

	*** MEETING STARTS ***	
	Agenda for today's meeting is here: <a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-community-irc-m...">https://github.com/opscode/chef-community-irc-m...</a>	9:01 AM
j^2	nathenharvey: thanks for the link	9:03 AM
holoway	lets jump straight to RFC chatter, yes?	9:03 AM
jonlives	sounds good	9:03 AM
nathenharv...	yes, unless anyone as additions to the agenda they'd like to suggest immediately	9:03 AM
	barring that, we should start with the PR about chef-solo. I believe this was discussed at the last meeting (I wasn't here) but the discussion was to be continued today	9:04 AM
holoway	lets do this one <a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/54">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/54</a>	9:04 AM
	chef-solo == chef-zero	9:04 AM
coderanger	holoway: Is there a reason we are re-discussing that one?	9:05 AM
holoway	only because it was on my agenda :)	9:05 AM
nathenharv...	It's my understanding that the discussion last time didn't include holoway and we agreed to discuss with him here today	9:05 AM
coderanger	Was talked about last week, conclusion was that it is frozen at least until chef_fs supports Ruby formats, until then there is no point even talking about it	9:05 AM
nathenharv...	(but I wasn't here last time either)	9:05 AM
holoway	coderanger: since its an RFC, though, shouldn't we merge it simply as a declaration of our intent?	9:05 AM
	(for example, we merged the Chef 12 features RFC before we wrote them)	9:06 AM

coderanger	holoway: Unless that intent will actually happen in a reasonable timeframe, I don't think so	9:06 AM
	Like we don't even have a plan on this one other than "do the thing"	9:06 AM
	and we know for a fact that there are major blockers	9:06 AM
holoway	I'm hesitant to leave it open but silently approved	9:07 AM
	for example, it basically says to me that we're undecided	9:07 AM
	and we're not - its a question of humans doing the work, but we should declare that we want to do the work	9:07 AM
	am I the only one that feels like that?	9:08 AM
adamleff	No, I completely agree with you, holoway. Document the pre-requisites in order for movement to start, and we should accept.	9:08 AM
miah	+1	9:08 AM
kallistec	this line of argument makes sense. Agree that we should document what level of compatibility we expect to happen	9:08 AM
miah	as chef-solo users it would be nice for us to have some knowledge of the roadmap	9:08 AM
coderanger	I think it is a question of degree, this one is so far off we don't know what the pre-reqs are other than a few notable blockers	9:08 AM
kallistec	coderanger: can we describe them in terms of outcomes?	9:09 AM
holoway	I think the outcomes are clear	9:09 AM
	I don't think it needs to hold on an implementation plan	9:09 AM
jonlives	i think given the main outcome is 100% chef-zero and chef-solo compat, if we merge it, it at least means we shouldn't move *away* from that objective.	9:10 AM

	statement of intent, as holoway said.	9:10 AM
holoway	I'm putting the shipit stick on it	9:10 AM
	jkeiser: lets figure out the resources to put on it	9:11 AM
	governance and maintenance	9:11 AM
jkeiser	Sounds good	9:11 AM
j^2	jkeiser: holoway \o/	9:12 AM
holoway	<a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/58">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/58</a>	9:12 AM
jonlives	as it stands, i think it's mergeable.	9:13 AM
coderanger	+1 from me :)	9:13 AM
adamleff	+1 - and great conversation in the PR, too. That was awesome.	9:13 AM
holoway	does anyone here have questions, or think its not a good place for us to begin?	9:13 AM
miah	html in a md?	9:13 AM
	i guess it 'views' fine	9:13 AM
nathenharv...	coderanger: thanks for writing up the blog posts about this! <a href="https://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/11/10/chef-go...">https://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/11/10/chef-go...</a>	9:14 AM
holoway	and thanks to jonlives for his clarification of the appeals process	9:14 AM
jonlives	de nada	9:14 AM

miah	so far i think #58 looks awesome	9:14 AM
holoway	alright - 30 seconds and then I'm putting the merge button on	9:15 AM
	noah does have a question about qualified voters	9:15 AM
	the tl;dr was anyone with a supermarket account is qualified to vote	9:16 AM
	was my thought	9:16 AM
coderanger	holoway: Do we want some kind of activity requirement?	9:16 AM
holoway	only if shit gets crazy on voting :)	9:16 AM
coderanger	OpenStack does "anyone with an accepted patch in the year before the election"	9:16 AM
	Fair	9:16 AM
holoway	I like the idea that people who care about Chef but aren't neccessarily contributing wiht code have a voice, in particular on CBGB	9:17 AM
jonlives	patch to what, in this case tho.	9:17 AM
	holoway: seconded	9:17 AM
holoway	since we (the developers) literally took all the actual power	9:17 AM
coderanger	Good point	9:17 AM
jonlives	i think supermarket accounts should be a good qualifier, we can always re-evaluate if things get crazy as holoway said.	9:17 AM
kallistec	Yeah, I think the BDFL powers of project lead are a fine check on any mischief	9:17 AM

holoway	there is no BDFL	9:18 AM
	:)	9:18 AM
	(your BDFL dislikes the phrase)	9:18 AM
kallistec	heh	9:18 AM
	<i>holoway smiles</i>	9:18 AM
jonlives	BAFL? :P	9:18 AM
miah	'dictator' 'voting' lol	9:18 AM
holoway	jonlives: you want to have one more PR to that thread and have that clarification?	9:18 AM
kallistec	point being that there is a check on any mischief and we can re-evaluate the process if it goes sour for unexpected reasons	9:18 AM
jonlives	holoway: sure, will do that just now	9:19 AM
ssd7	I'm +1 on supermarket accounts for now. I think we as a community will know when that isn't working	9:19 AM
	if it ever stops working	9:19 AM
holoway	ok - I put the +1 on it	9:20 AM
	jonlives: I'll merge your PR, and then you can take it away re: RFC editing	9:20 AM
	woot!	9:21 AM
	<i>holoway can't wait to give out commit bits</i>	9:21 AM

	nathenharvey: can you take point on implementing that RFC for us?	9:21 AM
miah	i'll start trying to commit again =)	9:21 AM
jonlives	holoway: done	9:21 AM
miah	er s/commit/contribute	9:21 AM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] jonlives opened pull request #68: Clarify qualified voters (gov_maint...gov_maint) <a href="http://git.io/Oz5M5w">http://git.io/Oz5M5w</a>	9:22 AM
nathenharv...	holoway: yes, indeed!	9:22 AM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] adamhjk pushed 3 new commits to gov_maint: <a href="http://git.io/VvoQYw">http://git.io/VvoQYw</a>	9:22 AM
	chef-rfc/gov_maint 6c6e50e Jon Cowie: Clarify qualified voters	9:22 AM
	chef-rfc/gov_maint 0997abc Jon Cowie: Merge branch 'gov_maint' of <a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc</a> into gov_maint	9:22 AM
	chef-rfc/gov_maint b53c252 Adam Jacob: Merge pull request #68 from jonlives/gov_maint...	9:22 AM
holoway	coderanger: I think ti would be appropriate if you did the needful on merging that PR	9:23 AM
	one sec	9:23 AM
jonlives	this is a very awesome moment, I have to say.	9:23 AM
coderanger	holoway: Will do :) I'll do them all after the meeting	9:23 AM
nathenharv...	much awesome.	9:24 AM
holoway	thanks to everyone who commented :)	9:24 AM

	lets get rid of sympa in celebration	9:24 AM
	<a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/63">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/63</a>	9:24 AM
jonlives	+10	9:24 AM
martinb3	+1000	9:24 AM
miah	+1	9:25 AM
holoway	is there anyone who is going to advocate for threadable over google groups?	9:25 AM
miah	(even though i cant deal with mailing lists) google groups will be a nice archive.	9:25 AM
	will threadable exist in 5 years?	9:26 AM
nathenharv...	questions like this have stalled this migration at least twice. I say: google groups ASAP	9:26 AM
miah	ya im more for GG than anything else	9:26 AM
jonlives	+1 for google groups	9:27 AM
adamleff	Also, threadable price may be a showstopper. :)	9:27 AM
ssd7	google groups is pretty much the only hosted option I think we should consider	9:27 AM
holoway	ok - lets merge this before we loose our will to write more email	9:27 AM
kallistec	OH of the day	9:27 AM
jonlives	heh	9:27 AM

<b>holoway</b>	ok - I stamped it, lets do the needful rfc-editors	9:28 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	:)	9:30 AM
<b>adamleff</b>	coderanger / jonlives: I know you have most of it down-pat, but if you need me to jump in on merging in any of the RFCs, let me know.	9:30 AM
<b>holoway</b>	ok - on to the next one	9:30 AM
	<a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/65">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/65</a>	9:30 AM
	token auth	9:30 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	This is one of mine if anyone has questions	9:31 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	i think this one looks fine	9:31 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	Given James' comments I would want to make sure this is compatible with the plans for chef-server from their side	9:32 AM
	It sounds like some work was already planned internally	9:32 AM
<b>ssd7</b>	I like it overall. I agree with seth falcon that server-side expiration policy would also be nice	9:32 AM
<b>holoway</b>	I like it too - what James was mentioning has come up in our own roadmap conversations for 15 prior to your RFC (nice timing!)	9:33 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	I think the server-side policy is just going to mean some tools don't work and the end user won't understand why	9:33 AM
	Should be a global thing	9:33 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	I like the general idea and am +1 on some form of it. I'm not yet sure I understand some of the details enough and am nervous about committing to some of the specifics as written	9:33 AM
<b>holoway</b>	one of the things this proposal brought up for me	9:33 AM



<b>kallistec</b>	right, is there any way to delegate more specifics to OAuth or something?	9:34 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	worth holding off for more detailed reading & commenting from chef-server folks and allied trades?	9:34 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	coderanger: but if you are running a chef-server for your org I could see needing to have a policy that says that people/tools have to re-auth over some period	9:34 AM
<b>holoway</b>	was that we need to be good to one another about the fact that the shape of what we can put in an RFC, and the specifics of what we actually produce might drift	9:34 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	sfalcon: I don't see much value in that, we don't do the same with keys so what would it add	9:34 AM
<b>ssd7</b>	coderanger: The only tools that didn't work would be those that didn't respect the specification though? Seem straightforward that you can request a token with expiry of X and then you get the min of X, SERVER_POLICY and are expected to check what you got back	9:34 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	and most tools are probably going to automatically acquire a token either from username/password or key	9:35 AM
	I think maybe we are talking past each other on the use for expiration times	9:36 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	The fact that keys don't ever expire is probably not considered a feature by some folks :)	9:36 AM
<b>holoway</b>	sfalcon: for sure - we're going to need to write up the key rotation endpoints as one good example of that	9:36 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	Generally if I was going to set expires on a key it would be +60s from now, as an ephemeral objcap proof	9:36 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	I'm a fan of this, especially if chef-client and browser clients can acquire tokens. I hate copying private keys around	9:36 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	coderanger: it seems totally legit that as an admin on a CS I can create a token with the expiration of my dreams. But not just anyone who can authN to the server can do that.	9:37 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	sfalcon: I'm just worried that the server policy stuff is inviting some very frustrating user experience	9:38 AM
<b>holoway</b>	coderanger: we could account for that, though - make the error message you	9:38

	get from the API awesome	AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	jkeiser: maybe a separate discussion, but tokens don't really solve key distribution?	9:38 AM
<b>ssd7</b>	or just make the default config no limit	9:38 AM
<b>coderranger</b>	Some admins will clamp down on it for no reason, ex. password policies	9:39 AM
<b>holoway</b>	jkeiser: yeah, I didn't understand that comment either	9:39 AM
	coderranger: but that doesn't mitigate the real use case	9:39 AM
	saying "we don't support that because we think your use case is stupid-pants"	9:39 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	coderranger: isn't that the point though? Some orgs _have_ password policies. They suck and are dumb. But not allowing the policy to be implemented...?	9:39 AM
<b>holoway</b>	isn't super awesome	9:39 AM
	:)	9:39 AM
<b>coderranger</b>	holoway: How much of a risk factor is stealing old keys? Is it that much more likely that you will steal an old key instead of a new one?	9:40 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	if we go to here, and there is a password-enabled page (even a web page) to create tokens, I can go up to the server, create a token by asking the user for their password, and then grab that token	9:40 AM
<b>coderranger</b>	Unless you are re-keying daily or weekly, I don't see it as removing that much risk from the system	9:40 AM
<b>holoway</b>	coderranger: you are making the wrong set of assumptions - I want to be able to say, as policy, that all keys expire in 1 day	9:41 AM
<b>coderranger</b>	And if you are re-keying that often, it has to be 100% automated so the policy doesn't really matter, it will know to set the expires time	9:41 AM
	holoway: Yes, I'm saying what does that actually get you	9:41 AM
<b>holoway</b>	coderranger: a feeling of contenment in my PCI audit?	9:41

		AM
<b>coderanger</b>	That means you think it is substantively more likely for a token to leak in its first 24 hours	9:41 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	Perhaps focusing on the expiry is a distraction. Clearly we can have both and it is an easy aspect to adjust/change	9:42 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	and I'm not sure on what basis that claim is being made	9:42 AM
<b>holoway</b>	it feels sane to me that I could set a policy on the identity endpoint with lifetime	9:43 AM
	and we can make the UX not suck	9:43 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	holoway: I still haven't seen a good description as to why though :)	9:43 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	Yeah, the only expiry question should be "is expiry a *required* feature for tokens--would we be OK with landing tokens if we didn't land expiry until later."	9:43 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	Well, expiry should be required, what we are discussing is admin overrides on expiry	9:43 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	I _think_ how some of these systems work is to embed assertions (for authz) into the token data and then there's some crypto around the token data.	9:43 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	I'm tired and not using all my words :)	9:44 AM
	s/expiry/expiry admin	9:44 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	sfalcon: Yes, I'm explicitly not doing that because signed tokens are annoying	9:44 AM
	nonce tokens are easier to implement and just as good in this situation	9:44 AM
<b>ssd7</b>	Are tokens valid even if the key that generated them is not longer valid?	9:44 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	The advantage of signed tokens is you can validate them without talking to chef server	9:45 AM
	ssd7: Yes, tied to the client or user, not the key	9:45 AM

<b>ssd7</b>	s/not/no/	9:45 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	ssd7: If the client or user is removed, then no, would not be valid just like existing keys wouldn't be valid	9:45 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	I'm up for the incremental approach. And I'm also interested in exploring how to get enough data into the token system to drive authz of some form (not object ACLs but more "roles")	9:45 AM
<b>holoway</b>	I think incremental feels right too	9:46 AM
	in particular, I suspect we will learn a bunch as we implement that we can't think about	9:46 AM
	in advance	9:46 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	For the endpoint, since tokens are tied to an identity, should it be scoped there?	9:46 AM
	e.g. /users/{user_name}/tokens	9:47 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	sfalcon: You can't create tokens for another user, so I don't think so	9:47 AM
<b>holoway</b>	but it's part of "you"	9:47 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	Do we want superusers or admins to be able to look at the list of a user's tokens?	9:47 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	coderanger: but an admin would want to manipulate and view tokens of other users? And maybe even create them?	9:47 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	yeah i was gonna say it feels more grokable having tokens under the user wot creates them API wise.	9:48 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	sfalcon: I was specifically avoiding that :) But it isn't unreasonable	9:48 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	It might make sense to scope them as sfalcon suggests, but make them inaccessible to anyone else	9:48 AM
<b>nathenharv...</b>	time warning: we only have 12 minutes left in this meeting. We should probably move this discussion to the ML or the PR or elsewhere and revisit at the next	9:48 AM

	meeting.	
<b>sfalcon</b>	It makes listing tokens more obviously non-scary :) same implementation details apply of course	9:48 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	Okay, will update the thing	9:48 AM
<b>holoway</b>	lets get more eyes on the PR	9:48 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	yeah	9:49 AM
<b>holoway</b>	but the clear intent is we want this	9:49 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	agreed	9:49 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	+1	9:49 AM
<b>holoway</b>	my guidance is try and get the MVP stated	9:49 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	coderanger: maybe we can find a time to chat a bit.	9:49 AM
<b>holoway</b>	if we can agree on what the mimum space is, lets do it	9:49 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	sfalcon: Sounds good	9:49 AM
<b>holoway</b>	also, new ec2 container service with scheduling	9:49 AM
<b>sfalcon</b>	I think what's there now is a great start especially through the lens of first thing to try	9:49 AM
<b>holoway</b>	ok, lets put this on the agenda again for next meeting	9:50 AM
<b>nathenharv...</b>	holoway: agree	9:50 AM
<b>holoway</b>	<a href="https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/66">https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/66</a>	9:51 AM

<b>nathenharv...</b>	I think we should move the other 2 PRs to next meeting, too and get on with our updates as we only have a few minutes left	9:51 AM
<b>holoway</b>	ok	9:51 AM
	lets do it	9:51 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	#66 isn't mergable yet anyway, but more comments welcome	9:51 AM
<b>holoway</b>	nathenharvey: go for it	9:51 AM
<b>nathenharv...</b>	community update. we're hosting a post mortem about a recent supermarket issue on Monday. you're all welcome to join us	9:51 AM
	<a href="https://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/11/13/contrib...">https://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/11/13/contrib...</a>	9:52 AM
	ChefConf 2015 dates, location, registration, cfp, etc are all now public	9:52 AM
	March 31 - April 2 at the Santa Clara Convention Center in California	9:52 AM
	Registration and CFP are now both open at <a href="http://chefconf.com">http://chefconf.com</a>	9:52 AM
	Tickets for contributors are \$700 with discount code CHEFSTAR	9:52 AM
	We are considering running a Community Summit / Open Spaces day on March 31 which is typically a day of training workshops. I'd love to know if you'd be interested in attending something like that.	9:52 AM
	We are also thinking about the training program that will be offered on March 31 and I'd be interested on your feedback about what classes should be offered. Last year we had git, ruby, post mortem, and kanban training in addition to the Chef classes.	9:52 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	nathenharvey: would love to have the summit	9:53 AM
<b>miah</b>	+1 summit	9:53 AM

<b>nathenharv...</b>	Check out juliancdunn's ML post about decommissioning the wiki - <a href="http://lists.opscode.com/sympa/arc/chef/2014-11...">http://lists.opscode.com/sympa/arc/chef/2014-11...</a>	9:53 AM
	also, James FitzGibbons has proposed a Chef stack exchange, participate in that proposal here - <a href="http://area51.stackexchange.com/proposals/77609...">http://area51.stackexchange.com/proposals/77609...</a>	9:53 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	+1 summit from me too	9:54 AM
<b>nathenharv...</b>	that's it for the community update. seems we're very likely to have a summit on March 31 as part of ChefConf :)	9:54 AM
<b>miah</b>	awesome	9:54 AM
<b>holoway</b>	on chef software things	9:55 AM
	I'm working with the rest of the company on our 2015 roadmap	9:55 AM
	and now that we've merged the RFC, we need to start figuring out who the LTs are	9:56 AM
<b>miah</b>	awesome	9:56 AM
<b>holoway</b>	and how that works in a roadmap	9:56 AM
	we're in kind of uncharted territory there, but we'll get started :)	9:57 AM
	sersut or kallistec have client updates?	9:57 AM
<b>sersut</b>	On the client side, we're proceeding as planned. GA release of Chef Client 12 is approaching. We'll be publishing a new RC today. Would appreciate if you can give it a shot and let us know if you see any blockers.	9:57 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	12 is backcompat with 11 server, right?	9:58 AM
	just to clarify	9:58 AM
<b>coderanger</b>	Yes	9:58 AM

<b>sersut</b>	On the exciting side jkeiser added Chef Provisioning into Chef DK and we've rolled out a release yesterday...	9:58 AM
<b>jonlives</b>	perfect	9:58 AM
<b>sersut</b>	that's pretty much it from the Client side..	9:59 AM
<b>holoway</b>	stephen or anyone else have server bidness?	9:59 AM
<b>mmzyk</b>	I'll jump in real fast with server update.	9:59 AM
<b>mmzyk</b>	Note was sent to the mailing list, RC6 is available for Server 12.	9:59 AM
	Testing is going on internally to fully vet it.	10:00 AM
	Hope for GA early next week.	10:00 AM
	Done.	10:00 AM
<b>nathenharv...</b>	Thanks, all. that's time, too	10:00 AM
<b>jkeiser</b>	chef-metal was renamed to chef-provisioning and is now available in the ChefDK (0.3.4). Announcing the RC (the ChefDK version) at AWS:reInvent today, blog post at <a href="https://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/11/12/chef-pr....">https://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/11/12/chef-pr....</a> 1.0 will come out when 1.0 bugs are driven to zero a la <a href="https://waffle.io/opscode/chef-provisioning">https://waffle.io/opscode/chef-provisioning</a> .	10:00 AM
<b>holoway</b>	awesome	10:01 AM
	thanks for coming, everyone	10:01 AM
	see you in two weeks	10:01 AM
	:)	10:02 AM
<b>nathenharv...</b>	thank you all for joining us today! Pretty amazing stuff all around	10:02



		AM
miah	<3	10:02
		AM
nathenharv...	*** MEETING ENDS ***	10:02
		AM