

nathenharv...	***** MEETING STARTS *****	
	Agenda for today's meeting: https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...	12:02 PM
holoway	hello	12:02 PM
jonlives	hola holoway	12:03 PM
nathenharv...	Three things have been merged in since the last meeting.	12:03 PM
holoway	yes!	12:04 PM
thom	afternoon!	12:05 PM
holoway	an update to the RFC polciy, and removing solaris 9 from supported platforms	12:05 PM
	and https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/88	12:05 PM
	which makes the requiremetns for merging easier - essentially two □	12:05 PM
	<i>pwm_away is now known as pwm</i>	12:06 PM
	lets move on to old bidness	12:06 PM
btm	that's two +1's for those of us using ascii.	12:06 PM
holoway	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/79	12:06 PM
	this is the RFC for doing just data bag items in ruby	12:07 PM
	which I think we all agree we would like in the dialects core refactor	12:07 PM
jonlives	yeah, that seems like the agreed upon plan	12:07

		PM
holoway	codranger: you still +1 on that refactor in general?	12:07
		PM
	I suppose regardless - lets close that one out	12:08
		PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] adamhjk closed pull request #79: RFC for Ruby data bag items (master...ruby_data_bag_items) http://git.io/AYZI	12:09
		PM
holoway	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/82	12:09
		PM
	ranjib__: you around?	12:09
		PM
ranjib__	Yeah	12:10
		PM
	<i>ssd7 thought, for a second, that github-bawt grew some killer language processing abilities.</i>	12:10
		PM
jonlives	hahaha	12:10
		PM
holoway	while I like the idea of the bootstrap stuff becoming the future (tm), it feels to me like we shouldn't block progress here	12:10
		PM
ranjib__	I dont know whats the plan around new bootstrapping gears	12:10
		PM
holoway	when last we talked, a few folks brought up that this might be possible with just Erb already	12:10
		PM
	I'm +1 on this feature	12:11
		PM
btm	ranjib__: so what part of the core template does this replace?	12:11
		PM
jtimberman	i'm super +1 on this. sometimes you don't want to go through the overhead of making a custom bootstrap template just to add e.g. 'apt-get update'	12:12
		PM
	(or whatever)	12:12
		PM
btm	ranjib__: this is just a "pre-template" not something that hooks into chef-full?	12:12
		PM

ranjib__	Nothing, just adds ability to include partials	12:12
		PM
jonlives	I'm still +1 on this too	12:12
		PM
stevenmur...	Same here.. or picking a new location to pull chef-client installers from	12:12
		PM
	+1	12:12
		PM
thom	would we want to define a set of hooks that one could implement with partials?	12:12
		PM
	(i'm +1 in general, just not sure i fully understand how this would work)	12:12
		PM
btm	stevenmurawski: that's the thing though. this sounds like --pre-template, not a partial version of the default chef-full template.	12:13
		PM
ranjib__	We can call this pre-template hook as well	12:13
		PM
btm	"Scope of this RFC is to offer users a mechanism to execute custom logic before the standard bootstrapping process"	12:13
		PM
ranjib__	Yup, like installing curl	12:14
		PM
holoway	ok - I say we take this conversation to the PR	12:14
		PM
martinisoft	+1 from me on #82, I think it can be a useful feature	12:14
		PM
jtimmerman	ranjib__: or wget!	12:14
		PM
adamedx	I like the idea	12:14
		PM
lamont_oc	hmmm, i'm actually much more in favor of it stated that way than "template partials"	12:14
		PM
nathenharv...	continue the discussion in the PR, revisit in two weeks to merge	12:14
		PM

ranjib__	Kk	12:15
		PM
holoway	I just put a comment on	12:15
		PM
	but lets assume merge imminent, pending updating with more detail	12:15
		PM
	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/83	12:15
		PM
	is next up	12:15
		PM
ranjib__	I need to update text on that one	12:16
		PM
	But the review comments are mostly addressed	12:17
		PM
holoway	ok	12:17
		PM
jtimberman	I added a comment to it about my ideas for use cases	12:17
		PM
holoway	lets also put it in the "going to merge next meeting unless someone screams or ranjib doesn't type" bucket	12:18
		PM
nathenharv...	holoway: done	12:18
		PM
ranjib__	☺	12:18
		PM
holoway	next up	12:18
		PM
	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/84	12:18
		PM
jonlives	that's actually already approved, just needs deciderating per comment in PR	12:19
		PM
	(up a few comments)	12:19
		PM

holoway	done	12:20
		PM
	fire at will, jonlives	12:20
		PM
jonlives	wewt, will merge after the meeting	12:20
		PM
holoway	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/65	12:20
		PM
	token auth	12:20
		PM
jtimberman	i love the idea of token authentication, i have no feedback on the specifics that are in the words in the rfc itself.	12:21
		PM
holoway	I feel like we're all essentially in agreement that we want token auth, and we would like to delegate ids	12:21
		PM
jonlives	yeah	12:22
		PM
holoway	most of the comments are about implementation	12:22
		PM
	which, honestly, will probably change anyway when we actually start implementing	12:23
		PM
thom	yup, looks like discussion is only over details not whether we should	12:23
		PM
holoway	so lets +1 this RFC	12:23
		PM
jonlives	sounds good to me	12:23
		PM
holoway	I know nathan smith and mark mzyk have some thoughts here too	12:24
		PM
	decider stamp stamp-ed	12:24
		PM
jonlives	gravy	12:25
		PM

holoway	attr api 2	12:25
		PM
	https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/77	12:25
		PM
thom	leaving the fun till last?	12:25
		PM
jonlives	that one says at the top it's not ready yet, like grolsch - we'll only let you merge it when it's ready :p	12:25
		PM
holoway	well, I think we are closing in	12:26
		PM
	kallistec: can you take the latest round of comments and update the RFC	12:26
		PM
kallistec	yeah, there's a bunch of possible implementations. Looks like there's consensus that we want to kill and bury square brackets	12:26
		PM
holoway	no square brackets	12:26
		PM
	what about the only strings no symbols questions?	12:26
		PM
ranjib_	+1	12:26
		PM
kallistec	which still leaves a few options to sort	12:27
		PM
holoway	ok - lets restart the thread here	12:27
		PM
	personally, I think the DWIM-y ness of indifferent accessors is nice	12:28
		PM
kallistec	reluctantly +1 on that, symbols are more convenient to type, but probably should have one way to do things here	12:28
		PM
holoway	I prefer them all the time	12:28
		PM
	even though clearly we teach people to use strings :)	12:28
		PM

jtimberman	node['chef-client'] ;)	12:28	
			PM
holoway	I'm not sure the status quo here is actually that big of a deal	12:29	
			PM
kallistec	yeah, hyphens and dots and so on ruin my fun times	12:29	
			PM
holoway	symbols are just the more 'advanced' feature ;)	12:29	
			PM
lamont_oc	i'm biased against them because of : <code>"foo-bar"</code> and the recent chef 12.0 symbol/string bug	12:29	
			PM
holoway	what bug is that?	12:29	
			PM
jonlives	the attribute caching one?	12:29	
			PM
kallistec	we forgot to to_s a thing and it broke the cache	12:30	
			PM
lamont_oc	cached symbol access different from strings	12:30	
			PM
holoway	I see	12:30	
			PM
lamont_oc	its just a bug	12:30	
			PM
holoway	ok - what's the general feeling? quick +1 if you want only strings, -1 if you want strings and symbols	12:31	
			PM
	30 second vote	12:31	
			PM
ranjib_	Only strings +1	12:31	
			PM
tball	+1	12:31	
			PM
lamont_oc	also only strings ends the bikeshed forever	12:31	
			PM

zts	+1	12:31
		PM
lamont_oc	+1	12:31
		PM
jonlives	+1	12:31
		PM
pwm	+1	12:31
		PM
kallistec	+1 :''''(12:31
		PM
martinisoft	+1	12:32
		PM
holoway	-1	12:32
		PM
jtimberman	+1 to only strings.	12:32
		PM
mivok	+1 :''''''('' (fffy)	12:32
		PM
holoway	man	12:32
		PM
thom	+1	12:32
		PM
ssd7	If only symbols isn't an option, I guess +1 :(12:32
		PM
jtimberman	and that was after the 30 seconds	12:32
		PM
holoway	all y'all ruin a good perl	12:32
		PM
jtimberman	holoway: we still <3 you	12:32
		PM
kallistec	I will rue this day	12:32
		PM

holoway	no you don't	12:32
		PM
adamedx	I was going to say "so say wel all..."	12:32
		PM
jtimberman	aww!	12:32
		PM
holoway	ok	12:33
		PM
jtimberman	I still want to <3 perl?	12:33
		PM
ssd7	kallistec: indeed, mark the date, I feel myself swearing about this in the future	12:33
		PM
jonlives	we'll have a historical archive of exactly who to blame ;)	12:33
		PM
holoway	I'm pretty sure we're all going to hate it	12:33
		PM
adamedx	it can be changed later	12:33
		PM
jonlives	blamelessly though, because devops.	12:33
		PM
holoway	which means we will change our minds	12:33
		PM
	re: adamedx	12:33
		PM
	ok - kallistec, please to update and bring back to the table	12:33
		PM
lamont_oc	yep, easier to add it than take it away	12:33
		PM
kallistec	10-4	12:33
		PM
jonlives	well, we could re-vote based on all symbols as a third option :p	12:34
		PM

holoway	we could	12:34 PM
thom	jonlives: the vote for that would be :(12:34 PM
holoway	since we are breaking the api, we could say only symbols in the new api	12:34 PM
jonlives	yeah - this is a breaking change one way or another.	12:34 PM
	and hopefully the last time attributes has to be redesigned :p	12:35 PM
lamont_oc	yep, that just creates the : <code>"foo-bar"</code> instead of <code>:foo-bar</code> thing to teach newbies	12:35 PM
holoway	no	12:35 PM
ssd7	just don't do that	12:35 PM
holoway	newbies would have to stop using <code>foo-bar</code>	12:35 PM
	the json translations will make that a bitch	12:35 PM
kallistec	and <code>ohai</code> would have to be scrubbed	12:35 PM
holoway	and <code>ohai</code> would have to be scrubbed	12:35 PM
	strings it is!	12:35 PM
	ok	12:35 PM
	moving on	12:35 PM
	lets talk for a few minutes about LTs	12:35 PM

lamont_oc	yeah, we also made a rule that node attributes should be node[cookbook] and we have some cookbooks named with dashes	12:36 PM
holoway	we have a few	12:36 PM
lamont_oc	so you'd want to rename chef-client cb to chef_client, or make exceptions in that rule, etc	12:36 PM
ssd7	yeah, I was only half serious, strings is fine	12:36 PM
holoway	basically, we have martinisoft	12:37 PM
	who is now the decider for freebsd	12:37 PM
	<i>holoway claps</i>	12:37 PM
	what's stopping the rest of y'all from stepping up and saying you are the lord of RHEL or Ubuntu?	12:37 PM
jonlives	holoway: on that note actually, the guidelines say LTs only produce roadmaps for code *outside* of chef-client and server. that's def the case?	12:37 PM
jtimmerman	holoway: no one wants to unleash that crazy on themselves;)	12:38 PM
	holoway: I'll step up for OS X tho, speaking of the crazy	12:38 PM
tball	+1 to jtimmerman stepping up!	12:38 PM
holoway	jonlives: I think we had the idea that we would want them to produce a roadmap for their component	12:38 PM
	jonlives: I'm not even sure how that will work at all, tbh	12:38 PM
thom	i have been meaning to step up for ubuntu, but i have a little bit of job changing to do first :)	12:38 PM
jonlives	holoway: that's what would stop me from stepping up, is the time demand to deal with that part.	12:38 PM

	and time zones too, mind :p	12:39
		PM
holoway	ok - if we remove the roadmap part, and it's just maintenance	12:39
		PM
jonlives	core is gonna have that to a much greater extent too, the roadmap stuff.	12:39
		PM
holoway	and decision making	12:39
		PM
jonlives	then I'd def step up :)	12:39
		PM
jtimberman	thom: i don't think you need to wait for job changing ;)	12:39
		PM
holoway	we also need one for core	12:39
		PM
btm	fwiw. I read rfc030 as saying that holoway "provides vision and roadmap" and LTs "publish a roadmap"	12:39
		PM
jonlives	we also need an LT for core - again, sans roadmap stuff I'd be up for that too	12:40
		PM
	or at least I'd nominate myself	12:40
		PM
thom	i'm happy to nominate myself for core, too.	12:40
		PM
jonlives	the roadmap stuff for core would seem to be hard for a non-chef inc person to handle anyway	12:40
		PM
holoway	if the roadmap part of the process is the blocker, I say we remove it	12:41
		PM
ranjib_	Yup	12:41
		PM
holoway	and we handle it with an RFC	12:41
		PM
jonlives	+1	12:41
		PM

ssd7	+1	12:41
		PM
ranjib_	No, keep it	12:41
		PM
martinisoft	Agreed there, after re-reading the newly merged #88 RFC, I'm a little scared of having to add roadmapping into my OSS cycle.	12:41
		PM
holoway	I admit that thom was my pocket candidate for core LT	12:41
		PM
martinisoft	I don't mind reviewing patches, proposing new ones, etc.	12:41
		PM
ranjib_	May be convert them as rfc involvement etc	12:41
		PM
holoway	ranjib_: that was where I was heading	12:42
		PM
martinisoft	+1	12:42
		PM
jonlives	I'd be against seeing LT almost limited to chef inc folks purely by virtue of time to spend on roadmaps	12:42
		PM
holoway	ranjib_: basically is there a difference between RFC participation and roadmaps?	12:42
		PM
jonlives	cos y'all get paid to work on this stuff a lot more than non-chef inc folks do :)	12:42
		PM
ssd7	+1, I have places I want to take certain subsystems, but I don't want to have to write up roadmaps as I want to get there incrementally as we have time	12:42
		PM
ranjib_	Yeah, i guess its more high level	12:42
		PM
	<i>gondoi is now known as zz_gondoi</i>	12:42
		PM
holoway	right - I can run a roadmap process with the maintainers	12:42
		PM
	and I think that would be healthy	12:42
		PM

ranjib_	Most cases a summary of rfc for that component	12:42
		PM
holoway	the way it is worded now, though	12:43
		PM
jonlives	I think having it as a separate process makes sense	12:43
		PM
btm	of course the problem with a roadmap is incentivizing other volunteers to implement it for you. so let's remove the roadmaps from rfc030.	12:43
		PM
holoway	a roadmap really has 3 things in it: a high level direction, themes for each functional area team, and a broad strokes guess of what you're going to do when	12:44
		PM
martinisoft	holoway: I don't think I'd mind that actually.	12:44
		PM
jonlives	holoway: essentially as decider you're gonna get to pick the core LT - if thom's interested and he's your favoured candiate that seems like a simple call :p	12:44
		PM
thom	holoway: i think that makes sense, and i also am happy to take on that 'generating roadmap' piece separately to any other LT duties if that makes sense	12:44
		PM
holoway	ok - lets remove roadmap creation from RFC0303	12:44
		PM
	LTs are about maintainence, review, decidering, and rfc process participation	12:45
		PM
btm	I'll make that PR.	12:45
		PM
	<i>holoway hugs btm</i>	12:45
		PM
jonlives	woot	12:45
		PM
	I'll submit myself for RHEL LT and core (just for democracy's sake) :p	12:45
		PM
holoway	awesome	12:45
		PM
thom	jonlives: fabulous. british mafia takeover	12:46

		PM
jonlives	:D	12:46
		PM
	win / win :P	12:46
		PM
holoway	we have four new RFCs	12:46
		PM
	and updates	12:46
		PM
	and 14 minutes left	12:46
		PM
	lets do updates fast, and then tackle as many RFCs as we get to	12:47
		PM
jonlives	not for today, but is there an update on governance board planned in the future?	12:47
		PM
	maybe one to add to the agenda for future updates	12:47
		PM
holoway	lets put it on the next agenda	12:47
		PM
jonlives	gravy	12:47
		PM
holoway	I admit it's gotten a little lost in the shuffle	12:47
		PM
	so the update is that folks got busy, and the maintainers have all the power	12:47
		PM
jonlives	excellent, thanks for the update :p	12:48
		PM
holoway	nathen and I will get it back on the "get implemented" train	12:48
		PM
jonlives	sweet	12:48
		PM
holoway	thanks for asking	12:48
		PM

jonlives	de nada!	12:48
		PM
holoway	nathenharvey: communtiy update?	12:48
		PM
nathenharv...	mailing list migration -- big fail :(12:49
		PM
	We exceeded Google Groups limits and there does not appear to be an easy way around this.	12:49
		PM
	I recommend we look at Discourse (http://www.discourse.org/) as our next option.	12:49
		PM
	We continue to host office hours to review PRs on Mondays and Wednesdays. Watch @ChefOfficeHours and the IRC rooms for details.	12:49
		PM
jonlives	chef - officially too big for google.	12:49
		PM
nathenharv...	jonlives: yeah, too much awesome in this community	12:50
		PM
holoway	nathenharvey: lets write an RFC	12:50
		PM
	re discourse	12:50
		PM
	and float it to the list	12:50
		PM
nathenharv...	holoway: I was going to update the current RFC	12:50
		PM
holoway	perfect	12:50
		PM
mivok	nathenharvey: wasn't it just that we were waiting for limits to be raised?	12:50
		PM
nathenharv...	but, yes	12:50
		PM
juliancdunn	mivok: it's unclear that the limits can be raised high enough	12:51
		PM

nathenharv...	mivok: yes...but we have to wait until April and then the question of whether or not they'll actually be raised is "maybe"	12:51 PM
holoway	for the record, I'm +1 on discourse - you can use it as a list if you want, or you can use it as a reddit style forum (which I much prefer, now)	12:51 PM
mivok	ah, ok	12:51 PM
nathenharv...	ChefConf - you should be registered. CHEFSTAR is the contributor discount code	12:51 PM
holoway	if you want to go and cannot for reasons that we can help with, reach out	12:52 PM
nathenharv...	there is a community summit on March 31 as part of ChefConf and there will be an organized hack day on Apr 3	12:52 PM
	+1 to what holoway just said. we want you there. let us know how we can help make that a reality	12:52 PM
	We continue to host office hours to review PRs on Mondays and Wednesdays. Watch @ChefOfficeHours and the IRC rooms for details.	12:52 PM
	That's it for today for community	12:53 PM
holoway	adamedx: updates?	12:53 PM
adamedx	We release Chef Server 12.04 yesterday	12:53 PM
	more goodness on key rotation	12:53 PM
	and a cookbook caching feature	12:53 PM
	We like the more frequent release cadence (i.e. weekly)	12:54 PM
	and we're aiming at getting nightlies to everyone soon	12:54 PM
	https://www.chef.io/blog/2015/02/18/chef-server...	12:54 PM

	with feature flags so new features can be tried out safely	12:55
		PM
	I believe we still owe an RFC on that	12:55
		PM
	maybe put that on the agenda for next time Nathen?	12:55
		PM
markvan	+2 on chef 12.0.4 release, from redhat 7 user	12:55
		PM
adamedx	awesome, thanks markvan	12:55
		PM
holoway	yep	12:55
		PM
	jtimberman: you have an update as well	12:55
		PM
adamedx	one more thing	12:55
		PM
jtimberman	Quick update on the chef-server cookbook. We're aware that there are issues using that cookbook with Chef Server 12, and that it may not work on all current supported platforms. The likely scenario is we'll deprecate chef-server cookbook for use with Chef Server 12, and defer to other new cookbooks to replace it (chef-server-cluster, chef-server-ingredient). I'm working on more detail about this soon, and by soon I mean EOB tomorrow,	12:55
	and post to the mailing list.	12:55
		PM
adamedx	we're working on a chef-client release for today (or Monday)	12:55
		PM
	https://github.com/chef/chef/blob/master/CHANGE...	12:56
		PM
	no more ruby 1.9.3 support for chef client 12.1.0	12:56
		PM
	done	12:56
		PM
	ok, I'm a little sad about the chef-server cookbook jtimberman	12:56

		PM
	but I will be happy if chef-server-cluster is as easy to use as chef-server :)	12:56
		PM
holoway	why wouldn't we update it?	12:56
		PM
lamont_oc	client 12.1.0 is passing in lamont-ci now	12:56
		PM
adamedx	awesome lamont	12:56
		PM
holoway	(that was my question - is chef-server-cluster a direct replacement for chef-server?)	12:57
		PM
mmzyk	Quietly, Team VI has pushed more public info to the chef-manage-issues repo. If you care about chef-manage, check out out. That's it for me. :)	12:57
		PM
	<i>jonlives imagines lamont-ci being lamont_oc really really quickly evaluating code in his head</i>	12:57
		PM
	Oh yeah, we released manage 1.9 and 1.9.1 - bug fixes, 1.9 added RHEL 7 support.	12:57
		PM
nathenharv...	2 minute warning	12:58
		PM
adamedx	excellent mmzyk, gracias	12:58
		PM
holoway	ok - anything else to cover? nathen, lets put the RFCs to the top of the agenda	12:58
		PM
	that we missed	12:58
		PM
nathenharv...	holoway: yep	12:58
		PM
holoway	ok	12:58
		PM
	see all you crazy cats in two weeks	12:58
		PM
jonlives	later all!	12:58
		PM

holoway	also, for next time	12:58
		PM
	if you want to have a strange meeting experience	12:58
		PM
nathenharv...	Awesome Community Chef Awards - Vote now! http://bit.ly/1AWTX34	12:58
		PM
holoway	listen to Sleep's "Dopesmoker" as your soundtrack	12:58
		PM
nathenharv...	thanks all. we'll meet again on March 5. same time and place.	12:59
		PM
	***** MEETING ENDS *****	12:59
		PM