

nathenharvey	**** MEETING STARTS ***	
jonlives	ok, agenda for today is here: <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...">https://github.com/chef/chef-community-irc-meet...</a>	12:01 PM
	one additional item is that chefconf was awesome, and nathenharvey and all who organized are awesome too and deserve a hefty round of applause :)	12:02 PM
adamedx	yeah	12:02 PM
Eeyun	yes	12:02 PM
kallistec	woohoo	12:02 PM
	<i>stevenmurawski applauds</i>	12:02 PM
	<i>Eeyun claps vigorously</i>	12:02 PM
adamedx	huge thanks to everyone who came	12:02 PM
jonlives	on which note, community update from (the awesome) nathenharvey!	12:02 PM
nathenharvey	indeed, thank you to everyone who attended ChefConf	12:03 PM
	if you were unable to attend, hopefully you caught some of the livestream and felt the warmth of 1500 Chefs hugging coming from Santa Clara	12:03 PM
	we're uploading recordings of all of the videos to this playlist on YouTube: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_DET0XsgrPc&amp;lis...">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_DET0XsgrPc&amp;lis...</a>	12:03 PM
	we also announced a survey at ChefConf hoping to get some data on use of community cookbooks	12:04 PM

	if you've not already done so, please take a few minutes to complete <a href="http://bit.ly/chefconf2015-cookbook-survey">http://bit.ly/chefconf2015-cookbook-survey</a>	12:04 PM
someara	mmmm data	12:05 PM
nathenharvey	We announced our three Awesome Community Chefs: jonlives, Matt Wrock, and coderanger	12:06 PM
ranjib	\m/	12:06 PM
adamedx	w00t	12:06 PM
nathenharvey	and we announced dates for the Community Summit in Seattle - Oct 14-15. <a href="http://summit.chef.io">http://summit.chef.io</a>	12:06 PM
	please save the date for the summit! we want to see all of you there	12:07 PM
jtimberman	strongly recommend the summit	12:07 PM
mary_grace	yay awesome Chefs!	12:07 PM
nathenharvey	jonlives: that's it for the community update for this week :)	12:07 PM
mary_grace	and +1 to summit!	12:07 PM
btm	nathenharvey: do we have an Awesome Chef hall of fame? I'd propose we add them to CHEF_MVPS.md.	12:07 PM
jtimberman	but beware the diller room ;)	12:07 PM
jonlives	thanks nathenharvey - over to adamedx for a chef software update	12:07

		PM
adamedx	thanks	12:07
		PM
nathenharvey	btm: great suggestion! I'll send a PR for CHEF_MVPS.md	12:08
		PM
adamedx	first, I hope everyone has tried out our packagecloud repos for chef-dk, chef-server, other chef releases	12:08
		PM
	<a href="https://packagecloud.io/chef">https://packagecloud.io/chef</a>	12:08
		PM
jonlives	yes, and thank you for that!!!	12:08
		PM
adamedx	cool, would definitely like to see feedback on that experience	12:08
		PM
ranjib	oh.. this is going to be awesome	12:09
		PM
thom	totally awesome	12:09
		PM
adamedx	chef-client isn't there... yet.	12:09
		PM
jtimmerman	YES	12:09
		PM
	this is superb.	12:09
		PM
adamedx	but the team is working on getting that in for apt / yum goodness	12:09
		PM
jtimmerman	we are! :D	12:10
		PM

adamedx	and eventually chocolatey / oneget (for Windows users)	12:10
		PM
	other than that	12:10
		PM
	the team is working on how releasing to those nightly channels	12:10
		PM
	can let us move faster without the breaks for production users that we saw earlier this year	12:11
		PM
	if you've seen our postmortems (including one we had at chefconf)	12:11
		PM
	there is definitely an element of more integration testing	12:11
		PM
	but I think the nightly releases are a key part of it	12:11
		PM
	btm, anything to add there?	12:11
		PM
	if not, I think that actually covers both the chef software and chef client / server updates	12:12
		PM
ranjib	is it possible to have a community channel? for arm and other platforms ?	12:12
		PM
adamedx	so back to you jonlives	12:12
		PM
jonlives	nice, thanks adamedx	12:12
		PM
adamedx	ah, interesting question	12:13
		PM
	jtimberman?	12:13

		PM
jonlives	I don't think we have any action items from the last meeting that aren't on the agenda	12:13
		PM
martinb3	Anything we can do to make it easier to download chef-client, like a CDN or something that covers multiple cloud providers' DCs.	12:13
		PM
jonlives	so on to PRs	12:13
		PM
btm	we're working on a couple RFCs regarding the release process from a couple most-mortems. There isn't a PR for those yet, just a branch, but we're tracking those actions.	12:13
		PM
jtimberman	adamedx: unsure, will make a note to investigate.	12:13
		PM
adamedx	k	12:13
		PM
	PRs then	12:13
		PM
jonlives	first PR is <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/109">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/109</a> from someara	12:13
		PM
nathenharvey	also, just so everyone's up-to-date: Adam Jacob is on vacation so Jon Cowie (jonlives) is the designated project lead until Adam returns	12:14
		PM
btm	<a href="https://github.com/chef/chef/issues/3205">https://github.com/chef/chef/issues/3205</a> <-- if you're interested in nightlies vs prereleases vs stable vs versioning madness for client	12:14
		PM
jonlives	I'd like to note btm's comment at the end there proposing an RFC for ohai config which will make both this and #108 easier and less breaky to deal with	12:14
		PM
ssd7	I'm +1 on what seems to be the consensus of the comments: Make the behavior an ohai configurable, default to the current behavior with some warning, change the default at some point in the future.	12:15
		PM
thom	is it worth holding both of these until we have the config RFC? or shall we just proceed on the assumption we will have?	12:15
		PM

<b>jonlives</b>	thom: that's what I was just about to suggest	12:15 PM
<b>ranjib</b>	+1	12:15 PM
<b>zts</b>	+1	12:15 PM
<b>thom</b>	(and make it clear in both that they're dependent on said config)	12:15 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	given that the ohai config RFC would give a clear path to making these much easier to implement, I vote for holding off	12:15 PM
	btm: were you planning to submit the ohai config RFC?	12:15 PM
<b>ssd7</b>	+1 on waiting for the config RFC. That said, if we are going to hold up changes behind that, we should make sure we actually have resources lined up to work on the Ohai config RFC's implementation	12:16 PM
<b>btm</b>	jonlives: I can, since I obviously have opinions.	12:17 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	agreed	12:17 PM
	excellent.	12:17 PM
<b>thom</b>	ssd7: agreed	12:17 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	to ssd7's point, would anybody like to volunteer to steer implementation of said upcoming config RFC?	12:17 PM
<b>btm</b>	I'll have something before next meeting.	12:17 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	we don't wanna have these two parked for ages.	12:17

		PM
<b>btm</b>	well, we kind of make an implication somewhere that you shouldn't write RFCs for stuff you're not going to implement, so, I'll work on that too.	12:18 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	sounds good.	12:18 PM
		PM
<b>thom</b>	btm: or i can, but let's confer after	12:18 PM
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	OK, I'll comment on those RFCs to the above effect after the meeting	12:18 PM
		PM
<b>thom</b>	jonlives: sounds good.	12:18 PM
		PM
<b>jonlives</b>	next we have <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/102">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/102</a> from dblessing	12:18 PM
		PM
	comments have varied on this one from strongly pro to strongly against.	12:19 PM
		PM
<b>ssd7</b>	(aside: btm Where is that implication? I'd like us to make it a bit more explicit, our RFCs are stacking up and feel a bit like unfunded mandates)	12:19 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	much as with .rb databags, I kind of feel like if we're going to support nested dirs in libraries etc, we also need to support it in recipes regardless of feelings around having hundreds of nested recipes in the first place.	12:20 PM
<b>ranjib</b>	we have similar code organization related challenges across LWRP, recipe. library segment, i think we can extend the resolver like logic across the board and then implement the whole nesting -> namespace logic	12:20 PM
<b>btm</b>	So I just looked at 102 for the first time, I'm not seeing an argument against the specific implementation, just how people use it?	12:21 PM
<b>thom</b>	yup, definitely agree for consistency's sake (and I think it's a useful feature anyway - there are some things that just need a boat load of recipes	12:21 PM
<b>ssd7</b>	I'm +1 on this. I suddenly don't love that :: is our separator as it would make more than 1 level of directories hard, but I doubt people would ever need more than 1 level.	12:21 PM

jonlives	btm: you're correct, coderanger did in fact say he was in favour of supporting it anyway, my bad.	12:21 PM
jtimberman	I'm -1 :/	12:21 PM
c_t	why would :: make more that one level of directories hard?	12:22 PM
btm	The segments aren't all the same nesting problem though. I just want chef to load all the libraries and I'm on the hook for whats in them, but it should only work with the specific recipes I ask it to.  jtimberman: why?	12:22 PM
jonlives	jtimberman: can you elaborate?	12:22 PM
thom	btm: they're not the same problem, but they are the same UX	12:22 PM
btm	ssd7: <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf...">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/blob/master/rf...</a> "Unless otherwise stated, the RFC author is also volunteering to implement the feature or process if accepted."	12:23 PM
jtimberman	i don't think this solves a problem, and i think it introduces a new one: someone who implements this for e.g. community cookbook will then make that cookbook unusable on older verssions of chef  yeah we can upgrade chef and i do that myself, but there's MANY organizations that are running old versions of chef for various reasons	12:23 PM
thom	jtimberman: then they pin an old version of the cookbook	12:24 PM
adamedx	so this would be unlikely to see use in community cookbooks for some time then	12:24 PM
jtimberman	i see this kind of feature as user-hostile.	12:24 PM
jonlives	jtimberman: we have the same issue every time we add metadata to cookbooks though	12:24



		PM
jtimberman	i see pinning cookbooks to older versions as a cop out tbh	12:24
		PM
btm	jtimberman: that's like, every breaking change ever though.	12:24
		PM
adamedx	does additional metadata always break things jonlives?	12:24
		PM
jonlives	adamedx: on older chef clients it can, yes	12:24
		PM
adamedx	k, I actually thought we ignored things we didn't know about	12:25
		PM
	but I get your point	12:25
		PM
jonlives	we have the RFC to add chef_version metadata to stop that, in a turtles-all-the-way-down twist.	12:25
		PM
ssd7	c_t: Sorry, not hard, just ugly	12:25
		PM
	c_t: imho anyway :)	12:25
		PM
jtimberman	does this actually solve a problem?	12:25
		PM
lamont_oc	yeah we cant block progress and start requiring backwards compat to chef client 11.0.0 for all time	12:25
		PM
zts	hands up who would use the nested recipes feature if it existed? Or is everyone "I* wouldn't use it, but sure, go ahead" ?	12:25
		PM
thom	i have definitely had places i'd've liked something like that in the past	12:26
		PM

<b>jtimberman</b>	like how many people out there are clamoring to have foo::bar::baz or whatever? sounds like a mess in a cookbook if you have that many recipes you need to split them up like this.	12:26 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	I'm more the latter, but I can definitely see the use if you have a large number of recipes	12:26 PM
<b>someara</b>	I'm kinda -1 on it too	12:26 PM
	it makes sense for libraries	12:26 PM
<b>ssd7</b>	Hrm. Two of our most prolififc cookbook authors are -1.	12:26 PM
<b>zts</b>	I tend to think a very large number of recipes is a smell, and I'm not convinced more nesting is the de-stinker for that case	12:26 PM
<b>lamont_oc</b>	i'm leaning towards using more recipes and fewer cookbooks to reduce the cookbook metadata maintenance overhead	12:26 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	since we've got multiple -1s on this, I propose we take this to the PR	12:26 PM
<b>someara</b>	but include_recipe "my_cookbook::myrecipe::foo::bar::baz::biz"	12:26 PM
<b>c_t</b>	the use case for nested recipes that comes to my mind is something like the apache2 cookbook	12:26 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	cos up until now, feedback on the PR was largely positive	12:26 PM
<b>thom</b>	jonlives: agreed	12:26 PM
<b>c_t</b>	(unless it's been radically rewritten)	12:27 PM
	just for organization, since there's about 800 recipes in there	12:27

		PM
jtimberman	jonlives: i was on vacation, and then at chefconf, when this PR was opened :D	12:27
		PM
jonlives	jtimberman: I'm being entirely blameless, I just want to make sure the convo is all in the same place :p	12:27
		PM
jtimberman	well not when it was opened specifically, but whatever. it fell off my radar	12:27
		PM
	jtimberman nods	12:27
		PM
c_t	but I don't think I'd use it much myself	12:27
		PM
someara	it sounds good on the face, but thinking about the implications on the UX makes me cringe	12:27
		PM
jtimberman	someara: exactly :D	12:28
		PM
ranjib	this will be super pain in its current form	12:28
		PM
jonlives	OK, let's punt on that one for now, anybody who is -1 on this please state that fact for the record on the PR	12:28
		PM
ranjib	specially the cheksum and syncing logic etc..	12:28
		PM
luckymike	nested recipes sound miserable	12:28
		PM
jonlives	+1s largely all seem to agree for the same reasons	12:28
		PM
thom	someara: but if we're allowing libs and lwrps to have directory structure, the UX is in fact consistent (although nasty in the run list)	12:28
		PM

<b>ranjib</b>	above all it helps people building deep inheritance	12:28 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	ok.	12:29 PM
<b>someara</b>	not really... in libraries you include and include_relative the same as Normal Ruby	12:29 PM
<b>ranjib</b>	thom, but they dont contribute to a linear resource collection	12:29 PM
<b>thom</b>	not looking forward to seeing all the "well i put my library in 'foo/bar/baz' and my recipe in 'foo/bar/baz' and now my cookbook is stuffed"	12:29 PM
<b>someara</b>	in the Chef DSL you're referencing them as cookbook::recipe	12:29 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	we're doing OK on time so I shall entertain max 5 mins more on this one :p	12:29 PM
<b>nathenharvey</b>	I'll add #102 to next week's agenda and we can continue the convo in the PR and again live here next week	12:29 PM
	<i>someara goes to the PR</i>	12:29 PM
<b>ranjib</b>	notifications from nested recipes also needs to thought out	12:29 PM
<b>jonlives</b>	I'm gonna juggle the agenda a little to deal with a quicker PR next, <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/8">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/8</a> from mattray	12:30 PM
<b>mattray</b>	This has been a known issue for awhile, networking in ohai doesn't cover anything other than 'public' or 'private'	12:31 PM
	And OpenStack especially hasn't done that	12:31 PM
	the PR kicked around inside Chef before RFCs existed	12:31

		PM
jonlives	this one is going to be in ohai 8, and will use new attributes so seems pretty safe.	12:32
		PM
	anybody against it?	12:32
		PM
btm	Because of always shipping latest Ohai in Omnibus, we let the ability to have a major release ship breaking changes slip away. I wonder if we want to force an Ohai Major to trigger a Chef Major (because version numbers are cheap) or if we want to lean towards the feature flags we discussed in the amazon platform_family PR?	12:33
		PM
jonlives	this one doesn't touche existing attributes if I read it correctly so not breaking	12:34
		PM
	but the general point bears further discussion I think	12:34
		PM
ranjib	im +1 on this.	12:34
		PM
c_t	+1	12:34
		PM
thom	btm: that sounds like an RFC - but I can see drawbacks to both	12:34
		PM
nathenharvey	15 minute warning (and a reminder that we changed this meeting to 50 minutes in length instead of a full hour)	12:35
		PM
thom	btm: (i'd lean towards Major == Major, though)	12:35
		PM
jonlives	ok, I'm going to approve this one unless anybody speaks up in the next 30 seconds	12:35
		PM
thom	i'm +1 on #8	12:35
		PM
btm	mattray: The line "This will be an Ohai 8 or later plugin." sounds like this has breaking changes?	12:35

**lamont\_oc**

ohai 8 is current

12:36

**mattray**

btm: that was there because the RFC was written when 7 was being developed

12:36

and I updated it to read 8 :)

12:36

**btm**

mattray: Is that line meaningful? Can we just get rid of it?

12:36

**chip-**

We *\*say\** version numbers are cheap, but the support policy RFC is predicated entirely on majors

12:36

**mattray**

we can get rid of it

12:36

**jonlives**

last chance to -1

12:36

**chip-**

and not release date

12:36

**jonlives**

mattray: I'll approve pending your removal of that line

12:36

**mattray**

jonlives: roger that

12:36

**jonlives**

ok, next we have <https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/100> from lamont\_oc

12:37

**btm**

Yeah +1 if it has no breaking changes. I inferred it did from the version note.

12:37

**jonlives**

carried over from last meeting

12:37

lamont_oc	i updated that PR with some notes on how read-only desired state might be accomplished, but the implementation of that is out of scope	12:37 PM
	i think i've incorporated all the other feedback that i got in prior edits	12:38 PM
jonlives	there's one outstanding question from phil on how dirtied data is detected	12:39 PM
	but other than that it seems like most feedback has indeed been incorporated.	12:39 PM
lamont_oc	that'll be a stored deep dup of the desired state	12:39 PM
nathenharvey	10 minute warning	12:40 PM
jonlives	is anybody -1 about this one?	12:40 PM
kallistec	lamont_oc: you could also do a hash of the canonicalized JSON but that'd be tricky from a compat point of view	12:40 PM
jonlives	(btm you ok to be editor again today btw?)	12:40 PM
lamont_oc	yeah, that'd only save a little bit of memory as well since desired state is small	12:40 PM
btm	jonlives: yeah, as soon as we accept something. :)	12:41 PM
lamont_oc	i don't think that's worthwhile to put in an RFC, its way into implementation detail	12:41 PM
jonlives	Given that lamont_oc has addressed the outstanding feedback raised, unless anybody is agin the idea, I'd like to approve this one.	12:41 PM
jtimberman	+1	12:42

		PM
thom	jonlives: do it	12:42
		PM
jonlives	60 secs to speak up	12:42
		PM
ranjib	+1	12:42
		PM
jonlives	ok, 'tis done.	12:43
		PM
chip-	awyeah	12:43
		PM
jonlives	last and final item is <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/106</a>	12:43
		PM
	from jkeiser	12:43
		PM
	the remaining issues here are mainly btm's feedback that this seems like an unfunded mandate	12:43
		PM
	I also agree that we should require an issue as the main "link" to the implementation	12:44
		PM
nathenharvey	5 minutes	12:45
		PM
jonlives	btm: can you elaborate on your concerns on the unfunded mandate side of things?	12:45
		PM
btm	jonlives: it doesn't look like the feedback about removing the "orphaned" status has been resolved yet either.	12:45
		PM
jonlives	oh, true, looks like that slipped through. I'll comment on that	12:46
		PM



btm	jonlives: so I agree that accepted standards track RFCs should be updated to Final when they're complete. Who does that? Do the RFC editors have to go through the list and then read all the chef code to try to figure out if it happened or not yet?	12:47 PM
jonlives	I'd say that should be up to the implementer, via a PR.	12:47 PM
btm	jonlives: We could have been doing that already, but we haven't organically. So I think we need to be clear that the implementer should open a PR against the accepted RFC when implemented.	12:48 PM
nathenharvey	much like mparadise has done in <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/113">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/113</a>	12:48 PM
jonlives	btm: agreed	12:48 PM
nathenharvey	I'll comment on the PR to that effect too, nathenharvey let's re-add this to next week's meeting for final approval pending those tweaks	12:49 PM
	jonlives: got it	12:49 PM
	in our last minute can we review / approve <a href="https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/113?">https://github.com/chef/chef-rfc/pull/113?</a>	12:49 PM
	I don't think there's really anything to do other than merge it in	12:50 PM
	<i>Aevin1387 is now known as Aevin1387_</i>	12:50 PM
jonlives	agreed	12:50 PM
someara	shipit.gif	12:50 PM
jonlives	I'll merge it now.	12:50 PM

ranjib	+1	12:50
		PM
	<i>Aevin1387_ is now known as Aevin1387</i>	12:50
		PM
jtimberman	that green button is awfully tempting	12:50
		PM
jonlives	and done.	12:50
		PM
btm	jonlives: and given 113, maybe we should say somewhere that editors can just merge those updates.	12:50
		PM
jtimberman	whew, it went away	12:50
		PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] jonlives pushed 1 new commit to master: <a href="http://git.io/ve7So">http://git.io/ve7So</a>	12:50
		PM
	chef-rfc/master 554476c Jon Cowie: Merge pull request #113 from chef/mp/rfc041-status-update...	12:50
		PM
jonlives	btm: good call	12:50
		PM
thom	btm: +lots	12:50
		PM
nathenharvey	ok, we're at time	12:51
		PM
github-bawt	[chef-rfc] btm deleted mp/rfc041-status-update at 737768d: <a href="http://git.io/ve79O">http://git.io/ve79O</a>	12:52
		PM
jonlives	and that's that!	12:52
		PM
nathenharvey	let's capture that editors can just merge updates like 113	12:52

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

12:52

12:52