robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 13:05

... Very true.

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 13:05

And then set berks to `http://supermarket.chef.io/channels/foo`

I mean the simple option would be to have `http://supermarket.chef.io/channels/foo/universe`

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 13:03

:thinking_face: And berkshelf would need updating to know about the channel param.

thom   Jul 28, 2016 13:03

@robbkidd: yes

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 13:02

I mean we might want to add channel data to the schema too for future use, but wouldn't be needed now

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 13:01

I think also that adding channels to Supermarket does _not_ imply a change to the universe schema. Channels would become a _flavor_ of universe that could be requested. `/universe` returns the cookbook versions in the default channel, `/universe?channel=foo` returns cookbook versions in the foo channel. Correct? I recommend we avoid changing the universe schema.

lamont   Jul 28, 2016 12:59

you must comply!

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:57

We'll get there eventually. :wink:

jtimberman   Jul 28, 2016 12:57

I brought up the views vs channels in our internal habitat channel for some discussion, we're tending on the side of consistency with existing things and using `channels` instead of `views` but not everyone has chimed in yet.

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:56

... that I'm worried about

It's the "query across all cookbook versions for the set of unique channels they are assigned to" that I suspect would need to occur if there is not a master list that can be trusted to be the whole list.

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:54

Yeah, to play my own devils advocate, the extra "moving pieces" are mostly a plain CRUD API which Rails makes not too hard.

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:53

The devils we find in the details may have us reëvaluate that, but it's worthy of trying.

I do like @coderanger's "A channel exists if it is either specified as an allowed channel or any cookbook is a part of the channel" as something to attempt an implementation around.

thom Jul 28, 2016 12:52

and yes, this looks a lot like time

thanks @kallistec

kallistec Jul 28, 2016 12:50

Alright, I think this meeting is about at time. I will add some language like what we've been talking about to the RFC and we can hammer out the details async on the github

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:50

:+1:

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:50

Sure. Yea. I like not changing the API needlessly.

I sense some weirdness if there are cookbook versions assigned to a channel that is removed from the config.

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:49

Just something to not rule out from the start :slightly_smiling_face:

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:49

OK.

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:48

Will be a lot fewer moving pieces if we don't also need to add a channel management API on top of this change

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:48

meditates upon coderanger's koan

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:48

Mostly I ask because my vote is for channel config to live in config files for simplicity and because they won't change often

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:47

Like, don't RFC "channels are stored in the database"

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:47

I think the more neutral wording is "A channel exists if it is either specified as an allowed channel or any cookbook is a part of the channel"

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:46

Correct. But it's specifying behavior that _influences_ implementation.

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:46

That implies channel management is in-band via database objects instead of config files

>An admin cannot delete a channel if there are any cookbooks assigned to it.

Some of that list already suggests implementation details

thom Jul 28, 2016 12:46

there are also two TODOs in the RFC right now - exclusivity, and how `universe` would get filtered

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:45

And all of this need some weighing in from the Supermarket product owner, Nathenus Harvia.

thom Jul 28, 2016 12:45

that's a solid list

kallistec Jul 28, 2016 12:44

I like that list

are there general statements about UI behavior we would want

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:44

Declare desired behavior. As an example: * Supermarket will have a single channel `default`. * When channel feature is disabled, all cookbooks are assigned to the `default` channel and the universe displays cookbooks from the `default` channel. * When the channel feature is enabled, multiple channels can be specified by an administrator. * Cookbooks can be assigned to a (single/multiple?) channel. * An admin cannot delete a channel if there are any cookbooks assigned to it. * An admin cannot rename a channel if there are any cookbooks assigned to it.

kallistec Jul 28, 2016 12:43

alright, so can we come up with a list of things we want decided before we do an up/down vote?

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:40

Ja.

thom Jul 28, 2016 12:40

i think we can hammer that out into user stories once we're ok with the idea

kallistec Jul 28, 2016 12:40

I'm happy to leave that open if everyone else is cool with it

robbkidd Jul 28, 2016 12:39

I don't think we should decide on implementation details yet.

kallistec Jul 28, 2016 12:39

Also we would need to decide what happens if you upgrade and then you decide you want to be on the automate-workflow channelset

@robbkidd: ^^

coderanger Jul 28, 2016 12:38

@kallistec: One thing to decide is how those config options live, config file, database, etc?

thom Jul 28, 2016 12:38

i guess my only question is - is that going to wind up with a whole bunch of folk with channels %w{ union rehearsal default } ?

kallistec Jul 28, 2016 12:36

Does that sound good as the thing we migrate you to when you upgrade?

Ok, next item. 1. a set of channels that can exist 2. default channel for new artifacts 3. default channel for universe if you set (1) to `["default"]`, (2) to "default", and (3) to "default"

personally, I'm convinced that it makes sense to go with what we're doing already in stuff the Chef community is familiar with

Channels wins?

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:32

i like channels

jtimberman   Jul 28, 2016 12:32

I mean, I don't *really* care a whole lot about which word is used. It's nice if it's consistent.

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:32

people will learn the jargon :slightly_smiling_face:

But I don't think it's a big deal either way

jtimberman   Jul 28, 2016 12:31

I like the words thom said

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:31

So my vote is omni* and artifactory terms

jtimberman   Jul 28, 2016 12:31

but

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:31

Also hab and chef have little consistency in general

jtimberman   Jul 28, 2016 12:31

@kallistec: I prefer "views"

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:31

I'm a fan of consistency.

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:30

@jtimberman: ??

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:29

i think views is good for consistency with hab; although maybe hab should switch to channels for consistency with artifactory and omnitruck?

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:28

anyway. Are there any objections to using the word "views" instead of "channels" ?

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:28

Mmmaybe.

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:27

maybe whatever UI stuff we end up doing can be disabled if the size of (set of channels that can exist) == 1

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:27

losts a bit of his soul typing "default defaults"

Right. Gotcha.

And probably 2 and 3 would have default defaults when the feature is disabled. Ja?

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:26

then it's effectively disabled

if you set (1) to `["default"]`, (2) to "default", and (3) to "default"

@robbkidd: I'm kinda thinking that you can configure (as admin): 1. a set of channels that can exist 2. default channel for new artifacts 3. default channel for universe

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:24

gets hand wavy In implementing a feature flag, we would need to figure out how to transition an install of Supermarket from no-channels to channel-:allthethings:

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:24

Not much to object to

Aside from some details with naming, it seems like a pretty straightforward :+1: proposal :slightly_smiling_face:

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:23

absolutely

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:23

that's a good point. I would just like to avoid the UI showing you that version 2.0 is there but you run berks or whatever and you get 1.0 because 2.0 isn't in the right channel

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:21

rather than try and solve with a bunch of developers on slack :slightly_smiling_face:

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:21

> I'd suggest a first version of views/channels be wrapped in a feature flag, defaulted to disabled, and that public Supermarket not enable it. I'm also :+1: on this

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:21

Yea. UI can be changed if we have solid user stories describing the feature.

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:20

this seems like something we could work with Chef's UX folk with

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:20

This would let the feature bake in private use cases before affected a much wider audience.

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:20

Showing the channels for the visible version is relatively easy, but seeing which versions are in which channels overall is harder in the current structure

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:20

robbkidd: :+1:

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:19

I'd suggest a first version of views/channels be wrapped in a feature flag, defaulted to disabled, and that public Supermarket not enable it.

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:19

@robbkidd: I mean stuff where you want to cross-ref it across versions quickly

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:19

I could kinda see having a beta and GA channel on the public supermarket

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:19

The contents in the tabs in the view of a cookbook are version-specific. More version-specific data could be added.

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:18

i'm not sure about public supermarket; i can imagine that people might well want to run CI pipelines against public supermarket if they're on hosted chef or something?

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:17

The UI might be tricky because the current Supermarket doesn't really feature version-specific info very much. Maybe tags in the version dropdown?

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:17

it seems almost like a facet ; could you then have a list of views/channels per cookbook that one could select?

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:17

@jtimberman: I'm fine with that (see also, comments on the PR :stuck_out_tongue:)

jtimberman   Jul 28, 2016 12:16

I think using the same word is good from a product consistency perspective

fwiw, in Habitat we call them "views" instead of "channels"

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:15

Also interested in what value anyone sees in this for the public supermarket

Anyone have opinions on how channels would look in the UI?

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:13

Doing more automation around Supermarket might increase the frustrations of that API re: scripting but I don't think that needs to be solved here.

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:12

with some additional features that make sense in the context of using Chef Automate (nee delivery) or if you have a pipeline that embodies similar opinions

---

July 28, 2016

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:12

Helps handle the case where a CI pipeline must build an artifact and put it somewhere for the rest of the pipeline to consume for further testing.

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:11

so I'm proposing the same thing should be possible with supermarket

for comparison, we use artifactory internally at Chef Software, and we publish packages first to an "unstable" channel, then run automated tests, if that passes the package goes to "current", then we manually promote to "stable" which is how you get a release

the idea is that you can publish artifacts for further testing (automated or manual) but you'd have to opt-in to seeing them until they are promoted

tl;dr, I'm proposing a way to assign artifacts in supermarket to "channels" or "views"

k, so the link is:https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/210

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:06

sounds reasonable to me

kallistec   Jul 28, 2016 12:04

it's not ready to move forward to approved, but we could talk about what's there

kinda?

thom   Jul 28, 2016 12:03

@kallistec: is the supermarket channels RFC done enough to be discussed?

not sure if there's a thing to be done

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:03

Poking people.

coderanger   Jul 28, 2016 12:02

We doing a thing?

robbkidd   Jul 28, 2016 12:00

:wave: