```
nathenharv...  ***** MEETING STARTS *****
holoway        jonlives: you want to be decider today, and I'll get myself situated with whats been going on?   12:03 PM
jonlives       holoway: sure                                                                                     12:03 PM
nathenharv...  Agenda for today: https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...                              12:03 PM
jonlives       ok, first up we have a community update from nathenharvey                                         12:04 PM
nathenharv...  hello everyone! weekly reminder about the cookbook survey -http://bit.ly/chefconf2015-cookbook-survey   12:04 PM
               Community Summit is Oct 14-15 in Seattle                                                          12:05 PM
               I'll be in London over the weekend and early next week scouting locations for the London summit which will likely   12:05
               be the second week of November                                                                    PM
jonlives       whee                                                                                              12:06 PM
ssd7           wooooot                                                                                           12:06 PM
nathenharv...  Some of us will be meeting up Saturday night for drinks. lmk if you can join us                   12:06 PM
martinisoft    yay :)                                                                                            12:06 PM
               *marks out calendar for summit*                                                                   12:06
```

```
                                                                                                PM
nathenharv...  Microsoft announced Ignite 2016 last week. Ignite is their big tech conference. and they announced it for the same   12:07
               dates as what we have planned for ChefConf                                                                             PM
jkeiser        Doh                                                                                                                     12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
nathenharv...  so...the dates of ChefConf 2016 will likely change                                                                      12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
jonlives       that's irksome                                                                                                          12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
adamedx        I'm sure once they see the chefconf date, they will wisely change theirs                                                12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
kierrr         oof                                                                                                                     12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
moted          :(                                                                                                                      12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
nathenharv...  we're playing a game of chicken with Microsoft. I'm pretty sure they'll end up moving to accommodate us.                12:07
                                                                                                                                        PM
stevenmur...   to be fair, that's pretty much the same week as they always have had teched                                             12:08
                                                                                                                                        PM
               it's usually been right around mother's day                                                                             12:08
                                                                                                                                        PM
nathenharv...  yeah, so, stay tuned on that. and that's the community update for today                                                 12:08
                                                                                                                                        PM
jonlives       thanks nathenharvey! ok, next we have updates on client & server etc from adamedx                                       12:08
                                                                                                                                        PM
```

```
adamedx   hello                                                                                12:08 PM
          my part of the update: we are working on a chefkdk release for early next week       12:09 PM
          with additional goodness around policyfile support                                   12:09 PM
jonlives  ooh nice                                                                             12:09 PM
adamedx   and now                                                                              12:09 PM
          I turn it over to ssd7 and mparadise                                                 12:09 PM
          for some server fun                                                                  12:09 PM
ssd7      First, our apologies for not sending out an update on the status of 12.1.0 before this.   12:09 PM
          The release has been delayed because our Hosted environment and a couple of our high-scale users have seen
          evidence of serious performance regressions. We want to fix these regressions before the 12.1.0 RC.   12:10 PM
          We deployed a new build with performance fixes to Hosted yesterday and will likely deploy some more fixes today.
          These changes are looking good so far, but we are still looking over the results and need to follow up with the user
          reports to ensure that they also address the issues seen by those users.             12:10 PM
          If you want or need to start testing the 12.1.0 release immediately, you can test the builds that we publish to the
          "current" packagecloud.io repository:                                                12:10 PM
          https://packagecloud.io/chef/current                                                 12:10 PM
```

```
           That's all from me. mparadise I think has things to say about one of the RFCs which comes a little later. (Unless    12:11
           you want to add something else to that ^)                                                                              PM
jonlives   anything for the server update mparadise?                                                                           12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
adamedx    yeah                                                                                                                12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
           I think that can wait until the rfc discussion                                                                      12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
           ssd7 thank u for update                                                                                             12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
mparadise  ssd has covered it well for the server/12.1 update.                                                                 12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
jonlives   ok - so a bunch of the stuff on the agenda was merged as it was approved last week and / or an rfc template         12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
           so the first new one is this tweak to the chef server API RFC:https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/123             12:12
                                                                                                                                  PM
mparadise  There are two significant changes beyond some minor corrections in this PR. This have come about as we've           12:13
           begun implementing client-side support for the header.                                                                 PM
           *these                                                                                                              12:13
                                                                                                                                  PM
           First: Previously if you did not specify an X-Ops-Server-API-Version, it would default to the minimum supported     12:13
           version. Now, it will default to 0 - and if 0 is below the minimum supported version, it will reply with a 406. This   PM
           allows us to ensure that clients that aren't version aware can't perform requests with the possible expectation of
           old/removed behaviors.
           Second: All responses will now contain a header X-Ops-Server-API-Version in the form { "min_version":A,             12:14
```

"max_version":B, "request_version": X, "response_version": Z}. PM

request_version is the version that the client requested, and repsonse_version is the version used to service the request. These will generally match except in 12:14 PM

cases of an unsupported/invalid request version, or when no header is present in the request. 12:14 PM

jonlives is defaulting to 0 likely to break any API clients that we know of at this point? 12:14 PM

mparadise We introduced this so that we had a means of knowing from the client whether or not we are talking to a server that has knowledge of versioning - if it does not know about versions, the header will be missing. 12:14 PM

Release 12.1 will deprecated the X-Ops-Api-Version-Info header, which is obsoleted by the new header. 12:14 PM

jonlives: eventually, yes. 12:14 PM

holoway mparadise: eventually what? it will break them? 12:15 PM

mparadise When the server revs to a point where version 0 support is dropped, old clients will not be permitted to make requests 12:15 PM

kallistec jonlives, mparadise but only when version 0 is retired 12:15 PM

at which point they would've broken anyway 12:15 PM

holoway right 12:15 PM

jonlives I think we need to communicate that very carefully then, because that means release X will suddenly cause all non-updated clients to break 12:15 PM

```
holoway      in the same way if we hadn't had it                                          12:15 PM

             ie:the version 0.6 Server API doesn't neccessarily work any more              12:15 PM

kallistec    jonlives: right, that'd be a 13.0 or 14.0                                    12:16 PM

jonlives     gotcha                                                                       12:16 PM

mparadise    If we hadn't, it could cause partial breakages or unexpected behaviors on    12:16 PM
             clients that don't know about versioning.

jonlives     could we specify in the RFC that said change would need to be in a major     12:16 PM
             release, if we didn't already?

martinisoft  jonlives: +1 on that addition *searches through RFC*                         12:17 PM

mparadise    The RFC doesn't address when those fall in product release cycles,but I      12:17 PM
             think the product lifecycle RFC could be updated for this?

jonlives     mainly I'm thinking that this would be pretty dramatic breakage so it'd be   12:18 PM
             good to clarify explicitly that this will be in a major release

mparadise    Alright, I can add that.                                                     12:18 PM

jonlives     sweet                                                                        12:18 PM

ssd7         So, to be clear, nothing in this RFC currently would break existing          12:19 PM
             clients. The goal was explicitly to not break existing clients. I imagine
             that deprecating v0 would be another RFC some point in the far future.
```

```
jonlives   aaah I see   12:20 PM
kallistec   or just a natural event in the release cycle   12:20 PM
jonlives   I missed that part   12:20 PM
kallistec   except that we now have a much better way of talking about it   12:20 PM
holoway   ya   12:20 PM
jonlives   i thought that defaulting to 0 would break stuff straight away, my bad.   12:20 PM
ssd7   kallistec: Right, we can choose when and how to deprecate v0, if ever.   12:20 PM
lamont_oc   this also lets the server support v0 and v1 and v2 at the same time and makes it easier to not break old clients when we have to implement v1   12:20 PM
jonlives   ok I feel better about this now then   12:20 PM
kallistec   yeah, v0 is "same behavior as a month ago"   12:21 PM
jonlives   ok with that said then, feedback on the PR has been many +1s, does anybody have any objections to approving this one?   12:21 PM
lamont_oc   otherwise shipping v1 would be a breaking change that would drop support for v0 suddenly and be a major change. now its a minor bump as long as v0 can still be supported.   12:21 PM
```

mparadise	lamont_oc: yes. And good thing, because 12.1 will be API v1 :)	12:22 PM
jonlives	last chance for any -1s or I'm a-merging this one	12:22 PM
	ok, 'tis approved.	12:23 PM
	will merge after the meeting	12:23 PM
holoway	woot	12:23 PM
jonlives	next we have https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/118 - last week we said that if chef-config was close to releasable by this meeting we'd proceed with that as the implementation - update from kallistec?	12:23 PM
kallistec	lemme find the PR for chef-config	12:23 PM
	https://github.com/chef/chef/pull/3270	12:24 PM
github-bawt	[13chef-rfc] 15jonlives closed pull request #123: Fix small mistake and add min / max headers to versioning rfc. (06master...06tc/update-versioning-rfc) 02http://git.io/vUv3g	12:24 PM
kallistec	status is, specs pass on Unix and Windows (or at least appveyor windows)	12:24 PM
lamont_oc	yeah, its very nearly there	12:24 PM
kallistec	kitchen tests do not pass b/c we need one extra build step to install the chef-config gem	12:24 PM

```
           and a similar change will be required to omnibus-software                                   12:25
                                                                                                          PM
jonlives   excellent. in which case, does anybody have any objections to continuing with chef-config  12:25
           instead of approving #118?                                                                     PM
kallistec  aside from that I don't foresee any roadblocks                                              12:25
                                                                                                          PM
lamont_oc  yeah, lets do it                                                                            12:26
                                                                                                          PM
adamedx    +1                                                                                          12:26
                                                                                                          PM
jonlives   sweet                                                                                       12:26
                                                                                                          PM
           RFC wise, do we want to do a new one to specify exactly what format the config used by     12:26
           chef-config for ohai will take?                                                                PM
lamont_oc  i think we have that separately already?                                                    12:26
                                                                                                          PM
thom       +1                                                                                          12:27
                                                                                                          PM
ranjib     yeah. thats in the existing RFC already                                                     12:27
                                                                                                          PM
jonlives   which RFC?                                                                                  12:27
                                                                                                          PM
           ranjib: did you mean that's in #118 or a different one?                                     12:28
                                                                                                          PM
```

```
ranjib     118                                                                                        12:28 PM
jonlives   aaah ok,.                                                                                  12:28 PM
           right, so we approve #118, with chef-config as the implementation that enables it.         12:29 PM
           do we need any changes to #118 in light of chef-config now being a thing?                  12:29 PM
kallistec  with chef-config being a thing, we can use the config_context mechanism instead of Ohai::Config   12:29 PM
jonlives   i think we're gonna need to remove references to client.rb and ohai.rb etc                 12:30 PM
           kallistec: could you take a look over #118 and tweak it to match what chef-config will make it look like then?   12:30 PM
           then we can mergerate it                                                                   12:30 PM
kallistec  for comparison, here is the chef_zero config contexthttps://github.com/chef/chef/blob/master/lib/ch...   12:30 PM
           in your config file you write chef_zero.port = 1974                                        12:31 PM
           jonlives: I will work with BTM on that                                                     12:31 PM
jonlives   awesome thanks                                                                             12:31 PM
```

```
           holoway: for context there, we were vetting if chef-config was going to be do-able instead of needing to look at   12:32
           another way to implement #118                                                                                        PM
           turns out it is, so yay :p                                                                                         12:32
                                                                                                                                PM
holoway    dope                                                                                                               12:32
                                                                                                                                PM
jonlives   that's it for the official agenda - jkeiser has added https://github.com/chef/chef-                                 12:33
           rfc/pull/126 and https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/127, and suggested that since today is a bit of a light meeting PM
           we could chat about them a bit
someara    re: #126 - is this different than the current compile_time stuff?                                                  12:34
                                                                                                                                PM
jkeiser    someara: this can be set at the recipe or cookbook level                                                           12:35
                                                                                                                                PM
someara    because .run_action has been a thorn since it was introduced.                                                      12:35
                                                                                                                                PM
           was really hoping to see it go away completely                                                                     12:35
                                                                                                                                PM
jkeiser    It is similar to compile_time in chef_gem, but applicable to everything                                            12:35
                                                                                                                                PM
jonlives   jkeiser: what's the motivation for #126 out of curiosity? that part is still boilerplate :p                         12:35
                                                                                                                                PM
           it seems to break the compile time / converge time distinction to me at first glance, curious as to the use case   12:36
                                                                                                                                PM
jkeiser    jonlives: the motivation is that the compile/converge model confuses and trips up users frequently, and the        12:36
           solutions to it are unclear                                                                                          PM
```

```
jonlives   is the eventual aim of this to merge the two stages then or something?                              12:36 PM

jkeiser    The idea is to let people live in an immediate mode if they would like to, without affecting other cookbooks and   12:36 PM
           users
           jonlives: I would like to, yes--but that'll be a whole nother conversation when it happens :)       12:37 PM

jonlives   hehe                                                                                                12:37 PM

jkeiser    A number of people would like to                                                                    12:37 PM

           This gives us the path, and lets users live in that model if they want to, so they can concentrate on their code   12:37 PM

holoway    jkeiser: I feel like this could be a huge mess                                                      12:38 PM

jonlives   I'm a little unsure if I like making the two stages more fuzzy in this way - it's gonna produce some cookbooks with   12:38 PM
           decidedly non-default behaviour in terms of when stuff runs in them.
jkeiser    The spec's job is to say how you can put resources and recipes into immediate mode, and to specify how that   12:38 PM
           interacts with the rest of the world
jonlives   my initial read is that this might *add* confusion.                                                 12:38 PM

holoway    I also have to say that I think the "trips up users" thing is overblown, but we could actually do some study to figure   12:38 PM
           that out
jonlives   i mean, I get where it's coming from, but it's allowing optional breaking of a fairly central paradigm of the way chef   12:39 PM
           works.
```

```
jkeiser   Sure. I see questions about it constantly, frustration and confusion from users of provisioning for example   12:39
                                                                                                                  PM
holoway   and it'll be completely opaque                                                                          12:39
                                                                                                                  PM
someara   I'm having trouble groking this one without having actually lived in the New Resource World yet          12:39
                                                                                                                  PM
jkeiser   Completely opaque?                                                                                      12:39
                                                                                                                  PM
holoway   and how do notifications work?                                                                          12:40
                                                                                                                  PM
jkeiser   It's in the spec                                                                                        12:40
                                                                                                                  PM
holoway   yeah - there will be no way to work together                                                            12:40
                                                                                                                  PM
          with things that don't work in "immediate" mode                                                         12:40
                                                                                                                  PM
jkeiser   Nah, they can. All notifications work the same, with one exception                                      12:40
                                                                                                                  PM
          If your resource runs immediately, and you try to send an immediate notification to a resource that hasn't been   12:40
          compiled yet, you can't do that                                                                         PM
jonlives  wouldn't this also mean that the resource collection would potentially be incomplete when a resource executes?   12:40
          you'd have to be very sure that everything it used was loaded prior to the "immediate" part             PM
holoway   what if the resource hasn't been defined?                                                               12:40
                                                                                                                  PM
```

```
jkeiser   ^^                                                                                  12:41 PM
holoway   right                                                                               12:41 PM
jkeiser   If the resource hasn't been defined, then you can send a delayed notification to it 12:41 PM
holoway   breaking, to be blunt, the *entire model in which you can declare things*           12:41 PM
someara   "run_resources :immediately` is not infectious"                                     12:41 PM
          see, I'd expect it to be                                                            12:41 PM
jonlives  but you're then sending a delayed notification to something which may not exist    12:41 PM
holoway   it *has* to be infectious to be sane                                                12:41 PM
          but then you remove all the ability to handle the things the resource collection can allow you to do  12:41 PM
jkeiser   jonlives: this is an issue?                                                         12:42 PM
jonlives  and since it hasn't been loaded yet, you don't know if it *will* exist.             12:42 PM
holoway   hell yeah its and issue                                                             12:42 PM
```

```
jonlives   jkeiser: it would make for very confusing errors                                      12:42 PM
jkeiser    jonlives: yeah, we resolve it when we resolve all other delayed notifications         12:42 PM
           I don't think it would. I think the error would look identical                        12:42 PM
holoway    it's the timing                                                                       12:42 PM
jkeiser    And happen at exactly the same point                                                  12:42 PM
holoway    I think this creates a mess that you can't walk back from                             12:42 PM
           we either have a model where you declare the resources you want                       12:43 PM
kallistec  I think you can paper over the notification thing by some sort of `only_if_dependend_resource_updated
           "resource[foo]"                                                                       12:43 PM
holoway    or we have a model where you don't have a resource collection at all                  12:43 PM
           and things execute immediately after definition                                       12:43 PM
           but living in the middle world is going to be fraught with ridiculous peril           12:43 PM
           one person turns on immediate mode                                                    12:43 PM
```

jkeiser	holoway: but what if you want to also be able to notify those resources? I think a resource collection still makes sense	12:43 PM
holoway	and all bets are off on the actual order	12:43 PM
jonlives	I don't like the idea that compile time would become "where things are loaded apart from sometimes where they run too"	12:43 PM
ranjib	+1. we need to post installation <-> pre execution hook	12:44 PM
holoway	my point is we need to be either all in or not	12:44 PM
jonlives	and also what holoway said is very true - order matters is a lot harder if a reaource might run at compile time instead	12:44 PM
holoway	if we have usability problems with the resource collection, fin	12:44 PM
	but you are fucking with order, and the order matters	12:44 PM
jkeiser	Order matters a lot, yeah	12:44 PM
	That's why the current system is so confusing	12:44 PM
holoway	no	12:44 PM
someara	at the same time, you *do* often need to converge before compiling a resource collection	12:44 PM

holoway	it's why the current system works	12:44 PM
ranjib	something like initializers .. to cleanly support this style .. else it screws the whole notification/resource collection/two phase mental modes.	12:45 PM
jonlives	i really don't think the current system is confusing though - I think we can better communicate what it does and why though.	12:45 PM
holoway	*or* its why a system without a resource collection works	12:45 PM
nathenharv...	5 minute warning	12:45 PM
lamont_oc	i'd like to see this as a global setting for a given resource collection at least	12:45 PM
someara	what about per-recipe compile/converge cycles?	12:45 PM
jkeiser	If you write X, Y, and Z statements in your code, then the system currently runs Y first if it's not a resource, and X and Z after. Out of order	12:45 PM
holoway	what I'm against isn't the idea that we can get to a functionally useful system that gives you what you want	12:45 PM
jkeiser	Out of order execution is the root of the confusion	12:46 PM
holoway	jkeiser: that's because you are not being declarative	12:46 PM
lamont_oc	so then we could turn it on for a whole LWRP and that wouldn't cause any issues with the execution of the main resource collection	12:46 PM

```
holoway    I see why its a problem                                                              12:46 PM
jkeiser    Yeah, so question: if we can turn it on for an entire resource collection rather     12:46 PM
           than selectively, what does that do?
jonlives   that problem won't go away here, it'll just let you write even *more* confusing      12:46 PM
           recipes where some of the resources run out of order too :p
holoway    if you want to fix that confusiuon                                                   12:47 PM
jkeiser    Like, let's just say, "main recipes don't get to run serially"                       12:47 PM
holoway    either everything moves to the model where it executes                               12:47 PM
           immediately after declaration                                                        12:47 PM
           or make Chef be more clear that you probably don't get what you expect               12:47 PM
           but when, for example, I declare a function                                          12:47 PM
           I don't get pissed off that it didn't run immediately                                12:48 PM
jkeiser    That's the thing, a function is sort of a template, you know it won't run because    12:48 PM
           you have to pass more input to it for it to even do its job
           A resource isn't like that, it *looks* like you've specified everything you need     12:48 PM
```

```
nathenharv...  2 minutes left                                                           12:48 PM
holoway        jkeiser: not for nothing, but what do you think a resource is?           12:48 PM
               jkeiser: a resource is EXACTLY like that                                 12:48 PM
               that's why we declare them                                               12:49 PM
               it's one reason it's *not just a fancy makefile*                         12:49 PM
jkeiser        holoway: so what are the parameters you later pass in order to instantiate the resource?   12:49 PM
holoway        jkeiser: it's not about parameters you pass, it's about when to execute the function (which you already know)   12:49 PM
               but I'm missing my point for the weeds                                   12:49 PM
               a hybrid makes it worse, not better                                      12:50 PM
               this won't be less confusing                                             12:50 PM
jkeiser        Yeah. I'll retool around non-hybrid                                      12:50 PM
holoway        it will be more                                                          12:50 PM
```

```
jkeiser        Message heard                                                                 12:50 PM

               So think about this for next time:                                            12:50 PM

holoway        and given that we have literally thousands of people who seem to be able     12:50 PM
               to cope with the way it is, and have modeled lots of complexity in it

               changing it needs to meet a wicked high bar                                   12:50 PM

jkeiser        People live in the world they are given                                       12:50 PM

               Especially when it's hard to change that world                                12:51 PM

holoway        because the potential for *complete chaos* is very high                       12:51 PM

jkeiser        If this proposal existed, but was controlled a flag on the run context       12:52 PM
               could be enabled by the user doing the run (*before* it started), how
               would that affect things

nathenharv...  we are at time                                                                12:53 PM

jkeiser        Like, if you could say even on a whole Chef run,                             12:53 PM
               `Chef::Config.immediate_mode`--and we would either error or warn if you
               tried to forward-reference something with an :immediate notification--no
               other changes

               Thanks all, that was super useful :)                                          12:53 PM

kallistec      also, no one responded to someara, but 'what about per-recipe                12:53 PM
               compile/converge cycles?' if we got there first, then per-recipe
               immediate converge would be less chaos
```

```
jkeiser    Yeah, run_recipe is that actually                                                                12:53 PM
holoway    kallistec: assuming each cycle was isolated and run in order, that would be just fine            12:53 PM
kallistec  if we intended to do that we'd need to be very sure that's where we want to go                   12:54 PM
jkeiser    Are you saying you're actually cool with each recipe in an existing run_list having its own compile/converge cycle?   12:54 PM
kallistec  so I really want to see what immediate mode feels like in real life                              12:54 PM
holoway    I'm saying it doesn't break the model of predictable, understandable order                       12:54 PM
jkeiser    I think that's a fair objection :)                                                               12:54 PM
holoway    because at least for a given run list X, I know that it will run in X                            12:54 PM
           in a hybrid mode, I don't                                                                        12:55 PM
jkeiser    I will get rid of all semblance of mixed modes                                                   12:55 PM
kallistec  otherwise we'd be incrementing to a thing that IMO sounds good but may not actually be good      12:55 PM
holoway    1,2,3 could have 3 run before 1                                                                  12:55 PM
```

```
           and that's totally unacceptable                                                            12:55 PM
jkeiser    Totally on board                                                                           12:55 PM
ranjib     how does cross recipe resource notifications work in per-recipe compile/converge style     12:55 PM
holoway    ranjib: it wouldn't                                                                        12:55 PM
           would be my guess                                                                          12:55 PM
           (I wouldn't do per-recipe, I owuld probably have compasable run lists)                     12:55 PM
someara    I feel like we should have a tool to visualize resource collections                        12:55 PM
           this stuff makes my head hurt                                                              12:56 PM
kallistec  ranjib: yeah, we'd have to reverse it so you do a subscribes but internally we don't convert the subscribe to a notify   12:56 PM
ranjib     hence i was trying to suggest.. what about a notification free stage                       12:56 PM
kallistec  where "convert the subscribe to a notify" is what occurs now                               12:56 PM
jkeiser    Yeah, I worry about the per-recipe thing more than I worry about a full-run immediate mode  12:56 PM
```

```
holoway        me too                                                                                    12:56 PM
kallistec      it'd have to be more like a specialized only_if, as I said                                12:56 PM
ranjib         i.e. initializers,, use chef dsl.., but not two phase style                               12:56 PM
jkeiser        There is a way we could go about getting a feel for this that doesn't break the whole world actually: we could feature-flag it with Chef::Config.immediate_mode (or something) that makes it clear it could go away, and let people get a feel for living in the world by enabling it   12:57 PM
holoway        I think there isn't any argument (I don't have one, anyway) that doesn't say a world where I can have my cake and eat it to, in terms of being able to say the value of a resource paramter is `cat /tmp/poop` where /tmp/poop comes from a resource   12:57 PM
kallistec      also another thing for me is that I really wouldn't want this behavior change tucked away in a metadata setting I would want to see it in the file   12:57 PM
nathenharv...  Let's keep this discussion going and it'll obviously be part of next week's meeting. But we need to end this meeting today to respect everyone's calendar   12:57 PM
holoway        is good                                                                                   12:57 PM
               sure                                                                                      12:57 PM
               released :)                                                                               12:58 PM
jkeiser        holoway: if you could take a look at the other RFC as well, that'd be nice :)             12:58 PM
nathenharv...  **** MEETING ENDS **** (but the conversation continues)                                   12:58
```

PM