

\*\*\*\*\* MEETING STARTS \*\*\*\*\*

jonlives

ok, first we have a community update from nathenharvey

12:01

PM

github-bawt

[chef-rfc] btm opened pull request #115: Release process RFC (master...release-process) <http://git.io/vviR1>

12:01

PM

nathenharvey

I have a PR expanding on some of the community guidelines that we'll discuss later

12:02

PM

*nulleric\_ is now known as nulleric*

12:02

PM

but as part of that, and today's community update, I'd like to encourage more people to volunteer as community advocates in the various online channels such as irc

12:03

PM

nulleric

how does one volunteer? PR?

12:03

PM

nathenharvey

and I'd like to ask that we put together some specific guidelines for irc. we have words that say things like who should have op and voice and we need to come inline with that

12:03

PM

jonlives

nulleric: PR to <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf...>

12:04

PM

nathenharvey

nulleric: yes, a pr to the community guidelines is how you volunteer

12:04

PM

two other quick reminders from my team

12:04

PM

please take (or thank you for taking) the Cookbook Survey - <http://bit.ly/chefconf2015-cookbook-survey>

12:04

PM

and be sure to mark your calendar / save the date for Chef Community Summit - <http://summit.chef.io> - October 14-15, 2015 in Seattle

12:05

PM

that's the quick update from community

12:05

PM

jonlives	ok, next we have chef software, client and server updates from adamedx	12:05 PM
adamedx	thanks	12:05 PM
nathenharvey	We should also mention, again, that Adam (holoway) is on vacation for the month of April and Jon Cowie (jonlives) is the designated project lead until Adam returns	12:05 PM
adamedx	this is pretty short, since many of us are returning from post-Chef Conf vacations	12:06 PM
jonlives	in case y'all wonder why I'm being all in charge and stuff :p	12:06 PM
burtlo	(applause)	12:06 PM
adamedx	an update on our status with releases of chef-client via packagecloud	12:06 PM
someara	(applause.gif)	12:06 PM
adamedx	as we mentioned last week, we've got a lot of stuff on packagecloud now: chefdk, chef-server, etc.	12:07 PM
ranjib	woot	12:07 PM
adamedx	we're still working on chef-client	12:07 PM
	key challenge has been platforms like Solaris	12:07 PM
	being moved to a new CI infrastructure that can reliably release to packagecloud	12:07 PM
	I think we're still a few weeks away from that	12:07

		PM
	but want to make sure everyone is still looking for it	12:07
		PM
	we will have a big party when that happens	12:08
		PM
jonlives	indeed	12:08
		PM
adamedx	that's it for me	12:08
		PM
jonlives	thanks adamedx!	12:08
		PM
	the one action item on the agenda from last week was for btm_ to submit an RFC for ohai config - any update on that btm_?	12:08
		PM
ssd7	Can I add one thing?	12:08
		PM
jonlives	ssd7: sure	12:08
		PM
ssd7	The LoB team is working to combine many of the repositories that make up the chef-server. Look for an email to chef-dev on the topic early next week.	12:09
		PM
	If you happen to be interested in chef-server dev that is :)	12:09
		PM
adamedx	thanks ssd7	12:09
		PM
jonlives	awesome thanks ssd7!	12:09
		PM
	btm_: be ye here?	12:09
		PM

btm_	jonlives: I apologize, I don't have anything coherent enough to push yet. I'll make it my next thing today.	12:09 PM
jonlives	no worries, thanks for the update!	12:10 PM
	ok, first PR on the agenda is nathenharvey's aforementioned <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/114">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/114</a>	12:10 PM
btm_	I would like to draw attention to finishing up a draft of a release process, which comes from a number of post-mortem action items. No need to talk about it today but I need feedback: <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/115">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/115</a>	12:10 PM
jonlives	rgr that	12:11 PM
adamedx	for next agenda btm_?	12:11 PM
jonlives	yeah	12:11 PM
nathenharvey	yes. I'm proposing two new sections to the community guidelines: guidelines for handling conflict and guidelines for handling incidents	12:11 PM
btm_	adamedx: yes, next week, but I need feedback before then definitely.	12:11 PM
jonlives	I'm basically happy with the changes made in #115 as they stand, anybody feel otherwise?	12:12 PM
martinisoft	Wait #114 or #115?	12:12 PM
jonlives	#114, rather	12:12 PM
	sorry	12:12 PM
	good catch :p	12:12

		PM
nathenharvey	I want to be sure that community advocates and everyone else are provided with some advice on how to deal with incidents or conflicts	12:12
		PM
jonlives	strongly seconded.	12:12
		PM
jtimberman	nathenharvey: +LONGINT	12:13
		PM
jonlives	6 secs for anybody to -1 nathenharvey's proposed changes or I'm deciderating it	12:13
		PM
	*60 secs	12:13
		PM
btm_	I'd like to table voting on this for a week. I know I have feedback. Some about the process itself, other feedback about the document.	12:13
		PM
kallistec	this is great	12:13
		PM
jonlives	btm_: on #114?	12:13
		PM
btm_	And this was just written.	12:13
		PM
jonlives	if people want more time to digest it, I'm happy to hold off until next week	12:14
		PM
martinisoft	nathenharvey: Is there any info related to this on choosing community advocates or how to reach them?	12:14
		PM
kierrr	^	12:14
		PM
nathenharvey	I'm really comfortable with giving some time for people to review and comment on the PR	12:15
		PM

jonlives	let	12:15 PM
stevenmurawski	I suggest a identifying file as thom is building for maintainers so it is parsable.	12:15 PM
	for advocates	12:15 PM
jonlives	let's add that to the agenda for next week then	12:15 PM
	+1 for the advocates file	12:15 PM
nathenharvey	I can create and advocates file, that's a great idea	12:15 PM
martinisoft	+1 as well along with #114 being updates to point to this file.	12:15 PM
btm_	hey, so how do humans parse the new MAINTAINERS file?	12:15 PM
nathenharvey	also we can setup an advocates mailing list or something	12:16 PM
jonlives	good call	12:16 PM
nathenharvey	but I'd imagine most advocates will know at least one other advocate	12:16 PM
jonlives	and if not, we should make sure to arrange intros etc	12:16 PM
nathenharvey	jonlives: yep	12:17 PM
btm_	thom: can we get a link added to the comments at the top of the MAINTAINERS file that if I click on it, I get a view that I	12:17

	can read easily like the markdown was?	PM
<b>martinisoft</b>	nathenharvey: I'm thinking along the terms of a potential victim seeking resolution for an issue and needing guidance/where to go	12:17 PM
<b>btm_</b>	I'm reluctant to put community advocates in a file of this format if we can't do that.	12:17 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	yeah, a clear "bat signal" would be a very good thing to have.	12:17 PM
<b>nathenharvey</b>	martinisoft: right, of course. I'll incorporate that as well	12:18 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	right, let's move discussion in #114 to the PR and be sure to capture the above suggestions.	12:18 PM
<b>martinisoft</b>	I'll add my comments there	12:18 PM
<b>burtlo</b>	(applause)	12:18 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	but generally, we want to make it very easy for people who need an advocate to be able to find one.	12:18 PM
<b>nathenharvey</b>	thanks. I'll have updates for next week and will add to the agenda for then	12:19 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	next on the agenda, we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/8">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/8</a> - this is ready to merge btm_ unless anybody wants to make last minute comments, mattray already made the necessary change.	12:19 PM
	shuffling the agenda slight, we also have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106</a> , which is still awaiting some tweaks from jkeiser in line with comments in the PR so no movement there for this week	12:20 PM
<b>jkeiser</b>	Yeah, let's wait on that. If someone else wants to pick it up for ownership that's fine too--I've got a mountain ahead of me this week	12:20 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	the final item on the agenda from last week is <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/102">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/102</a>	12:21 PM

	<i>heathsno_ is now known as heathsnow_</i>	12:21
		PM
	it doesn't look like dblessing is in here, but he's said that after reading feedback he's happy for this to not be implemented and suggests some improvements to LRWP docs etc.	12:21
		PM
	given that there are pretty strong opinions on this one, does anybody present feel strongly that this <i>*should*</i> be implemented?	12:22
		PM
	ie, in the face of the proposer being happy to leave this one unimplemented	12:22
		PM
	most of the detailed feedback in the PR seems to be somewhat against this	12:23
		PM
	so absent any strongly in favour beyond a +1, I'm minded to go with majority and close this one off	12:24
		PM
	we've got loads of time so I'll give a few mins for people to speak up	12:24
		PM
<b>someara</b>	still -1, on the basis that I'm not even sure what's being discussed	12:24
		PM
	It's probably important to define what exactly is meant by "nested recipes"	12:24
		PM
	but +10000 on improving docs around resource/providers	12:24
		PM
<b>kallistec</b>	really it's just letting you have directories under recipes/ in your cookbooks, as I understand it	12:25
		PM
<b>lamont_oc</b>	i'm -1 because i still don't understand a concrete use case	12:25
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	kallistec: yeah that's how I interpreted it too, plus being able to reflect that in recipes	12:25
		PM
<b>martinisoft</b>	-1 as well from me	12:25



		PM
<b>btm_</b>	someara: being able to have subdirectories in the recipe directory, with recipes in them, and a way to put those in the run list (recipe[apache2::modules::ssl])	12:25 PM
<b>jtimberman</b>	i'm still -1 on 102	12:26 PM
		PM
<b>ranjib</b>	-1	12:26 PM
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	so I propose we close this one off, and have an action item for the chef docs team to look at improving LWRP docs etc.	12:26 PM
		PM
	all in favour?	12:26 PM
<b>kallistec</b>	I'm not gonna advocate strongly for it, but I'm +0	12:26 PM
		PM
<b>martinisoft</b>	+1 to someara's suggestion to update docs. Is there any way we could get community feedback on gaps in the docs we need to fill?	12:26 PM
<b>jtimberman</b>	+1 to docs	12:26 PM
		PM
<b>someara</b>	apache2::modules::ssl implies a lot of things... does the ::ssl recipe have resource_collection visibility into apache2::module or not? local function definition scope	12:26 PM
	<i>someara opens his can of worms</i>	12:26 PM
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	martinisoft: we could put that feedback request to the mailing list for sure	12:26 PM
		PM
<b>martinisoft</b>	jonlives: Sounds good	12:27 PM
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	nathenharvey: would a plausible action item be to get somebody from the chef docs team to take this one on?	12:27 PM
		PM

btm_	someara: it only implies where we load the recipe from disk. otherwise it's exactly the same as if it was in the recipes directory.	12:27 PM
martinisoft	The Docs site is also a public repo, yes? I remember it getting opened up at some point.	12:27 PM
	<i>btm_ closes the can of worms.</i>	12:27 PM
kallistec	someara: that seems like a strawman to me, recipes would just have one more dir underneath them	12:27 PM
nathenharvey	<a href="http://github.com/chef/chef-docs">http://github.com/chef/chef-docs</a>	12:27 PM
jonlives	aha	12:27 PM
martinisoft	nathenharvey: Thank you <3	12:27 PM
burtlo	martinisoft I can give some assistance with navigating the docs and how they are built.	12:28 PM
jonlives	I might try and have a look at improving the docs, there's some stuff in the book that would probably help there too.	12:28 PM
nathenharvey	I propose someone take on the responsibility of opening an issue there	12:28 PM
martinisoft	burtlo: Ooo, yes please.	12:28 PM
jonlives	nathenharvey: I'll grab that	12:28 PM
	martinisoft too if he's interested	12:28 PM
	<i>martinisoft needs to up his LWRP game</i>	12:29

		PM
	ok, so anybody -1 closing this issue?	12:29
		PM
<b>btm_</b>	I'm uncomfortable with the arguments against it, so in that way I'm -1 closing it, but I don't care strongly for the feature.	12:29
		PM
<b>juliancdunn</b>	the "chef docs team" is currently one person so any community help towards improving them would be much appreciated	12:30
		PM
<b>burtlo</b>	(applause)	12:30
		PM
<b>kallistec</b>	Also, our doc writer is very responsive, if you feel that learning how that repo is structured and built is a barrier to entry for you, you can probably just write what you think should be in the docs in GFM in a bug report on the repo and James will help you	12:30
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	last call for any further -1s	12:30
		PM
	ok, closing that off - nathenharvey let's note that I'll take on getting that issue created and hopefully looking at the docs too	12:31
		PM
<b>nathenharvey</b>	got it	12:31
		PM
<b>github-bawt</b>	[chef-rfc] jonlives closed pull request #102: [WIP] Nested recipe support (master...nested_recipes) <a href="http://git.io/pLIn">http://git.io/pLIn</a>	12:31
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	ok folks, that's it for the agenda. any other business to bring to the meeting?	12:32
		PM
	I can always go back to obsessively watching nasdaq graphs :p	12:32
		PM
<b>nathenharvey</b>	<a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106?">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106?</a>	12:32
		PM
<b>juliancdunn</b>	congratulations jonlives on the IPO	12:32

		PM
jonlives	I can now legally say thank you :p	12:32
		PM
juliancdunn	I bought a few shares 'cause I love you folks :-P	12:32
		PM
jonlives	nathenharvey: we did #106, it's still waiting some last tweaks	12:33
		PM
btm_	nathenharvey: jkeiser> Yeah, let's wait on that. If someone else wants to pick it up for ownership that's fine too--I've got a mountain ahead of me this week	12:33
	<i>btm_ is now known as btm</i>	12:33
		PM
nathenharvey	:) thanks missed it inwhile taking notes	12:33
		PM
jonlives	juliancdunn: <3	12:33
		PM
	any other business then, or do we call the record shortest meeting? :p	12:34
		PM
	speak up folks in the back	12:34
		PM
btm	<a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/115">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/115</a>	12:34
		PM
burtlo	Was anyone able to take that issue while jkeiser is climbing the mountain? #106	12:34
		PM
btm	I'd take feedback now from anyone on the release process RFC, particular anyone who participated in the two recent release post-mortems.	12:35
		PM
jonlives	if jkeiser doesn't get time to finish #106 up by say tuesday or so I'll look at making the tweaks	12:35
		PM

btm	Is a release process rfc the rightful place to declare versioning for the project? I couldn't find it elsewhere in RFCs.	12:35
		PM
burtlo	(applause)	12:35
		PM
jonlives	i don't think we already document versioning anywhere else	12:36
		PM
adamedx	it definitely needs to be documented	12:36
		PM
jonlives	btm: some of this is remediation from the 12.1 PM I think, at a glance	12:36
		PM
	need to have a proper read through but at a skim it's looking like the right place for it	12:36
		PM
	let's all try and have a look at #115 for next week and give feedback etc	12:38
		PM
nathenharvey	ok, 115 is on agenda for next week	12:38
		PM
jonlives	anything else before we call it?	12:38
		PM
	last chance...	12:38
		PM
nathenharvey	we have 12 minutes left but I don't see any point keeping the meeting running just b/c my calendar says so	12:38
		PM
martinisoft	I'm reviewing #115 and making comments, nothing else here from me :)	12:38
		PM
jonlives	and lo, did the decider say unto nathenharvey "let the stars of finishing be shone upon the world that they might know the conclusion of mine works"	12:39
		PM
btm	jonlives: Yeah, I started writing an RFC for what we should do when a release is bad, which came out of the 12.2.0 post-	12:39

mortem we held at chefconf in the summit. But I ran into a lot of missing things I wanted to reference.

PM

jonlives

gotcha

12:39

PM

nathenharvey

\*\*\*\*\* MEETING ENDS \*\*\*\*\*

12:39

PM