

**holoway**

For those who want to see the agenda in advance, it is here:<https://docs.google.com/a/opscode.com/document/...>

ok - 9:03, if you're late, you're late

12:03 PM

## meeting begins ##

12:03 PM

Hi all - welcome to the first chef dev meeting

12:03 PM

thanks for taking the time out of your day to make it

12:03 PM

**burtlo**

(golfclap)

12:04 PM

**holoway**

the over-arching reason for the meeting is to kick of the process of getting more explicit about how the project is governed and managed

12:04 PM

so that's the bulk of the agenda

12:04 PM

before we get there, sersut (the engineering leader at Chef Software for the Chef Client) is going to drop a few words about whats upcoming in the next release

12:05 PM

nathenharvey is going to talk about supermarket (thanks for the post-mortems, cwebber)

12:05 PM

and then we'll go straight to talking about the plan for how we get more explicit

12:05 PM

if anyone has questions about how this meeting will be run, you can reference<https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master...>

12:06 PM

any questions before we head to sersut?

12:06 PM

once

12:06 PM

twice

12:06 PM

okay, you have the floor, sersut

12:06 PM

**sersut**

Ohai Chefs... Serdar here from Chef Client Team @ Chef...

12:06 PM

Some things that we've been working on in the last two weeks:

12:07 PM

1-) Chef Client 11.14.0 Release Candidates are out for all platforms...

12:07 PM

Give it a shot if you have not already :)

12:07 PM

We are planning to ship 11.14.0 for real some time next week...

12:07 PM

2-) Chef Development Kit 0.2.0 which includes Windows packages is

12:08 PM

	released as of yesterday...	
	However the download page link is not updated yet since it's still a manual process :(	12:08 PM
	<i>holoway high fives manual process</i>	12:08 PM
	we will update the link today and get a blog post out about the instructions to get it..	12:08 PM
	Some of the things that are "coming soon"	12:09 PM
	*) We are working on CHef CLient 10.34.0 release...	12:09 PM
	Watch the blog for announcement of release candidates this week...	12:09 PM
	*) One of the big things is that we will be working on a major release bump for Chef during the rest of the summer..	12:10 PM
	New version Chef 12 will be fully backwards compatible with Chef...	12:10 PM
	we will have yet another blog post about the details but the two important things in that release are:	12:11 PM
	<i>paulmooring_away is now known as paulmooring</i>	12:11 PM
	1-) SSL verification will be enabled by default along with the tooling needed for bootstrapping Chef nodes correctly..	12:11 PM
	2-) We will be updating the RUby version in the omnibus packages...	12:11 PM
holoway	sersut: to which version of ruby?	12:12 PM
burtlo	Ruby! Woot!	12:12 PM
sersut	Current thinking is to bump to Ruby 2.X and drop the support for Ruby 1.8.7	12:12 PM
alexbst	ohai chefs!	12:12 PM
lamont_oc	(2.1.2 as of right now)	12:12 PM
coderanger	holoway: Should we be holding questions until the end of each section?	12:12 PM
holoway	coderanger: lets see how we do without holding	12:12 PM
	<i>alexbst already misses his chef brothers and sisters.</i>	12:12 PM
zts	"major release bump for Chef" <- client, server, or both?	12:13 PM
holoway	zts: both	12:13 PM
someara	will the chef-client and chefdk ruby versions be synced going forward?	12:13 PM

<b>coderanger</b>	Roger, sersut re: 11.14rc, any thoughts on the chef-dev thread about the attributes syntax in the whitelist stuff?	12:13 PM
<b>sersut</b>	i don't want to consume the meeting with this topic... so maybe we can have a blog post out with some details and gather after that to chat more in detail..	12:13 PM
<b>holoway</b>	zts: I'm going to talk about it a little later in roadmap stuff, but there are things coming in the server side of 12 that I can't talk about publicly, but this should be the last time I can't talk publicly about whats happening on the server side	12:14 PM
<b>zts</b>	holoway: cool, no worries. Related question: if Chef 12 is fully backwards compatible, why the major version bump?	12:14 PM
<b>holoway</b>	sersut, coderanger: I think we should come to lazy consensus on the attributes syntax	12:14 PM
	zts: that would be the thing I can't talk about publicly	12:15 PM
<b>sersut</b>	coderanger: i have just skimmed over that thread... will look into it later today..	12:15 PM
<b>holoway</b>	zts: which sucks, I know, and fixing that is part of why I can't talk about it	12:15 PM
<b>zts</b>	holoway: ah :) np	12:15 PM
<b>sersut</b>	that's pretty much it from updates on the Client side...	12:15 PM
<b>holoway</b>	someara: re version sync, feels like it will be (and probalby should be)	12:15 PM
<b>sersut</b>	someara: ideally yeah	12:16 PM
<b>holoway</b>	nathenharvey: can you take down that we have an action for sersut, coderanger, and anyone else who cares to weigh in on the chef-dev list re attr syntax and come to lazy consensus?	12:16 PM
<b>sersut</b>	note that it doesn't mean that it's the only supported Ruby version tough..	12:16 PM
<b>nathenhar...</b>	holoway: got it	12:16 PM
<b>holoway</b>	yep	12:16 PM
	I have two other small things in client-ish lan	12:16 PM
	er land	12:16 PM
<b>btm</b>	someara: I think since ChefDK is new, we got away with whatever Ruby version we wanted so it is an ideal version, and we want to get the client omnibus package up there soon.	12:16 PM

<b>holoway</b>	the first is that we merged the on_failure rfc <a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master...">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master...</a>	12:17 PM
	so we'll be looking at the implementation in the cookbook and seeing about making it a core feature - it got universal ☐	12:17 PM
	the second is there was conversation on the ml about berkshelf and the need for a universe for assets on a chef server	12:18 PM
	after digging and talking with reset, we'll add an authenticated /universe endpoint	12:18 PM
	so you can have a source thats a chef server followed by the supermarket source	12:18 PM
<b>spheromak</b>	(yay)	12:18 PM
<b>holoway</b>	ok, nathenharvey - wanna spend a minute on community stuff?	12:18 PM
<b>nathenhar...</b>	holoway: yep, thanks	12:19 PM
	<a href="https://supermarket.getchef.com">supermarket.getchef.com</a> was officially released on Monday. This is a great step forward for our community site. Thanks to cwebber, the developer from full stack, and everyon who's helped by providing code, feedback, opening issues, and more. This was definitely a community effort.	12:19 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: Should probably have at least some discussion on chef-dev about RFCs as a general thing, "universal" is mostly of people that happened to be cc'd on that ticket	12:19 PM
<b>nathenhar...</b>	Since opening we've had a couple of production issues and have held three public post-mortems. Check <a href="https://blog.getchef.com">blog.getchef.com</a> for additional details.	12:19 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: got it - added to the next agenda item	12:19 PM
<b>nathenhar...</b>	Individual contributors should login to the Supermarket, using the legacy community site credentials or hosted Chef credentials. After logging in, assoicate your github account with your profile ( <a href="https://supermarket.getchef.com/profile/edit">https://supermarket.getchef.com/profile/edit</a> ). You will then be able to sign an individual contributor license agreement (ICLA) <a href="https://supermarket.getchef.com/icla-signatures....">https://supermarket.getchef.com/icla-signatures....</a> . Any CLA you've previously signe	12:20 PM
	d is still in force and this new CLA is identical to the one you've previously signed. However, confirming your CLA on the Supermarket site, makes it easier for us to tag your pull requests as coming from someone who's already signed a CLA. We have bot that watches our open source repos. When a pull request is made, it will be tagged with the CLA status of the contributor.	12:20 PM

	Companies who have a Corporate Contributor License Agreement (CCLA) have extra management capabilities in the Supermarket. Each CCLA will have one or more administrators who can manage additional signers on the CCLA.	12:20 PM
	Again, previous CLAs are still in force and the new CLAs on the Supermarket are identical to the ones you've previously signed. This is primarily an affirmation of your existing CLA and a link to your github account.	12:20 PM
kallistec	holoway: also please say if chef-rfc is the right venue to get items on the server roadmap	12:20 PM
nathenhar...	Over the next week or so all of the Chef maintained cookbooks will be added to the bot. At that time, all open pull requests will be checked to see if the author has a CLA on file with Supermarket.	12:21 PM
	If you need any help or have any questions about the new CLA process, please reach out to me ( <a href="mailto:nharvey@getchef.com">nharvey@getchef.com</a> ) or Chris Webber ( <a href="mailto:cwebber@getchef.com">cwebber@getchef.com</a> ).	12:21 PM
	The Supermarket itself is an open-source project that we're managing over on github - <a href="http://github.opscode.com/supermarket">http://github.opscode.com/supermarket</a> . Your feedback on the site is greatly appreciated. This is truly a community site for and by the community.	12:21 PM
	The Supermarket was the subject of yesterday's Food Fight Show podcast <a href="http://foodfightshow.org/2014/07/supermarket.html">http://foodfightshow.org/2014/07/supermarket.html</a> .	12:21 PM
	What questions can I answer for you about the Supermarket or the CLA process?	12:21 PM
holoway	kallistec: check	12:21 PM
btm	nathenharvey: mailing list, gitter?	12:22 PM
shlant	*excited clapping*	12:22 PM
nathenhar...	holoway: barring questions, I'm done with my update for this week.	12:22 PM
j^2	<a href="https://github.com/opscode/supermarket">https://github.com/opscode/supermarket</a>	12:22 PM
cwebber	gitter.im/opscode/supermarket is where chat is	12:22 PM
nathenhar...	btm: yes - mailing list is <a href="https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/chef-su...">https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/chef-su...</a>	12:22 PM
jalberts	nathenharvey: i notice the bot adds the 'signed cla' tag to github PRs. How/when is the 'verified cla' tag added?	12:22 PM
nathenhar...	cwebber: thanks for the gitter link	12:22 PM
jtimberman	good to note that there is a supermarket cookbook which is what we use to	12:23 PM

	deploy the app to prod, too. so you can run the same site locally for testing. <a href="https://supermarket.getchef.com/cookbooks/super...">https://supermarket.getchef.com/cookbooks/super...</a>	
lamont_oc	the green CLA tag is from when sethv was doing it manually	12:23 PM
nathenhar...	jalberts: sometime after you submit the PR and before you notice the tag ;)	12:23 PM
btm	jalberts: "verified cla" is a manual thing the client team has been doing since before the bot came online, we haven't reconciled the two tags yet.	12:23 PM
nathenhar...	cwebber: do you know the frequency of the bot checking in?	12:24 PM
jalberts	btm: ah. ok. was curious what the difference was. thx	12:24 PM
holoway	ok, any more supermarket/community in general questions before I move on?	12:24 PM
cwebber	it works via webhooks so each time an event occurs	12:24 PM
holoway	once	12:24 PM
MikeTLive	docs on standing up local mini-mart version of supermarket is needed.	12:24 PM
nathenhar...	jalberts: sorry, I misread your question... btm's got you covered though	12:24 PM
	<i>solarce waves to cwebber</i>	12:24 PM
jalberts	nathenharvey: i submitted 3 PRs yesterday and the 'signed cla' tag was added each time within 60 seconds	12:24 PM
	it works nicely	12:25 PM
nathenhar...	jalberts: +1	12:25 PM
jalberts	signing the cla process was very smooth	12:25 PM
holoway	nathenharvey: can you take a note to get some docs ready on local supermarket?	12:25 PM
	thanks MikeTLive	12:25 PM
	<i>ssd7 thinks we should make "mini-mart" the official term for that :)</i>	12:25 PM
	□	12:25 PM
someara	bodega	12:25 PM
holoway	ok	12:25 PM
nathenhar...	holoway: MikeTLive got it.	12:25 PM
holoway	once	12:25 PM

<b>Eulipion</b>	second bodega	12:25 PM
<b>holoway</b>	twice	12:25 PM
<b>cwebber</b>	MikeTLive: we need to work out some kinks because right now there is a missing component to doing it locally. Hit me up afterwards for more info	12:26 PM
<b>MikeTLive</b>	we've embraced chef community as core to our use of chef. wrapping community books, never forking, then contributing back adds/fixes. having that localized will really make it easy for our micro community of dozen+ ops-teams link in to the larger community.	12:26 PM
	cwebber: will do	12:26 PM
<b>holoway</b>	ok, moving on	12:26 PM
	as has been flapping about on the blog(s), and on the mailing list, and was the catalyst for this meeting	12:27 PM
	I think there was broad agreement that we needed to start being more regular and explicit about how we as a community work together to build chef	12:27 PM
<b>shlant</b>	*looks at coderanger*	12:28 PM
	I kid I kid	12:28 PM
<b>holoway</b>	that includes being more clear about how we make decisions (which you could also read simply as 'be clear'), where we talk about things, where we communicate things to folks who might not have been available for live conversation, and how we make the rules	12:28 PM
	the process to do that involves a couple of different core constituencies, and I want to make sure I haven't missed any	12:29 PM
	the first is obviously end users - folks who don't really have any desire to be in a room like this, but just use chef in their daily life	12:29 PM
	(this list is in no particular order)	12:30 PM
	we have chef developers, who care not only about how chef works day to day, but also the health and well-being of the internals	12:30 PM
	we have ecosystem developers, who care about how chef works as part of the tooling/software they build (test kitchen, berkshelf, deis, engine yard, amazon, etc.)	12:31 PM
	we have chef software, who have a pretty deep vested interest both in chef	12:31 PM

	as open source software and our commercial offerings built on top of it	
	and we have other organizations (like IBM) who embed chef in their products, but are less present in the day-to-day ecosystem	12:32 PM
	as the original chef author, I'm going to take the lead in gathering input from all of those constituencies	12:33 PM
	and focus in on getting us clear about two broad areas	12:33 PM
	the first is governance - how do we make decisions about how the project will be managed?	12:34 PM
	the second is what, for lack of a better term, I've been calling maintenance policy	12:34 PM
	how do the folks who do the work of writing code, proposing it for merge, and releasing the software do their work	12:34 PM
	in looking at lots of different models, I'm leaning toward one that looks like Docker	12:35 PM
	as a starting place for the conversation	12:35 PM
	there are a few things I like about what they've done	12:36 PM
	on governance, the advice they give is broadly advisory	12:36 PM
	deferring most authority to maintenance policy, which is set primarily by the maintainers	12:36 PM
	and the maintainer policy is very straightforward - you add yourself as a maintainer for a subsystem in a pull request, and the same model for accepting any other code takes over (simple majority with high level vetos)	12:37 PM
	(roughly)	12:37 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	I think it might help to clarify, I think when you say "they" you mean the Docker advisory board?	12:37 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: I'm not sure which use of the word they you are clarifying - but the Advisory Board set up here <a href="http://www.docker.com/community/governance/">http://www.docker.com/community/governance/</a>	12:38 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	"on governance, the advice they give is broadly advisory"	12:38 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: is the governance model, which basically puts most of the authority directly on the maintainers	12:38 PM
	coderanger: yes - by 'they' I mean the members of the advisory board give,	12:39 PM



	well - advice	
	what I like is that decisions are made by those who code	12:39 PM
	you can't pay to play and game the system	12:39 PM
	I think that, on how we manage the process, we need to do a couple of things	12:40 PM
	first, we need to bless lieutenants (happy to change the word) that take ownership of significant parts of the Chef code base	12:40 PM
	one example would be operating system It's, who take responsibility for (and merge patches directly) for given operating systems	12:41 PM
j^2	holoway: As a community member i like how you said "by 'they' I mean the members of the advisory board give, well - advice," it's good to see at the very beginning you are expecting advice not direction/dictation	12:41 PM
ssd7	Question (can be deferred for later): How does the Docker model compare to the model of other communities that have been around longer than Docker.	12:42 PM
holoway	j^2: good software is made and directed by the people who write it, not by other folks	12:42 PM
	ssd7: it's pretty lightweight	12:42 PM
j^2	holoway: +1	12:42 PM
sam____	Question (can be answered later) how does a new community cookbook name gets its name? first one to submit to supermarket wins or there will be some control as to how cookbooks are named? what is the policy to prevent duplicate cookbooks from showing up in supermarket?	12:42 PM
holoway	sam____: I'm going to table that	12:42 PM
	nathenharvey: can you track that ^^	12:42 PM
spheromak	_cough_ namespaces :)	12:43 PM
coderanger	namespaces was formally rejected this morning	12:43 PM
nathenhar...	holoway: got it	12:43 PM
coderanger	(good timing)	12:43 PM
holoway	spheromak: lets not have that argument	12:43 PM
someara	lets have it at the community summit	12:43 PM

<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: well, a PR was formally closed	12:43 PM
<b>spheromak</b>	yea not wanting to open that can	12:43 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: that had no code	12:43 PM
	and also, tabled :)	12:43 PM
<b>cwebber</b>	coderanger: not formally rejected, just set aside for later when we have cycles	12:44 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	holoway: how does that governance model cope with a maintainer with a particularly dogmatic view of an aspect of chef enforcing their version of canon?	12:44 PM
<b>holoway</b>	jonlives: great question	12:44 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: I would like to propose we evaluate the Python PEP model as a way to manage large-scale or complex changes	12:44 PM
<b>holoway</b>	in thinking through how it might work, I think we need a simple policy with escalating veto	12:44 PM
	jonlives: so lets say you become the LT of Enterprise Linux	12:44 PM
	jonlives: and you have 4 maintainers on your team (all volunteers, of course)	12:45 PM
	a patch comes in, the 5 of you review it, and a simple majority of 3 gets the go ahead to merge	12:45 PM
	if the LT thinks its harmful, they can veto the majority, and the majority can appeal to a project lead	12:45 PM
	who makes the call	12:46 PM
<b>MikeTLive</b>	ideally the Lt would not have to *do* anything until and unless a conflict emerges. - use standard quorum rules..	12:46 PM
	and only if the team still disagree with the Lt. would it go higher up	12:46 PM
<b>holoway</b>	yep	12:46 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	that sounds sensible!	12:46 PM
<b>holoway</b>	in all these cases, the folks who are in those roles exist in a file you make a PR against	12:46 PM
	and we have rules for their acceptance	12:46 PM

	including the project lead itself	12:47 PM
	getting to a first draft of those rules means talking to lots of constituents :)	12:47 PM
MikeTLive	simple rules and guides that define the structure and direction, when applied globally, combine to resolve most questions later.	12:47 PM
coderanger	holoway: It should probably be noted that in the case of disagreement, things should probably side with the status quo instead of one person making a decision	12:47 PM
jmink	holoway: What if you have a project with lots of maintainers? That would lead to latency in getting enough +1's	12:48 PM
holoway	coderanger: probably? I can think of plenty of examples where the mob builds bad software	12:48 PM
	coderanger: but yeah, lets say the No Asshole Rule applies to the community as well	12:48 PM
coderanger	holoway: Indeed, hence we favor the status quo	12:48 PM
MikeTLive	coderanger: most of the time. but dont be fooled by the popularity being more correct :) (i think you said something like that to me some months back)	12:48 PM
holoway	jmink: I think if we have that problem, we can adjust by simply having fewer maintainers, or changing the rules for how many you need	12:49 PM
jmink	Fair enough.	12:49 PM
holoway	jmink: I would *love* to have so many people invested in reviewing PRs that we have latency issues	12:49 PM
mivok	coderanger: by status quo do you mean favor rejecting a change if there is controversy?	12:49 PM
btm	holoway: I hope we can get a draft started soon, as constituent talking happens, so the process of developing the document doesn't stall and the iterations are public.	12:49 PM
	<i>holoway literally claps with joy at the thought</i>	12:49 PM
holoway	btm: yes. to be honest, there are two things that are holding up a first draft, and subsequent ones will be public	12:50 PM
coderanger	mivok: Yes, where "controversy" means that a large number of people are on both sides not just one loud person	12:50 PM

<b>holoway</b>	the first is that this activity has a big impact on Chef Software, and any big changes to the status quo have potential financial side effects - which means, for example, we need to talk to our internal management, and our board of directors	12:51 PM
	I've had those discussions already, and nothing I've said in this meeting is controversial to anyone	12:51 PM
	in those constituencies	12:51 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	this is good.	12:51 PM
<b>holoway</b>	the second is simply wanting to make sure we had no deep reservations about the broad path here, because what I'm heading towards is a place where the authors of the software have the majority of the say in how it is built	12:52 PM
	so this room needed to hear what would be in the draft before its even written	12:52 PM
	(for those of you who don't know, I'm also on the board of directors at Chef Software, so I'm well suited to carry those conversations)	12:53 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: One question, will employees follow this path to getting commit bits as well?	12:53 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	the broad outline of the docker model and the way it's been described sounds good to me at least :p	12:53 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: yes	12:53 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: (+1)	12:53 PM
<b>holoway</b>	the community is made up of people, not employees or non-employees	12:54 PM
<b>cwebber</b>	holoway: how do the governance things we are discussing apply to things like the supermarket itself (ie around namespace issues), and chef maintained cookbooks are those sperate of this?	12:54 PM
<b>ssd7</b>	Maybe I missed it in backscroll, but does being a maintainer == commit bit?	12:54 PM
<b>holoway</b>	cwebber: I'm explicitly just talking about the core chef project	12:54 PM
	ssd7: yes	12:54 PM
	ssd7: with rules around pressing the button	12:54 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	holoway: does the docker model require any sort of activity commitment from maintainers? ie if I became one and then had a busy month at work, does that cause problems?	12:54 PM

	or is that covered by voting in the team	12:54 PM
<b>holoway</b>	jonlives: I think we would want to have an activity commitment, but probably only used in cases of extreme disappearance	12:55 PM
	coderanger: on PEP, I've never been a python person	12:55 PM
<b>nathenhar...</b>	holoway: time check: we're at five minutes to the top of the hour	12:55 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	holoway: that sounds faie	12:55 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: would you take an action to write up how that process works, and we can put you talkinga bout it on the agenda for the next meeting?	12:55 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	*fair	12:55 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: Surely	12:55 PM
<b>holoway</b>	nathenharvey: thanks	12:55 PM
	nathenharvey: make sure coderanger gets 20 minutes on PEP	12:55 PM
	okay, in last 5 minutes	12:56 PM
	I want to talk about chef-rfc	12:56 PM
	and the roadmap	12:56 PM
	historically, the chef roadmap is driven almost entirely by Chef Software	12:56 PM
	with this model, we need to adapt that at least a little	12:56 PM
<b>btm</b>	jonlives: I've had success in other groups with unexcused absence for X period being the rule for removing someone for purposes of housekeeping, rather than kicking people out who have lives that occasionally get in the way of projects/hobbies.	12:56 PM
<b>holoway</b>	Chef Software still, obviously, gets to decied what its employees do	12:57 PM
	but we need a way for everyone to get involved and accept a proposal	12:57 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	btm: ack	12:57 PM
<b>holoway</b>	for now, I propose we re-start using the chef-rfc repository	12:57 PM
	for anything that has a broad impact on Chef	12:58 PM
	and that the policy for merging falls on me, and I will hew toward consensus, until we have a formal model in place	12:58 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	i think that sounds fair to begin with	12:58 PM

<b>holoway</b>	those who want to be kept up to date can subscribe to the github repo	12:59 PM
	assent is shown with a □ on the PR	12:59 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	what was that symbol? :p	12:59 PM
<b>holoway</b>	and, in lieu of a formal maintainership process, every vote will count	12:59 PM
	colon +1 colon	12:59 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	aha	12:59 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: I really think discussion should be held on chef-dev, not the individual tickets, github's model makes it too easy to get an echo chamber	12:59 PM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: I think we actually have more folks who are happy/willing/able to talk on the PR	1:00 PM
	coderanger: but if it gets into an echo chamber and we're not working, we'll talk about it in this meeting and change our minds	1:00 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	personally speaking I'd prefer the PR purely so it's all kept in one place.	1:00 PM
	but agreed - need to see how it goes	1:00 PM
<b>jtimberman</b>	what about, bring up the PR on the mailing list, and encourage the discussion on the PR?	1:01 PM
	just to reach a potentially broader audience?	1:01 PM
<b>holoway</b>	jtimberman: agreed	1:01 PM
<b>ssd7</b>	I imagine a lot of things would start as discussions on chef-dev, someone would take some time to make a pr to chef-rfc, and then discussion would continue on the PR in a more formal way	1:01 PM
<b>jeffbyrnes</b>	□ Love the transparency that the chef-rfc repo brings	1:01 PM
<b>adamleff</b>	bah, jtimberman just took the words out of my mouth as I was typing. No reason we can't use the mailing list to help drive the conversation.	1:01 PM
<b>jtimberman</b>	ssd7: ^5	1:01 PM
<b>holoway</b>	so put to the floor - we use chef-rfc, the author of an rfc posts to the mailing list, and the discussion happens on the pr	1:01 PM
<b>jtimberman</b>	adamleff: ^5	1:01 PM
<b>paulmooring</b>	jtimberman we could maybe automate sending all new PRs to the mailing list	1:01 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	+1	1:01 PM

paulmooring	+1	1:01 PM
ssd7	+1	1:01 PM
jeffbyrnes	+1	1:01 PM
sfalcon	+1	1:01 PM
nathenhar...	+1	1:01 PM
adamedx	+1	1:01 PM
holoway	+1	1:01 PM
moted	:1:	1:02 PM
jtimberman	+1	1:02 PM
JoeNuspl	+1	1:02 PM
paulyOC	+1	1:02 PM
adamleff	+1	1:02 PM
holoway	okay - is there a -1 ?	1:02 PM
	<i>holoway laughs</i>	1:02 PM
jeffbyrnes	heh	1:02 PM
spheromak	--	1:02 PM
	:)	1:02 PM
zts	+1	1:02 PM
jonlives	(I also just want to +1 this entire process)	1:02 PM
coderanger	+1	1:02 PM
someara	+1	1:02 PM
holoway	okay, last thing	1:02 PM
	<i>adamleff echo's jonlives statement</i>	1:02 PM
kallistec	+1	1:02 PM
holoway	this process should be complete no later than the community summit	1:02 PM
	ideally, the bulk of it should be done before then	1:02 PM
coderanger	Also should post regular reminders of "if you want to be involved, click this	1:02 PM

	Watch button"	
<b>dylannorth...</b>	+1	1:03 PM
<b>coderanger</b>	(maybe as a standard footer for RFC announcements)	1:03 PM
<b>ssd7</b>	holoway: this process == the more formal definition of the maintainership and RFC process?	1:03 PM
<b>tech356</b>	When is the community summit?	1:03 PM
<b>holoway</b>	ssd7: yes - I want to have a governance and maintainership model in place by the summit	1:03 PM
	<a href="http://www.getchef.com/summit/">http://www.getchef.com/summit/</a>	1:03 PM
	tech356: october 3-4	1:03 PM
<b>nathenhar...</b>	Community Summit - October 2-3 October	1:03 PM
<b>holoway</b>	er 2-3	1:03 PM
	<i>jonlives hopes in future for an EU summit :p</i>	1:04 PM
	do we have a volunteer to write an RFC on how we are going to process RFCs?	1:04 PM
<b>btm</b>	holoway: will you number rfc's when you merge them?	1:04 PM
<b>holoway</b>	btm: sure!	1:04 PM
	;0	1:04 PM
<b>btm</b>	holoway: me, volunteer.	1:04 PM
<b>holoway</b>	btm: great - take what we said in IRC, open the PR, and ship to the list for review	1:04 PM
	<i>btm jumps</i>	1:04 PM
<b>zts</b>	jonlives: ditto, even east coast USA would be a help :)	1:05 PM
<b>btm</b>	zts: ya'll can come vacation in Maine and talk about Chef any time.	1:05 PM
<b>holoway</b>	ok - we're 5 minutes past	1:05 PM
	any other urgent topics?	1:05 PM
	once	1:05 PM
	twice	1:05 PM



jonlives

hugs for all #hugops

1:06 PM

holoway

meeting adjourned

1:06 PM