

nathenharv...	**** MEETING STARTS ***	
thom	someara: tell me you don't now have a mental image of timberman on a giant swan	12:01 PM
fnichol	morning!	12:01 PM
adamedx	using minecraft cookbook jtimberman?	12:01 PM
someara	you're lucky I don't know how to use photoshop	12:02 PM
jtimberman	adamedx: yeah, gregf's one. i saw there's windows pull request for it too :)	12:02 PM
holoway	hi guys - I have to take my daughter to a tour of her new kindergarten, so I'm only going to be here for half the meeting	12:02 PM
	our agenda is here <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...">https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...</a>	12:02 PM
jtimberman	holoway: nice :D	12:02 PM
holoway	nathenharvey, do you want to start with the community update?	12:03 PM
nathenharv...	You bet!	12:03 PM
	As you all know, ChefConf is next week. Looking forward to seeing many of you there.	12:03 PM
jonlives	woohoo!	12:03 PM
thom	\o\ \o/ /o/	12:03 PM
nathenharv...	If you're unable to attend, please do tune in for the livestreams at <a href="http://chefconf.com">http://chefconf.com</a>	12:03 PM
	keynotes are live streamed, track sessions are recorded and posted online shortly after the conference	12:04 PM
	We've held two public postmortems discussing things we learned in recent	12:04

	releases and way we can improve collaboration	PM
	watch for full notes, etc. to land on the mailing list soon.	12:05
		PM
	the idea of hosting these postmortems or retrospectives is an important part of increasing or collaboration across the entire community	12:05
		PM
	that's the quick update from the community engineering team :)	12:06
		PM
jtimberman	i love everything about this.	12:06
		PM
jonlives	very much so	12:06
		PM
btm	I did email a summary of the 12.1.0 post-mortem to the existing thread on the chef@ mailing list, and invite replies.	12:06
		PM
holoway	my update is pretty short, and then I have to go	12:07
		PM
nathenharv...	btm: thanks!	12:07
		PM
thom	I'll be sending mine later today	12:07
		PM
holoway	as I said last week, I'm heading out on vacation in april	12:08
		PM
	in conversation with a bunch of folks, we've decided that I can delegate my project lead status while I'm gone	12:08
		PM
	I asked jonlives to be the project lead while I'm gone	12:09
		PM
ranjibd__	Nice	12:09
		PM
	<i>jonlives waves</i>	12:09
		PM
adamedx	yay	12:09
		PM
ranjibd__	hA	12:09
		PM

holoway	and jonlives has graciously accepted	12:09 PM
adamleff	That's awesome.	12:09 PM
thom	awesome	12:09 PM
adamedx	thank you jonlives	12:09 PM
	<i>btm hugs jonlives</i>	12:09 PM
thom	thanks jonlives!	12:09 PM
	<i>jonlives steeples his fingers and chuckles :p</i>	12:09 PM
jtimberman	jonlives: woot! :D	12:09 PM
holoway	I asked jon to use his powers for good	12:10 PM
nathenharv...	thank you jonlives! you'll get extra hugs at ChefConf, for sure	12:10 PM
jonlives	that I can live with :p	12:10 PM
holoway	and to avoid making big structural changes	12:10 PM
	:)	12:10 PM
jtimberman	jonlives fits the part because he loves metal as much as holoway ;)	12:10 PM
zts	jonlives: do you have a price sheet for bribes yet? :)	12:10 PM
jonlives	zts: have your people speak to my people :p	12:10 PM

holoway	ok, I gotta go - so I say that jonlives gets to practice being me today	12:10 PM
jonlives	rgr that!	12:10 PM
	so, next on the agenda is a chef client / server update from adamedx :p	12:11 PM
adamedx	thanks	12:11 PM
	so as nathenharvey mentioned	12:11 PM
	we've had some post mortems	12:12 PM
	and I'd just like to +1 that we keep an eye on what we've learned from those	12:12 PM
	other than that	12:12 PM
	we updated Chef Server last week to 12.06	12:12 PM
	and this week we released Chef Client 12.2.0.rc.2 — please give it a try!	12:13 PM
jaym_	rc.1	12:13 PM
	rc.2 is on it's way out	12:13 PM
adamedx	we'd like to release that in the next few days	12:13 PM
	ah, yeah, I think rc.2 is only on RubyGems, thank you jaym_	12:13 PM
jaym_	that is correct	12:13 PM
adamedx	For Windows users there is a new dsc_resource that is part of that release	12:14 PM

	also	12:14 PM
	expect to see some news about Chef Provisioning and Test Kitchen Windows guest support	12:14 PM
	before our next IRC meeting	12:14 PM
	that's it from me	12:14 PM
ranjibd__	Awesome	12:14 PM
jtimberman	adamedx: i hear some news about that is posted on the chef mailing list ;)	12:14 PM
adamedx	ah, there is that	12:15 PM
jaym_	jtimberman: fletcher is asking people to try out the beta	12:15 PM
someara	ps: are we doing this next week in light of ChefConf?	12:15 PM
jtimberman	right :D	12:15 PM
jonlives	nathenharvey said we were gonna skip next week I think	12:15 PM
someara	k	12:15 PM
nathenharv...	that's correct, no meeting next week	12:15 PM
jtimberman	someara: but if you want to do an open space at the community summit at chefconf ;)	12:15 PM
jonlives	ok, so next we have a couple of deferred PRs from last week.	12:15 PM
	firstly, <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/3">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/3</a> from jkeiser	12:16 PM

	be ye around, good sir?	12:16
		PM
jkeiser	yarr. Let's see	12:16
		PM
nathenharv...	unless someone proposes an irc meeting as an open space during the community summit on Tuesday ;)	12:16
		PM
someara	I'm just going to stand outside the conference with noah and a couple of soap boxes and a megaphone preaching about resources	12:16
		PM
jkeiser	Yeah, that one seems OK to me still. Pretty old!	12:17
		PM
jonlives	on #3, it looks like feedback was broadly positive	12:17
		PM
	outstanding request from nathenharvey to add copyright notice at the bottom	12:17
		PM
jkeiser	I'm approaching the implementation of it with the resource cookbook/crazytown	12:17
		PM
jonlives	but unless anybody wants to -1, once that's done I think this one looks good to go	12:18
		PM
jkeiser	ah! Let me go do that, he sent me mail (I've been ignoring a lot of mail in the frenzied rush to chefconf)	12:18
		PM
jonlives	anybody -1 on #3?	12:18
		PM
	this being parallization in chef recipes	12:18
		PM
	also, spelling.	12:19
		PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] jkeiser pushed 1 new commit to jk/in_parallel: <a href="http://git.io/jGOE">http://git.io/jGOE</a>	12:19
		PM
	chef-rfc/jk/in_parallel b004c5f John Keiser: Update rfc1-in_parallel.md	12:19
		PM
jonlives	last call...	12:19
		PM

jkeiser	We should state that "future things" sections will require a new RFC since they are underspecified	12:19 PM
jonlives	jkeiser: wanna add that too then I'll deciderate it?	12:19 PM
jkeiser	Sure	12:19 PM
jonlives	btm: you ok to handle rfc merges while I'm being holoway?	12:19 PM
jkeiser	Seems like a good thing in general	12:19 PM
kallistec	jkeiser: does what you're doing in crazytown match the RFC?	12:20 PM
btm	jonlives: yup	12:20 PM
jonlives	gravy	12:20 PM
kallistec	just asking b/c my experience with other stuff is I have to change the spec as implementing teaches me things	12:20 PM
jkeiser	kallistec: I haven't done anything on it yet, so I'm not sure :) But if I do anything different and decide it's better, I'll come back here	12:20 PM
kallistec	k	12:20 PM
jkeiser	Yeah, I agree	12:20 PM
	Honestly I was letting this one languish for exactly that reason	12:20 PM
	But I don't really mind it and it very well *could* be the final shape	12:21 PM
	So it's worth moving forward	12:21 PM
jonlives	agreed	12:21 pm

	we can always revisit if revisions are needed	12:21
		pm
	ok, so next and also from jkeiser, we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/11">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/11</a>	12:21
		pm
	copyright notice also needed btw	12:21
		pm
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] jkeiser pushed 1 new commit to jk/in_parallel: <a href="http://git.io/jGsL">http://git.io/jGsL</a>	12:22
		pm
	chef-rfc/jk/in_parallel 2c414cd John Keiser: Update rfc1-in_parallel.md	12:22
		pm
jkeiser	Oh God, it's my past coming back to haunt me	12:22
		pm
	I'd actually like to withdraw this one--I'm increasingly sure that we should do it differently	12:22
		pm
jonlives	that's easy then	12:22
		pm
	I'll let you close that one off	12:22
		pm
	onto new business then!	12:22
		pm
jkeiser	OK!	12:22
		pm
jonlives	first we have btm's roadmap proposal: <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/105">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/105</a>	12:23
		pm
jkeiser	Like, a few bits of it I'd like to keep but not the whole lot	12:23
		pm
btm	jkeiser: it'd be nice if you left a bit of a comment as to why when you close it.	12:23
		pm
jonlives	it looks like feedback on #105 is positive, btm wanna give a quick summary?	12:23
		pm
jkeiser	Done	12:24
		pm



github-bawt	[chef-rfc] jkeiser closed pull request #11: mixlib-config 3 RFC (master...jk/mixlib-config-3) <a href="http://git.io/jGGw">http://git.io/jGGw</a>	12:24 pm
btm	yeah, so people want a roadmap, but we want a roadmap that might be true. since maintainers/LTs don't represent teams of developers hard at work on Chef features, this roadmap encourages maintainers/LTs to talk about direction and write it down.	12:25 pm
kallistec	I wonder if the year/quarter is necessary. On the one hand, don't want to create a graveyard of well-intentioned ideas that never happen, on the other hand it feels like developer capacity in open source land is way more chaotic so it's harder to say when things should occur	12:25 pm
jonlives	yeah	12:25 pm
kallistec	^^ my only issue/concern	12:25 pm
	I'm +1 modulo figuring out the timing thing (which only appears in examples)	12:26 pm
jonlives	if we start running into said graveyard, that'd def be a good indication we need to change some stuff anyway	12:26 pm
	anybody else have any other concerns on this? as an LT I'm pretty happy with this proposal as it stands	12:26 pm
thom	the only other way i can think of is using priorities, which don't have the timing issue but do have the "who decides the priority" potential issue	12:26 pm
btm	kallistec: yeah I started with the normal next major/minor version, but we're not blocking releases on features. but we definitely don't want it to become just a list of things we want. if there are times, it gives us a tool to go talk to people and say "hey, is this still REALLY happening, or just a wish?"	12:27 pm
thom	i'm happy with it as it stands though	12:27 pm
jonlives	priorities are kind of back to the LT deciding what's important to *them* though, which runs back into proscriptive land a bit.	12:27 pm
kallistec	another way to go would be kanban-y wip limit of some kind	12:27 pm
thom	jonlives: exactly	12:27 pm

jonlives	I'd be a bit against a WIP limit for the same reason - the LT is kind of a blocker there	12:27 pm
	we've had the same experience internally with kanban	12:28 pm
kallistec	I don't see a problem though, it doesn't block anyone from scratching their own itch	12:28 pm
jonlives	kallistec: you meant WIP roadmap items?	12:28 pm
btm	jonlives: that comes down to who the LT is. it's up to the LT to accept feedback from maintainers/contributors and come up with words. If you've got an LT who's just putting shit in there for their own personal dreams, I think that's an LT issue, not a roadmap issue.	12:29 pm
kallistec	just that the roadmap has "here are the next 5 big-ish things we want to accomplish"	12:29 pm
	or whatever the number is	12:29 pm
jonlives	kallistec: ah right, gotcha	12:29 pm
	I think we should try this in its current form and iterate once we've learned more about how it pans out in practice	12:30 pm
adamedx	I think high level direction can be helpful	12:30 pm
matray	I think we should make sure assumed things get captured, like adding support for new operating systems	12:30 pm
	As in, we know we're going to support Ubuntu 16.04 or RHEL 7.1	12:31 pm
jonlives	sure, that makes sense as a roadmap item I think	12:31 pm
	general +1 / -1 on trying it out in its current form and iterating once we get a feel for it?	12:31 pm
nathenharv...	+1	12:32 pm
jtimberman	+1	12:32

		pm
<b>zts</b>	+1	12:33
		pm
<b>adamedx</b>	+ 1	12:33
		pm
<b>thom</b>	+1	12:33
		pm
<b>jonlives</b>	anyone agin' it?	12:33
		pm
<b>kallistec</b>	yep, let's do it +1	12:33
		pm
<b>jonlives</b>	ok, let's do it.	12:33
		pm
<b>ranjibd___</b>	Do it	12:33
		pm
<b>btm</b>	I'll make the initial file. everyone with opinions on what they want to be in the roadmap, talk to the lieutenants (and maintainers where there are no LTs).	12:34
		pm
<b>jonlives</b>	sweet	12:34
		pm
	next we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106</a>	12:34
		pm
	tracking RFCs on the standards track, another jkeiser.	12:35
		pm
<b>jkeiser</b>	I've just been somewhat worried lately about whether past RFCs actually go anywhere. I know I haven't had time to merge a few of mine yet	12:35
		pm
	So I wanted a way to get a feel for whether something is happening, and a way to make sure we've got at least a little attention focused on it	12:36
		pm
<b>jonlives</b>	i'm broadly in favour of this RFC, I just query whether we need an Abandoned status instead of just using Withdrawn.	12:36
		pm
<b>jkeiser</b>	I didn't remove that?	12:36
		pm
<b>jonlives</b>	nope	12:36
		pm

jkeiser	Yeah, I removed that	12:36 pm
	Oh, Orphaned	12:37 pm
	I'm OK with removing the extra status	12:37 pm
jonlives	gravy	12:37 pm
jkeiser	I don't mind the idea of someone else having to come forward and making a new one	12:37 pm
btm	jkeiser: I'd like the tracking URL to be just an issue, not PRs. We often close PRs and open up a new rebased one, or someone else takes over, or we need multiple PRs. You can always edit the issue to update the status and specify that it stays open until implemented.	12:37 pm
jkeiser	@btm I think I made it an array	12:37 pm
	The idea is you just put relevant stuff in there that will help people figure out what's going on in implementation land	12:38 pm
	I'm not sure we should restrict the URLs at all	12:38 pm
ssd7	I wonder if we need an "Implementors" field or if that could just be tracked by people assigning themselves to the bug	12:38 pm
thom	ssd7: i think the latter	12:38 pm
jonlives	yeah the latter sounds like it'd work well enough	12:39 pm
btm	jkeiser: so I like having a place you can follow along that gets updated regularly. I'm a bit reluctant to encourage the RFC to get regular edits.	12:39 pm
	jkeiser: e.g. oh so and so created another PR, let's go back and update the RFC.	12:39 pm
jonlives	I think stating there has to be a top-level issue makes sense	12:39 pm
jkeiser	As long as we can still have multiple things, and *can* update the RFC, I'm	12:40

	cool with it. A top level issue will help in a lot of ways (including reducing churn)	pm
<b>ssd7</b>	For RFCs that are actual Chef features that require code, I'd be +1 on actually just requiring there to be an issue also opened when we merge the RFC.	12:40 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	there are a couple of tweaks etc to be made here still so I move we punt this until the next meeting	12:41 pm
<b>jkeiser</b>	I just removed Orphaned	12:41 pm
	<i>adamedx_ is now known as adamedx</i>	12:41 pm
<b>github-bawt</b>	[chef-rfc] jkeiser pushed 1 new commit to jk/track_accepted_rfcs: <a href="http://git.io/jG4r">http://git.io/jG4r</a>  chef-rfc/jk/track_accepted_rfcs a718f75 John Keiser: Update track-rfcs.md	12:41 pm 12:41 pm
<b>btm</b>	yeah, we need to specify in this RFC what happens. I'll comment on the PR about that.	12:41 pm
<b>jkeiser</b>	And I believe it already reflects the top level issue	12:41 pm
	Okey doke!	12:41 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	ok, next we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/107">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/107</a> from thom	12:42 pm
<b>thom</b>	so i've been watching the rust community for a while, and one of the great things they do is that they assign a PR to someone straight off the bat. it gives the submitter a sense of inclusion, puts the PR on someone's radar, and everyone's a winner  i'd like to do the same for chef	12:43 pm 12:43 pm
	(there's also <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef/pull/3114">https://github.com/chef/chef/pull/3114</a> which is kind of tied in, which adds a machine readable maintainers file)	12:44 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	feedback on the PR has been universally +1 on this, anybody have outstanding comments or -1s?	12:44 pm
<b>ssd7</b>	+1. I recently made a very minor change to Erlang/OTP. A bot ran the tests	12:44

	and assigned the PR for review. It was super pleasant. I think assigning reviewers is also the only real way to get traction on this massive pile of PRs and Issues	pm
btm	I'd like to just say I think this starts to enforce the requirement that maintainers respond to PR's with 48 hours: <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf...">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf...</a>	12:44 pm
jtimberman	thom: should that be thoml, not toml? ;)	12:44 pm
jonlives	yeah	12:44 pm
thom	jtimberman: ho ho :)	12:45 pm
	btm: yep	12:45 pm
jonlives	ok, 30 secs for objections or I'm deciding it	12:45 pm
kallistec	as long as there's a way to be on vacation :)	12:45 pm
	<i>kallistec eyes jtimberman</i>	12:45 pm
btm	yeah, can we say that actually?	12:45 pm
	<i>someara eyes a giant swan</i>	12:45 pm
adamedx	yeah, let's say that	12:45 pm
jonlives	good call	12:45 pm
	<i>jtimberman whistles innocently.</i>	12:45 pm
thom	sure	12:46 pm
jonlives	thom: wanna add that? I'll pre-emptively approve for once that's done	12:46

		pm
	ok, last of the new RFCs is <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/108">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/108</a> from lamont_oc	12:46 pm
nathenharv...	15 minute warning	12:46 pm
kallistec	adding my official +1 for the record, with the same requirement that we have a vacation mode	12:46 pm
lamont_oc	so on 108 we pretty much have to do the first bit	12:47 pm
jtimberman	kallistec: does it help that i'm going to go play Diablo after this?	12:48 pm
thom	(done)	12:48 pm
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] thommay pushed 1 new commit to tm/auto_assign: <a href="http://git.io/jG0V">http://git.io/jG0V</a>	12:48 pm
	chef-rfc/tm/auto_assign 51f255d Thom May: maintainers can go on vacation	12:48 pm
jonlives	lamont_oc: is the eventual intention to do both?	12:49 pm
lamont_oc	yes	12:49 pm
jonlives	since this is a potentially breaking change, I'd be particularly interested to hear from anybody -1 to this	12:49 pm
lamont_oc	if we decide on how to configure ohai optional behavior then the second bit may be opt-in to start and then change the default in a major release	12:50 pm
btm	we should probably work up an RFC for that soonish.	12:50 pm
jtimberman	lamont_oc: do we need to specifically call out other Unix platforms besides solaris?	12:50 pm
	is solaris a lonely island of hope (or despair) here?	12:51 pm
jonlives	we got bitten by the DNS thing on Mac OS too	12:51 pm

lamont_oc	solaris is really driving it, but my intention is that no platform will be special	12:51 pm
jtimberman	(maybe NIS is the despair..)	12:51 pm
lamont_oc	that's a large part of the point, which is that pre ohai 7.0 the definition of these attributes was all over the place (at least for fqdn)	12:52 pm
lamont_oc	so in ohai 7 that got cleaned up, but that was way before we had an RFC process, so its never been standardized, and i'd like to not see people start hacking randomly on the attributes and have them drift into different meanings on different platforms again	12:52 pm
jonlives	i like standardising the behaviour of those attributes a lot, my main concern is having a breaking change like that go out in a minor release, since in *theory* it might alter behavior on other platforms.	12:53 pm
	I think it might be useful to clarify how exactly this changes behavior for the major supported platforms	12:53 pm
lamont_oc	which change are you worried about? first or second?	12:53 pm
jonlives	both, if they're different to what happens now	12:54 pm
	ie, if we ship a minor release that alters how those attribs work on linux, but it fixes it on solaris, linux users be mad.	12:54 pm
	wondering how easy it would be to clarify exactly what this changes for the main supported systems	12:54 pm
	makes the RFC a bit more explicitly reassuring on how much of a breaking change it is.	12:55 pm
kallistec	yeah, a table of system state, old output, new output	12:55 pm
nathenharv...	5 minute warning	12:55 pm
jonlives	yeah	12:55 pm
lamont_oc	ah okay	12:55 pm



jonlives	I move we add that, and then revisit this next meeting	12:55 pm
kallistec	e.g. solaris with broken dns, null, NIS domain	12:55 pm
lamont_oc	yeah i can try to come up with some tables	12:56 pm
btm	part of the problem is that we pack ohai into chef, so a major version release of ohai isn't necessarily a major release of chef.	12:56 pm
lamont_oc	although its not really "solaris with" its just "hosts with"	12:56 pm
jonlives	yeah	12:56 pm
	<i>kallistec taking break before next meetings see y'all later :)</i>	12:57 pm
	really it's just to make it clearer where people should expect to see changes	12:57 pm
lamont_oc	goal is linux and solaris act the same, its just that solaris doesn't function with hostnames with dots in them, while linux normally is configured that way, etc	12:57 pm
adamedx	lamont_oc, thx for the RFC, great start	12:57 pm
	yeah	12:57 pm
jonlives	let's see if we can take a quick look at <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/36">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/36</a> in the remaining 5 mins	12:57 pm
nathenharv...	I'll move this RFC to the agenda for our next meeting	12:57 pm
jonlives	thanks nathenharvey	12:58 pm
nathenharv...	(where "this RFC" is the ohai identity attributes)	12:58 pm
jonlives	hmm serdar isn't here I think	12:58 pm

<b>btm</b>	nathenharvey: I'd like to propose that these meetings be scheduled to last 50-55 minutes instead of 60.	12:58 pm
<b>thom</b>	jonlives: it's mostly mine now	12:58 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	thom: aha	12:58 pm
<b>thom</b>	jonlives: i updated as requested last week	12:58 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	anybody against approving #36?	12:59 pm
<b>thom</b>	if everyone's happy then i'll fix the diagrams and it's hot to trot	12:59 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	all comments etc have been tackled, feedback is positive.	12:59 pm
	speaking now or forever hold your peace	12:59 pm
	ok, approving that one once thom updates the diagrams with the latest changes.	1:00 pm
<b>thom</b>	grazi	1:00 pm
<b>btm</b>	jonlives: I've got another meeting starting now, I'll edit bits after.	1:00 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	and that	1:01 pm
	and that's that!	1:01 pm
<b>nathenharv...</b>	OK. Final thing for today that I'd like to ask for is to btm's suggestion that we make these meetings 50-55 min	1:01 pm
<b>jonlives</b>	I'm fine with that, 50 min meetings are awesome	1:01 pm
<b>nathenharv...</b>	quick +/-1 on your way out would be appreciated	1:01 pm

thom	+1	1:01
		pm
matrray	bah, he just wants bio breaks between meetings	1:01
		pm
jonlives	+1	1:01
		pm
matrray	+1	1:01
		pm
zts	+1	1:01
		pm
thom	easier to get to standup ;)	1:01
		pm
nathenharv...	will update for our next meeting which is Thursday, April 9	1:02
		pm
	**** MEETING ENDS ****	1:02
		pm
		1:02
		pm