

nathenharv...	*** MEETING STARTS ***	
	so much for your one more minute ;)	9:03 AM
holoway	this is why you have them!	9:03 AM
	man, a guy can't get no respect	9:04 AM
	<i>ortho_stice waves</i>	9:04 AM
	ok - lets talk agenda	9:05 AM
	we have two RFCs from last time that were still having discussion	9:05 AM
	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/71 - Dialects	9:05 AM
	and https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/69 - Audit Mode	9:05 AM
nathenharv...	There was a note last time to discuss "what "size" of thingy needs an rfc? "	9:05 AM
holoway	most of Chef Software is hanging out in Seattle for the open house of our new office	9:06 AM
nathenharv...	and a note to discuss https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/commit/67d9...	9:06 AM
holoway	cool	9:07 AM
nathenharv...	Shall we start with https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/69?	9:07 AM
	audit mode	9:07 AM
holoway	lets start with audit mode	9:07 AM
	jinx	9:07

		AM
nathenharv...	holoway: please get out of my head	9:07
		AM
holoway	sersut is the real driver, and he plans puts forth a reasonable plan at the end	9:08
		AM
	speak of the devil	9:08
		AM
	lets merge this iwth our talk of what an RFC is	9:08
		AM
	and how big/little it makes sense ofr htem to be	9:09
		AM
	essentially, I would like to see the RFC merged before audit mode is	9:09
		AM
	and have a status that reflects its status as "thing we are doing, but we reserve the right to fuck about with implementation, which will reflect in updated RFC"	9:09
		AM
	when we spoke last, I think jonlives and coderanger felt like that was already possible inside the existing RFC strucutre	9:10
		AM
	yes?	9:10
		AM
jonlives	yeah	9:10
		AM
	our thinking was that accepted / final already models this	9:10
		AM
holoway	right	9:10
		AM
	so I'm +1 on saying we merge this RFC, make it accepted but not final, have a note about how/where to find the implementation	9:10
		AM
	I like hiding it behind a feature flag	9:10
		AM
jonlives	+1 too	9:11
		AM
holoway	any against?	9:11
		AM

coderanger? you're so quiet, its making me nervous

9:11

AM

:)

9:11

AM

ok

9:12

AM

with none against, I say we move to merge

9:12

AM

I'm putting my stamp on it

9:12

AM

jonlives

woot - will get all deciderated rfcs merged after the meeting

9:13

AM

holoway high fives jonlives

9:13

AM

holoway

<https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/71>

9:13

AM

dialects

9:13

AM

I think my feelings on dialects remain unchanged

9:14

AM

which is the mechanism that would *enable* dialects probably brings about interesting experimentation for the sophisticated

9:14

AM

that may well result in something awesome for everyone (including new users)

9:15

AM

but I don't like it as a way to stealth-inject a yaml-attributes mechanism as default, for example

9:15

AM

(unless we all settle there because we're blown away by the expressive power of indentation and glorious, glorious syntax)

9:15

AM

jonlives

yeah

9:16

AM

jtimberman still finds json easier to write than yaml

9:16

AM

jtimberman	:)	9:16 AM
jonlives	i kind of agree with lamont that best practices etc need to be a lot more nailed down to make this an attractive proposition as anything other than an experiment	9:16 AM
holoway	yep	9:16 AM
jtimberman	jonlives: +1	9:16 AM
jonlives	cos it's gonna make things a lot more confusing if not done carefully	9:16 AM
jtimberman	I concur with Lamont. The potential for confusing new users is high.	9:17 AM
holoway	essentially, Noah's opening statement is pretty concise on this	9:17 AM
	<i>drag00n Echoes jtimberman</i>	9:17 AM
	we like the implementation cleanup, and the potential for experimentation	9:18 AM
jonlives	yeah	9:18 AM
martinisoft	I would agree with jtimberman and Lamont on that PR	9:18 AM
holoway	we don't at all like the diea of adding more syntax to core by default	9:18 AM
jonlives	+1	9:18 AM
sersut	+1	9:18 AM
jtimberman	i'd love love love, for example, to be ble to write ohai plugins in other languages.	9:19 AM
	(not that i would because <3 ruby, but the capability is important to me, for users' flexibility sake)	9:19 AM

	i don't think that's in the scope of the RFC though	9:19 AM
holoway	is this a fair summary?	9:19 AM
	Here is the tl;dr from IRC on the Dec 11 meeting.	9:20 AM
	* We like the implementation cleanup that happens here.	9:20 AM
	* We like the potential for experimentation.	9:20 AM
	* We don't like the idea of having yet more options in core Chef, and think it will bring more confusion, not less.	9:20 AM
	So, if this RFC becomes essentially in line with above, we're collectively :+1:.	9:20 AM
jonlives	holoway: sounds good	9:20 AM
jtimberman	(thumbsup) +1, cake.	9:20 AM
martinisoft	holoway: +1	9:20 AM
kallistec	My reading of Lamont's comments it that he's -1 on the whole thing	9:20 AM
holoway	kallistec: yeah, that's my reading too	9:20 AM
	but that's because he's where I am, which is that all the experiments will only be 'better' on suspect aesthetics	9:21 AM
	but that's something I believe, not something I know	9:21 AM
	and if coderanger wants to do the work to clean things up	9:21 AM
	and we get the ability to experiment with plugins, it's pretty good	9:21 AM
	(for example, would be interesting to see what integrated consul template	9:22

	support would be like)	AM
kallistec	for my part, my gut reaction is -1 but I want to allow experimentation even if I don't think the experiment will succeed	9:22 AM
jonlives	yeah	9:22 AM
	pretty much how I feel too :p	9:22 AM
holoway	when I see "clean up and make pluggable" I'm +1	9:22 AM
jonlives	yeah	9:22 AM
holoway	when I think about whether those plugins will give me anything I actually want, I'm suspicious but not willing to poop on it without letting someone put their shoulder to the metaphorical wheel	9:23 AM
jonlives	^ this	9:23 AM
jmickle	wow, i came in at the right time	9:23 AM
jonlives	we're really approving the experimentation mechanism here, not the results.	9:23 AM
c_t	Chef After Dark	9:23 AM
holoway	ya	9:23 AM
jmickle	i was feeling bad about my hangover slow start today and missing the channel this morning, but now i completely disregard that	9:24 AM
holoway	it's the little gifts of community that make us a family, jmickle	9:24 AM
	<i>kierrr is waiting for the smooth jazz music.</i>	9:24 AM
	talking about poop is part of it	9:24 AM
jmickle	hahaha	9:24

		AM
jonlives	heh	9:24
		AM
jmickle	(agenda pls)	9:24
		AM
	<i>jmickle apologizes for being late</i>	9:24
		AM
holoway	kierrr: there will be no smooth jazz in my meeting. http://rd.io/x/QMxWK0ABDLs/	9:25
		AM
	ok	9:25
		AM
	next up	9:25
		AM
	nathan brought up https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/commit/67d9...	9:25
		AM
	but I think we settled it	9:25
		AM
	tl;dr, its done	9:25
		AM
	yes kallistec?	9:25
		AM
kallistec	yes	9:26
		AM
jmickle	+1	9:26
		AM
c_t	I thought that had been settled a while back	9:26
		AM
	+1	9:26
		AM
holoway	so yeah, unless someone remembers why we took a notes	9:26
		AM
	I say case closed	9:26
		AM

jonlives	it's already merged too :p https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master...	9:26 AM
holoway	so yeah, good times	9:26 AM
nathenharv...	shall we dig into robust attribute tracing support - https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/75	9:26 AM
holoway	from the title, I want it like I want ice cream	9:26 AM
jmickle	drop it like its hot	9:27 AM
ortho_stice	hah	9:27 AM
jonlives	holoway: my reaction exactly	9:27 AM
jmickle	dont drop that thun-duh-duh?!	9:27 AM
jtimmerman	mmm ice cream	9:27 AM
jonlives	the implementation still needs more discussion I think, but the motivation def sound good to me	9:28 AM
jtimmerman	ice cream isn't hot tho, but that's okay, we have cake for that. I'm +1 on having this capability.	9:28 AM
jmickle	ha	9:28 AM
ortho_stice	so, yeah, I submitted the tracing RFC. agreed - implementation is a head-scratcher.	9:28 AM
c_t	+1	9:28 AM
jmickle	ct+=1	9:28 AM
kierrr	drop it like it's (cake)	9:28 AM

jtimberman	oh right, ortho_stice is Clinton Wolfe :D	9:28 AM
kallistec	implementation-wise, the problem is the same thing that screws us in general with any attempt to improve attributes	9:28 AM
jtimberman	author of the RFC ;)	9:29 AM
holoway	kallistec: shit be complex	9:29 AM
ortho_stice	:)	9:29 AM
c_t	(-1 to me having to implement it though)	9:29 AM
kallistec	which is that you have to return something from attribute[element_ref]	9:29 AM
	and you can't look ahead	9:29 AM
holoway	what if we went more bold?	9:29 AM
jmickle	hehehe	9:29 AM
holoway	what if we put in a breaking, secondary syntax	9:29 AM
	that supported tracing	9:29 AM
kallistec	that's how I'd like to do it for sure	9:30 AM
jtimberman	holoway: like, node.default_trace_me['foo'] = 'an thing'	9:30 AM
holoway	not at all	9:30 AM
	something like	9:30 AM

jtimberman	or wrap em in a block?	9:30 AM
holoway	node.attr('foo', 'bar', 'baz')	9:30 AM
	the entire 'make it a hash' is the problem	9:30 AM
	it isn't a hash	9:30 AM
kallistec	yeah, you have to have the full pathspec available during a single method call	9:30 AM
ortho_stice	yeah	9:31 AM
holoway	I mean, I respect why I did that to all of us	9:31 AM
	because I thought to myself	9:31 AM
jmickle	#freeticketstochefconf?	9:31 AM
holoway	"Self, all these people know perl or python or ruby, so they'll be really familiar with hashes"	9:31 AM
	"and ruby lets me do all kinds of crazy implementing []()"	9:31 AM
jtimberman	haha.	9:31 AM
holoway	but I should have stopped when I got hit with the lack of auto-viv	9:31 AM
	instead of barreling through like it was the only syntax that would ever work	9:32 AM
	so what if we threw someone like lamont off the leash	9:32 AM
	and we figured out how to get an alternate syntax that is safer, gives more power, and you can opt in to as soon as its ready	9:33 AM

jtimberman	yeah, +1 as long as the existing doesn't change/break.	9:33 AM
jonlives	yeah	9:33 AM
jtimberman	obviously	9:33 AM
ortho_stice	well, here's the thing - one major use case for this is that you have an attar being set "somewhere"	9:33 AM
	and you want to find the "where"	9:33 AM
holoway	yep	9:33 AM
ortho_stice	if I knew the "where", I'd go there and use the alternative syntax	9:34 AM
jonlives	on the flip side, doing this with the existing attrib system sounds like it'd be somewhat gnarly.	9:34 AM
c_t	but then if you knew the "where", you might not need it so much	9:34 AM
	it seems like	9:34 AM
ortho_stice	nod	9:34 AM
holoway	it will be incredibly gnarly	9:34 AM
	just look at the gymnastics for delete	9:34 AM
Tech356	Isn't implementation a bit off topic for this meeting?	9:34 AM
c_t	an alternate syntax sounds fine to me, but it does raise the spectre of being super hellish	9:35 AM
kallistec	ortho_stice: well, if you give up on tracing "deep" path specs and only filter at one level of depth then things are easy again, at the cost of false positives in your filter	9:35 AM

ortho_stice	mhhmm	9:35 AM
holoway	Tech356: not neccessarily	9:35 AM
c_t	since it's pretty much a given I think that both syntaxes will end up mixed together	9:35 AM
jonlives	Tech356: not entirely, because impl factors may prevent the rfc being merged in its current form	9:35 AM
	we're not gonna code up the whole thing or anything :p\	9:35 AM
holoway	I mean, I intentionally turned it more existentially	9:36 AM
	I think much of the issues with attributes tie to implementation	9:36 AM
	and we either decide to just keep yelling at people that they should relax and learn to love default	9:36 AM
	except when they shouldn't	9:36 AM
	<i>jtimberman chuckles</i>	9:36 AM
	or we open ourselves up to make something that actually works better	9:36 AM
jonlives	indeed	9:36 AM
ortho_stice	lamont was talking about an upcoming attribute implementation overhaul. My thought for now was just that the RFC inform the overhaul; if there are any opportunities to preserve context or path, and thus ease the tracing implementation....	9:37 AM
holoway	and push down the road a little what it means to migrate	9:37 AM
	ortho_stice: right - that's how I got here	9:37 AM
	if we're going to put effort into overhauling attributes	9:37

		AM
ortho_stice	gotcha	9:37
		AM
holoway	lets not waste our time on an interface that might just have reached its logical conclusion	9:37
		AM
	and instead focus on what an interface that is delightful would be	9:38
		AM
jonlives	wholeheartedly agreed	9:38
		AM
holoway	and then figure out how to help move people from A->B	9:38
		AM
ortho_stice	nod	9:38
		AM
jonlives	i'll hold off on getting my attribute precedence table tat for now then...	9:38
		AM
holoway	(which, depending on how we build the new interface, could be a straight port in a later version, or even a rewerite)	9:38
		AM
jmickle	im personally on the fence with this one....	9:38
		AM
holoway	jonlives: DO IT	9:38
		AM
jmickle	jonlives: quitter...	9:39
		AM
jonlives	:p	9:39
		AM
jtimmerman	apache = Mash.new for life	9:39
		AM
holoway	jmickle: which part? the RFC, or my crazy sidebar?	9:39
		AM
jmickle	holoway: sidebar	9:39
		AM
holoway	say more	9:39
		AM

jmickle	holoway: i dont wannna	9:40 AM
holoway	jmickle: ok	9:40 AM
jmickle	holoway: im just not convinced overhauling is good just yet	9:40 AM
	holoway: not enough evidence either way	9:40 AM
	holoway: maybe i dont fully understand the problem	9:41 AM
jonlives	do we think perhaps this RFC might need the context of what's happening with the overall attrib overhaul?	9:41 AM
jmickle	jonlives: +1	9:41 AM
	context def is lacking	9:41 AM
jonlives	kallistec: are their plans for an RFC on the attrib overhaul?	9:41 AM
kallistec	jmickle: I raged about attributes a while back in this PR: https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/9	9:41 AM
	which is before the modern RFC era btw	9:42 AM
holoway	you can see this RFC as an example of some of the real complexity in the current https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master...	9:42 AM
jmickle	tl;dr	9:42 AM
holoway	ok	9:42 AM
	nathenharvey: lets put this at the top of the agenda for the next meeting	9:42 AM

jmickle	il have to review after the meeting	9:42
		AM
	and get back to you	9:42
		AM
	apologies	9:43
		AM
nathenharv...	holoway: got it	9:43
		AM
holoway	no matter what, we need to make it clear we're not going to force a big rewrite	9:43
		AM
jonlives	yeah	9:43
		AM
jmickle	yeah right now holoway the first impression sounds its a overhaul and rewrite entirely	9:43
		AM
	which ithink is what puts me on the fence	9:43
		AM
holoway	I meant rewrite of cookbooks	9:43
		AM
kallistec	jmickle: my tl;dr is 1. split desired and observed state, 2. structure get/set so the full pathspec is known and we don't have trainwreck errors (no method error on nil for node[a][b])	9:44
		AM
holoway	we can refactor the attr implementation any time we want, if testing is good	9:44
		AM
jmickle	ah	9:44
		AM
holoway	and I think we need 1 for sure	9:44
		AM
	and 2 is obvious	9:44
		AM
jonlives	yeah	9:44
		AM
jmickle	kallistec: actually that i can agree with	9:44
		AM

	that i dont have any reserves about	9:44
		AM
	1 would be a major gain i think	9:44
		AM
ortho_stice	I really like #2	9:44
		AM
holoway	kallistec: do you and lamont want to propose that as an RFC?	9:44
		AM
	so we can start arguing syntax	9:45
		AM
kallistec	oh, and also #3 split normal out to its own thing b/c the persistence behavior is weird	9:45
		AM
jmickle	ha	9:45
		AM
jonlives	i think that should def happen, this one'll be a lot easier to merge with the context from that one	9:45
		AM
kallistec	holoway: will do	9:45
		AM
holoway	ok	9:45
		AM
jmickle	kallistec: well i need more context on #3 im weird and you havent split me out yet :-P	9:45
		AM
holoway	15 minute warning	9:45
		AM
nathenharv...	15 minute warning	9:45
		AM
	damnit	9:45
		AM
holoway	hahahahaha	9:45
		AM
	<i>holoway hugs nathenharvey</i>	9:45
		AM
	ok	9:45

		AM
jmickle	if i +1 the 15 minute warning does it become 16?	9:46
		AM
kallistec	jmickle: normal attrs persist between runs while other kinds do not, this causes a ton of bugs	9:46
		AM
holoway	community mgrs want to update the peoples?	9:46
		AM
nathenharv...	indeed!	9:46
		AM
jmickle	got it	9:46
		AM
nathenharv...	as holoway mentioned, we're celebrating our new office with an open house today in seattle	9:46
		AM
	if you're in town, come by	9:46
		AM
jmickle	i wish :(9:46
		AM
martinisoft	In Madrid, otherwise I would fly out there again :D	9:47
		AM
nathenharv...	CFP & Reg for ChefConf ongoing. CHEFSTAR is the contributor discount code	9:47
		AM
jmickle	back to my question anyone have codes available for cefconf?	9:47
		AM
	ah	9:47
		AM
jtimmerman	martinisoft: i'd rather be in madrid tbh ;)	9:47
		AM
jmickle	ty	9:47
		AM
nathenharv...	we're still planning a shutdown of wiki at end of year	9:47
		AM
jtimmerman	wiki.opscode.com shutdown entirely?	9:47
		AM

nathenharv...	jtimberman: yes	9:48 AM
	targeting 1 Jan 2015 for new mailing list, too	9:48 AM
jonlives	huzzah!	9:48 AM
jtimberman	\o/ to both those things	9:48 AM
jmickle	+1 me	9:48 AM
nathenharv...	please go upvote some questions on stackexchange proposal - http://area51.stackexchange.com/proposals/77609...	9:49 AM
holoway	https://i.imgur.com/x5O9r8b.jpg	9:49 AM
	^ new office kitchen	9:49 AM
someara	wow	9:49 AM
ssd7	nathenharvey: re the mailing list, does it look like we will be able to move emails or will we be going with a static archive of the old stuff?	9:49 AM
nathenharv...	contrib to coderanger's kickstarter - https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/coderanger...	9:49 AM
martinisoft	I hear there are Chef branded Pint glasses over there. :D	9:49 AM
jmickle	holoway: love it, congrats	9:49 AM
	<i>martinisoft wants one plzkthx</i>	9:49 AM
holoway	martinisoft: this is true!	9:49 AM
jmickle	holoway: savea desk for me :-P	9:49 AM

holoway	martinisoft: where do you live?	9:49 AM
jtimberman	omg we have pint glasses and i don't have one :O	9:49 AM
c_t	I wish the Chef HQ open house was not on the absolute worst day it could have possibly been for me	9:50 AM
martinisoft	holoway: The Windy City of Chicago.	9:50 AM
jonlives	me neither, just saying :p	9:50 AM
nathenharv...	ssd7: I refuse to answer that question right now....b/c I'm not certain of the answer and don't want to lie	9:50 AM
jtimberman	i mean, i can put a chef sticker on one of my current pint glasses..	9:50 AM
ssd7	nathenharvey: that's cool	9:50 AM
nathenharv...	that's it for community update	9:50 AM
jmickle	alright thanks all have a good day :-)	9:51 AM
holoway	cool	9:51 AM
	for us as a company, we're moving offices	9:51 AM
	having a good year in general	9:51 AM
	lots of people going to be taking time for the holidays, including me	9:51 AM
	we're still really trying to figure out how to use the new contrib and governance process	9:52 AM
	but we'll put more effort behind it	9:52 AM

	and that's it for Chef Software stuff	9:52 AM
	<i>martinisoft will not complain about being forced to work in Madrid with his co-workers</i>	9:52 AM
matti	jonlives: \o/ :)	9:52 AM
nathenharv...	sersut: client update?	9:52 AM
sersut	I've made a summary of our upcoming releases here: https://gist.github.com/sersut/b8e182d15db8560b... will post it to our blog soon...	9:53 AM
	more releases coming :)	9:53 AM
holoway	cool	9:53 AM
sersut	also to re-iterate any issue you see on the migration path from Chef Client 11 to Chef Client 12 let us know.. that's it from me unless there are any unclear points..	9:54 AM
nathenharv...	Thesoloniuss: has a server updates	9:54 AM
Thesoloniuss	Now that the server github repos have been opened up the server is team is consolidating oc_erchef into an apps topology. This means we will be relocating chef_db, chef_objects, chef_wm, oc_chef_wm, and oc_chef_authz into oc_erchef/apps and deprecating the external repositories.	9:54 AM
holoway	+100	9:55 AM
Thesoloniuss	Those repositories will still exist, however, new PRs/Issues should be opened against github.com/opscode/oc_erchef There should be no functional difference in the server (no changes in pedant were needed).	9:55 AM

	This might mean a 1.0.0 release for oc_erchef :-)	9:55 AM
	PR at https://github.com/opscode/oc_erchef/pull/63	9:55 AM
nathenharv...	5 minute warning	9:55 AM
Thesolonius	oc_erchef will also be a functional library to be used by other applications	9:55 AM
	all public includes will be in a top level include folder	9:55 AM
	That's it right now	9:56 AM
nathenharv...	3 minutes left: what do YOU want to discuss?	9:57 AM
jonlives	I've gotta jump into another meeting - will get rfc merged in a few hours after meetings are all done here	9:57 AM
	later y'all	9:57 AM
holoway	jonlives: thanks man	9:57 AM
	say hello to your peeps	9:57 AM
jonlives	np!	9:57 AM
	will do!	9:57 AM
adamleff	I can help with the RFCs if needed to - just let me know.	9:57 AM
jtimberman	jonlives: cheers!	9:57 AM
holoway	adamleff: feel free to get to it before jonlives	9:58 AM
jonlives	adamleff: sweet - https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/69? is the one	9:58

	needing merged :)	AM
holoway	I'm sure he won't mind	9:58
		AM
adamleff	roger that - can do :)	9:58
		AM
jonlives	not at all!	9:58
		AM
jtimberman	nathenharvey: i released a new homebrew cookbook to work better with Chef 12.	9:58
		AM
Tech356	nathenharvey: Windows support. I am a bit concerned since the windows cookbook wasn't touched in the month of November.	9:58
		AM
nathenharv...	We'll take a few weeks off here next meeting will be 8 Jan 2015	9:58
		AM
Tech356	and it has lots of outstanding issues and PRs	9:58
		AM
c_t	what, no meeting on Christmas Day?	9:59
		AM
kallistec	Tech356: I think the platform team has been working a lot on tweaking ChefDK to work better on windows and other windows work	9:59
		AM
jtimberman	c_t: you can meet here if you want.	9:59
		AM
	c_t: may be a meeting of one...	9:59
		AM
holoway	Tech356: do you want to be a maintainer for windows?	10:00
		AM
kallistec	Tech356: also, we	10:00
		AM
holoway	Be happy to turn you loose	10:00
		AM
nathenharv...	Tech356: noted. I'll see if we can get some resources looking at those. stevenmurawski or someara might be able to look at some of those issues	10:00
		AM
kallistec	...we're moving a lot of windows stuff into core, so the windows cookbook won't be the center of the universe for how things are going on windows	10:00
		AM

nathenharv...	also, +1 if you'd like commit on that cookbook	10:00 AM
Tech356	holoway: If I knew more about Ruby and Chef, maybe. but I don't know if I can at the moment	10:00 AM
c_t	jtimberman: I'm sure that'll go over fabulously on the home front	10:00 AM
holoway	Tech356: I bet you can triage	10:00 AM
	ok, bye!	10:01 AM
nathenharv...	OK, we're at time.	10:01 AM
	*** MEETING ENDS ***	10:01 AM