

btm	today's meeting is later than normal due to the summit. agenda: https://github.com/opscode/chef-community-irc-m... wifi at the summit is dropping a lot of packets.	1:31 PM
nathenharv...	holoway: hello!	1:34 PM
holoway	hello web friends	1:34 PM
miketheman	hello	1:34 PM
btm	nathenharvey: are we going to play journey in the meeting room?	1:35 PM
shlant	#hugops for all	1:35 PM
jonlives	hi holoway and summitfriends! and other webfriends too of course :p	1:35 PM 1:35 PM
miketheman	verbal disputes over what "heavy metal" is acceptable is not easy	1:35 PM
nathenharv...	jonlives: hello!	1:35 PM
juliancdunn	too bad we can't have holoway's computer update the /topic based on the song that's playing	1:36 PM
holoway	okay - let us begin	1:36 PM
nathenharv...	Hello everyone and welcome back to the IRC meeting	1:36 PM
holoway	the song is "dangerous but worth the risk"	1:36 PM
nathenharv...	in Seattle, we have a room of people not speaking to one another.	1:36 PM

jaymzh	Hi Adam.	1:36 PM
juliancdunn	nathenharvey: feels like home	1:36 PM
	<i>kallistec still convinced "New World Order" is maximum apropos</i>	1:37 PM
holoway	so - thanks for coming	1:37 PM
nathenharv...	and IRC meeting. My IRC is being projected in the room for those that just want to read along.	1:37 PM
holoway	for us, anyway, this is a first actual IRC meeting	1:37 PM
	that involves the summit - we'll have another one in london	1:37 PM
nathenharv...	Today's agenda is here - https://github.com/opscode/chef-community-irc-m...	1:37 PM
icarus	aloha	1:37 PM
wdpro_kevin	I lurk in physical meetings too	1:38 PM
nathenharv...	but I'd like to suggest that we toss out that agenda and let holoway walk us through the CBGB and we'll circle back to our pre-announced agenda as time permits	1:38 PM
holoway	lets start the actual meeting	1:38 PM
	if you want to play along, you can listen to Ratt's greatest hits, to get the full summit experience	1:38 PM
nathenharv...	yeah... *** Meeting Starts ***	1:39 PM
holoway	is there an agenda topic that needs addressing before we start	1:39 PM
juliancdunn	nathenharvey: I'd still like to close off & merge the platform support RFC today	1:39 PM

jkeiser	How do I get some RFC discussions on the agenda?	1:39 PM
holoway	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/58 <-- is the PR I just submitted for the governance and maintenance policy	1:39 PM
	lets do that	1:39 PM
	juliancdunn: can you paste a link to the PR?	1:39 PM
icarus	does anyone find this midly autistic, haha	1:39 PM
shain	+1 to julian	1:39 PM
juliancdunn	stand by	1:39 PM
icarus	mildly*	1:39 PM
atiniir	mild?	1:39 PM
jaymzh	indeed - my RFC isn't on there either. :(1:39 PM
juliancdunn	it's all quiet and heavy metal is playing. I feel like I'm in Adam's head	1:40 PM
kisoku	I had to fly to the US to be able to finally make one of these meetings :-P	1:40 PM
jkeiser	I will want at some point to discuss https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/48 , https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/49 and https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/50	1:40 PM
rarenerd	kisoku: same here ;)	1:40 PM
jkeiser	If there is time	1:40 PM
juliancdunn	platform support RFC: https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/21	1:40 PM

holoway	ok - lets take platform support	1:40
		PM
nathenharv...	jkeiser: I'll capture those for the agenda also, you can always contact me or submit a PR to the repo where we set the agenda for these meetings	1:41
		PM
jkeiser	ok! next time I'll do that, thanks	1:41
		PM
juliancdunn	holoway: you want to do that now, or cbgb first?	1:41
		PM
holoway	no, lets do this first	1:41
		PM
	there was lots of discussion on this RFC	1:41
		PM
	I think we should do two things	1:41
		PM
	1) we should merge it as it stands	1:41
		PM
	2) we should make it clear that we can, and will, update the RFC as we evolve	1:42
		PM
jonlives	I'm +1 on both	1:42
		PM
shain	+1	1:42
		PM
holoway	any dissenters?	1:42
		PM
holoway	you have 30 seconds to make with your -1	1:42
		PM
tomduffield	should we have a specifically outlined changelog section to show when a platform is deprecated	1:42
		PM
shain	but only if julian fixes this typo: "discretion"	1:42
		PM
tomduffield	or should we just trust people to look at git history	1:42
		PM
shain	;)	1:42

		PM
holoway	tomduffield: lets trust the humans for now	1:42
		PM
juliancdunn	shain: lol. that sounds rude doesn't it	1:42
		PM
tomduffield	holoway sounds good to me	1:43
		PM
	+1	1:43
		PM
holoway	okay - 10 more seconds	1:43
		PM
miketheman	I think the appendix at the end explains per-platform cycles nicely	1:43
		PM
holoway	okay - I'm putting my +1 on the PR	1:43
		PM
miketheman	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/21/files	1:44
		PM
jaymzh	+1 - but I've only just scanned it	1:44
		PM
holoway	@coderanger I have approved said PR, make with the editing at will	1:44
		PM
miketheman	+!	1:44
		PM
coderanger	Reminder you can uncheck Show Notes to make reading easier on the diff screen	1:44
		PM
	holoway: Roger	1:44
		PM
jonlives	coderanger: I'll grab this one if you want since you're summiting	1:44
		PM
holoway	is there anything else that folks feel has broad consensus that we can just merge, before I derail?	1:44
		PM
	1 minute	1:44
		PM

atiniir	should the specific components of chefdk be detailed explicitly	1:45 PM
coderanger	Might have to merge later once the internet works better	1:45 PM
nathenharv...	perhaps jaymzh's PR about attributes?	1:45 PM
jaymzh	pretty please?	1:45 PM
jonlives	coderanger: I'll grab it then :)	1:45 PM
holoway	nathenharvey: link?	1:45 PM
jaymzh	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/53	1:45 PM
kallistec	I think we reached consensus on https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/20 though it could be edited for format	1:45 PM
nathenharv...	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/53	1:45 PM
holoway	also, we switched the music to Pantera, because people don't understand how amazing Ratt was	1:45 PM
jaymzh	holoway: I enjoyed both	1:45 PM
nathenharv...	https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/53 is the chef 12 attributes PR from jaymzh	1:46 PM
atiniir	pantera sounds better out of those speakers, go figure	1:46 PM
jaymzh	though Phil Anselmo continues to be an ass	1:46 PM
c_t	now if we just had some real music	1:46 PM
miketheman	I'm a little concerned with adding more options to attribute precedences	1:46 PM

Dieselttime	:%s/was/is/g	1:46 PM
miketheman	especially wihtout having clear debugging techniques for "where did my attribute come from"?	1:46 PM
holoway	miketheman: I think this doesn't actually add any more options - it just makes it clear	1:46 PM
jaymzh	miketheman: chef 12 has some pretty awesome tools for that	1:46 PM
holoway	miketheman: in particular, right now, you really can't safely delete anything	1:47 PM
jaymzh	miketheman: at the moment, we - and many others - actually cannot move to Chef 11 because there's no way to wholesale overwrite keys	1:47 PM
	or delete things	1:47 PM
holoway	and yeah, I think kallistec needs to publicize his tools for attr discovery	1:47 PM
	and debugging	1:47 PM
	kallistec: can you take an action to write (rewrite) a blog post?	1:47 PM
miketheman	holoway: it adds more interfaces for the user to change attributes, not necessarily more levels	1:47 PM
coderanger	+1, I still have to direct people to the chef 11 release blog post for info on node.debug_values	1:48 PM
kallistec	I'm happy to do that, or we can republish jtimmerman 's post	1:48 PM
miketheman	and without kallistec on their team, figuring this out is a Hard Thing	1:48 PM
juliancdunn	yes, customers ask for auditing/tracing tools all the time, so that'd be great	1:48 PM
Dieselttime	why can't we safely delete things?	1:48 PM

jaymzh	Dieselttime: there's no way to delete things.	1:48
		PM
coderanger	jaymzh: I'm still not sure why we aren't matching the normal Ruby names with rm_ and remove_	1:48
		PM
jaymzh	.delete() doesn't do waht you thin kit goes	1:48
		PM
miketheman	jaymzh: I look forward to new tracing and deubggin in Chef 12 - haven't seen that yet	1:48
		PM
kallistec	either way, I'll take responsibility for getting it on the chef blog	1:48
		PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] jonlives closed pull request #21: Platform support policy proposal (master...platform-support-policy) http://git.io/PNJgvA	1:49
		PM
nathenharv...	holoway, kallistec: I've captured the action	1:49
		PM
holoway	ok - I propose that this room look at 53, and in two weeks, we are merging it unless there are strong negative cases we haven't dealt with on the PR	1:49
		PM
miketheman	jaymzh: might make sense to elaborate in the rfc why .delete() doesn't do what you think it does	1:49
		PM
shain	I like this RFC for clarity of attributes.	1:49
		PM
coderanger	+! on #53 functionality, I would just prefer to see the methods renamed	1:49
		PM
holoway	nathenharvey: can you record that decision, so we remember to merge at the euro summit	1:49
		PM
nathenharv...	got it	1:50
		PM
holoway	lets take the conversation about it to the PR	1:50
		PM
atiniir	great idea on the elaborate on the why of .delete()	1:50
		PM
holoway	jaymzh: please to elaborate on the why of .delete() :)	1:50
		PM

jaymzh	miketheman: I'm not sure I can even explain that will without a very complicated dive into the way attributes work with the [] operators. the short version is ... you can only delete down to the sub-sub-hash of the precedence. ther's litterally no syntax for delete. node[f].delete will error out... and node.default[f].delete will delete cookbook_default but not role_default	1:51 PM
holoway	lets put https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/20/files on the list for merging at the euro summit as well	1:51 PM
	jaymzh: put a paragraph in the PR	1:51 PM
jaymzh	holoway: k	1:51 PM
holoway	if you haven't read it, it's been open for a while, it's back-compat, and it will make things better for movning forward	1:51 PM
jaymzh	holoway: miketheman other than that explanation - any objections?	1:51 PM
holoway	but here is your heads up	1:51 PM
juliancdunn	is monkeypatching .delete() on the Mash too disgusting? 'cause otherwise people might continue to use it	1:52 PM
atiniir	jaymzh: i think even than or a wee bit more would be fine. give people a jumping off point to understand more if they want	1:52 PM
holoway	ok - in the interest of time, lets move on	1:52 PM
	please take the conversation to the PR	1:52 PM
juliancdunn	roger	1:52 PM
miketheman	jaymzh: I guess it's not entirely clear to me as to what interfaces will exist, rm_default vs remove and other operatios, and where they are used.	1:52 PM
	holoway: roger, will contiune there	1:52 PM
holoway	so 53 and 20 are both on the docket for merge, and I expect a flurry of good times on 53 at least	1:53 PM

nathenharv...	Next agenda item then is #58 - https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/58	1:53
		PM
	<i>IronYuppie is now known as DavidAronchick</i>	1:53
		PM
	Proposed governance and maintenance policy	1:53
		PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] coderanger pushed 1 new commit to master: http://git.io/lx4wUw	1:53
		PM
	chef-rfc/master 0fd9db6 Noah Kantrowitz: After written confirmation from Julian on IRC, add copyright disclaimer.	1:53
		PM
shain	fyi holoway: in the future we may want to specify PR53 and PR20, since there already is an RFC20 != PR20	1:53
		PM
holoway	ya	1:53
		PM
	thanks	1:53
		PM
	those are PR#	1:53
		PM
jonlives	I am very excited about #58.	1:54
		PM
holoway	so, lets talk 58	1:54
		PM
j^2	RE: PR 58, i put a comment about the total number of people, an even number could be challenging at a later date? no...tie breakers?	1:54
		PM
holoway	this is the culmination of trying to think about how to be more explicit about our behavior, that started a few months back	1:54
		PM
	<i>IronYuppie is now known as DavidAronchick</i>	1:54
		PM
	<i>coderanger dances, ♪ ♪ (· o ·) ♪ ♪ ♪ (· o ·) ♪ ♪</i>	1:54
		PM
	j^2: luckily, the governance board doesn't actually decide anything	1:54
		PM

	as a refresher, there are two things specified in this PR	1:54
		PM
	one is the creation of a maintenance policy	1:55
		PM
j^2	holoway: true, but at the same time advice is can still get hairy too though right?	1:55
		PM
holoway	that is how we manage Chef (and any attendant product we wants)	1:55
		PM
	the other is the governance board (from here on the CBGB, for greater awesome)	1:55
		PM
	the CBGB is the way people have a formal voice who aren't actively maintaining the code	1:56
		PM
	one thing that was important to me was that we be clear that the decision making authority rests with the people doing the work	1:56
		PM
jonlives	holoway: you excepted, does being a member of the CBGB exclude being a maintainer or vice versa?	1:56
		PM
holoway	who are closest to the problem	1:56
		PM
miketheman	and to be clear, CBGB is _not_ MAINTAINERS?	1:56
		PM
	or what jonlives said	1:56
		PM
holoway	jonlives: no - and in particular, 3 of the CBGB are LTs	1:56
		PM
jonlives	coolio	1:57
		PM
holoway	but 4 of those seats are for users, and my hope is they aren't contributors	1:57
		PM
j^2	Should the LTs be from a small medium and large project/cookbook?	1:57
		PM
	so you have a full scope of different issues for different sizes?	1:57
		PM

atiniir	holoway: doing the work and closest to the problem might not be == ?	1:57
		PM
holoway	j^2: maybe? one thing I wanted to be careful about was too much process design up front	1:57
		PM
j^2	holoway: understood, just a thought	1:57
		PM
holoway	j^2: I think that would be great, I'm not sure we need to formalize it	1:58
		PM
j^2	agreed	1:58
		PM
holoway	atiniir: right - you could be a user with an issue.	1:58
		PM
	atiniir: the important bit to understand is that the people with the authority are the people who can do something about it - not the other way around	1:58
		PM
	ie: we're the boss of us	1:58
		PM
	;)	1:58
		PM
miketheman	holoway: I was unclear as to who drives the roadmaps - it appears that both maintainers and CBGB own that	1:58
		PM
holoway	miketheman: yeah - I'm unclear about that too, because I think its a great idea to have a roadmap	1:59
		PM
shain	I like this as a "let's try and see what happens" - it feels like MVP. Any more might be overengineering O.o	1:59
		PM
holoway	miketheman: and I've gotten pretty good in the last few years at the roadmap process for a company	1:59
		PM
	miketheman: I have almost no idea how to map that to a community	1:59
		PM
	miketheman: although I expect it's probably identical?	1:59
		PM
	the maintainers own the roadmap, the CBGB provides input	2:00
		PM

miketheman	holoway: I think it totally maps to companies and projects	2:00 PM
atiniir	holoway: users who participate in discussion / testing would then be able to influence maintainers, and it'd be against a maintainers interest to just ignore users.	2:00 PM
miketheman	holoway: but a roadmap for the community	2:00 PM
	?	2:00 PM
holoway	ok - well, then the roadmap starts with me talking about what we want to accomplish in the next year at a high level	2:00 PM
atiniir	that was might to have a ', yeah?'	2:00 PM
holoway	and then breaking that down to the individual teams/areas that need to have a plan	2:00 PM
	and we decide whats in or out based on how it helps us achieve our goal	2:00 PM
miketheman	"The primary purpose of the CBGB is to advise the Leadership on matters related to supporting the long-term governance, structure, and roadmap of the Project." <= so this would mean the CBGB doesn't own the roadmap, but helps maintainers decide direction?	2:01 PM
holoway	miketheman: bingo	2:01 PM
	<i>ctracey_ is now known as ctracey</i>	2:01 PM
	<i>paulmooring is now known as paulmooring_away</i>	2:01 PM
	CBGB only ever advises	2:01 PM
	maintainers decide	2:01 PM
jonlives	as it should be.	2:01 PM

juliancdunn	I need time to digest and meditate on this PR	2:01
		PM
atiniir	aye tis good	2:01
		PM
shain	so say we all	2:01
		PM
holoway	(in real life, I was fist-bumping barry crist)	2:01
		PM
miketheman	holoway: got it. so https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/58/files might need some polishing	2:01
		PM
holoway	out intent is to have this open for discussion here, and at the next meeting as well	2:02
		PM
	I'll publish a blog post about it, and post to the list, after this meeting	2:02
		PM
miketheman	cool.	2:02
		PM
holoway	we'll take input, polish it up, and then adopt	2:02
		PM
	the one thing I want to bring up	2:02
		PM
	is we need to have some LTs	2:02
		PM
	I put some draft slots in the PR to make it clear what kinds of areas feel like they make sense	2:03
		PM
	but the list is far from exhaustive	2:03
		PM
	one thing I was hoping to deal with here is the question of whether we want to hold on formalizing adding any LTs or Maintainers	2:03
		PM
	until the RFC is merged	2:03
		PM
	In real life, I'm looking at coderanger	2:03
		PM

	haz you feels on that topic?	2:04
		PM
miketheman	LTs on CBGB or MAINTIANERS?	2:04
		PM
	<i>kallistec watches coderanger make with they typey typey</i>	2:04
		PM
holoway	maintainers	2:04
		PM
atiniir	will various roles have 'terms' (as in duration)	2:04
		PM
holoway	the LTs on the CBGB are LTs from maintainers	2:04
		PM
coderanger	I haven't gotten down to the maint policu	2:04
		PM
atiniir	going on LT could be daunting if it's for life	2:04
		PM
miketheman	(btw - having multiple LTs might get confusing)	2:04
		PM
holoway	atiniir: the CBGB has a 12 month term, the LTs and Maintainers are until they remove themsleves with a PR	2:04
		PM
juliancdunn	shain: I know what I'm nominating you for	2:05
		PM
coderanger	but if it is similar to the last draft I think it should should be a +2 thing, if two existing maintainers think you should be in, you are in	2:05
		PM
miketheman	unless the CBGB LTs are actually maintainer LTs?	2:05
		PM
holoway	miketheman: I think its important to have LTs for specific subsystems	2:05
		PM
jonlives	atiniir: it's open source - nobody can force you to stay on longer than you want to :)	2:05
		PM
icarus	coderanger deserves honorary medals for his irc help	2:05
		PM

	<i>shain sends a dirty look at julian</i>	2:05
		PM
coderanger	Keeps things easier than a full-quorum vote	2:05
		PM
atiniir	holoway can you explain how that would work ? or should i rtfrfc	2:05
		PM
holoway	miketheman: they are maintainer LTs who are voted in	2:05
		PM
	yes	2:05
		PM
coderanger	but makes sure there is some oversight	2:05
		PM
holoway	let me summarize the maint policy	2:05
		PM
jaymzh2	yeah, MAINTAINERS should be similar to kernel - you can remove yourself, or people can request your removal, but it shouldn't be specific terms	2:05
		PM
holoway	basically, it starts with me	2:05
		PM
jonlives	^ +1 this	2:05
		PM
atiniir	jonlives: sure by the cyberbullying these days...	2:05
		PM
	by = but	2:05
		PM
jonlives	atiniir: in all seriousness, that's why https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master... has already been approved	2:06
		PM
j^2	jonlives: true dat	2:06
		PM
holoway	I'm the first project lead, and my job is to to resolve disputes, provide direction, and delegate. I also have final veto power.	2:06
		PM
coderanger	Lts should probably be handed fuzzily until we figure out what they are going to actually be	2:06
		PM

atiniir	jonlives: kk ty	2:06
		PM
coderanger	Like will we have a LT for commuinty (nathenharvey)?	2:06
		PM
shain	+1 coderanger	2:06
		PM
atiniir	+1	2:07
		PM
jaymzh2	+1	2:07
		PM
holoway	the plan is to delegate areas of Chef (and software that is associated with it) to LTs, who have authority (and a veto) over changes to their area	2:07
		PM
	<i>jaymzh2 is now known as jaymzh</i>	2:07
		PM
	those areas also have Maintainers	2:07
		PM
	all of those people have commit bits to Chef and attendant projects	2:07
		PM
	<i>paulmooring_away is now known as paulmooring</i>	2:07
		PM
	coderanger: +1	2:07
		PM
coderanger	For LTs right now, I would want to see it just done via pull req so there can be a public discussion, and trust holoway to thumbsup appropriately (if he is okay with that responsibility)	2:07
		PM
holoway	when a PR comes in, the maintainers and LT for the areas it touches do a +1 with simple majority causing a merge. If the simple majority becomes too onerous, we can change the rules	2:08
		PM
coderanger	The first few will probably be whomever wants to volunteer	2:08
		PM
j^2	coderanger: seems reasonable	2:08
		PM
miketheman	so to be perfectly clear, the LT position is a involved-with-code position	2:08

		PM
jaymzh	holoway: how does one request to be a MAINTAINER for a thing that's not on the list? PR? so like, would I submit a PR putting my name in as an LT for, say, Attributes, and then discussoin ensues?	2:08 PM
holoway	codranger: yeah - I think we shouldn't add any LTs until we approve the RFC, then start PRs	2:08 PM
jaymzh	holoway: ah, you mostly answered that	2:08 PM
holoway	jaymzh: that was my vision - you can propose a section, make yourself the LT, and then we talk	2:08 PM
codranger	holoway: Fair, though getting an idea of interest from the community starting now seems prudent	2:08 PM
holoway	miketheman: yes	2:08 PM
codranger	At least to get an idea if the fiefdoms are split up appropriately	2:08 PM
holoway	codranger: and they probably aren't :)	2:09 PM
	I think operating system support is one that will be obvious	2:09 PM
codranger	Like is "Ubuntu" good? Or should it be per version? etc	2:09 PM
holoway	codranger: please god let it not be per version	2:09 PM
miketheman	codranger: I think a blanket area is a good place to start	2:09 PM
codranger	Or will all the Linux teams step on each others toes all the way	2:09 PM
jonlives	LTs all the way down :p	2:09 PM
codranger	holoway: 14.04 seems to be enough of a special snowflake some days ... :P	2:09 PM
miketheman	LTS != LTs	2:09

		PM
jaymzh	holoway++	2:10
		PM
holoway	also, its prudent that we'll use the RFC process to change the policy as needed	2:10
		PM
miketheman	20 minutes	2:10
		PM
coderanger	Basically for right now I think we should just let the delegated teams self assemble a bit, see who is interested in each area	2:10
		PM
holoway	coderanger: +100	2:10
		PM
jonlives	holoway: re the requirement for maintainers to attend dev meetings etc, what happens about those in inconvenient timezones?	2:10
		PM
miketheman	+1	2:10
		PM
coderanger	And from that draw out the leadership structure	2:10
		PM
holoway	jonlives: we make an exception :)	2:10
		PM
jonlives	coolio	2:10
		PM
holoway	jonlives: we should change the doc in the PR	2:10
		PM
coderanger	So the action item is to make a space for those teams to assemble	2:10
		PM
jonlives	holoway: I'll add a note	2:11
		PM
coderanger	Maybe just a public google doc?	2:11
		PM
holoway	I have a suspicion that people will want to start actually signing up faster than we merge the PR	2:11
		PM
coderanger	Thats probably the lowest-friction option	2:11
		PM

martinisoft	Wanted to ask if anyone has stepped forward or is there any place for FreeBSD support in the maintainer area. If not then I am not seeing how to propose this since the 'how chef is maintained' document is not created yet.	2:11 PM
jaymzh	holoway: that'd be a good problem to have.	2:12 PM
holoway	martinisoft: there is a place for that! if you want to be the LT for FreeBSD, I +1 you right now	2:12 PM
kallistec	I recall from previous meeting that we wanted an LT to emerge from a non-western hemisphere timezone and that person would then lead a second IRC community meeting at a good time for them and geographically similar folks	2:12 PM
holoway	martinisoft: and I look forward to the FreeBSD merge storm	2:12 PM
shain	I know at least 4 people who would LOVE an LT for freebsd	2:12 PM
holoway	martinisoft: it's a great example, because I haven't used freebsd in years - so I'm so deeply unqualified to maintain it	2:13 PM
martinisoft	I run a FreeBSD fileserver at home. Chef is tricky there and I want to make it better.	2:13 PM
coderanger	holoway: We also need to grok how this maintenance policy fits in with stuff outside chef client/server (cookbooks, social stuffs, etc)	2:13 PM
holoway	coderanger: yeah - I have some thoughts there	2:13 PM
miketheman	kallistec: it definitely brings up the idea of async meeting and mailing list decision-making	2:13 PM
coderanger	holoway: Like we talked before about molding the RFC process to look kind of like this model too :)	2:13 PM
holoway	basically, I was thinking about adding a section that talks about the fact that an LT can be over a completely different project	2:13 PM
	for example, Mixlib::Shellout	2:14 PM
jonlives	holoway: it seems like a lot of the components fit under the chef repo - the maintainers file is gonna get pretty busy methinks	2:14 PM
juliancdunn	coderanger: also, the ecosystem tools like TK, chefspec, etc.	2:14

		PM
atiniir	so. many. words.	2:14
		PM
martinisoft	holoway: So at least in #58 I don't see a FreeBSD section. Should I comment in the PR?	2:14
		PM
holoway	or maybe fnichol decides he wants to use this model for TK	2:14
		PM
kallistec	miketheman: yes, that's good generally (I'm more active on ML than IRC because I can do it at a time that's convenient for me) but it's good to have a real-time meeting so you can get ppls attention if you need it	2:14
		PM
holoway	martinisoft: yeah - post merge, you could just send a PR, put yourself there, and viola	2:14
		PM
	atiniir: this is the short version!	2:14
		PM
	ok, I have a need for a real life bio break, because of all my coffee	2:15
		PM
	the role of me will now be played by barry crist	2:15
		PM
atiniir	holoway: note to self, get a screen reader	2:15
		PM
holoway	time to party	2:15
		PM
miketheman	kallistec: no doubt, which is why in-person exists. We can chat offline about that further	2:15
		PM
nathenharv...	Barry_: has the holoway keyboard ;)	2:15
		PM
jonlives	holoway: in the short term, do initial volunteers for LT PR against the relevant repo, or against this RFC proposal?	2:15
		PM
martinisoft	holoway: Cool. So the how chef is mainted doc would also be part of that RFC merge or separate?	2:15
		PM
btm	holoway: (Barry) what do you think about CGBG quorum/voting? It looks like there's some responsibilities under Operation that would require being clear about that.	2:15
		PM

coderanger	One thing that I think is possibly implicit is what happens is there is more than one LT for a subsystem	2:16 PM
martinisoft	holoway: Actually, what jonlives just said :D	2:16 PM
juliancdunn	btm: you may need to teach Barry how to use IRC	2:16 PM
coderanger	Do we just not do that?	2:16 PM
holoway	hey now.	2:16 PM
adamleff	jonlives: I'd love to see it in a single place so there's one place to look, vs. trying to enforce a document standard across N number of repos.	2:16 PM
btm	juliandunn: I think the "type in that box" instructions were more than adequate. ;)	2:16 PM
holoway	[Barry] agree we should be clear about responsibilities re: Operations.	2:16 PM
jonlives	that's kind of the way I was leaning too, just clarifying what the intent was	2:16 PM
coderanger	15m warning	2:16 PM
miketheman	I move that this get a lot more eyeballs reviewing the PR	2:17 PM
nathenharv...	+1	2:17 PM
shain	+1	2:17 PM
holoway	yep	2:17 PM
Barry_	that was fun	2:17 PM
holoway	so, lets talk about timelines	2:17 PM

	miketheman: I agree, we need way more eyeballs	2:17
		PM
	I say we do what coderanger suggested, and make the maintainers file a google doc right now	2:18
		PM
	and let folks suggest	2:18
		PM
	meanwhile, we keep the PR open for actual changes to process/meaning/etc	2:18
		PM
miketheman	both section (project) addition, as well as LTs	2:18
		PM
adamleff	I know it was brought up the last time that the blog was for stuff that was “finished” and ready for consumption, but I move that a PR of this significance may be a perfect time for a blog post with some accompanying language as to holoway’s vision for this, etc.	2:18
		PM
holoway	adamleff: yeah, I have that ready to go	2:19
		PM
jonlives	holoway: +1 on the google doc	2:19
		PM
adamleff	w00t	2:19
		PM
	<i>zz_gondoi is now known as gondoi</i>	2:19
		PM
holoway	adamleff: as PAntera is saying right now, i just need 5 minutes alone	2:19
		PM
	:)	2:19
		PM
	on CLAs - we're talking with lawyers	2:19
		PM
	I think it would be great to move to Developer Certificates of Origin	2:20
		PM
nathenharv...	10 minutes 'til end of meeting	2:20
		PM
Barry_	would like to lower barrier on CLA's... actively working on this.	2:20

			PM
holoway	but, and Barry_ can correct me, I don't think we're all the way there yet on what that does to risk	2:20	PM
DavidAron...	coderanger: I'm not sure i'm 100% on the "more than one LT" per subsystem. Can you explain more?	2:20	PM
miketheman	4 updates yet to be covered	2:20	PM
holoway	coderanger: I don't think there will be more than one LT per subsystem. lots of maintainers, one decider	2:20	PM
juliancdunn	can we move to the other items, since we need to let this bake out	2:20	PM
DavidAron...	coderanger: (can cover offline due to short time)	2:20	PM
holoway	yep	2:20	PM
Barry_	right.... I think this is mostly about us getting comfortable but also some real issues.	2:20	PM
holoway	lets move	2:20	PM
coderanger	holoway: That should be slightly more explicit then :)	2:21	PM
holoway	coderanger: you and your explicit	2:21	PM
	but I agree	2:21	PM
	one LT per subsystem	2:21	PM
coderanger	holoway: I <3 words	2:21	PM
holoway	I respect it	2:21	PM
	okay	2:21	PM

nathenharv...	OK. so we move the CBGB discussion to the PR / blog / ML and move this meeting on to updates	2:21 PM
jonlives	if there's 1 LT the appeals process should also be documented	2:21 PM
	ie appeal to decider	2:21 PM
holoway	jonlives: it is to the project lead	2:22 PM
	to use the veto	2:22 PM
	thats the process	2:22 PM
	okay - lets move on to other business	2:22 PM
	looking forward to vigorously stretching the limits of what a PR can do	2:22 PM
	:)	2:22 PM
nathenharv...	First update is from the community: The summit is underway in Seattle, we're holding our next Summit in 2 weeks in London	2:22 PM
	hope we'll meet IRL at one or both	2:22 PM
ssd7	(Thanks to everyone at the summit for doing this meeting on IRC, much appreciated)	2:23 PM
nathenharv...	that's the quick community update	2:23 PM
Barry_	... got to run. thanks everyone!	2:23 PM
nathenharv...	sersut: chef-client update?	2:23 PM
sersut	On the client side we will be announcing a new Chef DK release (0.3.0) with the first working prototype of Policyfiles..	2:23 PM

	watch out the blog for more information on this... it'll land very soon..	2:24
		PM
jonlives	ooh shiny!	2:24
		PM
adamleff	(thumbsup)	2:24
		PM
tech356	Will Policyfiles land for 12?	2:24
		PM
holoway	kallistec: I think that also drives the cookbook version stuff	2:24
		PM
	kallistec: we should close on that next meeting	2:25
		PM
kallistec	agree	2:25
		PM
holoway	kallistec, acn you answer tech356	2:25
		PM
sersut	Policyfile feature will be an ongoing work... this version is the first preview version so it'll be a while before it's finalized..	2:25
		PM
nathenharv...	5 minutes	2:25
		PM
holoway	yep - and since we aren't breaking existing interfaces, we can ship it quickly and iterate	2:25
		PM
kallistec	tech356: there's some server support we need for this to work well that will not be in 12.0.	2:25
		PM
	server changes will be backcompat, so they can be added at any time	2:26
		PM
holoway	nathenharvey: can you make an appeal for communtiy advocates?	2:26
		PM
tech356	kallistec: is there a target release or just when it is ready?	2:26
		PM
nathenharv...	please, can we have some community advocates	2:26
		PM

kallistec	chef-client supports policyfiles right now in "compatibility" aka "kludge" mode	2:26
		PM
holoway	hahaha	2:26
		PM
	how do they become one?	2:26
		PM
juliancdunn	what is a "community advocate" ?	2:26
		PM
btm	nathenharvey: can you put the lunch time of the summit on https://www.getchef.com/summit/ ?	2:26
		PM
nathenharv...	PR's to https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master... , nominate yourself or other as community advocate	2:26
		PM
holoway	the current mode is about learning how it feels, then we'll rock a great implemetnation	2:26
		PM
	lets have a goal to have a few folks volunteer by the next irc meeting in london	2:27
		PM
nathenharv...	btm: lunch today is 12:30. agenda is also here https://github.com/opscode/chef-summit-2014/wiki	2:27
		PM
juliancdunn	hotel staff is playing the xylophones, so I gues we need to wrap up	2:27
		PM
jkeiser	I need to hit this next session, and I'll be pretty active in it, so can you guys handle looking at my RFCs (or can we do them before)	2:27
		PM
holoway	ok	2:27
		PM
	<i>holoway waves</i>	2:27
		PM
	thanks for coming	2:27
		PM
kallistec	tech356: things will come out as we finish them, don't have a specific timeline. https://github.com/danielsdeleo/policyfile-jenk... gives you a feel for what is working now	2:27
		PM
holoway	see all you crazy cats	2:28
		PM

nathenharvey: so endeth the meetingth

2:28

PM

jkeiser

I don't know if there is enough time allotted to deal with both RFCs and "the big questions" here

2:28

PM

nathenharv...

holoway: a more elaborate appeal for advocates will be posted to blog and ML soon. And yes, we should have some by London summit

2:28

PM

****Meeting Over****

2:28

PM