nathenharvey ***** MEETING STARTS *****

Agenda for today's meeting - https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet... 12:00 PM

thom oh hi! 12:00 PM

jonlives righty ho all, first up we have a community update from the ever-delightful nathenharvey 12:01 PM

nathenharvey Hello! 12:01 PM

Reminder about the community summit, please mark your calendars: summit.chef.io - Oct 14-15 in Seattle 12:02 PM

I'd also like to plead with you to consider becoming a community advocate. 12:02 PM

jonlives (any estimate on dates for the london summit yet?) 12:03 PM

nathenharvey we have a number of places where we meet as a community that do not have advocates and could use them. the process is easy - submit a PR to the community guidelines 12:03 PM

Majost_mbl Where can I find information about becoming a community advocate? 12:03 PM

nathenharvey the other advocates will review and approve 12:03 PM

jonlives: not yet 12:04 PM

Majost_mbl: https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf... 12:04 PM

Majost_mbl Thanks. :) 12:04 PM

nathenharvey	Those are the updates from community for today	12:05 PM
jonlives	thanks nathenharvey - next we have chef software, client and server updates from adamedx	12:05 PM
adamedx	hello	12:05 PM
	I'll just add my weekly plug for packagecloud	12:05 PM
	today's news is that we now have nightly builds of chef-client on packagecloud!	12:05 PM
	https://packagecloud.io/chef/current	12:05 PM
jonlives	nice!	12:05 PM
adamedx	there's also a stable channel	12:05 PM
kierrr	woo!	12:06 PM
adamedx	where traditional "released" builds will land	12:06 PM
	12.3.0 should be the first one	12:06 PM
	to show up in stable	12:06 PM
	the package is called 'chef'	12:06 PM
	if you're using apt / yum	12:06 PM

Windows builds still aren't available through that channel

but we are exploring ways to do that

jaym   you can get the stable builds in travis :)

adamedx   using Chocolatey or other windows repos

:)

also

there is a 12.3.0.rc.0 release out

thanks to work from thommay and his colleagues

jonlives   huge plusses to the legion of builds

adamedx   yeah :)

and the release services folks as well, many others

jonlives   plusses to all involved.

adamedx   and chef old times + community

thom   yup, cast of many :)   12:08 PM

adamedx   chef-client was the hardest one   12:08 PM

because of the multiple platforms   12:08 PM

this has been a work in progress for a LONG time   12:08 PM

so yes, thank yous everywhere   12:09 PM

all right   12:09 PM

that's it for me   12:09 PM

jonlives   thanks adamedx   12:09 PM

ranjib   you guys should blog about it , we all can learn a lot from that :0)   12:09 PM

adamedx   definitely ranjib   12:09 PM

jonlives   action items from last week, we have https://github.com/chef/chef-docs/issues/499 to improve the LWRP docs, and BTM filed a PR for ohai config we'll be talking about shortly.   12:09 PM

nathenharvey   Just a quick point of order: I would like to remind everyone that Adam Jacob's out and Jon Cowie is acting project lead until Adam returns.   12:09 PM

jonlives   next I'd actually like to deal with the old PRs first, cos we have three roughly ready to go, and the 2 new PRs are much more weighty.   12:09 PM

so first up we have https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106 from jkeiser   12:10

jkeiser Damn, I wish I'd had time to look at my RFC the last 2 days. I don't think the "provides?" problem is as big as people think.
12:10 PM

jonlives i've made tweaks to that today in line with the outstanding comments, so once people are happy with that it's largely ready to go.
12:10 PM

jkeiser: this one is the rfc process tracking one
12:10 PM

jkeiser Oh, wrong one.
12:10 PM

OK :)
12:10 PM

Yay! Thanks for doing that
12:11 PM

jonlives if folks could have a look at the latest change to #106 and +1 on the PR (or -1 if desired) we should be able to get this one merged.
12:11 PM

will leave final decision until next weeks meeting, but it's pretty much there.
12:11 PM

next up, we have https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/114 from nathenharvey
12:11 PM

nathenharvey here I've tried to add some guidance for dealing with conflict and incidents. Feedback has been incorporated
12:12 PM

and an advocates.toml is being proposed as a way to quickly identify who the advocates are.
12:13 PM

jonlives we have a decent number of +1s on this, and feedback has been incorporated. is anybody against approving this for merge as it stands?
12:13 PM

coderanger "Apply the punitive action."
12:13 PM

	I would like to see that reworded	12:13 PM
	We as a community don't punish people	12:14 PM
	We take steps to protect our users and defend our spaces, but we shouldn't aim to punish	12:14 PM
adamedx	suggested replacement?	12:14 PM
jonlives	"corrective" perhaps?	12:15 PM
nathenharvey	kicking someone out of IRC is a punishment. Maybe reword as "take appropriate punitive action"?	12:15 PM
jonlives	I think coderanger's issue is specifically with the word punitive	12:15 PM
coderanger	I don't see that as a punishment, corrective sounds better definitely.	12:15 PM
adamedx	I like that better also	12:15 PM
coderanger	The point of the action is some positive goal, not to be specifically punitive	12:15 PM
tBunnyMan	"corrective action" sounds a bit better I suppose	12:15 PM
nathenharvey	I could change that to "corrective" and change the section called "Punitive Actions" to "Corrective Actions"	12:16 PM
jonlives	ok, if I pre-approve for once "punitive" has been changed to "corrective", anybody against merging as that stands?	12:16 PM
coderanger	+1	12:16

zts   +1

ranjib   +1

jonlives   last chance to -1

tBunnyMan   +1

Aevin1387   +1

kierrr   +1

jonlives   ok, done.

next up, we have https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/115 from btm, who is unable to make the meeting today

with that said, the outstanding feedback is on specifics of version numbering...anybody have any other comments to add to this one?

the version numbering issue raised has actually been an issue with all releases to date, so I'm minded to not let that stand in the way of merging this.

or rather, a fix to that could be a PR against this RFC.

kallistec   or just a PR against omnibus

jonlives   yeah

kallistec the behavior we want doesn't seem controversial and we just do things the way we do now b/c of how rubygems sorts 12:20 PM

coderanger My only comment is that it would be nice if the email went out before the last step, since some of those steps are many hours long 12:20 PM

github-bawt [chef-rfc] nathenharvey pushed 1 new commit to clarify_advocates: http://git.io/vfRQk 12:20 PM

chef-rfc/clarify_advocates ce9dd3c nathenharvey: Use 'corrective', not 'punitive' 12:20 PM

jonlives coderanger: before which step, sorry? 12:20 PM

martinisoft_ is now known as martinisoft 12:21 PM

coderanger jonlives: last step of the client release process. 12:21 PM

jonlives ah gotcha 12:21 PM

coderanger jonlives: As it stands, there is usually a window of about 30m where a new version is installable via some means but has not yet been announced because some builds are in progress 12:21 PM

jonlives coderanger: could you add that as a comment on the PR then - if a few more people could +1 / -1 on the PR please, we should be able to get this in next week hopefully. 12:21 PM

coderanger I am +1 to the degree that this checklist does accurately document the current process though 12:21 PM

So maybe I should ask for process changes post acceptance :) 12:22 PM

jonlives coderanger: ok, if you're happy to do that, is anyone against merging as it stands? show of +1s for merge please 12:22 PM

adamedx +1 12:23 PM

PM

ranjib +1   12:23

PM

martinisoft I'm keen on a +1 here   12:23

PM

I did ask about RC things, but it looks like until nightlies become a thing, this can get modified later.   12:23

PM

jonlives ok, by the powers vested etc etc I shall approve it.   12:23

PM

martinisoft: right   12:23

PM

ok, on to new business.   12:24

PM

we have https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/118 from btm (not present) on an initial draft for ohai config specification   12:25

PM

if folks could take a look at the PR and +1 / -1 / comment, we can hopefully work through any issues during the week and   12:26
look at merging in the next meeting.   PM

unless anybody has topics on that PR to raise during this meeting?   12:26

PM

will give it a couple of mins for thought collecting etc   12:26

PM

kallistec jkeiser: could we do this more elegantly with config contexts? Maybe extract some of lib/chef/config.rb, workstation config   12:27
loader, etc. to a gem that chef and ohai can dep on?   PM

coderanger What about config lines of the form word[:key] = 'asdf'?   12:28

PM

A straight method_missing impl wouldn't make those not crash   12:28

PM

kallistec   coderanger: like knife[:foo], yeah?   12:28 PM

jkeiser   You mean, can we use grouped config in ohai?   12:28 PM

Like Mixlib Config?   12:28 PM

ranjib   i dont like the nested key based syntax, and will +1 on dan's suggestion   12:28 PM

yeah , exactly   12:28 PM

jkeiser   Yeah, I'd like to make it standard everywhere   12:28 PM

kallistec   jkeiser: yeah, ohai is using mixlib-config anyway   12:28 PM

jkeiser   Well, what I'd really like is to combine the features of resource attributes and mixlib-config into one ball of wax and use *that* everywhere, but that's another story :)   12:29 PM

kallistec   but we need to share the default config so chef and ohai would both have the same config contexts   12:29 PM

...defined   12:29 PM

jkeiser   Ah, yeah   12:29 PM

jonlives   yeah   12:29 PM

jkeiser   Is there any reason we can't just share one config?   12:29 PM

Yeah, I think that's what you are saying   12:30

coderanger	jkeiser: Ohai shouldn't depend on the chef gem.

kallistec	jkeiser: best way to do it is extract shared code to a lib

jkeiser	Right, a common gem is necessary

kallistec	b/c of what coderanger just said

coderanger	A possible quick fix is to do a shoddy line-based parser that just tries to eval each line and ignores any lines that fail?

kallistec	I believe that would also be enormously useful for folks who want to build some tool that uses chef's config w/o bringing all of chef's deps

jonlives	that sounds like an outstanding idea

jkeiser	Yes yes and yes

jbellone	kallistec: +1 to that.

kallistec	compared to what berks was forced to do

martinisoft	I like this idea

jonlives	kallistec: you ok to write that up in a PR comment?

kallistec	will do

jonlives	nice.	12:32 PM
	anyone else got anything they'd like to discuss during the meeting on that one?	12:32 PM
lamont_oc	so i'm a bit concerned that we need this in order to unblock another RFC which is needed to solve a customer problem, and this just turned into a fairly major project to extract chef-config out into a gem	12:33 PM
jonlives	that part is still a suggestion at this state, fwiw	12:34 PM
	if there's a strong case for it not being done that way, that's equally valid.	12:34 PM
	if said customer problem is urgent enough that it this would block it, we might want to look at an interim fix too.	12:34 PM
lamont_oc	i definitely think its the right thing to do, but its not iterative development	12:35 PM
	right	12:35 PM
jonlives	how about kallistec comments up his suggestion on the PR, and we try to propose at least one iterative fix that would work in the meantime. we may even want pulling out config to be a separate PR.	12:35 PM
nathenharvey	14 minute warning	12:36 PM
lamont_oc	yeah, i'm good with that	12:36 PM
jonlives	sweet	12:36 PM
	finally, for the remainder of the time we havehttps://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/117 from that fountain of ideas that is jkeiser	12:37 PM
jkeiser	This seems to be a desired feature. The discussion around it is centered on whether we scan all the "provides?" methods	12:37

on all resources and providers when a DSL method is called. In this RFC we still do that, actually.

jonlives I'm not expecting to approve this one today, discussion has been active to say the least :p

jkeiser However, in Chef 13 we would only do it for DSL that was explicitly declared somewhere. Like, you couldn't say "def provides?(name); name == 'my_new_dsl_name'; end" and expect my_new_dsl_name to show up in recipe DSL.

rsmomo is now known as rmoshier

lamont_oc i still need to digest the issues around provides? i didn't get to it yesterday

jkeiser I'm actually willing to retool the proposal to still have method_missing alongside the explicit methods, if we feel that's an essential feature. Like, it *does* let you do ActiveRecord-style resource names

Like, you could have sql_<dbname>_<tablename> for arbitrary db and table names, as a resource name

I feel queasy about that, and about this as a method for doing it, however

Anyway, yeah, I don't think we're far off, and I don't think we'll approve it today

jonlives per my comments on the PR it'd be good to clarify exactly what the raised issues around scanning etc were, cos that part honestly confused me a little :p

jkeiser I added some comments. If it still confuses, I'll add another

jonlives thanks kindly!

jkeiser Actually, I'll just do that. Full summary with example

jonlives that would be awesome.

jkeiser	That should be enough for today on this. Table to next week	12:39 PM
lamont_oc	yeah, i think i may have actually gotten confused between provides? and suggests?	12:39 PM
coderanger	Basically can you make a resource that responds to arbitrary and unknown names	12:40 PM
	Right now, you can.	12:40 PM
	If we want to keep that behavior in Chef 13, we need to rethink the direction of this RFC	12:40 PM
lamont_oc	i don't think we actually have any use case for overriding provides? and i just implemented it similarly to suggetss? since i needed the latter for providers	12:40 PM
jonlives	as a general idea, I love the idea behind this PR. most of jkeiser's ideas I end up thinking "huh. that totally makes sense, wish I'd thought of it" :p	12:40 PM
jkeiser	I'm in favor of removing that behavior in favor of explicit "provides". provides takes a block still	12:41 PM
	So you can say "provides :my_resource { ... }"	12:41 PM
	And get full control over the decision of whether you implement that resource with the current node and such	12:41 PM
lamont_oc	this morning i suspect that you can actually remove that both for resources and providers, and that its an implementation detail, not an API that anyone is using.	12:41 PM
jkeiser	I'm a fan :)	12:42 PM
coderanger	lamont_oc: I am very much using it for Providers	12:42 PM
lamont_oc	ah, 'k	12:42

jonlives   I do like the idea of explicit provides.   12:42

jkeiser   The world I really want is one where each piece of DSL is associated with a list of possible resources and providers   12:42

And when you go to that one method, instead of scanning *everyone*, it just scans the ones who said they provided that DSL   12:43

lamont_oc   provides is evaluated at class loading time and you don't have a node yet   12:43

jkeiser   And if there was only one, global one, we can even bypass the scan entirely   12:43

Yeah, you still have to decide between them at runtime   12:43

lamont_oc   so i'd like to try to keep the api consistent between resources and providers, adding blocks to one and not the other will be confusing   12:43

coderanger   lamont_oc: If you use a block with it, it gets the node as an arg   12:43

jkeiser   lamont_oc: we already support them, I believe   12:44

lamont_oc: on both   12:44

coderanger   ditto with the quick filters like os and platform   12:44

jkeiser   And, I agree   12:44

coderanger   Indeed, blocks are a feature of NodeMap currently   12:44

jkeiser	It seems like we are approaching consensus, but we should take the week to decide	12:45 PM
	Let's allow the meeting to continue :)	12:45 PM
lamont_oc	yeah, and i'm just not awake enough right now	12:45 PM
jonlives	that's really all we have for today - let's make sure to capture feedback herein on the PR	12:45 PM
jkeiser	OK!	12:45 PM
jonlives	is that two early finishes in as many weeks??	12:45 PM
nathenharvey	2 in a row!	12:45 PM
	***** MEETING ENDS *****	12:46 PM