13:01:53 **<dhellmann>** **#startmeeting releaseteam**

13:01:54 **<openstack>** Meeting started Mon Nov 9 13:01:53 2015 UTC and is due to finish in 60 minutes. The chair is dhellmann. Information about MeetBot at http://wiki.debian.org/MeetBot.

13:01:55 **<openstack>** Useful Commands: #action #agreed #help #info #idea #link #topic #startvote.

13:01:57 **<openstack>** The meeting name has been set to 'releaseteam'

13:01:59 **<ttx>** o/

13:02:06 **<dhellmann>** courtesy ping for ttx, dims, lifeless

13:02:06 **<ttx>** I'll let you mix

13:02:22 **<dhellmann>** I started an agenda in the calendar portion of https://etherpad.openstack.org/p/mitaka-relmgt-plan

13:02:42 **<dhellmann>** and ttx added some items to https://wiki.openstack.org/wiki/Release\_Cycle\_Management

13:03:21 **<dhellmann>** ok, starting with meeting time

13:03:26 **<dhellmann>** **#topic meeting time**

13:03:55 **<dhellmann>** I'd like to push this back an hour, if we can? with the daylight savings time shift, it's a bit early here

13:04:01 **<ttx>** Works for me

13:04:22 **<dhellmann>** ok, I'll update the meeting schedule in the wiki and eavesdrop

13:04:42 **<ttx>** **#agreed meeting time change 1400 UTC Mondays**

13:04:54 **<dhellmann>** thanks

13:05:06 **<dhellmann>** **#topic release notes vs. deliverables**

13:05:14 **<dhellmann>** I saw the question from SergeyLukjanov in #openstack-release

13:05:23 **<SergeyLukjanov>** o/

13:05:40 **<ttx>** It feels like a given deliverable should have a given release notes doc

13:05:42 **<dhellmann>** I expected each repo to have reno installed, but I see your point about one set of notes per deliverable

13:05:51 **<ttx>** since that's the same "release"

13:06:07 **<ttx>** maybe it's just about combining things from multiple repos

13:06:14 **<ttx>** into a single doc

13:06:33 **<ttx>** so they would still all have reno

13:06:51 **<SergeyLukjanov>** probable reno support building release notes from several repositories? and conf located in a "main" deliverable repo?

13:06:52 **<ttx>** but reno could generate "deliverable release notes" given a list of projects ?

13:06:53 **<dhellmann>** through reno, or when we push the HTML to docs.openstack.org?

13:07:48 **<ttx>** dhellmann: I guess the important part is to have a single something we can point users to when we do a release announcement

13:08:05 **<dhellmann>** how ugly would it be to simply put the notes in one repo this cycle?

13:08:11 **<ttx>** i.e. Sahara 6.0.0 is out, here are the release notes, here are the tarballs

13:08:46 **<dhellmann>** I'm not sure the sphinx stuff in the releases repo supports multiple deliverables right now, either

13:08:47 **<ttx>** dhellmann: that would separate the notes change from the change itself... apart from that, not too ugly I suppose

13:09:14 **<ttx>** it just makes one of the repos "special"

13:09:16 **<SergeyLukjanov>** IMO it's not so ugly to store all release notes in single repo

13:09:21 **<dhellmann>** right, longer term we'd want to have them closer to the code, but short term we have other things we have to implement this cycle

13:09:42 **<ttx>** we haven't that many deliverables anyway

13:09:54 **<ttx>** neutron I expect would suffer the most

13:10:05 **<ttx>** since the -aas teams are pretty separate

13:10:23 **<dhellmann>** I think the neutron teams have started adding reno to each repo, let me look at the list of patches again

13:10:44 **<ttx>** so having them contribute release notes to the other repo would certainly be more painful than for sahara or manila

13:10:47 **<dhellmann>** **#link https://review.openstack.org/#/q/topic:add-reno,n,z**

13:11:26 **<dhellmann>** I see a patch for neutron and networking-cisco

13:11:59 **<ttx>** OK, let's just say that deliverables use release notes in a main repo

13:12:08 **<ttx>** and punt that to next

13:12:10 **<dhellmann>** yeah, let's give this more thought but do the simple thing for now

13:12:34 **<dhellmann>** **#action dhellmann follow-up to reno thread on ML with instructions for multi-repo deliverable projects**

13:13:16 **<dhellmann>** **#topic governance reviews**

13:13:39 **<dhellmann>** Update Octavia release model: https://review.openstack.org/#/c/226933/

13:14:02 **<ttx>** that one sounds pretty good to me

13:14:14 **<dhellmann>** that one has sign-off from the ptl and both of us, so I think we should go ahead and merge it

13:14:29 **<ttx>** reok, pushing it now

13:14:45 **<dhellmann>** Make ironic-inspector and its client release:managed https://review.openstack.org/#/c/237611/

13:15:26 **<ttx>** how is the ironic release liaison work going so far ?

13:15:49 **<ttx>** I feel like they are on top of it

13:15:57 **<dhellmann>** they've been fairly responsive

13:16:08 **<ttx>** and they already have managed stuff

13:16:22 **<dhellmann>** yeah, that was key for me

13:16:23 **<ttx>** so I'd be +1 on it, if you're comfortable with the load

13:17:02 **<dhellmann>** well, under the new "we're not going to come looking for you" system, it shouldn't add to much

13:17:04 **<ttx>** basically for project teams we already handle and that have responsive liaisons, I'm +1. I'm +0 on everything else until we nail the automation

13:17:15 **<dhellmann>** I agree

13:17:41 **<dhellmann>** ok, let's take the change and add the 2 projects

13:17:51 **<ttx>** ok, approving now

13:17:51 **<dhellmann>** er, deliverables :-)

13:18:26 **<ttx>** done

13:18:44 **<dhellmann>** **#topic progress on relmgt-plan**

13:18:57 **<dhellmann>** we have a few sub-items here

13:19:06 **<ttx>** yes, let's start with those

13:19:30 **<dhellmann>** first, based on some discussion in one of the team meetings I noticed last week, I realized we haven't updated the liaison duties in the project team guide to reflect the changes in our use of LP

13:20:13 **<dhellmann>** maybe we should talk about that last item, "expand on 'getting rid of LP for change management within projects'" a bit before we talk about doc changes

13:21:14 **<dhellmann>** ttx: I think that was your item, what did you feel needed to be expanded?

13:21:42 **<ttx>** when I reviewed the paragraph last week I wasn't sure we covered all the bases

13:22:18 **<ttx>** it's not a clear set of actions

13:22:41 **<ttx>** like "we might be breaking some statistics gathering tools by not targeting bugs to milestones"

13:23:00 **<ttx>** should really be "look up tool X and check of we are going to break it"

13:23:13 **<ttx>** i.e. turn the discussion into a series of actions

13:23:22 **<dhellmann>** more than stackalytics?

13:23:29 **<ttx>** probably not

13:24:35 **<dhellmann>** who owns that code?

13:24:38 **\* dhellmann** checks gerrit

13:25:04 **<dhellmann>** https://review.openstack.org/#/admin/groups/183,members

13:29:34 **<ttx>** what did you mean by "options: -direct-release) like in infra-manual ??"

13:30:54 **<dhellmann>** I don't know what that is. I probably was typing as someone was talking in the room.

13:32:53 **<ttx>** ok, I think the action plan is clearer now

13:33:04 **<dhellmann>** yeah, that looks much better

13:33:50 **<ttx>** ok, we can move on

13:33:58 **<dhellmann>** the release tools are still creating and updating milestones, should we change that before M1?

13:34:26 **<ttx>** I'm unsure which tools we'll be using for M1

13:34:48 **<dhellmann>** yeah, I was thinking of the post-versioning script we use for libraries

13:35:31 **<dhellmann>** ok, good

13:35:51 **<ttx>** I'll take the release tooling analysis. I removed myself from the stackalytics check

13:35:59 **<dhellmann>** should we roll the liaison duties changes into this action list?

13:36:16 **<dhellmann>** I'll ping the stackalytics folks and ask them to figure it out

13:36:27 **<ttx>** it's more a "new model for milestones" thing I think

13:37:35 **<dhellmann>** do you want to look at that list of duties, or shall I?

13:38:04 **<dhellmann>** I'll take it

13:38:06 **<ttx>** please do

13:38:27 **<dhellmann>** ok, let's talk about splitting off the stable team

13:38:43 **<dhellmann>** at the summit we discussed recommending that they stand as a separate team

13:38:53 **<dhellmann>** do we have enough people involved to make that work?

13:39:23 **<ttx>** I think we do. I feel like the duties are now well separated with the release team

13:39:24 **<dhellmann>** I did not notice a lot of involvement from folks I thought were stable maintainers on the mailing list thread about extending the kilo support window

13:40:12 **<ttx>** yeah. I fear there is a bit of chicken-and-egg though. They don't really own that piece

13:40:27 **<dhellmann>** yeah

13:40:33 **<ttx>** So they would start by being the stable branch policy custodians

13:40:47 **<ttx>** and hopefully grow into owning the health of the branches themselves

13:40:48 **<dhellmann>** good point

13:40:49 **<Jokke\_>** dhellmann: do we actually know if we have enough folks or not before splitting the team. IMHO the stable group is really suppressed unless really needed anyways

13:41:11 **<dhellmann>** Jokke\_ : that was my initial question

13:41:13 **<dhellmann>** **#link https://review.openstack.org/#/admin/groups/120,members**

13:41:17 **<ttx>** well, the thing is, the release team doesn't handle the stable team. So it's not a "split"

13:41:22 **<dhellmann>** lots of names on that list, but I'm not sure how many are active

13:41:31 **<dhellmann>** ok, poor choice of words

13:41:43 **<ttx>** I guess the question is more: do we have a stable team

13:41:55 **<dhellmann>** they're under the release ptl now, though, and we want \*that\* to change

13:42:14 **<ttx>** if it needs to be under life support under release management to survive, I'd say it needs to die

13:42:18 **<dhellmann>** well, yes, identifying the active team members is a good place to start

13:42:28 **<Jokke\_>** yeah ... currently we do not have stable team, but bunch of folks who work either under the projects or rel management

13:42:34 **<ttx>** I feel like we have prevented them from owning the issue though

13:42:44 **<Jokke\_>** ttx: ++

13:42:52 **<ttx>** mostly my fault, having a foot in two places

13:43:10 **<ttx>** If they had their team and PTL, they could also justify the resources

13:43:21 **<dhellmann>** yeah, looking at this list I think some are actually fairly active these days

13:43:28 **<ttx>** rather than be the 4th wheel of release management

13:43:36 **<Jokke\_>** ttx: I think that would help

13:43:40 **<dhellmann>** right, so what's the first step?

13:43:47 **<dhellmann>** s/first/next

13:43:50 **<ttx>** dhellmann: I'll propose it this week to the list

13:43:52 **<dhellmann>** k

13:43:54 **<ttx>** see who steps up

13:44:08 **<dhellmann>** **#action ttx propose stable maintenance team be set up with its own PTL**

13:44:17 **<ttx>** it might actually be good timing with that stable discussion

13:44:32 **<dhellmann>** serendipity for the win

13:44:47 **<ttx>** because seriously, the gap between the number of people needing those branches and the number of people stepping up to help is huge

13:45:08 **\* dhellmann** nods

13:45:34 **<ttx>** anyway, will sned that this week and we'll see where it goes

13:45:38 **<johnthetubaguy>** just to check, we said the projects own their own stable branch releases at the moment?

13:45:45 **<ttx>** I'm mostly trying to refocus the release team or release things

13:45:50 **<ttx>** on\*

13:46:04 **<ttx>** rather than make us decide for a bunch of other folks on stable matters

13:46:14 **<dhellmann>** johnthetubaguy : yes, we're talking about the overall stable maintenance team that manages the policy, etc. rather than landing patches, per se

13:46:22 **<ttx>** and preventing them from stepping up

13:46:33 **<johnthetubaguy>** dhellmann: cool, makes sense

13:46:53 **<dhellmann>** ttx: ++

13:46:54 **<ttx>** dhellmann, johnthetubaguy: well ideally that team would grow people that would maintain the stable branches too

13:47:05 **<ttx>** but one step at a time :)

13:47:11 **<dhellmann>** ttx: sure

13:47:21 **<johnthetubaguy>** ttx: yeah, good call

13:47:27 **<ttx>** At this stage I just want to empower the few people that help

13:48:11 **<dhellmann>** let's move on, one or two more things to cover

13:48:14 **<ttx>** dhellmann: ack

13:48:28 **<dhellmann>** for "next steps on automation" I think I just need to work with fungi on the spec

13:48:45 **<dhellmann>** we did mention some other changes to existing tools during the LP discussion

13:49:23 **<dhellmann>** I'm going to try to focus on the spec this week, and leave the code changes for late in the week or early next

13:50:41 **<dhellmann>** for the reno rollout, we need a publishing job set up to copy files from project builds up to docs.openstack.org/releasenotes (the place loquacities and ajeager agreed on)

13:50:51 **<ttx>** ok

13:51:39 **<dhellmann>** I added that as an action under "enable new model for milestones"

13:52:23 **<dhellmann>** ok, I think that's it for the agenda

13:52:28 **<dhellmann>** **#topic open discussion**

13:52:32 **<ttx>** ack, nothing else for me

13:52:51 **<dhellmann>** I noticed some of the reno-related tasks are duplicated, so I'll go through the plan and clean that up a bit

13:53:04 **<dhellmann>** the feature stuff related to version handling, in particular, shows up twice

13:53:39 **<dhellmann>** other than that, I think we're done

13:54:00 **<ttx>** agreed

13:54:05 **<dhellmann>** good, we can go ahead and sign off a bit early

13:54:12 **<dhellmann>** thanks, ttx!

13:54:18 **<dhellmann>** **#endmeeting**