

holoway	well, lets not dally	
nathenhar...	Agenda for today's meeting is here - https://github.com/opscode/chef-community-irc-m...	12:00 PM
jonlives	thanks nathenharvey	12:01 PM
	oh - SUPER excited about EU summit this year. I can go now :p	12:01 PM
holoway	the tl;dr - we're going to go over some of the outstanding action items from last meeting, fast updates on whats up, and then I'm going to try and close out the supported workflows RFC	12:01 PM
	questions about the agenda? you have 30 seconds to make with the typing	12:02 PM
jonlives	nyet, tovarich general	12:02 PM
nathenhar...	*** meeting started *** (just to be clear)	12:02 PM
holoway	in soviet russia, agenda questions you!	12:02 PM
	okay	12:02 PM
	ssd7: put up the rrfc for deeply nested keys	12:03 PM
	ssd7: you wanna give a tldr?	12:03 PM
jonlives	(could I request we do the workflow RFC before 9.45 when I have to leave please? apologies if screws with order)	12:03 PM
holoway	jonlives: yeah, I'll skip updates	12:04 PM
jonlives	awesome	12:04 PM
holoway	okay, since ssd7 is being quiet, I'll do it	12:04 PM
	from my perspective, this RFC just codifies the ways we expect folks to find deeply nested keys	12:04 PM
	I think we should deprecate the node.foo.bar syntax (a suggestion coderanger makes)	12:05 PM
	and assuming the other improvements can be made without compromising back-compat in a way that isn't a deprecation, we should approve the RFC	12:05 PM
	anyone against?	12:06 PM
btm	deprecation message in Chef 12?	12:06 PM
jonlives	holoway: didn't the RFC propose node.foo.bar as well as node['foo']['bar']	12:06 PM

	tho?	
holoway	jonlives: it does, and I think we need to include it (since it works today) and announce our intent to pull it in 13	12:06 PM
jonlives	ah ok gotcha	12:06 PM
	agreed - I think that makes sense	12:06 PM
sersut	:shipit:	12:07 PM
holoway	ok	12:07 PM
shain	As it turns out - my PR for updated 'partial search' supports this syntax	12:07 PM
lamont_oc	+1 on deprecating	12:07 PM
coderanger	I had thought we already deprecated it, but I guess it was never formal	12:07 PM
holoway	coderanger: yeah, it's not printing a warning, for example :)	12:07 PM
coderanger	Just most of us have avoided that syntax for years :)	12:07 PM
	<i>holoway nods</i>	12:07 PM
someara	can we have node['environment'] with this?	12:07 PM
coderanger	someara: Separate issue	12:07 PM
holoway	ok, nathenharvey - take an action item for ssd7 to clean up anything left, add the deprecation statement for the dot syntax, and ship it	12:08 PM
nathenhar...	holoway: got it	12:08 PM
nlloyds	RFC is here: https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/40/fil...	12:08 PM
holoway	IRC meeting time RFC was just me dropping the ball	12:08 PM
	previous decisions stands, which is to move to thursday	12:09 PM
coderanger	holoway: Thoughts on the escaping question?	12:09 PM
	<i>paulmooring_away is now known as paulmooring</i>	12:09 PM
jonlives	coderanger: could you link to the relevant comment please?	12:09 PM
	(haven't seen that one)	12:09 PM
holoway	coderanger: we should DWIM	12:09 PM
coderanger	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/40/fil...	12:10 PM
holoway	ie: don't force an escape unless there is ambiguity	12:10 PM

coderanger	I don't think we should allow escaping at all	12:10 PM
holoway	which there almost never is, even with dots-for-keys	12:10 PM
coderanger	If there is ambiguity, you should use the un-ambiguous array syntax	12:10 PM
holoway	+1	12:10 PM
jonlives	I think I agree with coderanger here - adding escaping just adds a confusing edge case	12:11 PM
coderanger	and yeah, I'm okay with saying that because of how astronomically rare this is :)	12:11 PM
shain	+1 on not escaping	12:11 PM
sersut	+1 coderanger will keep things a lot more simpler...	12:11 PM
holoway	coderanger: please add that as a comment for ssd7 to track, and mention my +1 from this meeting	12:11 PM
	if there is ambiguity, use the array syntax	12:11 PM
btm	did we think about search since the last meeting and I missed it?	12:11 PM
	<i>ssd7 is following along but would def. appreciate a summary of our conclusions here</i>	12:11 PM
holoway	ah, you are here :)	12:12 PM
ssd7	sorry, a few minutes late :)	12:12 PM
holoway	btm: we're leaving it as an implementation detail for now - since we own the query parser and the document format, we can solve it	12:12 PM
shain	@btm I need to put a RFC together for the PR regarding search that I did before the RFC thing was official	12:12 PM
holoway	(in a way that doesn't hurt back-compat either)	12:12 PM
	<i>btm nods</i>	12:13 PM
	okay, moving on to coderanger's RFC for the RFC process	12:13 PM
ssd7	Two questions in my RFC: Do we want this to change in the server side APIs?	12:13 PM
	The search API requires '_'s and the partial search api expects an array currently	12:14 PM
holoway	ssd7: thats what btm was just asking	12:14 PM

btm	nathenharvey: can you note shain will make a search rfc?	12:14 PM
holoway	ssd7: we should approve the RFC as is, and we should then talk about the implementation details.	12:14 PM
shain	@ssd7 @holoway that's an implementation detail - let's talk offline	12:14 PM
nathenhar...	btm: got it!	12:14 PM
holoway	ssd7: tl;dr, we own the query parser in the search api and could handle _/.	12:14 PM
	ssd7: and partial search supports the array syntax, so that's at least part of the battle :)	12:15 PM
	ok - anything else on this topic before I close it for really reals?	12:15 PM
kallistec	I don't see the array syntax being specified as part of the desired end goal in the RFC	12:15 PM
holoway	ok - I'm reversing myself. All-yall dogpile on that RFC, with a goal of having it finalized by the next meeting	12:16 PM
	<i>kallistec will comment on RFC</i>	12:16 PM
	:)	12:16 PM
	ok, next item was the RFC for workflow	12:17 PM
	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/37	12:17 PM
	for the RFC process	12:17 PM
ssd7	(If we can get some consensus next week, I'll edit the RFC before the day before this time :))	12:17 PM
jonlives	I'm broadly +1 for coderanger's RFC RFC as long as we (community in general) are prepared to help out people who submit stuff without metadata, or the odd mistake etc	12:18 PM
coderanger	Workflow RFC is a thing, I think the structure should all be there now	12:18 PM
	Just needs a bit more descriptive text maybe?	12:18 PM
	Also we need to sort out the initial Editor staff	12:19 PM
holoway	coderanger: I'm not sure it does - we can update it as we go, but it's pretty good.	12:19 PM
	my only comment was going to be how do we decide who the editors are	12:19 PM

shain	I'm -1 on RFC numbers	12:20 PM
holoway	my proposal is that the decider+editors can approve new editors via a simple majority on a PR against this RFC	12:20 PM
kallistec	coderanger: can you clarify the role fo the editor?	12:20 PM
jonlives	can someone be both an editor and a decider?	12:20 PM
kallistec	*of, even	12:20 PM
coderanger	For most similar processes it is technically by appointed by Decider, but generally anyone that volunteers is accepted, it really isn't a glamorous job :)	12:20 PM
holoway	shain: sorry, really want numbers	12:20 PM
sersut	i think we should have a section called "Editors" and volunteers can add themselves to that section via PR / editors approve or reject using simple majority	12:20 PM
holoway	sersut: yep	12:20 PM
coderanger	kallistec: Editors just handle the procedural bits of RFCs, moving files around, allocating numbers, etc	12:21 PM
shain	@holoway ok, I just don't see value in an arbitrary number unless it ties to something. It's a minor nitpick though :D	12:21 PM
jonlives	I'm willing to volunteer to be an editor (initially at least) as long as it doesn't rule me out from potentially sumitting myself as a decider :p	12:21 PM
holoway	shain: it ties to the contents, so we can say "see RFC002 for how we manage the chef project over here"	12:21 PM
coderanger	The numbers are just really really useful for talking about RFCs	12:21 PM
thom	yeah, i think having numbers is handy (hi)	12:22 PM
holoway	jonlives: I'm happy to make you a decider on a subsystem you care about	12:22 PM
kallistec	shain: for example, everyone in python land knows what pep 8 is	12:22 PM
	<i>holoway high fives thom</i>	12:22 PM
jonlives	holoway: gravy - just wasn't sure if the PEP system calls for the two roles to always be seperate people :p	12:22 PM
holoway	jonlives: nah	12:22 PM

coderanger	The downside of the numbers is it does make a little more work for the editors, but I'm okay with that	12:22 PM
shain	Cool :) As long as there is a purpose	12:22 PM
coderanger	And if we get fancy, much of the work could be scripted, but thats probably overkill	12:22 PM
holoway	coderanger: is public domain vs cc0 a thing? should we just say its all cc0	12:22 PM
jonlives	coderanger: we can fix that with devops (in its manifestation of communicating)	12:23 PM
holoway	so its all universal jurisdiction-wise?	12:23 PM
thom	i think CC0 is a more precise thing, and thus useful	12:23 PM
coderanger	holoway: No, CC0 is just a legal version of PD	12:23 PM
holoway	coderanger: exactly - so we should just say everything is CC0, link to it, and drop the public domain part	12:23 PM
coderanger	since some countries literally don't allow putting work in the public domain	12:23 PM
thom	in that some amount of effort has been expended on porting it to !US legal systems	12:23 PM
coderanger	holoway: That isn't a thing, in countries that do allow it, CC0 is public domain	12:24 PM
jonlives	coderanger: might be worth adding a bit to the RFC about how one applies to be an editor / decider to make the process explicit	12:24 PM
holoway	coderanger: you miss my point. just cahnge the copyright section to say that they are under CC0, and this in the public domain	12:24 PM
coderanger	jonlives: Deciders are appointed, initially by holoway though they can sub-delegate themselves	12:24 PM
jonlives	coderanger: totally - would be good to clarify that in the RFC is all :)	12:25 PM
holoway	ie: everything is cc0, so you always use the 'legalease' verison	12:25 PM
shain	since editors don't actually decide things (based on the doc) are we missing a role for deciders?	12:25 PM
z	Is a decider a global bit, or subsystem specific?	12:25 PM
shain	Or did I miss something?	12:25 PM
holoway	shain: decider is in the role	12:25 PM

	shain: I am the decider!	12:25 PM
coderanger	shain: Thats on the list	12:25 PM
	<i>holoway thumps his chest</i>	12:25 PM
holoway	z: for now, its global, but I can delegate	12:25 PM
shain	@holoway I heard you say that in a Judge Dredd voice lol	12:25 PM
holoway	z: and I shall delegate	12:25 PM
	shain: I was saying it in a judge dredd voice	12:25 PM
coderanger	How about I add that if someone wants to be an editor the should email chef-dev@?	12:25 PM
	<i>shain highfives @holoway</i>	12:26 PM
holoway	coderanger: they issue a PR to the RFC, and its simple majority of editors with a veto power by the decider	12:26 PM
z	coderanger: It'd be nicer to have it somehow GitHub-based, IMHO	12:26 PM
holoway	coderanger: adding their name to the list	12:26 PM
jonlives	yeah I think github would make more sense	12:26 PM
coderanger	Okay, that works :)	12:26 PM
z	Mailing lists its hard to see what the outcome was	12:26 PM
holoway	ok, so we have a couple action items	12:26 PM
z	Merged + closed, vs. not merged + closed is very 'obvious'.	12:26 PM
coderanger	I'll ad myself as Editor #1 since I guess I'm volunteering to help if I'm writing this :)	12:27 PM
jonlives	I'm also willing to volunteer, which requires coderanger to majority agree with himself :p	12:27 PM
holoway	nathenharvey: coderanger is going to add a section on how to become an editor (PR to RFC, simple majority of editors, veto power of the decider)	12:27 PM
z	Do we need quorum assertions in the context of this, because if we have 100 editors, blocking adding a new one until 51 chime in seems clunky?	12:28 PM
holoway	nathenharvey: also update the copyright sections to just say all work in the repository is published under CC0, which means public domain	12:28 PM

	z: we'll cross that bridge when we come to it	12:28 PM
jonlives	that's a nice bridge to have, given the un-glamorous nature of editing :p	12:28 PM
shain	lol @jonlives	12:28 PM
freezey	jank	12:28 PM
z	we could sell that bridge. as a service.	12:29 PM
holoway	ok - anything else on this RFC? I want to thank coderanger for doing literally all the work, both of the research and the RFC	12:29 PM
z	coderanger++	12:29 PM
holoway	a super valuable service to us as a community	12:29 PM
nathenhar...	holoway: I've captured those 2 action items	12:29 PM
shain	+1	12:29 PM
jonlives	+1	12:29 PM
thom	+1	12:29 PM
nathenhar...	coderanger rocks!	12:29 PM
holoway	really good stuff	12:29 PM
coderanger	Thanks y'all :)	12:29 PM
holoway	ok, moving on	12:29 PM
	I'm skipping to the end of the agenda, for jonlives	12:29 PM
jonlives	gracias!	12:30 PM
holoway	based on the feedback we heard during the Berkshelf Riot of 2014	12:30 PM
	I went back and looked at the issues facing the folks who were feeling isolated, left out, or behind the curve	12:30 PM
	and the result was https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/34	12:30 PM
	the tl;dr is that my plan is to do two things	12:30 PM
	first, bless the historic monolithic repository workflow as one that is universally supported	12:31 PM
	along with the independent software workflow	12:31 PM
	second, to build an abstraction that brings those two workflows as close	12:32 PM

	together as possible in daily use	
	so that documentation, tool builders, and end users have less confusion when moving between them	12:32 PM
jonlives	I'm so +1 this, it captures the best of "use chef how you want" while still providing some kind of standardisation to make it clearer what the supported baseline is	12:32 PM
	and prior to that PR I wasn't sure how possible that was going to be.	12:33 PM
	<i>Inxchk_ is now known as Inxchk</i>	12:33 PM
thom	i think it's useful for an awful lot of orgs to have reassurance that the mega-repo approach isn't being completely discouraged	12:33 PM
z	It feels like we skewed to "If you're not doing repo per cookbook, you're failing" which isn't really how we want to be. So +1 to opscore/chef-rfc#34.	12:33 PM
coderanger	It is super-semantics-y but I don't love the use of the word "supported" since other workflows aren't "un-supported", IRC/ML will still try to help just the same	12:34 PM
jonlives	coderanger: better word to use?	12:34 PM
travis-ci	[travis-ci] opscore/chef#3141 (master - 2d15333 : Claire McQuin): The build has errored.	12:34 PM
	[travis-ci] Change view : https://github.com/opscode/chef/compare/35410ab...	12:34 PM
	[travis-ci] Build details : http://travis-ci.org/opscode/chef/builds/32024565	12:34 PM
holoway	coderanger: lets talk about that	12:34 PM
coderanger	jonlives: "recommended" is one option	12:34 PM
holoway	its not recommended	12:34 PM
jonlives	yeah I like recommended less	12:34 PM
kierrr	blessed/endorsed?	12:34 PM
jonlives	^ same applies	12:35 PM
z	Only slightly joking when I ask how can RFC2119 help us.	12:35 PM
coderanger	"prepared workflow" perhaps? (also has cooking metaphor)	12:35 PM
holoway	we, as a community, are going to make sure those workflows work via that	12:35 PM

	interface	
mivok	'suggested'?	12:35 PM
holoway	and if you want your tools to work well, you should target that as well	12:35 PM
paulmooring	are other workflows actually "supported" if we're not accounting for them in tooling?	12:35 PM
holoway	we really are committing to support those two workflows	12:35 PM
	we can make a million other workflows, and making them supported is just a PR away	12:35 PM
jonlives	^ this	12:35 PM
shain	I am fine with 'supported' - perhaps we should just state that there are many other ways to shave this yak, but these will be the ones we talk about.	12:35 PM
coderanger	Okay, then perhaps it should be made clear this is "Chef Inc-supported" and that the community isn't making the same statement quite as globally?	12:36 PM
imeyer	this better be good	12:36 PM
lamont_oc	effectively, if one of these approaches is busted, then the client team will wind up fixing it, if some other workflow is busted then it may be "PRs accepted"	12:36 PM
holoway	coderanger: that's not what I'm saying	12:36 PM
shain	s/talk about/have common something something	12:36 PM
z	holoway: Is there a 'low bar' in terms of the degree of documentation and tooling support around a supported workflow? A minium standard?	12:36 PM
holoway	the community commits to these two workflows	12:36 PM
	I don't care what we support in the wild	12:36 PM
	ie: help who you want, obviously	12:36 PM
	but if you say something "works with chef"	12:36 PM
	and you don't support those two workflows	12:36 PM
jonlives	"baseline workflows"?	12:37 PM
holoway	your shit be broke per the Great Workflow RFC	12:37 PM
thom	z raises an interesting point; what does 'supported' imply - docs? tools? not being mocked on twitter?	12:37 PM

coderanger	holoway: Yeah, its the implication of other things being un-supported by contract that troubles me	12:37 PM
	Maybe I	12:37 PM
	I'm just overthinking it :)	12:37 PM
someara	supported is a very strong word	12:37 PM
holoway	coderanger: I think you are. One thing the Riot showed us was that we needed to not be ambiguous	12:37 PM
jonlives	I quite like "baseline workflows" or something similar - it's what's supported out of the box, doesn't indicate it's canonical or all that will ever be supported	12:37 PM
cwebber	how do you deal with the case where something is explicitly designed for a given workflow? ie Berkshelf or Strainer	12:37 PM
z	"Supported by Chef Software, Inc and recommended for general usage."	12:37 PM
holoway	z: this isn't about chef software	12:38 PM
coderanger	holoway: Fair point	12:38 PM
shain	"Common Successful Workflows"	12:38 PM
jonlives	cwebber: then it's not RFC compliant :p	12:38 PM
holoway	z: this is about us as a community	12:38 PM
lamont_oc	Minimum Viable Workflow Support	12:38 PM
someara	how about "vetted"	12:38 PM
jonlives	nobody like baseline? :p	12:38 PM
holoway	z: y'all don't get a vote on what Chef Software does or does not do	12:38 PM
z	Lemme break out a thesaurus. One sec.	12:38 PM
shain	@someara +1	12:38 PM
holoway	jonlives: I don't like baseline, because I think we need to say specifically that if you follow these paths, you will besupported	12:39 PM
	in the documentation	12:39 PM
	in irc	12:39 PM
	on mailing lists	12:39 PM

z	holoway: So how do you deal with companies who want Chef Software to explicitly recommend and support a given workflow?	12:39 PM
jonlives	hmm true.	12:39 PM
tomduffield	packaged? included?	12:39 PM
coderanger	holoway: I think basically I just want a stronger statement that these are support but not required	12:39 PM
holoway	z: as members of the Chef community, we support the workflows in RFC34	12:39 PM
jonlives	z: that's kind of a different question - that's a chef inc matter.	12:39 PM
coderanger	There is some test to that effect, but I think it needs a bit more power	12:39 PM
holoway	z: but that's my problem	12:39 PM
z	holoway: jonlives: Fair enough.	12:39 PM
paulmooring	From my POV new users/community members are looking for strong language like supported to guide them and people doing something different are going to do what they want regardless of the community calling it supported	12:40 PM
holoway	coderanger: can I give you the task to post some verbiage? I think it can only help	12:40 PM
paulmooring	so I'm +1 on not shying away from strong language	12:40 PM
z	Do we need a PEP-8 but for workflows? A standards document? Then a list of workflows which meet that standard, and are thus recommended?	12:40 PM
coderanger	holoway: Roger	12:40 PM
holoway	z: this is stealthily just that	12:40 PM
z	So why not be explicit.	12:40 PM
holoway	(note that the actual things you type are 95% identical)	12:40 PM
someara	"these two example workflows have been vetted by the chef community, have tooling around them, and are referenced in our documentation"	12:40 PM
shain	again +1 @someara	12:41 PM
cwebber	the more I read this convo the more i am in favor of "supported"	12:41 PM
lamont_oc	FWIW, when we're considering enterprise customers with contracts i'd like to be able to state that RFC34 are 'the' supported workflows.	12:41 PM
jonlives	what about something like "LTS"	12:41 PM

	bit stronger than just "supported"	12:41 PM
imeyer	LTS doesn't really instill confidence in many	12:41 PM
holoway	just to be clear, as the RFC decider - I'm not shipping it without the word support, because you need the strength it implies. I'm also +1 on coderanger and someara qualifying	12:41 PM
	one thing the upset folks, many of whom aren't here (because they are 'users', not 'builders')	12:42 PM
z	jonlives: As someone who's seen how \$vendor[commercial_linux_distribution] handles kernel bugs in an LTS release, that acronym inspires zero confidence.	12:42 PM
coderanger	I think with that section beefed up then supported with be good, since it is true that these are supported, it is just the opposing implication that is troublesome	12:42 PM
jonlives	^ this	12:42 PM
paulmooring	+1 coderanger	12:42 PM
holoway	is ambiguity we all understand as a strength is seen as a deep negative	12:42 PM
	for example, I super want miah to build her rubygems universal thing as a prototype against this interface	12:43 PM
cwebber	coderanger: so explicitly discussing how new workflows come into being and that they are not implicitly not supported?	12:43 PM
holoway	because I've been Mr Doubty McDoubty pants about it for years	12:43 PM
	but just because she targets that interface doesn't mean we all support it	12:43 PM
benchMark	Hey all, I wish I had time to hang out and explain why I dislike the repo-per-cookbook but I have to finish up preparations for a trip to China in the morning.	12:43 PM
holoway	but it sure makes it easier	12:43 PM
benchMark	I only had time to troll on Twitter. ;)	12:43 PM
coderanger	cwebber: Not that specific, just making it clear that jumping the rails doesn't void your warranty	12:43 PM
holoway	benchMark: hi!	12:43 PM
cwebber	coderanger: +1	12:43 PM

lamont_oc	can we just state that those are the supported workflows very strongly and then call out in its own section what that means for other workflows — not that they are unsupported/not-supported/will-never-be-supported but that they're just out of scope	12:43 PM
shain	It feels like we just need a nice caveat	12:43 PM
imeyer	i just want chef to keep working the way it has for the past few years	12:44 PM
holoway	benchMark: yeah, this canonifies that repo-per-cookbook aint the only future	12:44 PM
jonlives	It's also gonna make it much easier to have a nice baseline for workflow tooling to shoot for	12:44 PM
benchMark	The TL;DR is that we have a tremendous amount of boilerplate in our cookbooks and additional process overhead for the smallest cookbook changes.	12:44 PM
holoway	imeyer: victory is yours	12:44 PM
z	can we use explicit language to say that 'supported' simply means meets a minimum bar, and not that all other flows are bad?	12:44 PM
imeyer	i frankly don't have any opinion because you're all wrong anyway	12:44 PM
	:D	12:44 PM
holoway	z: that is not what supported means	12:44 PM
z	okay then I'm really freakin' confused.	12:44 PM
shain	supported means we know how it works, we have things built up around it that we will maintain, and we'd recommend you use it.	12:45 PM
holoway	z: supported means we are going to fix bugs, ensure that new tools target it, and teach people how it works	12:45 PM
shain	however, if it doesn't fit, go ahead and do something else! :)	12:45 PM
holoway	exactly	12:45 PM
z	i want someone to not call me a dick on Twitter for using a mono-repo, and for the tooling the community builds to not make assumptions that everyone in the universe uses Berkshelf v4.7-beta-1	12:45 PM
someara	"supported" implies that you'll get no help from support@company if you're "doing it wrong"	12:45 PM
holoway	z: you get that here	12:45 PM

imeyer	being called a dick has nothing to do with using a mono-repo, alex.	12:45 PM
	er, z	12:45 PM
	that being said, z is right	12:45 PM
jonlives	(can stay for the whole meeting now, yay)	12:45 PM
holoway	that is an explicit goal of this RFC	12:45 PM
lamont_oc	10th amendment to RFC34: all other workflows are the domain of the community and get as much support as the community provides	12:45 PM
someara	ie, you void your warranty if you have to stray from the doc and examples	12:46 PM
imeyer	this nonsense of people being adamntly against workflow vs another and being assholes about it	12:46 PM
	is not cool	12:46 PM
holoway	z: what I'm saying about minimum bar is above - if miah targets this interface, that doesn't mean we all agree to support that workflow	12:46 PM
	z: there is more to being supported than just meeting the interface bar	12:46 PM
c_t	no, lamont_oc, the 10th Amendment to that RFC needs to be that All workflows not expressly given to Chef Inc. are reserved to the developers.	12:46 PM
z	holoway: Sorry I'm obviously just slow. I now understand this is not a Chef Software commitment to invest any cycles into these things, other than Chef Software employees are participants in the wider community and therefore *may* invest cycles (no guarantee)	12:46 PM
jonlives	imeyer: that's a problem we can't fix with an RFC. this si just about codifying workflows that chef inc will commit to maintaining support for, and by extension that the community can code for	12:46 PM
holoway	z: right - community meeting, not a company meeting	12:47 PM
benchMark	The catch is that when a particular workflow is the supported ones, it is going to have the implicit effect of shaping the development as whole toward the "blessed" workflow.	12:47 PM
	Regardless of intentions.	12:47 PM
holoway	benchMark: which is precisely one of my intents	12:47 PM
z	that is indeed the kicker.	12:47 PM
imeyer	jonlives: well, yeah.. i didn't mean to imply we could.	12:47 PM

jonlives	benchMark: except there isn't just one supported workflow, which is why I like this so much.	12:47 PM
imeyer	i'm just saying it's a problem, regardless.	12:47 PM
jonlives	this is capturing the two most prevalent workflows and explicitly stating that chef supports both.	12:47 PM
z	if the two RFC34 Supported Workflows are 'repo per cookbook' and 'mono repo', then I guess we solve for the two big user camps?	12:48 PM
holoway	benchMark: a dep resolver that doesn't support both workflows is a flawed resolver	12:48 PM
benchMark	Cool!	12:48 PM
	I joined the conversation already in progress.	12:48 PM
	holoway, jonlives: +1	12:48 PM
jonlives	z: exactly	12:48 PM
z	does that mean we EOL RFC34 for every new workflow, btw?	12:48 PM
holoway	z: yep - monolithic and independent software projects are the two workflows	12:48 PM
	z: have you read the RFC?	12:48 PM
nathenhar...	benchMark: here's the RFC - https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/34	12:48 PM
z	yes	12:48 PM
holoway	:)	12:48 PM
benchMark	nathenharvey: thanks	12:48 PM
holoway	the other part of the RFC is a proposed interface	12:48 PM
z	i'm still a little clueless on whether the RFC process allows amending additional things (new workflows) without a RFC number bump	12:48 PM
jonlives	aside, I will be so freaking happy to have a solid list of supported workflows to code tooling against	12:49 PM
holoway	z: yeah, we can mutate the RFC	12:49 PM
z	OK. Thanks for clarifying that.	12:49 PM
holoway	by adding the abstraction in that interface, we can unify 95% of the behaviors we have in the wild	12:49 PM

jonlives	gives the agility to adapt to changing trends while still codifying the supported (and most prevalent) too	12:50 PM
holoway	jonlives: hopefully we can give you a library to code against that takes care of the differences for you	12:50 PM
nathenhar...	10 minute warning	12:50 PM
jonlives	ohmygodyesplease	12:50 PM
shain	+1 on the RFC as it stands	12:50 PM
holoway	jonlives: which, to coderanger and others point, means experiemental workflows could just be patches to that library	12:50 PM
	a few last points	12:50 PM
jonlives	that sounds like a future I shall enjoy being part of :p	12:50 PM
holoway	json policy documents by default	12:51 PM
jonlives	I'm +1 on that	12:51 PM
coderanger	Until yaml is supported, +1	12:51 PM
cwebber	so if a tool doesnt support one workflow or the other is just deemed uncomplaint with the RFC?	12:51 PM
holoway	cwebber: bingo	12:51 PM
paulmooring	+1 on json	12:52 PM
jonlives	(tho if there's a lib to do that then compliance should be trivial-ish)	12:52 PM
holoway	anyone want to argue pro ruby by default?	12:52 PM
lamont_oc	(i'm not sure why json is part of this RFC, seems like an implementation detail that should be dropped, but +1 json)	12:52 PM
holoway	(for the record, we should fix the tooling around the ruby DSL so that its safe to use in all cases, but thats another deal)	12:52 PM
z	+1 on json. obligatory troll that we could XSLT an XML policy and thereby validate its conformance to a standard.	12:53 PM
jonlives	lamont_oc: it's more explicity "not ruby by default"	12:53 PM
joshsz	json parsing is slower FWIW, might be an issue in very large environments	12:53 PM
jonlives	json just happens to be the only other supported format :p	12:53 PM

z	erk fsck thats not quite what I meant but hey	12:53 PM
	<i>z is slow.</i>	12:53 PM
holoway	okay	12:53 PM
jonlives	joshsz: then we add msgpack support ;)	12:54 PM
holoway	joshsz: I think it won't matter in practice	12:54 PM
joshsz	jonlives: ;) just go full protobufs	12:54 PM
holoway	(did anyone notice I slipped chef-solo/zero support in as a supported workflow?)	12:54 PM
	(cause I totally did that)	12:54 PM
coderanger	5m left	12:54 PM
holoway	okay	12:54 PM
	so, our two action items	12:54 PM
joshsz	holoway: likely. I do like the "pure rubyness" of yaml though. I think it might be exclusionary to non-rubyists but the number of non-ruby implementations of yaml might speak otherwise	12:54 PM
jonlives	joshsz: different issue tho, yaml isn't supported at all yet.	12:55 PM
holoway	one is for me to clean up any left over basics, like 'two' vs 'three'	12:55 PM
joshsz	roger	12:55 PM
nathenhar...	holoway: other is for coderanger and someara suggest some ways to qualify what is meant by "supported"	12:55 PM
holoway	the other is coderanger will post in a comment some language to clarify that support doesn't mean you aren't free to rock how you like	12:55 PM
	nathenharvey: exactly	12:55 PM
	once those two are done, I will merge the RFC	12:56 PM
	I'm in mexico next week	12:56 PM
shain	(thumbsup)	12:56 PM
holoway	so you have one week before I'm paying attention to you monkeys at all	12:56 PM
	:)	12:56 PM
lamont_oc	holoway: where?	12:56 PM

jonlives	<feels> this PR gives me a lot of hope that Chef will keep the "do what works" that I love, and that makes me happy. </feels>	12:56 PM
holoway	lamont_oc: Sayulita	12:56 PM
c_t	1 Mexico St., Mexico	12:56 PM
holoway	okay	12:56 PM
lamont_oc	nice	12:57 PM
	<i>en00ch is now known as jgillis</i>	12:57 PM
shain	@jonlives +1	12:57 PM
holoway	nathenharvey: do you have any community stuff you want ot put in the last 3 minutes?	12:57 PM
	sersut?	12:57 PM
bawt	sersut not found	12:57 PM
nathenhar...	yep	12:57 PM
	We will be hosting two Community Summits this year.	12:57 PM
btm	bawt: forget sersut	12:57 PM
nathenhar...	First will be October 2-3 in Seattle - http://www.getchef.com/summit/	12:57 PM
	Second will be October 15-16 in London - http://www.getchef.com/summit-london/	12:57 PM
	Registration for both summits is now open, we hope to see you there!	12:57 PM
	There are also a couple of great updates on the Supermarket	12:57 PM
sersut	one thing... 11.14.4 release is on the way fixing some regressions... list is found here:	12:57 PM
nathenhar...	We've added the ability to share tools and plugins on the site. https://supermarket.getchef.com/tools . You can publish your own tools and plugins on the site.	12:58 PM
sersut	https://github.com/opscode/chef/issues?q=is%3Ao...	12:58 PM
jonlives	so happy about EU summit	12:58 PM
nathenhar...	oc-id, an OAuth 2 provider for Chef, has been open sourced https://github.com/opscode/oc-id . This is one of the necessary	12:58 PM

	pieces for running your own instance of the Supermarket and brings us one step closer to making running your own internal Supermarket feasible.	
holoway	bawt: sersut is a smart, capable, dedicated maintainer of chef.	12:58 PM
nathenhar...	If a cookbook includes a CHANGELOG.md file, that file is now displayed on the Supermarket site. https://supermarket.getchef.com/cookbooks/super... is an example. One note on this though, it's only active for newly uploaded cookbooks that have a CHANGELOG.md.	12:58 PM
jonlives	nathenharvey: where does one register for EU summit? it just says information coming soon	12:58 PM
nathenhar...	Earlier this week, we held a hack session on the Tomcat cookbook. Thanks to everyone who participated! You can time shift and participate now, too! https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=heXIAX8QT5A	12:58 PM
	jonlives: click the "register now" button in the header	12:58 PM
	The apache2 cookbook recently hit 2.0.0 which includes some breaking changes. If you're using this cookbook, you should lock your production environment to something < 2.0.0 until you've had a chance to verify the new version in your infrastructure. https://supermarket.getchef.com/cookbooks/apache2	12:58 PM
jonlives	oh haha scrolling fail.	12:59 PM
nathenhar...	That's it on community. What questions can I answer for you? in the 60 seconds remaining	12:59 PM
joshsz	+1000 to this process! :)	12:59 PM
mmzyk	We should mention that the open server server has an 11.1.4 RC out that can be downloaded and tested out.	12:59 PM
holoway	mmzyk: thanks!	12:59 PM
lamont_oc	holoway: one thing, we've supported comments in json for ages (default yajl-ruby behavior), broke it in 11.14.2, fixing it s a regression and making it official and tested	12:59 PM
mmzyk	Using the omnitruck api, set prerelease to true and you shall be able to download it.	1:00 PM
nlloyds	jonlives: http://www.cvent.com/d/84qf4h/4W	1:00 PM
holoway	lamont_oc: thats hilarious, given the mild drama re: comments in json	1:00 PM
	okay	1:00 PM

lamont_oc

indeed

1:00 PM

gondoi

apache2 2.0.0 has breaking changes, but it also supports apache 2.4 now!

1:00 PM

;-)

1:00 PM

holoway

**** meeting closed **** :)

1:00 PM