

| | | |
|--------------|--|----------|
| holoway | good morning | |
| jonlives | morning holoway | 12:04 PM |
| holoway | sorry to be late - shenanigans abound with my schedule :) | 12:04 PM |
| jonlives | no worries | 12:05 PM |
| holoway | ok - we've got a bunch of things to review from the last meeting, and several new topics - if you want the rundown, click btm's link above | 12:06 PM |
| nathenhar... | hello, everyone! | 12:06 PM |
| jonlives | hi nathenharvey :) | 12:06 PM |
| fnichol | hello nathenharvey | 12:06 PM |
| holoway | first up was the merge attribute syntax RFC from SSD | 12:06 PM |
| ssd7 | merged! | 12:06 PM |
| holoway | https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/40 | 12:06 PM |
| | (clap) | 12:07 PM |
| jonlives | yay! | 12:07 PM |
| sersut | woohoo | 12:07 PM |
| holoway | coderanger did, in fact, rock out the mailing list on the RFC process | 12:07 PM |
| | and we cross-posted it | 12:07 PM |
| kallistec | ^5 | 12:07 PM |
| holoway | I wanted to suggest that some folks other than coderanger should send the PR to make them an editor :) | 12:07 PM |
| jonlives | I was meaning to submit one. I shall do so! | 12:08 PM |
| | <i>btm as well. i like words.</i> | 12:08 PM |
| holoway | jonlives and miketheman sent a PR to update the monolithic repo generator, as two examples of mono users | 12:08 PM |
| | https://github.com/opscode/chef-dk/pull/150 | 12:08 PM |
| c_t | I have a couple of ideas for RFCs, but none are quite ready for prime time | 12:09 PM |
| jonlives | yep - main point to consider there is whether it defaults to rb or json for envs and roles | 12:09 PM |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|----------|
| holoway | it should default to json | 12:09 PM |
| jonlives | i landed on json, but per comments in the PR the docs need clarifying a bit | 12:09 PM |
| holoway | yep | 12:09 PM |
| sersut | +1 on json | 12:09 PM |
| fnichol | +json as well | 12:09 PM |
| holoway | i see james scott was already paged | 12:09 PM |
| ssd7 | +1 on json by default. Least surprises for new users. | 12:09 PM |
| miketheman | my only argument for rbuy is that it's been a well-established primitive that can be pretty useful | 12:09 PM |
| | (and abused) | 12:09 PM |
| jtimberman | +120912378 for json | 12:09 PM |
| c_t | (the more interesting, but further from being ready, is proposing an alternate search syntax to take advantage of Postgres' JSON capabilities and search that way) | 12:10 PM |
| jonlives | also +1 on json | 12:10 PM |
| holoway | miketheman: I agree with you. I feel like the rest of the world decided they preferred the non-ruby forms. | 12:10 PM |
| miketheman | c_t: it ain't all that grand. :) We use it here, and it's a pain in the butt | 12:10 PM |
| coderanger | until chef_fs supports ruby, JSON +1 | 12:10 PM |
| jtimberman | miketheman: it's cognitive load to learn so many new things, but JSON is pretty reasonable, and those that want to rock out ruby still could. | 12:10 PM |
| | `knife diff` is the hot sauce. | 12:10 PM |
| holoway | coderanger: which I think it needs to do, fwiw | 12:10 PM |
| c_t | miketheman: yeah, but solr (or reasonable ersatz solr) is a pain in the butt too | 12:10 PM |
| jkeiser | I agree, fwiw | 12:11 PM |
| holoway | c_t: I think it's off topic for this moment, but I would like to hear what makes the embedded solr a pain in your butt | 12:11 PM |
| coderanger | holoway: Sure, just don't want to conflate multiple features :) | 12:11 PM |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|----------|
| miketheman | holoway: I'll defer to the rest of the world, and the tooling around those files, but we (admittedly bad idea?) use ruby heavily in certain roles and envs | 12:11 PM |
| holoway | miketheman: I don't think it's a bad idea at all | 12:11 PM |
| | miketheman: I think it just hasn't become the consensus default | 12:11 PM |
| jonlives | I erred on the side of keeping it as simple as possible, and json is wot it ends up as on the server. | 12:11 PM |
| ssd7 | To be clear, ruby files will still be supported, this is about what the tools do by default | 12:12 PM |
| holoway | did I miss if we posted about this rfc to the list? | 12:12 PM |
| | er, not rfc, PR | 12:12 PM |
| miketheman | hm - I don't recall it being part of the mialing list - jonlives ? | 12:12 PM |
| github-bawt | [chef-rfc] jonlives opened pull request #51: Proposing myself as an editor (master...master) http://git.io/5NieVg | 12:12 PM |
| jonlives | I didn't, no | 12:12 PM |
| miketheman | oh, holoway - we use ruby roles in anger. :) | 12:12 PM |
| jonlives | happy to do so though :) | 12:12 PM |
| holoway | miketheman: that's what I'm talking about | 12:12 PM |
| jonlives | (coderanger per editors btw, https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/51 :)) | 12:13 PM |
| holoway | yeah, before we merge, lets get a few more eyeballs on it | 12:13 PM |
| jonlives | ok, will send it round to the list after this | 12:13 PM |
| | general chef or chef-dev? | 12:13 PM |
| holoway | sersut, you should feel free to merge at your will | 12:13 PM |
| | general chef | 12:13 PM |
| jonlives | rgr that | 12:13 PM |
| sersut | roger.. | 12:13 PM |
| github-bawt | [chef-rfc] coderanger pushed 2 new commits to master: http://git.io/-ttJog | 12:13 PM |
| | chef-rfc/master 30a10b7 Jon Cowie: Proposing myself as an editor | 12:13 PM |
| | chef-rfc/master 564d852 Noah Kantrowitz: Merge pull request #51 from jonlives/master... | 12:13 PM |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|
| holoway | my hectic schedule made me not edit my PR - but I'm going to edit and merge https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/34 | 12:14 PM |
| | well, I'll have an editor merge it | 12:14 PM |
| jonlives | and there is now more than one editor, yay :p | 12:15 PM |
| miketheman | redundant editors | 12:15 PM |
| holoway | nathenharvey, do you want to talk about https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/47 | 12:15 PM |
| | the RFC for guidelines for IRC and the ML | 12:15 PM |
| nathenhar... | sure. we've started work on ... the RFC for guidelines for IRC and the ML ;) | 12:15 PM |
| | and, more generally, for the entire community. | 12:16 PM |
| | there have already been quite a few comments and edits but it's certainly not complete yet and could use additional input from everyone who cares | 12:16 PM |
| | specific things that still need to be added include remedies to be considered when someone acts outside our guidelines | 12:17 PM |
| | and the roles associated with enforcing the policy. likely need different humans for different areas (mailing list, irc, etc.) | 12:18 PM |
| jonlives | holoway / nathenharvey just a note that someone please grant me write access to the chef-rfc repo :) | 12:18 PM |
| github-bawt | [chef-rfc] btm opened pull request #52: Proposal to add myself as an editor (master...add-btm-editor) http://git.io/d1DFeg | 12:18 PM |
| nathenhar... | no requirement that those humans work for Chef Software, Inc. | 12:18 PM |
| jonlives | that almost seems worth a meeting of its own | 12:18 PM |
| nathenhar... | jonlives: indeed! | 12:19 PM |
| jonlives | rather than having to shoehorn it in here - worthy of serious thought methinks. | 12:19 PM |
| holoway | yeah - to ssd7's comment, I think once we enumerate what those roles are, we should make the process for actually becoming one clear, and likely similar to the existing RFC process | 12:19 PM |
| nathenhar... | I was going to propose a meeting outside of this schedule to pick-up further discussion on the guidelines | 12:19 PM |
| holoway | lets do it | 12:19 PM |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|
| jonlives | +1 | 12:20 PM |
| kallistec | sounds good to me | 12:20 PM |
| fnichol | i'd be interested; one of my goals for test kitchen is to adopt a clear code of conduct as well | 12:20 PM |
| nathenhar... | I will announce a meeting time on that on the chef and chef-dev mailing lists and host that meeting before the next instance of this meeting | 12:20 PM |
| btm | regarding community guidelines, it seems like many people want to see consequences spelled out for violations, but that means building some kind of justice system too, and I think we need more participation to do that. | 12:20 PM |
| mivok | +1 on another meeting - this needs a lot of discussion | 12:20 PM |
| kallistec | agree w/ btm | 12:20 PM |
| holoway | we can take it up the special meeting | 12:21 PM |
| miketheman | do we take snapshots of people and put them up behind the cash register? This is an open source community, after all | 12:21 PM |
| holoway | my instant reaction to the idea of a justice system is awkwardly negative, given the spirit of participation, yadda-yadda | 12:21 PM |
| c_t | miketheman: "Do not accept checks from Mike T. Man" | 12:21 PM |
| github-bawt | [chef-rfc] coderanger closed pull request #52: Proposal to add myself as an editor (master...add-btm-editor) http://git.io/d1DFeg | 12:21 PM |
| holoway | but I think you are right :) | 12:21 PM |
| | ok, the next topic was me writing about the deprecation of the OSS web ui | 12:22 PM |
| kallistec | yes, those words are scary, but are the right ones IMO | 12:22 PM |
| holoway | which fell victim to the same schedule creep as my other assignment :) | 12:22 PM |
| | meanwhile, coderanger wrote a very cogent blog post on the matter | 12:22 PM |
| kallistec | I read it, but can you post a link coderanger ? | 12:23 PM |
| holoway | I shall do my best to remedy my slow-ness | 12:23 PM |
| c_t | https://coderanger.net/chef-webui/ | 12:23 PM |
| coderanger | holoway: Feel free to cross-post or adapt it directly if you want | 12:23 PM |
| holoway | coderanger: thanks - I will do that | 12:24 PM |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|----------|
| | (and of course reference you) | 12:24 PM |
| coderanger | holoway: https://github.com/coderanger/coderanger.net/bl... | 12:24 PM |
| | (if you want the markdown) | 12:24 PM |
| holoway | RFC-17 ,the fixes for file specificity, was merged | 12:25 PM |
| | https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/blob/master... | 12:25 PM |
| coderanger | yes | 12:25 PM |
| holoway | huzzah | 12:25 PM |
| ssd7 | +100000000000 | 12:25 PM |
| jonlives | ^ this | 12:25 PM |
| shain | (hug) | 12:25 PM |
| holoway | looking forward to the patch - I was bit by my own choice of using templates/default yet again last week | 12:25 PM |
| github-bawt | [chef-rfc] coderanger pushed 1 new commit to master: http://git.io/wPU8iQ | 12:26 PM |
| | chef-rfc/master c08885e Noah Kantrowitz: Update rfc018-attribute-syntax.md | 12:26 PM |
| coderanger | Hah, I notice that github renders the ID number as octal though, so it says RFC 15 | 12:26 PM |
| | ::sadtrombone:: | 12:26 PM |
| holoway | ok j^2 wants to talk about https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/44 | 12:26 PM |
| j^2 | yep :D | 12:26 PM |
| | tl;dr Ubunutu 14.04 uses Upstart by default. 12.04 or 13.10 didn't, and the next one (LTS) will be using systemd. | 12:26 PM |
| | The service resource won't restart without declaring specific providers. | 12:26 PM |
| | I wrote this RFC to try to push this fix along. | 12:27 PM |
| | i've been working with cheeseplus too on this it's not just me ;) | 12:27 PM |
| jtimberman | fwiw, I had a PR for opscode/chef about this recently. | 12:27 PM |
| cheeseplus | it is referenced in the RFC I think | 12:27 PM |
| coderanger | j^2: I can fix up the formatting later, but can you add the copyright notice </ippedantic> | 12:28 PM |

jonlives there's a more general PR for dynamic provider selection I think too 12:28 PM

sersut that is <https://github.com/opscode/chef/pull/1596> 12:28 PM

j^2 I wanted to open this up to the community to see how it thought how we should fix this. There's a real problem which is 14.04 support but at the same time there is a need for a long term solution on this 12:28 PM

cheeseplus also referenced in the RFC 12:28 PM

jonlives that's the one sersut 12:28 PM

jtimberman yeah, that's right, lamont's is super duper better than mine :) 12:29 PM

j^2 sersut: yep, i think that's the `_correct_` way to do this 12:29 PM

cheeseplus short term: 14.04 service provider doesn't work out of the box 12:29 PM

long term: intelligently picking the service provider if two are in play 12:29 PM

jonlives short term is really just adding a version-specific entry to the platform mapping, no? 12:30 PM

holoway so, at a high level, my question on lamont_oc's pr is really just whether it impacts back-compat? 12:30 PM

jonlives: and that was my second question 12:30 PM

is this as simple as saying the defaults are different on the versions? 12:30 PM

j^2 jonlives: the challenge with it is that technically 14.04 can support 3 different init systems but defaults to upstart 12:30 PM

i think i have a little chart in the RFC 12:31 PM

ssd7 Right, we can definitely just update the static mapping to fix this ubuntu issue now. I'd still like to see Lamont's more general solution discussed 12:31 PM

but it can be done separately from this issue 12:31 PM

holoway right 12:31 PM

sersut I think the immediate problem can be fixed either via `platform_mapping` or something like this: <https://github.com/opscode/chef/blob/master/lib...> 12:31 PM

jonlives j^2: one option would be specifically documenting how to override the platform mapping if people want a different default 12:31 PM

cos it's not gonna be possible to keep users of all three happy in the short term I suspect 12:31 PM

| | | |
|--------------------|---|----------|
| holoway | is it rational to say the first thing we do is update the platform map to reflect the upstreams wishes with their default init system | 12:32 PM |
| kallistec | One thing that has me a little concerned is that we have 3 or 4 ways to map a resource declaration in a recipe to specific back end code | 12:32 PM |
| jonlives | holoway: that sounds rational to me | 12:32 PM |
| holoway | is there anyone opposed to merging that and getting it out? | 12:32 PM |
| j^2 | +1 | 12:33 PM |
| holoway | 30 seconds to -1 | 12:33 PM |
| btm | ssd7: wasn't there a breaking issue with changing the static provider mapping? /cc jtimberman | 12:33 PM |
| kallistec | btm: for 13.10 perhaps? | 12:33 PM |
| | we had to back some change out related to this | 12:34 PM |
| | I'm +1 but pending results of investigation | 12:34 PM |
| someara | would doing this in cookbooks still work? https://github.com/opscode-cookbooks/httpd/blob... | 12:34 PM |
| ssd7 | I'm not remembering a specific incident, but I don't see a way to fix this without breaking at least a few people | 12:34 PM |
| holoway | for lamont_oc's patch, I think it actually addresses another issue, which is the state of play with multiple incompatible init systems co-existing | 12:34 PM |
| btm | I'll find it and post it on the PR. | 12:34 PM |
| jtimberman | on 13.10, iirc, not all things were converted to upstart. | 12:34 PM |
| ssd7 | *someone* will depened on the current mapping and if that changes, they will have to change their cookbook | 12:34 PM |
| jonlives | holoway: indeed | 12:35 PM |
| holoway | which I think we warn them, and inform them of the upstreams wishes on the matter | 12:35 PM |
| miketheman | can it be done with some sort of deprecation warnings? | 12:35 PM |
| jonlives | someara: that def works, but I think defaulting to the distro default is sensible | 12:35 PM |
| juliancdunn | miketheman: dunno how you'd do that | 12:35 PM |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|----------|
| ssd7 | Right, Lamont's new feature could theoretically fix this while hurting fewer people, but I think it needs more thought and discussion. | 12:35 PM |
| holoway | which is my second point | 12:35 PM |
| j^2 | someara: possibly. but it would require a hellva overhaul in some cookbooks right? | 12:36 PM |
| miketheman | should it even be a Chef 12 thing? | 12:36 PM |
| btm | ssd7: I believe the issue was that for some important packages we only had upstart scripts for some important packages, but many packages weren't including upstart scripts yet. | 12:36 PM |
| jtimberman | btm: yeah | 12:37 PM |
| | that seems familiar. | 12:37 PM |
| j^2 | don't forget this is only for one LTS distro too right, so if we can get a higher bang for our buck, i think we should be looking there. | 12:37 PM |
| holoway | there is a right hard thing here, which is this: there is chaos in ubuntu's upstream, our job is to adapt to the upstreams wishes, and communicate the impact | 12:37 PM |
| jonlives | yeah | 12:37 PM |
| holoway | people will be pissed at "chef", but honestly, it's worse if we coddle them | 12:37 PM |
| someara | trying to find lamont's PR.. | 12:37 PM |
| holoway | if you're trying to write portable automation for ubuntu, you need to deal with this | 12:38 PM |
| jonlives | someara: did you mean https://github.com/opscode/chef/pull/1596 | 12:38 PM |
| holoway | and the right baseline assumption is ubuntu's assumption | 12:38 PM |
| jonlives | I agree | 12:38 PM |
| someara | thanks | 12:38 PM |
| j^2 | holoway: ehh, at the same time our users expect a certain level of support. if i say service: restart it should restart the service right? | 12:38 PM |
| fnichol | that feels about right | 12:38 PM |
| holoway | j^2: if its possible to restart it | 12:38 PM |
| cheeseplus | I mean Chef is supposed to abstract ALL THE THINGS | 12:39 PM |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|----------|
| holoway | j^2: which, if you are the author of a cookbook that purports to support ubuntu but haven't dealt with their init system | 12:39 PM |
| | ... | 12:39 PM |
| cheeseplus | ;P | 12:39 PM |
| holoway | now, I think we should also agree that lamont_oc's PR, along with whatever changes sersut, kallistec, and others think are needed | 12:39 PM |
| juliancdunn | there's a natural limit to the abstraction :-) | 12:39 PM |
| holoway | is a great way to make the system DWIM | 12:40 PM |
| jonlives | yes. | 12:40 PM |
| coderanger | I think the issue is breaking code in places where they did deal with it and have stuff setup correctly now | 12:40 PM |
| cheeseplus | ^ | 12:40 PM |
| coderanger | Fixing 14.04 seems like a definite win given how broken it is | 12:40 PM |
| holoway | who in this room is currently suffering this issue in their daily life? | 12:40 PM |
| coderanger | but there might be stuff on 13.10 that is working now that will no longer work | 12:41 PM |
| j^2 | i was/am :) | 12:41 PM |
| c_t | not me | 12:41 PM |
| jtimberman | holoway: that ubuntu 14.04 services need a provider specified? | 12:41 PM |
| c_t | instead I suffer from being a propellerhead who uses normal Debian instead of Ubuntu, so it's a bit of a wash | 12:41 PM |
| holoway | is there anyone opposed to setting the defaults to the upstream, and warning people that your cookbooks might break due to us conforming with the upstreams wishes? | 12:41 PM |
| someara | the only problem I see the interrogation thing is.... the system can lie | 12:42 PM |
| jtimberman | as author of a pull request to do that, i am for that, not opposed ;) | 12:42 PM |
| coderanger | holoway: Yes, I am against that on 13.10 | 12:42 PM |
| ssd7 | someara: we are tabling that option for now in favor of a short term provider update | 12:42 PM |
| jtimberman | someara: by default? | 12:42 PM |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| miketheman | holoway: we just launched in to 14.40 recently, and on an services that are upstart - we declare it explicitly. | 12:42 PM |
| coderanger | holoway: A breaking change is a breaking change | 12:42 PM |
| someara | ubuntu packages currently are half upstart and half systemv, depending on the package | 12:42 PM |
| miketheman | 14.04* | 12:42 PM |
| coderanger | holoway: Even if it is More Correct™ | 12:42 PM |
| btm | holoway: we did that in #1412 but reverted it in #1582 because it broke more packages than it fixed on 13.10. | 12:42 PM |
| someara | kk | 12:42 PM |
| holoway | ok | 12:43 PM |
| coderanger | Yeah, that :) | 12:43 PM |
| holoway | but we think we should set it on 14.04? | 12:43 PM |
| coderanger | Yes, 14.04 is much less likely to break things since the defaults are currently effectively useless | 12:43 PM |
| holoway | good times | 12:43 PM |
| cheeseplus | +1 | 12:43 PM |
| j^2 | coderanger: agreed | 12:43 PM |
| holoway | nathenharvey: j^2, please submit a PR to change the default provider on 14.04 | 12:44 PM |
| jtimberman | +1 for 14.04 | 12:44 PM |
| j^2 | will do | 12:44 PM |
| c_t | +1 | 12:44 PM |
| holoway | sersut: can you take the action to consider whether we change the 13.10 default with chef 12 | 12:44 PM |
| coderanger | +1 | 12:44 PM |
| holoway | it sounds like no in an 11 patch release | 12:44 PM |
| ssd7 | holoway: nathenharvey Can we somehow tag that issue as "requires blogpost" or something to make sure that we take some time to write about it either as a blog post item or a lengthier release note item | 12:44 PM |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|
| someara | init shells out to "service whatever start", which will work properly with upstart afaik | 12:44 PM |
| sersut | sure.. | 12:45 PM |
| holoway | ok | 12:45 PM |
| jtimberman | 13.10 is EOL July 17, 2014 | 12:45 PM |
| | fwiw. from: https://wiki.ubuntu.com/Releases | 12:45 PM |
| holoway | jtimberman: good to know - sersut can take that into account on whether we do anything at all | 12:45 PM |
| kallistec | coderanger: not a discussion for right now, but perhaps we ought to establish a policy on breaking changes that are kinda semver edge cases, like upstream breaking changes, EOL for an upstream item, etc. | 12:45 PM |
| nathenhar... | ssd7: got it | 12:45 PM |
| jtimberman | (thumbsup) | 12:45 PM |
| holoway | (fyi, this is one reason I dislike semver) | 12:46 PM |
| | ok - lets do udpates fast | 12:46 PM |
| fnichol | holoway: good thing that chef doesn't interact with anything else at all, eh? :) | 12:46 PM |
| holoway | so juliancdunn goets his time | 12:46 PM |
| coderanger | kallistec: Yeah, so many overlapping layers of "compat" | 12:46 PM |
| holoway | fnichol: right? | 12:46 PM |
| j^2 | thanks everyone :) | 12:46 PM |
| holoway | nathenharvey: | 12:46 PM |
| | nathenharvey: go for community if you need it | 12:46 PM |
| btm | ssd7: I was just thinking we should keep this ubuntu 13.10 'known issue' in the 11.16.0 release notes too (https://github.com/opscode/chef/commit/9e629347...) | 12:47 PM |
| nathenhar... | blogged about behaving responsibly in the chef community | 12:47 PM |
| | summits are still coming up in Seattle and London - register soon | 12:47 PM |
| | that's pretty much it for community | 12:47 PM |
| | ICYMI: http://www.getchef.com/blog/2014/08/27/behaving... | 12:47 PM |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|----------|
| holoway | ok - on the chef software front, we will have an RC for Chef Server 12 soon | 12:48 PM |
| | which I'm looking forward to on a bunch of fronts, not the least of which is no longer having to be cagey about it | 12:48 PM |
| jonlives | looking forward to the sekrit :p | 12:48 PM |
| shain | @jonlives the sekrit is a pony | 12:49 PM |
| miketheman | t-10mins | 12:49 PM |
| holoway | also, one thing that is worth mentioning, for those of you who remember couchdb, it is finally gone from my life | 12:49 PM |
| | serdar, chef client? | 12:49 PM |
| | er, sersut :) | 12:49 PM |
| jtimberman | holoway: RIP CouchDB | 12:49 PM |
| jonlives | ^ may it rest in pieces. | 12:50 PM |
| sersut | For Client we have a new 11 release coming up with some new Windows Features... | 12:50 PM |
| | <i>someara looks for change</i> | 12:50 PM |
| c_t | "Friends, Romans, Databases, lend me your ears..." | 12:50 PM |
| holoway | ok - juliancdunn, https://github.com/opscode/chef-rfc/pull/21 | 12:50 PM |
| juliancdunn | ohai | 12:50 PM |
| btm | Chef 11.16.0.rc.0 is out in gems, I'll have an omnibus build out as soon as I can gain the favor of the build system. | 12:51 PM |
| juliancdunn | the RFC states what platforms and platform versions we'll support | 12:51 PM |
| | the RFC is aspirational. | 12:51 PM |
| | tier 1 platforms are those that are most popular, and we will commit to building on them AND doing post-build verification on them all. | 12:51 PM |
| | tier 2 are other platforms, and we <i>*may*</i> do post-build verification. | 12:51 PM |
| | <i>alexbst_ is now known as alexbst</i> | 12:51 PM |
| | then we have all the others, the unsupported ones. | 12:52 PM |
| | One notable topic is that we will intend to stop supporting Solaris 9 on October 1, 2014 (end of Extended Support). | 12:52 PM |

| | | |
|--------------|---|----------|
| | In the future, we intend to stop supporting Solaris variants at end of Premier Support, so for Solaris 10 that's January 1, 2018. | 12:52 PM |
| | I am aware that "platform support" is always a contentious topic (there are about 100 comments on it). | 12:52 PM |
| | However, I would like to drive this proposal to a conclusion no later than the next developers meeting. | 12:52 PM |
| | I'll open the floor to questions now, and then we can decide on what outstanding items there are before we merge this. | 12:52 PM |
| tech356 | Is Windows 7 included in the Tier 1 support? | 12:53 PM |
| juliancdunn | it is not currently. we generally left off OSes that are desktop-only. | 12:54 PM |
| | it is a ChefDK-supported platform though. | 12:54 PM |
| nathenhar... | **5 minute warning** | 12:55 PM |
| holoway | gents, I have to hop in a car to make it to foster city | 12:55 PM |
| juliancdunn | if there are no other comments, when should I merge this? | 12:55 PM |
| shain | +1 | 12:55 PM |
| holoway | nathenharvey: you have the con for closing out our meeting :) | 12:55 PM |
| btm | juliancdunn: would be good to say something about "desktop-only" in the document. there's a long history of folks who used to wonder why windows desktop versions weren't on the download page for chef-client. | 12:55 PM |
| nathenhar... | holoway: thanks | 12:55 PM |
| juliancdunn | btm: acknowledged | 12:56 PM |
| holoway | juliancdunn: post to the mailing list one more time, get more eyeballs on it, and assuming no large issues come up, we merge in two weeks (next meeting) | 12:56 PM |
| juliancdunn | ok | 12:56 PM |
| | <i>holoway waves</i> | 12:56 PM |
| jonlives | laters holoway! | 12:56 PM |
| juliancdunn | bai holoway! | 12:56 PM |
| nathenhar... | 3 minutes remain for a round table if anyone would like to raise a topic | 12:57 PM |
| jonlives | gentle prod for a chef inc. employee to please give me write access to chef- | 12:57 PM |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|----------|
| | rfc soonish ;) | |
| | ^ action item not topic :p | 12:57 PM |
| miketheman | coderanger: I have an rfc cooking in my braind | 12:57 PM |
| nathenhar... | Our next meeting will be Sept 18 | 12:58 PM |
| coderanger | miketheman: :) | 12:58 PM |
| miketheman | I want to float the idea out, how fleshed out must it be before submitting? | 12:58 PM |
| jonlives | that clashes with velocity NY fwiw | 12:58 PM |
| miketheman | more to gauge interest in whether or not it's worthwhile | 12:58 PM |
| coderanger | miketheman: zero percent | 12:58 PM |
| jonlives | so attendance from NY folks may be spotty | 12:58 PM |
| nathenhar... | jonlives: I have that captured as an action item | 12:58 PM |
| jonlives | nathenharvey: thanks! | 12:58 PM |
| coderanger | miketheman: pull reqs are cheap :) | 12:58 PM |
| miketheman | coderanger: got it. | 12:58 PM |
| btm | coderanger: there's been some question as to when an RFC gets consensus for merge. Does it always happen in this meeting? | 12:58 PM |
| juliancdunn | jonlives: just invited you to the rfc-editors team | 12:59 PM |
| jonlives | juliancdunn: thanks! | 12:59 PM |
| kallistec | miketheman: also email to chef-dev if you want to go that route. either one is fine | 12:59 PM |
| miketheman | kallistec: awseome, thanks - I want to start the conversation, knowing it's going to be a long discussion. :) | 12:59 PM |
| coderanger | btm: RFCs aren't consensur based, Adam has only and final say right now | 1:00 PM |
| | btm: So if you can convince him, it can happen anywhere :) | 1:00 PM |
| juliancdunn | so we're at time | 1:00 PM |
| nathenhar... | **Meeting adjourned** | 1:01 PM |
| | | 1:01 PM |