exactly how I imagined it
11:10 AM <@btm> [#rfc_comment_thursday](#)
11:11 AM <j^2> thom: how/what can i answer
11:12 AM <@btm> j^2: i think the first paragraph of the specification got edited a bunch and became a little disjointed.
11:12 AM <j^2> btm: ok, that valid
11:12 AM <@btm> other than my feeling of that, I think most people were happy with the RFC as scoped.
11:12 AM <martinb3> I'm +1 with the minor edits btm suggested, at j^2 / martinisoft_'s discretion
11:12 AM <@thom> i like btm's suggested edit
11:13 AM <j^2> yeah i felt like i had to hit that home pretty hard, but the "sticker" RFC is still very much on the table
11:13 AM <@thom> and am +1 in general i think
11:13 AM <j^2> btm: scoped that is
11:13 AM <j^2> nice, i'll take an action item of rewording per btm's suggestion and repost after this meeting
11:14 AM <@btm> I'm +1 with the tidying up.
11:14 AM <@thom> thanks, jj. let's try and get the stickering bit clarified for next week
11:14 AM <j^2> thom: perfect
11:14 AM <stevenmurawski> I still can't get the salt'n'peppa out of my head
11:14 AM <j^2> martinisoft_: any words on this?
11:15 AM <@btm> I also want to state for the, uh, legal record, that it's awesome how many people engaged in the RFC discussion who don't normally in the technical ones.
11:15 AM <stevenmurawski> Alright, noted that this is tabled for next week.
11:15 AM <@btm> can we just approve this now provisionally?
11:16 AM <j^2> per the updates btm?
11:16 AM <martinb3> +1
11:16 AM <@btm> yeah, looking at the comments it seems pretty settled.
11:16 AM <martinb3> for approving now.
11:16 AM <@thom> alright, let's do that. i'm happy to approve
11:16 AM <stevenmurawski> got it
11:17 AM <@btm> yay *hugs*
11:17 AM <j^2> :D
11:17 AM <@btm> I mean, yay *holds out arms to signal desire to hug* ;)
11:17 AM <@thom> lo
11:17 AM <@thom> l
11:17 AM <@thom> we're gonna bounce down the agenda a little now and hit <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/157> ; chef-client exit codes
11:18 AM <@thom> is carpnick around?
11:18 AM <github-bawt> [chef-rfc] lamont-granquist pushed 1 new commit to lcg/cookbook-gem-metadata: <http://git.io/v4SoM>
11:18 AM <github-bawt> chef-rfc/lcg/cookbook-gem-metadata a19a633 Lamont Granquist: update demotivator
11:18 AM <@thom> actually regardless i think this is probably ready to go?
11:18 AM <stevenmurawski> I'm +1 on it
11:19 AM <stevenmurawski> anyone with any major objections?
11:19 AM <@thom> btm had some comments, but i think we can approve regardless?
11:20 AM <@btm> yeah, I added two minor notes about being more clear about two things. I'd like to leave room in the approval for nick to fix those and +1 all the way.
11:20 AM <@thom> yep
11:20 AM <github-bawt> [chef-rfc] lamont-granquist pushed 1 new commit to lcg/omnibus-chef-native-gems: <http://git.io/v4S6e>

11:20 AM <github-bawt> chef-rfc/lcg/omnibus-chef-native-gems be7bdb1 Lamont Granquist: review comments

11:21 AM <@thom> conditionally approved!

11:21 AM <stevenmurawski> conditional approval noted for 157

11:21 AM <@thom> ok, lamont_oc is up next with <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/162> ; additional native gems for omnibus

11:22 AM <@thom> i'd still like to see some words that we won't consider code under some licenses for inclusion

11:23 AM <lamont_oc> the only outstanding issue on that one was all of ranjib's concerns afaiK

11:23 AM <adamedx> I'm with thom's suggestion on licenses

11:23 AM <lamont_oc> oh sorry 162

11:23 AM <lamont_oc> yeah, that's fine

11:24 AM <@thom> lamont_oc: sorry, let's do 162 first and then gem-in-metadata

11:24 AM <@thom> ok

11:24 AM <@btm> do we know what that is? "All gems must have licenses that are compatible with the Apache 2.0 license" ?

11:24 AM <lamont_oc> i don't think that's entirely accurate

11:25 AM <github-bawt> [chef-rfc] jjasghar pushed 1 new commit to martiniandJJ/rfc-4-hugs: <http://git.io/v4SiX>

11:25 AM <github-bawt> chef-rfc/martiniandJJ/rfc-4-hugs 60c388c JJ Asghar: Updated per @btm's suggestions.

11:25 AM <@thom> i think we can talk to Chef legal and nail that down

11:26 AM <lamont_oc> well from a legal standpoint we can ship GPLv3 code just fine and satisfy the distribution requirement of the license, but customers will not like that at all

11:26 AM <@coderanger> Given that this isn't a structural change, I'm not sure this even needed to be an RFC.

11:26 AM <@coderanger> So as a notification of a few specific adds, I think we could approve this now

11:27 AM <@thom> i think the licensing point is the only reason i don't want to approve this no

11:27 AM <@thom> w

11:27 AM <@coderanger> If we want to have a more generic process for requesting a gem be included that would be its own thing.

11:27 AM <@thom> ok, that's a fair point

11:28 AM <@thom> let's do that

11:28 AM <lamont_oc> yeah, i guess that's what i'm trying to get at

11:28 AM <@coderanger> But as written this is pretty straightforward, and we know these are all compatible

11:28 AM <@thom> 162 is approved

11:28 AM <@ssd7> yay!

11:28 AM <lamont_oc> i want to ship this stuff, and i want input and want to announce that we're doing this, in the client, and why... so i cut an RFC because that's the process we've got...

11:28 AM <@thom> we'll do another one as a generic how to add stuff

11:29 AM <@coderanger> Yeah, just saying we shouldn't scope creep 162 :D

11:29 AM <@coderanger> lamont_oc: We should hold a funeral for recipe[postges::ruby]

11:29 AM <@coderanger> :)

11:29 AM <lamont_oc> okay, yeah, like i just posted i don't think we should be listing liblzma in 162

11:29 AM <@thom> ok, on to #160 - <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/160> - add gem to cookbook metadata

11:30 AM <@thom> lamont_oc: yeah no

11:30 AM <@thom> (when you say funeral i hope you mean viking boat burial)

11:31 AM <@thom> so 160 i think looks good to go?

11:31 AM <@coderanger> +1 160

11:31 AM <lamont_oc> so 160 is the one where ranjib seemed to have the only remaining concerns and he seems to have withdrawn them

11:31 AM <@coderanger> Implementation will be "interesting" but will make my life 1000% easier :)

11:31 AM <ranjibd> +1 it will be interesting to see perf implications after 160 :-)

11:31 AM <@btm> i would like to approve 160 in 2010.

11:31 AM <lamont_oc> ah there's ranjib...

11:32 AM <martinisoft> j^2: Sorry was on my way back from the clinic. I'm a sick fox this week :(

11:32 AM <@thom> btm: that late?

11:32 AM <j^2> martinisoft: no worries, I rep'd our RFC the best i could :D

11:32 AM <j^2> martinisoft: feel better :D

11:32 AM <martinisoft> j^2: I thought you would <3

11:32 AM — martinisoft offers elbow hugs

11:32 AM <@thom> ok, i'm not hearing any dissent so let's approve

11:33 AM <martinisoft> thom: None from me on that one

11:33 AM <stevenmurawski> Cool beans

11:33 AM <lamont_oc> 161 i have work to do on the words in that one, we discussed it last time

11:33 AM <@thom> awesome! unleash the hounds of approval

11:34 AM <stevenmurawski> so noted

11:34 AM <lamont_oc> so should skip that one and do 157 or 148

11:34 AM <@thom> ok, let's roll 161 to the next meeting?

11:34 AM <lamont_oc> yes

11:34 AM <@thom> we've done 157, so 148

11:34 AM <@thom> someara: yo

11:35 AM <@someara> hi

11:35 AM <@thom> <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/148> - namespaces

11:35 AM <@btm> thom: (just sometime before chef_gem)

11:35 AM <@someara> to revisit.... the document was really about managing the namespace-we-have.. that is, the giant flat one

11:36 AM <github-bawt> [chef] jaym created jdm/sign-v1.3 (+1 new commit): <http://git.io/v4SMh>

11:36 AM <github-bawt> chef/jdm/sign-v1.3 c3825f6 Jay Mundrawala: Add sign v1.3

11:37 AM <lamont_oc> i guess the problem i see with the actual RFC is that its a bit overly vague and just states that we should do something about the problem, without really offering solutions.

11:37 AM <@someara> right. it was to start discussion

11:37 AM <@someara> ssd hit it on the head with "It seems to be the biggest problem might just be maintainers who have disappeared completely."

11:37 AM <lamont_oc> yeah, whats the process for declaring a cookbook abandoned and taking back the namespace?

11:38 AM <@someara> and what that actually means

11:38 AM <@someara> does "taking it back" mean putting it up for adoption?

11:38 AM <@someara> etc

11:38 AM <lamont_oc> ideally you'd want to have found a new maintainer before really taking it back

11:39 AM <@someara> let's table it for now and revisit it after the new year, since it's unlikely any movement will happen before then

11:39 AM <lamont_oc> but before that, there probably needs to be a process to move a cookbook to an "abandoned" state (based on over a year of no releases or something) and then it gets put up for adoption and the owner gets some nag e-mails

11:39 AM <@ssd7> I like the idea of a "maintainer of last resort" which could be a group of volunteers who mostly focused on finding homes for important cookbooks that have lapsed

11:40 AM <martinb3> Do we need to approve or disapprove the RFC, since it's just information gathering?

11:40 AM <@someara> I'm not sure

11:40 AM <@thom> i don't want to leave this open indefinitely

11:40 AM <martinb3> Or maybe it will get revised into specific consensus? I don't think I have strong feelings either way, just wasn't sure procedurally what we're supposed to do.

11:40 AM <lamont_oc> i don't see much downside to approving it

11:41 AM <@someara> I think we've pretty much settled on "chef as a language"

11:41 AM <@someara> vs "chef as a software distribution"

11:41 AM <@coderanger> It isn't an actual plan for fixing things though.

11:41 AM <@someara> right

11:41 AM <@coderanger> Just a statement of options

11:41 AM <@thom> but that's fine for an RFC

11:41 AM <@coderanger> thom: No, isn't

11:41 AM <@coderanger> thom: An RFC should be a solution to a problem so we know what we are deciding on.

11:42 AM <@ssd7> I think we should just close it. Closing it doesn't mean it wasn't a valuable discussion. Perhaps from there someone can come up with a concrete proposal

11:42 AM <@ssd7> s/from there/from the info in that discussion/

11:42 AM <@someara> +1 for closing.. I got the comments I was after

11:43 AM <@thom> someara: it's your RFC, fundamentally. maybe we need to figure out a way of doing this sort of thing better

11:43 AM <@someara> its not actionable in its current form

11:43 AM <@btm> ssd7: +1 it's been a useful discussion. coderanger +1 we don't need discussions archived as RFCs, but rather specifics about what they're implementing.

11:43 AM <martinb3> If someara is +1 for closing it, I'm +1, backing his decision.

11:43 AM <tas50> lets meet up sometime and hash out the details part and put the detailed rfc together

11:43 AM <martinb3> It's generated a lot of interesting comments.

11:43 AM <@someara> we can reference it in a future "here's how to fix it" RFC

11:44 AM <@btm> I always encourage the use of the chef-dev category (mailing list) for discussion. We can use etherpad or gists or whatever for editing to a common view. We don't use this communication channel enough.

11:44 AM <@thom> well, we have an Informational track that we could stuff this into, but regardless, consensus seems to be to close

11:44 AM <lamont_oc> +1 close

11:44 AM <@thom> let's label it withdrawn and close

11:44 AM <@thom> btm: that's a fair point

11:45 AM — martinb3 should use chef-dev more too.

11:45 AM <github-bawt> [omnibus-chef] jaym pushed **5** new commits to jdm/fips: <http://git.io/v4S9p>

11:45 AM <github-bawt> omnibus-chef/jdm/fips 624262d Jay Mundrawala: Use bundler 1.10.6

11:45 AM <github-bawt> omnibus-chef/jdm/fips d2f25da Jay Mundrawala: Update omnibus software

11:45 AM <github-bawt> omnibus-chef/jdm/fips 10411ea Jay Mundrawala: Update omnibus

11:45 AM <@thom> thanks, everyone

11:46 AM <@btm> i'm going to use it soon to talk about how we communicate build versions, so everyone better be watching. :)

11:46 AM <stevenmurawski> Next Thursday, November 26 is the Thanksgiving holiday in the US. As such, we

11:46 AM <stevenmurawski> will not meet next week. Our next meeting will be Thursday, December 3, 2015

11:46 AM <stevenmurawski> 9AM-9:50AM PST <http://everytimezone.com/#2015-12-03,240,cn3>

11:46 AM <stevenmurawski> *** Meeting Ends ***