**** MEETING STARTS ****

holoway: might be a minute or two late   12:02 PM

holoway   HOLOWAY HAS ARRIVED   12:02 PM

nathenharv…   but we can start with a review of the agenda   12:02 PM

holoway fires his own smoke cannons   12:02 PM

boom   12:02 PM

https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...   12:02 PM

we have changed the order of the meeting a bit today based on feedback   12:03 PM
from our last meeting and the reality of the actual agenda at our regular
meetings

start with updates, then new prs, then older prs   12:03 PM

cmluciano   12:04 PM

holoway   my Chef Software update is pretty short - lots of folks going full on for   12:04 PM
ChefConf prep

I have one issue to bring up to the group, which is that I'mg oing to be   12:05 PM
unavailable for the month of april

(It's been 7-8 years, depending on how you count, and I'm going to take a   12:05 PM
long vacation)

ranjib__   Do it   12:05 PM

thom   enjoy!   12:05 PM

jonlives   big +1 for month long vacation.   12:05 PM

| adamedx | excellent | 12:05 PM |

| holoway | one thing the RFC process hasn't done is make space for having an interim decider | 12:05 PM |

| jonlives | that was just what I was about to say | 12:05 PM |

| | it does say you can delegate it though I think | 12:05 PM |

| holoway | yep | 12:06 PM |

| jtimberman | holoway: awesome! (re: vacation) :D | 12:06 PM |

| holoway | so I'm going to start that conversation, and we'll send something to the list when I know where I'm delegating it to | 12:06 PM |

| jonlives | gotcha | 12:06 PM |

| holoway | and that's me | 12:06 PM |

| | nathenharvey, you're up | 12:06 PM |

| nathenharv… | community update: ChefConf is less than 2 weeks out | 12:07 PM |

| | please do let us know if you can't come and why. I hope to give every one of you a hug there | 12:07 PM |

| | we have an amazing line-up ... you're decision on which talk to go to is going to be difficult for sure | 12:08 PM |

| | we're also going to introduce a "Chef Ambassador" program where people can self-identify as someone who newer folks can ask questions and such | 12:09 PM |

| | so watch for details on that at the conference | 12:09 PM |

| | that's it for community | 12:09 PM |

adamedx: over to you 12:09 PM

adamedx we're releasing a new Chef Client 12.1.2 12:10 PM

to address regressions in package providers (yum, homebrew) 12:10 PM

also 12:10 PM

we've triaged the latest openssl vulnerability 12:10 PM

and we will announce something before 12pm 12:10 PM

around if users of Chef packages that distirbute openssl 12:11 PM

are affected 12:11 PM

12pm PDT 12:11 PM

Currently things are looking positive in that regard 12:11 PM

that's it for me Nathen 12:11 PM

btm I'd like to have a post-mortem on the 12.1.0 release. Discussion is here:https://github.com/chef/chef/issues/3107 12:11 PM

holoway do eet 12:12 PM

jonlives I second having a postmortem 12:12 PM

adamedx agreed btm 12:12 PM

ranjib__ +1 on that 12:12 PM

thom	yes.	12:12 PM
holoway	btm: get it on the schedule :)	12:12 PM
	ok - we closed https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/86	12:13 PM
nathenharv…	moving on down the agenda, ranjib__ closed two PRs recently. Just wanted to be sure everyone saw that in case you were wondering why we're not discussing those anymore	12:13 PM
thom	btm: next tuesday, same time as this?	12:13 PM
btm	thom: sounds good. On IRC okay?	12:13 PM
thom	think it's best for most people, yeah	12:14 PM
jonlives	i'd argue text isn't a good format for a PM	12:14 PM
holoway	I just want to make sure we know that I Think the use cases in both those PRs are good	12:14 PM
ranjib__	Yeah, both of them needs more work and should be raised in different format	12:14 PM
jonlives	doesn't convey emotions or intent well	12:14 PM
holoway	btm: hangouts	12:14 PM
	or zoom	12:14 PM
nathenharv…	this is the other closed pr -https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/82	12:14 PM
holoway	for the reasons jonlives says	12:14 PM
	ranjib__: are you still running point on doing that?	12:14 PM

ranjib__   We cant extend the erb based approach indefinitely, dan did some work,   12:14 PM

btm   k. I'll set up the post-mortem.   12:15 PM

ranjib__   Yeah, i have to come up with bootstrap overhaul type proposal   12:15 PM

Supporting different hooks via erb will be painful   12:15 PM

holoway   cool   12:16 PM

thanks!   12:16 PM

ok, next up   12:16 PM

https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/103   12:16 PM

nathenharvey - you want to summarize for the room?   12:16 PM

nathenharv…   Yep.   12:16 PM

We tried migrating to google groups under our Chef google apps for business account.   12:17 PM

we're still a provisional account or something so got immediately shutdown for sending too many messages.   12:17 PM

our provisional account status should be lifted in April and then we *should* have our limit increased. but nobody at google can tell us if that will actually happen   12:18 PM

or what the new limit might be   12:18 PM

so ... I'm proposing it's time we modernize our mailing list capabilities and migrate to Discourse   12:18 PM

We would enable all of the mail-in, mail-out, treat it like a mailing list capabilities that discourse supports   12:19 PM

jonlives	shibbit.	12:19 PM
cmluciano	shibbit indeed	12:19 PM
holoway	I'm +1 to this - I prefer reading it on discourse to email anyway	12:19 PM
mary_grace	+1	12:19 PM
holoway	I actually think we should go one step further	12:19 PM
kierrr	+1	12:19 PM
martinisoft	+1	12:19 PM
holoway	and publicly bless the discourse instance and stack overflow	12:19 PM
lamont_oc	i actually think that something more like forums/reddit would be better than e-mail for most users anyway	12:20 PM
holoway	(here is a moment where I really wish coderanger was here)	12:20 PM
kallistec	As long as I can still act like a neckbeard and use email, all the +1	12:20 PM
jonlives	^ that :p	12:20 PM
holoway	you can, but you're missing out	12:20 PM
thom	what kallistec said	12:20 PM
holoway	neckbeard	12:20 PM
jtimberman	fire it up in mutt.	12:20 PM
jonlives	I'll fire you up in mutt.	12:20

kierrr ^ beat me to it — 12:20 PM

holoway "you're a curses!" — 12:21 PM

nathenharv… we had a "Q & A" section on the original community site. it ended up being a "Q" section in practice. — 12:21 PM

kvanderw_afk is now known as zz_kvanderw_afk — 12:21 PM

holoway exactly — 12:21 PM

the chef tag on stack overflow is quite active — 12:21 PM

martinb3 It would certainly help with all the unanswered chef questions on SO — 12:21 PM

jtimberman jonlives: bdha was creating a mutt as a service thing for pobox ;) — 12:21 PM

nathenharv… holoway: indeed — 12:21 PM

martinb3 holoway: exactly. — 12:21 PM

holoway we could then have Chef Software say that those two places are monitored by both us and the community — 12:21 PM

jtimberman nathenharvey: yeah we didn't really have anyone dedicated to the A — 12:21 PM

holoway and add a requirement for maintainers to be present in both — 12:21 PM

jonlives holoway: where's the role of #chef in that? — 12:22 PM

holoway live discussion — 12:22 PM

you wanna talk to the peoples, you ccome to #chef/#chef-hacking — 12:22 PM

jonlives	ah ok, so we're not de-blessing #chef, just wanted to make sure.	12:22 PM
holoway	is where builders live	12:22 PM
	nah	12:22 PM
	plenty blessed	12:22 PM
	but not the most accessible	12:22 PM
jonlives	yeah	12:22 PM
jtimberman	the eternal plight of irc.	12:22 PM
holoway	and this is a total random aside, but we should implement a highfive bot	12:22 PM
nathenharv…	let's ditch irc and open up a slack instance	12:23 PM
thom	holoway: see oc-rfc	12:23 PM
	for that latter bit	12:23 PM
holoway	http://huonw.github.io/blog/2015/03/rust-infras... < in particular, the highfive bot	12:23 PM
martinb3	Would be it hosted as SaaS or by Chef Inc.? Just curious about the recourse available when issues arise.	12:23 PM
jtimberman	nathenharvey: not-sure-if-trolling.jpg	12:23 PM
nathenharv…	martinb3: is your question about hosting about discourse?	12:24 PM
sdelano	we talking about robots? I want the shipit robot to be in IRC and not hipchat, but I might be crazy	12:24 PM

holoway nathenharvey: I'm -1 on not using irc - it's actually free in all the best ways 12:24 PM

martinb3 nathenharvey: yes. 12:24 PM

holoway sdelano: not a ship robot, I want the highfive bot for delegating maintainers to reviews based on the maintainers.md file 12:24 PM

jonlives we're getting a little off topic on discourse, folks :p 12:24 PM

holoway yes 12:24 PM

holoway sucks 12:24 PM

nathenharv… martinb3: I'd prefer to give someone some money to worry about keeping it running 12:24 PM

holoway to the topic at hand 12:24 PM

anyone -1 on discourse? 12:25 PM

ranjib_ All the fancy stuff works aweful on linux desktops 12:25 PM

jonlives holoway: I sentence you to once months vacation as penalty. 12:25 PM

nathenharv… someone who isn't responsible for making hosted chef stay up 12:25 PM

holoway AW, MAN 12:25 PM

just when I was getting amped up to be really stressed out, too 12:25 PM

kierrr haha 12:25 PM

ranjib_ Long live irc n irssi 12:25 PM

nathenharv…	martinb3: so, probably hosted. but we'll look at the economics and go from there	12:26 PM
holoway	ok	12:26 PM
	lets say the hosting decision lives with Chef Software, because either way, we're going to pay for it	12:26 PM
	either with bodies and $$, or just $$	12:26 PM
jtimberman	maintainers/moderators: same people as in IRC? or other volunteers?	12:27 PM
martinb3	nathenharvey, holoway: I was mostly curious. I'm still +1 for the choice.	12:27 PM
	:)	12:27 PM
holoway	if it's bodies and $$, I would be super open to sharing the burden with the community	12:27 PM
	ok	12:27 PM
	next up	12:27 PM
	nathenharvey: I approve your PR	12:27 PM
nathenharv…	jtimberman: advocates would carry over from the current mailing list and new advocates could be nominated by with pr to https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf...	12:28 PM
jtimberman	cool.	12:28 PM
holoway	next uphttps://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/91	12:28 PM
	er next up https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/91	12:28 PM
nathenharv…	kallistec: https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/91 is up next.	12:28 PM

holoway   kallistec?   12:29 PM

kallistec   yeah, so we agreed to make the IDs everywhere be sha signatures of things   12:29 PM

I need to update the RFC but also think about how we get there from the initial version which will be shipping with "wrong" signature algorithms   12:30 PM

thoughts on that would be most welcome   12:30 PM

Also, any feedback on the promotion API would be welcome   12:30 PM

jonlives   I love the promotion API.   12:30 PM

there's your feedback :p   12:31 PM

kallistec   it's definitely something that could be done on client (as in HTTP consumer) side   12:31 PM

holoway   just make it back-compat with a flag   12:31 PM

but the number of users is small   12:31 PM

kallistec   holoway: server-side flag?   12:31 PM

jonlives   if only we had API versioning to help fix that problem... </cunningleadin>   12:31 PM

holoway   kallistec: client side   12:31 PM

so, are we ready to +1 this PR, or do we need more work?   12:32 PM

kallistec   I need to update to remove language about IDs being arbitrary   12:32 PM

aside from that I think it's good to be accepted,   12:32 PM

holoway   ok   12:33

jonlives shall we pre-approve for merge once that's done, or need to review again? 12:33 PM

holoway lets put this into the accept queue for next week 12:33 PM

kallistec and I will make a commitment to keep it updated as some of the design details become more solid 12:33 PM

holoway ya 12:33 PM

jonlives gravy 12:33 PM

holoway lets pre-approve it 12:33 PM

why stand on ceremony when the outcome is not in doubt? 12:33 PM

how about this 12:33 PM

jonlives right 12:33 PM

ranjib__ is now known as _ranjib 12:33 PM

holoway jonlives can merge this RFC as soon as he is happy with kallistec's updates 12:33 PM

jonlives sounds good to me 12:34 PM

kallistec woot 12:34 PM

thom sounds good 12:34 PM

martinisoft agreed 12:34 PM

holoway ok, pr updated 12:34 PM

https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/92 - api versioning

12:35 PM

is mp here?

12:35 PM

mparadise - pingles!

12:35 PM

so, the tl;dr

12:36 PM

I updated this RFC as follows based on feedback received here and via other venues:

12:36 PM

Changed and expanded wording to make more clear that this is not per-endpoint versioning, but rather is global range across the server, with each version defining a set of behaviors across all APIs.

12:36 PM

Expanded on the notion that while product version must specify supported and deprecated Server API Versions, the relationship was not reciprocal - Server API Version can be incremented independently of product version, although no versions can be retired or deprecated except through appropriate product releases according to accepted support lifecycle

12:36 PM

documentation.

12:36 PM

Added example request-responses to demonstrate how version fits in, the responses expected for a given version in a changed endpoint, and how the established minimum and maximum supported versions will affect this over time.

12:36 PM

Clarified that there is not a 1:1 relation between a new version number and a single endpoint change - a new version number can include many new behaviors.

12:36 PM

Removed special version labels based on discussion in the IRC developers meeting - they add potential sources of confusion more than they simplify usage.

12:36 PM

(where "I" == mparadise)

12:36 PM

jonlives   I'm a lot happier with this now that we've clarified the global numbering scheme - I still worry about it adding a lot of confusion to writing API clients or

12:37 PM

integrating with it though.

that said, I'm unsure how to avoid that as well.   12:37 PM

holoway   my instinct is that we approve this RFC in its current state, implement a feature with it, and see if we hate our life   12:37 PM

jonlives   agreed   12:37 PM

holoway   if we do, we come back   12:37 PM

mparadise   Sorry holoway ,looked the other way for a moment   12:37 PM

holoway   we could spend the rest of our lives arguing about abstract corner cases   12:37 PM

jonlives   and we really have to make sure we document changes between versions :p   12:37 PM

holoway   or we can just *hit* those corner cases   12:37 PM

jonlives   like, a lot.   12:37 PM

holoway   :)   12:37 PM

jonlives: +100   12:37 PM

mparadise   jonlives: that's a big part of why I wrote documentation requirements into the RFC   12:38 PM

jonlives   and I thank you for that <3   12:38 PM

holoway   do people want another week to digest   12:38 PM

mparadise   to help keep things clear, so there's no confusion with what's supproted & where   12:38 PM

jonlives   honestly, I'm up for merging as is and trying a feature as holoway suggested.   12:38 PM

holoway	60 seconds to -1 if you want to wait	12:38 PM
ssd7_	I'm +1 on going forward with this idea with the understanding that we will need to revise it if we get eaten by a grue	12:38 PM
holoway	while mparadise explains	12:38 PM
thom	i think we suck it and see. +1	12:39 PM
jonlives	gonna make it a lot easier to add stuff like metadata fields for damn sure :p	12:39 PM
holoway	ya	12:39 PM
_ranjib	Yup	12:39 PM
holoway	okay	12:39 PM
	lets do it	12:39 PM
	done	12:41 PM
	okay, on to the 'should we be considering these' queue	12:41 PM
	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/3	12:41 PM
lamont_oc	jonlives: actually the server supports arbitrary metadata already, just discovered that yesterday	12:41 PM
nathenharv…	John Keiser is out. I updated the agenda so that lamont_oc is up next withhttps://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/100	12:41 PM
holoway	ok	12:41 PM
mparadise	jonlives:we made an interesting re-discovery about metadata fields yesterday	12:41 PM

	lamont beat me to it	12:41 PM
jonlives	oh nice!!	12:41 PM
holoway	so I'm a liar	12:41 PM
nathenharv…	lamont_oc: you're up with https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/100	12:42 PM
holoway	this is desired/current state split	12:43 PM
lamont_oc	okay	12:43 PM
	so updated the endpoints to /desired and /current	12:43 PM
	fleshed out the description more with the use case of locking down the /desired state so the node can't update it	12:43 PM
	also added some more about how it would be implemented with the node being composed of new desired and current objects, and the ACLs on the node would also be composed of those	12:44 PM
	that incorporates most of the feedback that i think i've gotten so far	12:45 PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] marcparadise pushed 1 new commit to mp/server-api-versioning: http://git.io/hui2	12:45 PM
	chef-rfc/mp/server-api-versioning b22c24a Marc A. Paradise: update per stevendanna's comment	12:45 PM
jonlives	with the latest revisions, I like this as is	12:45 PM
holoway	so one of my questions is, can we implement this without breaking the client side api by clever application of defaults?	12:45 PM
lamont_oc	yes, should be backcompat by default	12:45 PM
	that's easy	12:45 PM

nathenharv… 15 minute warning — 12:45 PM

thom yeah, i think this is good now — 12:46 PM

holoway awesome — 12:46 PM

then I am +1 — 12:46 PM

lamont_oc i'm not quite certain how to make node creation work in the world where nodes can't update their own desired state — 12:46 PM

holoway anyone -1? — 12:46 PM

lamont_oc so i want to chat with mark a about that, but its a bit of an implementation detail — 12:46 PM

holoway lamont_oc: they can register and report, they just have an empty run list — 12:46 PM

martinisoft Looking forward to this, +1 — 12:46 PM

jonlives I think this is what we all wish it had been like all along :p — 12:47 PM

jtimberman wait, nodes won't be able to update their run lists with tihs? — 12:47 PM

lamont_oc well alternatively we could say that in that world you have to use the new bootstrapping code that has the user create the node first — 12:47 PM

_ranjib I need more time to think on this, lot of code does node.save — 12:47 PM

holoway yeah — 12:47 PM

this is a big change — 12:47 PM

kallistec jtimberman: it will be possible to configure the server to behave that way — 12:47 PM

jtimberman kallistec: oh acls? — 12:47

holoway — that we're all +1 in principle, but we should be real sure — 12:47 PM

jtimberman — or whatever. — 12:47 PM

thom — jtimberman: might not. acls — 12:47 PM

holoway — ok - lets let this stay open for another week — 12:48 PM

jtimberman — as long as i can still make that happen i'm +1 — 12:48 PM

lamont_oc — jtimberman: that's an option. won't be the default at first for certain. the existing behavior will always be an option. — 12:48 PM

holoway — to give marination time — 12:48 PM

that gives _ranjib time to think and comment — 12:48 PM

jtimberman — because i really like being able to modify node's run lists in a run. — 12:48 PM

holoway — but we're really close — 12:48 PM

yeah, and that won't break — 12:48 PM

and the defaults should be the back-compat ones — 12:48 PM

which means we can ship it — 12:48 PM

which I love — 12:48 PM

_ranjib — Yeah — 12:49 PM

holoway — if we can make it a behavior change you opt in to over time, that's the best — 12:49 PM

kallistec right, self-creating nodes is a thing that everyone of a certain scale will do, plus some other use cases (aws autoscale)   12:49 PM

lamont_oc yeah, some people would like the option to break that for security, there's a future bikeshed about making that the default. we will always support the current behavior as an option at least.   12:49 PM

nathenharv… 10 minute warning   12:50 PM

chip- The ability to restrict nodes from updating their own run_lists has been brought up in every THE ENTERPRISE engagement I've ever had.   12:50 PM

holoway nathenharvey: lets mark this for next time   12:50 PM

chip- it makes compliance offers sweat bullets   12:50 PM

nathenharv… holoway: yep   12:50 PM

holoway (also, I could build you a compliant system that works like phil describes - node assignment isn't arbitrary, which is what you actually want)   12:50 PM

(and code is tightly controlled before it gets injected to the environment)   12:50 PM

(but it doesn't mean we shouldn't implement the feature)   12:51 PM

:)   12:51 PM

https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/36   12:51 PM

Github Issue Workflow fOr Chef   12:51 PM

lamont_oc and _ranjib: node.save still works the way it always does as far as the 'user' is concerned -- if you update your run_list then we'll 'dirty' the desired state and the next node.save will update it on the server.   12:51 PM

_ranjib Ok   12:51

nathenharv... thom: you've been doing work on that lately. want to get us caught up? https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/36 — 12:51 PM

thom yeah — 12:52 PM

so a lot of what i've done is just line up with the current policy around maintainers — 12:52 PM

and try and make it clear that we want to get as many PRs in as possible, so we're willing to be lenient in what we accept — 12:52 PM

adamedx_ is now known as adamedx — 12:53 PM

holoway by which we mean we're willing to have maintainers clean them up? — 12:53 PM

thom yep — 12:53 PM

holoway cool — 12:53 PM

jtimberman yeah — 12:54 PM

thom not required, but if a maintainer wants to do that, it's a great opportunity to help the submitter learn, and it gets us more code — 12:54 PM

holoway man, that diagram is both awesome and makes me want a bot — 12:54 PM

thom i might actually hype that a little more — 12:54 PM

holoway: :D — 12:54 PM

jonlives might it be worth adding a category to cater for people who write a PR but don't know rspec well enough to write tests for it? — 12:54 PM

jtimberman like, not merging a PR because there's some minor code placement and waiting for the contributor to do that for *months* is a bad experience for them, when it would probably take just as much time to just rewrite the things. i've been doing this on cookbooks and *shocker* it's not a big deal :) — 12:55 PM

jonlives — seems like that's almost a separate branch that requires more work — 12:55 PM

jtimberman — lots of people seem to appreciate it :) — 12:55 PM

holoway — we did that a lot in the early days — 12:55 PM

thom — the diagram i take no credit for, that's all serdar — 12:55 PM

jtimberman — yup — 12:55 PM

holoway — we taught a lot of people rspec — 12:55 PM

thom — jtimberman: yeah exactly — 12:55 PM

jtimberman — lack of unit tests means "we have a mentoring opportunity" — 12:55 PM

thom — ok, i'll add some specifics there — 12:55 PM

nathenharv… — 5 minute warning — 12:56 PM

thom — is it goodness otherwise? — 12:56 PM

holoway — I think as long as we're clear that we're not *requiring* a maintainer to do it — 12:56 PM

jonlives — yeah — 12:56 PM

holoway — use your judgement — 12:56 PM

thom — yah — 12:56 PM

holoway — we could even have a crew of people who volunteer to do that kind of cleanup — 12:56 PM

	which would be interesting	12:57 PM
jtimberman	i'm totally volunteering to do that for cookbooks :)	12:57 PM
lamont_oc	there are some PRs that we've closed without prejudice because there weren't specs and the feature wasn't sufficiently interesting enough to prioritize	12:57 PM
holoway	thom: update the rfc to reflect what we just said, then shout out all the maintainers on a comment	12:57 PM
	and get ourselves a bunch of +1s	12:57 PM
thom	roger	12:57 PM
holoway	and lets get this mergified	12:58 PM
	and... that's a wrap	12:58 PM
	2 minutes early	12:58 PM
martinisoft	Agreed there, I like this overall and would even propose we look at making small tools to help automate parts of this workflow to make it easier for maintainers to be aware of things like the article holoway linked to (the high-five thing)	12:58 PM
nathenharv…	we made it through the agenda :)	12:58 PM
jonlives	I like this weekly thing, stuff gets done :p	12:58 PM
holoway	martinisoft: absolutely	12:58 PM
btm	kallistec: https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/105 <-- draft of raodmapping as promised last week.	12:58 PM
nathenharv…	next meeting is March 26. We will then take a week off for ChefConf	12:58 PM

martinisoft	My OSS plate is fairly full, I like to lean on automation to keep me focused if I can <3	12:58 PM
jtimberman	nathenharvey: but that doesn't mean that at chefconf's community summit we can't have an open space session to jump in IRC ;)	12:59 PM
kallistec	btm: thanks!	12:59 PM
nathenharv…	**** MEETING ENDS ***	12:59 PM