

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
23:00:58	fukawi2	!open-meeting
23:00:58	lord-taco	**** MEETING OPENED AT 23:0:58 BY fukawi2 ****
23:01:23	nicedream	joined #archserver-meeting
23:01:40	fukawi2	welcome all... thanks for taking the time out to join the meeting :)
23:02:18	fukawi2	there's been some discussion that I missed (but read over) about the order of the agenda for meetings.
23:02:25	sbnet_phone	Pleasure to be here
23:03:23	fukawi2	we'll run with the order on the agenda that we've got for today, unless something starts taking too long, then we'll hold the discussion and come back to it at the end for the benefit of those who don't need to be involved but would like to be here for other topics
23:04:04	fukawi2	so, first up is the Kernel...
23:04:04	fukawi2	!topic Kernel - LTS or Standard Upstream? CentOS? Debian?
23:04:04	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Kernel - LTS or Standard Upstream? CentOS? Debian?'
23:04:43	fukawi2	I think this has been much been decided to run with the upstream (AL) -lts kernel, using 2.6.32 for 'redgum'
23:04:53	triplem1	
23:04:55	jowilkin	Yes i think so
23:04:58	fukawi2	am I correct in this understanding?
23:05:04	sbnet_phone	I feel the same
23:05:09	jowilkin	It is actually the kernel devs who maintain this branch
23:05:33	jowilkin	Well 1 kernel dev, which is the only thing that concerns me
23:05:54	triplem1	think this is agreed then.
23:06:01	lordmetroid	I am here
23:06:53	fukawi2	I can see jowilkin's concern.... would it be worth perhaps approaching the AL team and seeing if we could perhaps "join forces" to create and maintain the -lts
23:07:20	lordmetroid	Well, it is worth a try I suppose
23:07:27	triplem1	hm, i think that the kernel lts is itself maintained by a real kernel dev and not by any AL guys.
23:07:38	jowilkin	I think they have only chosen this one because it maintained by a kernel dev
23:07:38	lordmetroid	The worst answer is no and that simply takes us to the same position we are in now
23:07:41	faelar_as	I'm not into kernel stuff but, doesn't desktop and server use different features ?
23:07:45	jowilkin	they don't do anything special to maintain it on the AL side
23:08:08	triplem1	right.
23:08:29	jowilkin	Faelar_AS: we may change some configuration settings to make it better for a server, but the basic patching and everything will be the same that AL uses
23:08:35	triplem1	therefore, only one kernel dev (haberman, or so) is doing this by himself, fine for me for the first release.
23:08:58	ras0irwell	, what about enabling some modules in kernel instead of patching? i mean selinux, lxc etc.
23:09:01	jowilkin	triplem1 has pointed out in the past that so many distros are using 2.6.32 that it's unlikely for support to end anytime soon
23:09:12	fukawi2	ok... can we say we're happy to run with the current situation for 'redgum' and see how that works?
23:09:19	triplem1	
23:09:30	lordmetroid1	
23:09:32	fukawi2	ie, just pulling the AL -lts kernel and configuring it for AS purposes?

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
23:09:33	jowilkini	agree, i'm happy with the current setup
23:09:46	faelar_as	If we can work together (AL + AS) it is fine, as long as we have a server-aimed kernel at the end.
23:10:05	jowilkin	right now it is actually the main AL kernel, but it will become the -lts kernel as soon as they adopt 2.6.33
23:10:33	fukawi2	ok, sounds good
23:10:49	fukawi2	let's roll with that for now and revisit in the future if we need to
23:10:56	fukawi2	any further discussion on the kernel?
23:11:07	lordmetroid	.
23:11:25	fukawi2	!topic ArchServer Package Portal - General Discussion; Licensing
23:11:25	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'ArchServer Package Portal - General Discussion; Licensing'
23:11:30	fukawi2	sbnet_phone: over to you....
23:12:46	jowilkin	Can we get some information on what exactly APP is and what it's purpose is?
23:13:02	sbnet_phone	OK, app is in the works
23:13:06	triplem	http://wiki.archserver.org/index.php/ArchServer_Package_Portal
23:13:08	lord-taco	http://wiki.archserver.org/index.php/ArchServer_Package_Portal = "ArchServer Package Portal - ArchServer Wiki"
23:13:16	lordmetroid	I want to have one of those search functions that exists on archlinux.org
23:13:37	ras0ir1	
23:13:38	fukawi2	guys -- let sbnet_phone give us his status update, then we'll have questions please
23:14:01	sbnet_phone	The idea is to take all git packages and maintain via a web interface
23:14:42	lordmetroid	Sounds interesting, though I still haven't learned how to create a package so I have nothing to compare to
23:14:46	sbnet_phone	It is another 80% done and testing on sqlite MySQL and pgsq
23:15:49	sbnet_phone	I should have a great demo Monday or Tuesday
23:15:54	lordmetroid	Awesome
23:16:48	sbnet_phone	Been held up because of actual work
23:17:04	fukawi2	one question I've had a couple of times is how can we help you? you've taken on the development by yourself, and AFAIK no one has been giving you any assistance.....
23:18:32	sbnet_phone	None needed until demo time. Then mostly testers for II tweaks
23:19:19	lordmetroid	Considering you expect a demo to be available in a few days, it doesn't seem to need all that much work
23:19:29	faelar_as	Is this php-based ? I quote the wiki : Written in PHP (cake framework?) unless a good case can be made for installing Rails on the server?
23:19:36	lordmetroid	But I am happy to help you
23:19:43	fukawi2	ok -- well just ask if you need anything
23:19:47	sbnet_phone	PHP fully
23:19:55	sbnet_phone	NP
23:19:58	fukawi2	any more status update or question time? (sorry, I should have asked that before my question)
23:19:58	faelar_as	Framework ?
23:20:20	lordmetroid	The least I could do is to testrun it
23:20:41	faelar_as	Sorry, I'm asking question to see if I can help since I know PHP
23:20:47	lordmetroid	Maybe you should upload it to a git repository, so that anyone can help at their whim
23:21:08	faelar_as	So it's on topic I guess....
23:21:24	sbnet_phone	Sbcms hit my site for the 2.0 beta framework

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
23:22:25	sbnet_phone	I'm in the middle of git on my server
23:22:59	sbnet_phone	Need to convert my CVS to git then it will be pulic
23:23:05	sbnet_phone	Public
23:23:42	triple	there is a special repo for you on the git.archserver.org server
23:24:22	triple	you could put it up there as well, if you wish.
23:24:34	sbnet_phone	Sure
23:24:54	fukawi2	the biggest tool that it will give us that I'm eager for as far as project coordination goes is ownership of packages. The APP will be the 'final say' on who owns which packages, so we know who is responsible for what
23:25:31	jowilkin	it would be nice to have an AUR like system as well, if i understand right APP will provide this?
23:25:35	fukawi2	rather than relying on comments at the top of PKGBUILDs :)
23:25:51	faelar_as	Will it handle both official and unofficial (AUR-like) package ?
23:25:52	sbnet_phone	Yes. This is true. Saves us from that wiki page
23:26:06	fukawi2	yes, I'm looking forward to retiring that page ;)
23:26:48	sbnet_phone	Yes it will also include aur type integration
23:27:28	fukawi2	any more questions for sbnet_phone regarding the APP?
23:27:43	faelar_as	Not yet :)
23:28:00	sbnet_phone	LOL
23:28:48	fukawi2	okie dokie then.... we'll leave it at that then and just say we look forward to seeing the demo when it's ready :)
23:28:49	fukawi2	!topic Installation ISO
23:28:49	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Installation ISO'
23:29:00	fukawi2	triple -- the floor is yours
23:29:14	triple	Install ISO is working, we need to test this still with real Hardware, probably we need to add other packages to the
23:29:15	triple	ISO, right now it is stripped to the bone.
23:29:58	lordmetroid	I never get anything but the minimal net-install
23:30:20	jowilkin	net install isos still need to be created, but the framework is in place to make them
23:30:41	lordmetroid	Ok
23:31:00	lordmetroid	Sorry to say, I need to go and pickup my dad so I'll be away from 30+ minutes
23:31:40	triple	so, has anybody tested the isos using real hardware?
23:31:56	jowilkin	lol, not me
23:32:04	ras0ir	yeah i tested it on my laptop
23:32:11	triple	i think mostly we did vbox stuff and this we need to change, to test the iso booting and installing as well
23:32:57	triple	so, all feedback is quite positive and i do think that we are close to the final touchdown
23:32:57	faelar_as	Are you intersted on a parallels test ?
23:33:28	triple	faelar_as: not really, real hardware with like raid stuff and all this is my real interest right now.
23:33:28	jowilkin	One topic that fits in here i think is do we provide any additional install routes for users
23:33:49	jowilkin	do we continue to provide vbox images? do we build images for other types of virtual machines?
23:34:06	jowilkin	this is how many people will use AS most likely, in a VM
23:34:27	jowilkin	also do we provide specialized ISOs/Images, such as lamp images, etc
23:34:36	triple	i think ras0ir already did some stuff with qemu and xen. so yeah, we should follow this as well.
23:34:49	ras0ir	well, for vps users, we should create templates, xen image is needed at the moment

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
23:35:07	fukawi2	I was about to say that ras0ir :P
23:35:14	nicedream	I know from reading webhostingtalk.com, almost everyone is using either Xen or OpenVZ
23:35:32	triplem	ras0ir: haven't you made a OpenVZ as well?
23:35:34	fukawi2	VBox can still be installed from the ISO, but Xen users will be better off with a xen image
23:35:50	faelar_as	I agree on the need of virtual images, but I don't think preconfigured stuff like lamp are needed for the moment
23:35:52	ras0ir	yeah openvz images are ready
23:36:02	nicedream	I can make a Xen image - I just made one for AL a few days ago.
23:36:05	ras0ir	and they work under LxC too
23:36:12	fukawi2	faelar_AS +1... ultimately we want to provide the LAMP "images" etc via aif-scripts
23:37:00	fukawi2	each AIF script will only be a couple of KB, so they can be included on the standard core and netinstall images, and the user can just call setup with the AIF script to suit his/her requirements
23:37:05	triplem	i do agree on the aif-scripts and no "pre-configured" images, at least for the first release(s)
23:37:21	faelar_as	Something on my mind, is the ISO a raw image ? I think of something like ArchBoot
23:37:22	triplem	1
23:38:10	faelar_as	If like to install from USB key, and dd if=/path/archserver.iso is the less annoying way to do so
23:38:24	triplem	faelar_as: i haven't tested it until now, but this image should work on an usb drive as well.
23:38:46	triplem	we are using the newest archiso and therefor use isolinux, which is hybrid
23:39:02	triplem	but a test is needed
23:39:12	faelar_as	Ok
23:39:36	triplem	fukawi2: this would be worth an action, i think ;-)
23:39:43	fukawi2	would someone like to volunteer to test the image with a USB stick?
23:39:48	jowilkin	a test using unetbootin would be nice as well, i think a lot of people use it
23:40:10	nicedream	I can start unetbootin right now
23:40:13	faelar_as	I have a USB key lying here
23:40:51	faelar_as	And maybe a useless harddrive somewhere to test a real install
23:41:00	fukawi2	!action nicedream and faelar_AS to test the installation ISO on a USB stick and report their results back to triplem and/or jowilkin
23:41:00	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'nicedream' to follow up: and faelar_AS to test the installation ISO on a USB stick and report their results back to triplem and/or jowilkin
23:41:32	nicedream	I'll test the iso w/ unetbootin right after this chat is over
23:41:34	fukawi2	!action fukawi2 to test the installation ISO on real hardware and report their results back to triplem and/or jowilkin
23:41:34	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'fukawi2' to follow up: to test the installation ISO on real hardware and report their results back to triplem and/or jowilkin
23:42:17	fukawi2	any more discussion/questions regarding the Installation ISO?
23:42:19	jowilkin	it would be nice for someone to try lvm and/or raid also, although if it works with the AL installer, it should work with the AS installer, we have not touched that part of the code

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
23:42:49	ras0ir	as i know AL's going to release dual arch ISOs too, will we do that too?
23:42:58	triplemjowilkin	: thats what i meant with "real hardware", since these packages are right now missing in the iso ;-)
23:43:28	triplemras0ir	: i do think so, that we should provide something like this. but this is not a high prio on my list
23:43:31	jowilkin	is there a big demand for dual arch isos?
23:44:03	jowilkin	the size of the dual arch iso is pretty large compared to a single arch iso, so there is no advantage to it from that point of view
23:44:11	faelar_as	Please confirm : dual = i686 + x86_64 ?
23:44:16	ras0ir	Faelar_AS: yes
23:44:31	fukawi2	!action ras0ir file an enhancement request on the bug tracker to investigate dual-arch iso for a future release
23:44:31	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'ras0ir' to follow up: file an enhancement request on the bug tracker to investigate dual-arch iso for a future release
23:44:55	faelar_as	It's quite usefull for a desktop if you do install on-the-go
23:45:20	jowilkin	this would be interesting but seems like a low priority for now
23:45:29	triplemfukawi2	: add an action point to add some feature requests for different aif scripts (e.g. lamp)
23:45:34	faelar_as	But for a server you probably know the hardware and don't really bother about a reusable install media
23:45:54	fukawi2	lets take discussion on the dual-arch to the bug tracker.... it is not something we should focus on for initial release
23:46:04	triplem1	
23:46:17	ras0ir	ok
23:46:19	fukawi2	triplem: I'll add it to the bottom of the agenda ;)
23:46:34	triplem	cool
23:46:50	fukawi2	any more discussion/questions regarding the Installation ISO?
23:47:36	fukawi2	!topic Licenses - Current Status
23:47:36	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Licenses - Current Status'
23:47:57	fukawi2	I'm not sure who raised this or exactly what the discussion is about?
23:48:05	ras0ir	well it's my turn :)
23:48:23	fukawi2	ah, ok then :)
23:48:59	ras0ir	the current license of wiki is PDL.. from point of freedom, PDL is not a free (free as in freedom) license
23:49:16	ras0ir	IMHO it should be FDL
23:50:00	triplem	would be FDL compatible with Attribution-Share Alike 3.0
23:50:02	triplem	?
23:50:13	ras0ir	yes
23:50:28	sbnet_phone	Fdl
23:50:39	ras0ir	FDL is compatible with CC licenses
23:50:48	fukawi2	ras0ir: link to the wiki license? all I can see if the "Public Domain" link in the footer....
23:51:06	fukawi2	or are you talking about the docs?
23:51:25	ras0ir	http://www.openoffice.org/licenses/PDL.html
23:51:27	lord-taco	http://www.openoffice.org/licenses/PDL.html = "Public Documentation License"
23:52:01	ras0ir	all the articles on the wiki should be released under FDL
23:52:05	triplem	so, if we are going FDL, could i copy some content from the e.g. fedora wiki (share alike) to our wiki without any copyright infringement?

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
23:52:26	ras0ir	triplem: sure, FDL allows this
23:52:37		sbnet joined #archserver-meeting
23:52:59		triplemand could we have a warranty disclaimer on our documentation?
23:53:07		sbnet_phone departed #archserver-meeting
23:53:32	triplem	so, that we do not have to cover a million dollars if somebody screws up his datacenter because of a wrong AS install?
23:53:54	ras0ir	yeah, you can have warranty disclaimer
23:54:06	triplem	perfect. go with FDL then
23:54:09	jowilkin	how do we know that a warranty disclaimer we come up with is legally binding/correct in all the locations that AS may be used?
23:54:35	fukawi2	ras0ir: I meant where in the wiki does it say it's under PDL?
23:54:46	jowilkin	i have this question with regard to the message in /etc/motd/ and /etc/ssh/issue.ssh as well, do these messages carry any legal weight and how do we know they do?
23:55:16	ras0ir	fukawi2: the link in footer
23:55:35	fukawi2	jowilkin: we'll come back to that... let's stick with the wiki for now (I've noted it to come back to)
23:56:04	fukawi2	am I looking at a different wiki? All I have is "Content is available under Public Domain."
23:56:35	ras0ir	oops, i got it wrong sorry
23:57:11	fukawi2	do you mean the doc site? :)
23:57:27	ras0ir	yes
23:57:40	faelar_as	http://docs.archserver.org/ <-- PDL
23:57:42	lord-taco	http://docs.archserver.org/ = "ArchServer Project :: Start"
23:57:42	fukawi2	ok, cool.... I'm with you now :)
23:58:10	ras0ir	ok, there's no problem with wiki's license
23:58:13	triplem	so, ras0ir, you say, that we should go with FDL for the wiki as well as the Documentation site, that we can have a warranty disclaimer for this as well, right?
23:58:20	triplem	ah, i was too fast.
23:58:41	fukawi2	well since I put the PDL on the docs site, I guess I should say something to it....
00:00:18	fukawi2	I think the official documentation is an area where we can really set ourselves apart from other distributions.... if we can create comprehensive and accurate documentation (like the FreeBSD Handbook) then I think it will be of great benefit to our users which will help promote us
00:00:48	ras0ir	sounds nice to me
00:01:01	fukawi2	so along that vein, *not* being able to copy and paste from the fedora wiki (for example) means that we have to take that little bit of extra effort to make sure what we are writing is original and accurate to AS
00:01:52	fukawi2	if our docs are just a "Wiki Aggregator" from other wiki's, then we're not reaching our full potential for what we can offer through the documentation
00:02:07	triplem	fukawi2: but how to make sure, that the content is not copied?
00:02:28	ras0ir	Citations?
00:02:52	triplem	the license alone delivers then alot of working surface
00:03:38	fukawi2	the PDL also has the benefit of warranty disclaimers
00:03:57	ras0ir	CC has that too
00:05:00	fukawi2	having said all that.... I'm open to the majority opinion and whatever the rest of the team believes to be best :)

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
00:05:39	fukawi2	personally at the end of the day, I'm more interested in pushing buttons and typing code than legalese (sorry ras0ir :P)
00:05:54	fukawi2	I don't have a strong opinion either wya
00:05:55	fukawi2	way*
00:06:00	faelar_as	I think we have an interesting point here
00:06:11	sbnet	that's why we have ras0ir
00:06:16	triplem	fukawi2: i would like to shift this decision to the next meeting, because about something like this i need to take at least a short nap
00:06:25	faelar_as	About the need of a good and consistent official documentation
00:06:25	lordmetroid	b
00:06:44	nicedream	Well, I am open to either license for the docs, but....I don't know if the choice of license depends on the fact that we want to have really good docs
00:07:00	nicedream	We could have good or bad docs with either license
00:07:05	triplem	nicedream: +1
00:07:08	faelar_as	Maybe I'm wrong, but we currently don't really know "how" things will work
00:07:43	faelar_as	(sorry I don't have finished yet, but I think'n'type slowly in english)
00:07:49	nicedream	I guess I am trying to say that using a license to force us to write a good set of docs and not just copy/paste isn't a good reason to choose a license
00:07:49	triplem	lets just put this decision to the next meeting, right now, at least i am very confident that the license for the wiki is "correct".
00:07:56	fukawi2	any objections to holding this discussion over until next meeting to allow further informal discussion and independent research? there will no doubt be at least 1 more meeting before release and the license doesn't need to be decided until release time....
00:08:15	sbnet	none here
00:08:20	nicedream	none
00:08:22	triplem	n
00:08:31	jowilkin	sounds good to me, legal talk makes my brain hurt
00:08:32	faelar_as	My point is that since we don't know how we will organise that part of the project, it is hard to find the perfect fitting license for it
00:08:36	fukawi2	!action fukawi2 next meeting agenda: docs licensing
00:08:37	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'fukawi2' to follow up: next meeting agenda: docs licensing
00:09:06	fukawi2	back to jowilkin's query about the default motd notice....
00:09:17	nicedream	Good, I wanted to mention this too
00:09:32	jowilkin	personally i think this should be sort of thing an end user adds
00:09:43	nicedream	I saw the notice when I logged in, and thought it was kind of....lame (no offense)
00:10:01	lordmetroid	I got no opinion on licenses other than copyright and patents are evil
00:10:06	jowilkin	also it appears twice when logging in through ssh
00:10:33	jowilkin	the first thing i do after i install AS is make /etc/motd and /etc/ssh/issue.ssh blank so i dont see these messages
00:10:46	nicedream	It reminds me of those emails with a wall of text that say you must destroy and delete if someone sent you confidential info by mistake
00:11:13	fukawi2	suggestions for something better to include? :)
00:11:32	nicedream	If anything at all, it should be something very simple

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC) **Nick** **Message**

00:11:46 ras0irwell what about putting these text under
 /usr/share/docs/archserver/legal.txt?

00:11:50 faelar_as Our website url :P

00:11:56 sbnetsimple couple of sentences saying what the server is and that
 you shouldn't be there without permission. nothing special

00:11:57 nicedream Like "Last logon on 5 March 2010"

00:12:10 jowilkini think it should be vanilla, what comes wih ssh by default

00:12:22 fukawi2nicedream: that is done through ssh, not motd or issue.ssh

00:12:49 triplemjowilkin: vanilla, no way, we are ArchServer, come on

00:13:04 fukawi2!action fukawi2 update motd and issue.ssh to a simpler
 ArchServer "advertising" message

00:13:04 ^ lord-taco ***** ACTION POINT: 'fukawi2' to follow up: update motd and
 issue.ssh to a simpler ArchServer "advertising" message**

00:13:19 nicedream OK - But something simple like that.

00:13:28 fukawi2 I will invent something ;)

00:13:50 fukawi2 any more queries regarding legalese?

00:13:52 jowilkini dont think both files should contain the same thing, or
 else you get the message twice when login via ssh

00:14:08 lordmetroid Can we abolish all the legalese?

00:14:16 fukawi2 jowilkin: yes, I will fix that too... I forgot that would
 happen ;)

00:14:36 fukawi2!action fukawi2 fix double display of motd and issue.ssh when
 logging in through SSH

00:14:36 ^ lord-taco ***** ACTION POINT: 'fukawi2' to follow up: fix double display
 of motd and issue.ssh when logging in through SSH**

00:14:37 nicedream I like the idea of keeping it plain, with maybe an short
 ArchServer advertising message

00:15:21 fukawi2nicedream: I will simplify it and discuss again next meeting
 if we're still not happy ;)

00:16:15 faelar_as Please, no ASCII ART :D

00:16:19 fukawi2 I'm cautious of the time for those of us where it's after
 midnight, so I will bring forward some "general interest"
 agenda items so those who aren't involved with packaging can
 leave after that if they wish and leave the devs to discuss
 the packaging etc topics

00:16:47 faelar_as Thank you fukawi2

00:17:03 fukawi2!topic Financial Report

00:17:03 { lord-taco ***** NEXT TOPIC: 'Financial Report'**

00:17:22 fukawi2 current summary of the project financials are here:
 http://tu.archserver.org/~fukawi2/acct_summary-100306.pdf

00:17:24 lord-taco http://tu.archserver.org/~fukawi2/acct_summary-100306.pdf =
 "tu.archserver.org/~fukawi2/acct_summary-100306.pdf"

00:18:35 fukawi2 for those who aren't aware, the payments for our main server
 (hydrogen) at LeaseWeb are due every 3 months in March, June,
 September and December

00:18:54 lordmetroid How much does it cost?

00:19:01 fukawi2 that server costs EUR-45 p/month which is a good deal that I
 managed to get from LeaseWeb after explaining what the server
 was for

00:19:39 jowilkin departed #archserver-meeting

00:19:39 nicedream Is that for a dedicated box or just colocation?

00:19:47 fukawi2 dedicated

00:19:52 fukawi2 it's a Dell R200

00:19:58 nicedream good deal

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
00:20:11	ras0ir	cool
00:20:33	nicedream	Specs on it?
00:20:39	lordmetroid	When will we run out of cash?
00:20:43	nicedream	Just cause I'm curious
00:20:51	fukawi2	nicedream: I'll cover that in infrastructure report
00:20:59	nicedream	cool
00:21:01	tripleml	lordmetroid: lol
00:21:04	jowilkin	joined #archserver-meeting
00:21:27	fukawi2	LordMetroid: donations Jan - March were approx AU\$90 short which I made up the difference - we are "running at a loss" at the moment
00:22:34	fukawi2	I am happy to make up the difference in between donations and server costs... I knew when I started the project that it would require financial input from me for quite a while, so I made sure that the server costs were within my budget even if I had to pay them all myself
00:22:56	fukawi2	I want to highlight that I do NOT expect any member of the team to contribute via donations
00:23:11	tripleml	still, thanks fukawi2 for his donations in time and money
00:23:36	fukawi2	each team member is contributing their own input to the project via their work and non-monetary contributions....
00:23:50	fukawi2	money is easier to get than good help ;)
00:23:51	lordmetroid	Yes, indeed that we are grateful for, I personally am a little bit short on cash at the moment
00:24:02	faelar_as	tripleml is right here, thank you fukawi2
00:25:23	ras0ir	thank you :)
00:25:33	fukawi2	there is currently a large donation that came in this morning just before the meeting from tripleml which ties in to the infrastructure report
00:25:58	fukawi2	that is why we have a relatively large balance on the PayPal account at present
00:26:20	faelar_as	So thanks to tripleml too !
00:26:20	fukawi2	the donation is for a specific purpose which I will cover in infrastructure
00:26:38	ras0ir	you rock guys!! :)
00:26:55	fukawi2	yes -- some devs have been making donations, even after I told them that I don't expect it and that they shouldn't do it... so thank-you to them :)
00:28:19	fukawi2	any more queries/thoughts/suggestions on the financial state of the project?
00:28:46	ras0ir	i think it's enough
00:28:50	faelar_as	Maybe this is more infrastructure related but
00:29:14	faelar_as	Do you have extra cash going out for bandwidth exceed or things like that ?
00:30:04	fukawi2	LeaseWeb provide 300gb of bandwidth per month at the moment with hydrogen (based on 95th percentile accounting)
00:30:37	fukawi2	at the moment we are well under that, and with the speed-limiting on the repos, and all our mirrors, I expect it will remain that way for a while :)
00:30:57	faelar_as	Alright
00:31:12	fukawi2	the 300gb is itemized as EUR-10 on the invoice, so if we do start exceeding it, it will only cost an extra EUR-10 to double it :)
00:31:27	lordmetroid	That is cool
00:31:38	faelar_as	Perfect
00:31:51	ras0ir	great

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
00:31:54	fukawi2	FYI: 95th Percentile Accounting is detailed here: http://www.leaseweb.com/article/bandwidth
00:31:58	lord-taco	http://www.leaseweb.com/article/bandwidth = " Dedicated Server Hosting
00:32:09	fukawi2	for those who are interested
00:32:46	fukawi2	lastly on the financial, I'm hoping after our first release is successful, we may be able to find some form of sponsorship from somewhere to at least assist with costs :)
00:34:02	fukawi2	perhaps if we could find a VPS provider willing to provide AS images to their clients, they might like to sponsor us or something
00:34:11	fukawi2	but these are thoughts for a later discussion :)
00:34:27	ras0iri	hope linode does this :p
00:34:34	fukawi2	!topic Infrastructure Report
00:34:34	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Infrastructure Report'
00:34:59	fukawi2	our infrastructure at the moment is main spread across 2 servers
00:35:14	fukawi2	hydrogen which is a dedicated Dell R200 hosted by LeaseWeb in Amsterdam
00:35:28	jowilkin	departed #archserver-meeting
00:35:34	lordmetroid	what is the 29 euro per month for a dedicated server?
00:35:41	jowilkin	joined #archserver-meeting
00:36:03	fukawi2	Quad-core Intel Xeon 2.16g, 1gb RAM, 2 x 160gb HDD
00:36:17	ras0ir	could someone +v jowilkin ?
00:36:26	fukawi2	thanks ras0ir
00:36:34	jowilkin	sorry i seem to keep losing connection
00:37:16	fukawi2	I have configured the HDD's in RAID-1 to protect against 1 failing, which means we have 160gb available to us
00:37:17	lordmetroid	Are you sure you got a deal? There seems to be cheaper options
00:37:34	fukawi2	it also has a DRAC card for out-of-band management
00:38:19	fukawi2	LordMetroid: yes
00:38:50	fukawi2	I traded some of the bandwidth for the extra hard drive, DRAC card and extra IP addresses
00:38:57	lordmetroid	ok
00:39:39	fukawi2	there are cheaper options, but my main concern with them is that they don't have multiple HDD's and by the time you add the extra HDD, ip addresses etc it ends up being more than EUR45
00:40:01	fukawi2	I'd hate for our main server to go down because of a failed hard drive... that would just be embaessing
00:40:09	lordmetroid	mmm
00:40:48	fukawi2	our second server is a VM guest hosted at my work... it's job is basically to run Lord-Taco (including the web ui for the logs) as well as backups of hydrogen
00:40:58	fukawi2	that server is 'lithium'
00:41:32	fukawi2	nothing greatly exciting with that
00:41:48	fukawi2	now, the interesting part of the report!
00:41:53	lordmetroid	It seems to work without problems
00:42:22	fukawi2	it was discussed during the week regarding having a dedicated build 'farm' so all devs are compiling against the same toolchain's etc
00:42:48	fukawi2	I have managed to acquire a HP DL380 G3 to use for this purpose
00:42:57	ras0ir	YAY
00:43:11	fukawi2	however it was only after I got it that I found out it has old Xeon's in it, which are only 32-bit
00:43:24	fukawi2	and without VT-x
00:43:34	faelar_as	Ouch :(

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
00:43:52	ras0irerr	
00:44:00	fukawi2	so it's not really suitable as a build box since we can't build 64-bit packages, nor virtualize on it (I wanted to move lithium off my work's VMware server onto this box)
00:44:02	fukawi2	BUT
00:44:06	fukawi2	I think I have a solution
00:44:34	fukawi2	qemu does full CPU virtualization... it claims to be able to virtualize a 64-bit CPU even if you have a physical 32-bit CPU
00:44:57	jowilkin	isn't qemu dead slow without vt-x?
00:45:18	tripleml	this will be a performance hit anyways
00:45:27	fukawi2	so I am currently experimenting with this avenue of action to see if it is viable... it will no doubt have a probably significant performance impact, but at the very least it will give us what we need as a short to mid-term solution
00:46:34	jowilkin	i have a spare server that can be used for this purpose as well, it is 64-bit, dual core, it is not a permanent solution, but can be used in the short term
00:46:44	jowilkin	it is unused right now except to host my repo
00:47:27	fukawi2	I know our Asterisk box at work is about to be retired for a hardware upgrade... that box is an Opteron with 64-bit so I'm hoping I may be able to convince work to let us use it... it is an old model so it won't be sold to any of our clients and will just gather dust in the storeroom otherwise
00:47:58	fukawi2	this brings us back to the donation from tripleml
00:48:45	fukawi2	tripleml kindly made the donation to enable us to replace the CPU's in this DL380 with newer Xeon's that support 64-bit.... AU\$75 would cover the cost of 2 x Xeon's from ebay that we were looking at the other day
00:49:11	fukawi2	however I have not been able to find any information on whether the motherboard / chipset would actually support 64-bit CPU's
00:49:27	tripleml	ouch
00:49:46	fukawi2	so I am reluctant to buy these CPU's and then find out that they won't work anyway
00:50:31	faelar_as	Hum... question here
00:50:39	fukawi2	yes Faelar_AS?
00:50:50	faelar_as	What "is about" means ?
00:51:01	jowilkin	do you have physical access to server? couldnt you open it up and look at the chipset?
00:51:30	fukawi2	yes -- but I can't find any information on the google about it because it is such an old server/chipset
00:51:40	fukawi2	it is from around 2003 - 2004 as best I can tell
00:51:40	faelar_as	I would like to know if it worth the trouble to go the qemu64on32 way since it probably consum a part of your time
00:52:10	fukawi2	Faelar_AS -> I have lots of time like the "google 20% time" at work so don't worry about that :)
00:52:40	tripleml	lol
00:52:42	jowilkin	64-bit was quite rare in that time frame wasnt it? i would guess no support
00:52:50	fukawi2	I propose I continue to investigate the qemu option, and getting the use of the old Asterisk box from work, and either refund tripleml's donation or keep it for server costs (tripleml's choice)
00:53:20	tripleml	fukawi2: use it for the new server, for server costs, whatever...

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
00:54:19	fukawi2	if I can't get the old server from work, then we look at jowilkin setting up a VBox guest on his server to act as our 64-bit build box, and the DL380 can be use as our 32-bit build box
00:55:02	jowilkin	it would be no problem at all, the box and bandwidth are free for me right now
00:55:15	faelar_as	Will you run ArchServer on it ? ;)
00:55:29	jowilkin	yes if its a build box, i would have to ;)
00:56:07	faelar_as	Could have been AL no ? But anyway...
00:56:18	fukawi2	assuming you are happy to run is a VBox guest.... it means you can restrict the CPU / RAM allocations so when someone is compiling something it doesn't kill the rest of the server for you, and when/if we want to move it in the future, it's just a matter of transferring the VBox disk images :)
00:56:37	fukawi2	it will probably be AL, with AS in chroot's
00:57:55	fukawi2	remembering that long-term we will need a chroot for each release because the toolchain versions are likely to change between releases... so there will be a chroot for 'redgum' and another for 'spruce', thyeen one each for 32 and 64 bit.... chroots everywhere!
00:58:33	triplemjowilkin:	i am more then willing to help setting this up.
00:59:13	jowilkin	ok, i will install an AL 64-bit vbox and get you access
00:59:35	fukawi2	I am hoping to get work's permission to house the DL380 in the server room at work, which will give it a good physical environment, as well as a 4mb/4mb link to the internet
01:00:29	fukawi2	jowilkin: before you do that, let's see if I can get this old server from work..... and either way, we shoudl also talk to sbnet about his pkgbuild.com build server that he has built to get his input on how it should be setup :)
01:00:49	triplemg	ghost, you meant
01:00:49	jowilkin	i think you mean ghost1227 with pkgbuild.com
01:00:56	tripleml	lol
01:01:10	fukawi2	uhhh, yes... that's what I said... I think xchat did an s/ghost/sbnet/ on me :P
01:01:56	jowilkin	ok just let me know
01:01:57	fukawi2	enough on the infrastructure I think, unless there are any more queries?
01:02:22	faelar_as	No.
01:02:33	lordmetroid.	
01:02:38	ras0irk	
01:02:50	fukawi2	oh -- lastly, the DL380 will have at least 1tb of disk, so we will be able to use it for archival storage :)
01:03:19	fukawi2	that's the last of the general interest discussions... thank-you to those who have stayed up late to participate :)
01:03:20	triplemfukawi2:	thats you old NAS?
01:03:48	faelar_as	Alright, I'll leave you then
01:03:50	fukawi2	from here on I think it's mainly technical / packaging /dev topics from here in, so those who aren't interested can go to bed if they wish :)
01:04:03	fukawi2	triplem: yes... or at least the HDD from it ;)
01:04:04	ras0ir	Faelar_AS: good night :)
01:04:18	triplemg	n8
01:04:20	faelar_as	But before I would like to thank you all again, this project is an amazing adventure so far !
01:04:34	fukawi2	we will arrange for another meeting in the future, but we will no doubt talk to you before then anyway :)

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:04:45	fukawi2	thank-you for your input too Faelar... especially our logo! :D
01:04:56	triplemu	h, logo...
01:05:02	faelar_as	Yeah, I will probably need input on the website design later
01:05:05	triplem	one more think about the logo for the iiso...
01:05:15	faelar_as	yes ?
01:05:20	fukawi2	triplem: it's sorted, I will update you in private :)
01:05:29	triplem	fukawi2: okay.
01:05:31	fukawi2	let Faelar get his beauty sleep :P
01:05:35	triplem	sure
01:05:42	faelar_as	hehe
01:05:46	faelar_as	See you later !
01:05:47	triplem	gn8
01:05:48	Faelar_AS	departed #archserver-meeting
01:05:49	ras0irc	cya
01:06:19	fukawi2	!topic Decisions for Package Additions - Process
01:06:19	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Decisions for Package Additions - Process'
01:06:45	fukawi2	triplem: this one is yours :)
01:06:56	nicedream	departed #archserver-meeting
01:07:05	triplem	my poposal is to use the same kind of process as for the package version bumps
01:07:22	triplem	ign off by two different TUs, furthermore for a new package be added at least one TU needs to be willing to maintain this package
01:07:45	triplem	s/^ign/sign/g
01:07:55	fukawi2	sign-off is next on the agenda... we're only talking about initial addition of the package to the repo atm aren't we?
01:08:07	fukawi2	ie, adoption by a TU
01:08:28	jowilkin	i think he means at least 2 TU should agree that a package should be added
01:08:35	fukawi2	ah ok
01:08:35	jowilkin	and one willing to maintain it
01:08:41	triplem	right
01:08:50	fukawi2	well taking a step back to view how the repos should work...
01:08:56	triplem	so sign-off is probably misused here.
01:08:57	fukawi2	my thoughts are it should be a little different to AL
01:09:23	fukawi2	[server-core] is the most basic package for installation
01:09:35	fukawi2	[server-extra] is "everything" else maintained by devs
01:10:05	triplem	agree 120% on server-core.
01:10:15	lordmetroid	Isn't that how ArchLinux has it too?
01:10:17	fukawi2	[server-community] for binary packages that are not maintained by devs to the level of [server-extra]
01:10:34	triplem	but where is the difference then?
01:10:52	fukawi2	I never really understood why AL has the differentiation between devs that maintain [core] and [extra], and their TU's who maintain [community]
01:11:08	lordmetroid	The TU came from the AUR
01:11:11	triplem	server-extra is for me (IMHO) core-packages like e.g. java and ruby and stuff, server-community is e.g. web-applications
01:11:37	fukawi2	LordMetroid: exactly... why not just make them a dev and put the package in [extra]?
01:11:52	lordmetroid	triplem: Sounds like a good differentiation
01:11:58	jowilkin	i like how AL has the rule that nothing in core depends on any other repo, extra can depend on core

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:12:03	jowilkini	think we should maintain this
01:12:08	fukawi2	agreed
01:12:13	jowilkinextra	should depend on core, but not community
01:12:18	jowilkincommunity	can depend on core or extra
01:12:33	fukawi2	agreed
01:12:38	lordmetroid+	
01:12:43	jowilkin	but we are a little off topic now :)
01:12:43	triplemsure,	except build dependencies.
01:12:47	triplem	right.
01:12:57	fukawi2jowilkin:	yes we are... lol
01:13:16	jowilkini	like triplem's idea that at least 2 people agree that a package should be added, the question is how to handle this
01:13:24	jowilkin	should it be mailing list, or website, or ... ?
01:13:33	fukawi2	perhaps an enhancement to the APP?
01:13:34	triplem	right, this is the same like the next point as well.
01:13:39	fukawi2	a package nomination module?
01:13:45	triplem	fukawi2: good idea
01:13:51	lordmetroid	Built into the APP seems to be the simplest
01:13:58	fukawi2	sbnet: is this feasible? (if you're still there)
01:14:32	triplem	so, right now, i would just make it via the mailing list, and sbnet can then add this to the APP
01:14:50	fukawi2	the tuser mail list?
01:14:54	jowilkin	which list?
01:14:55	fukawi2	tusers*
01:15:02	jowilkin	it seems like it should be publicly viewable
01:15:22	triplem	isnt tu publicly viewable?
01:15:28	lordmetroid	But how do we decide which packages should be included?
01:15:51	fukawi2	tusers list is publicly viewable, just not postable :)
01:16:02	lordmetroid	http://www.archserver.org/index.php?page=team
01:16:04	lord-taco	http://www.archserver.org/index.php?page=team = "ArchServer Project :: ArchServer Team"
01:16:04	fukawi2	http://lists.archserver.org/private/tusers/
01:16:04	lord-taco	http://lists.archserver.org/private/tusers/ = "Tusers Private Archives Authentication"
01:16:07	triplem	cool, thats okay for this purpose
01:16:16	jowilkin	LordMetroid: i guess this gets back to fukawi2's discussion of what each repo should contain
01:16:57	triplem	server-core for all packages which are needed to get a workable system
01:17:22	triplem	extra for all packages which are required for a server (e.g. programming languages, databases, ...)
01:17:23	jowilkin	one easy rule is add no packages that depend on X :D
01:17:25	fukawi2	I think 'workable' should be either removed or changes
01:17:32	fukawi2	changed*
01:17:58	triplems	/workable/basic
01:17:59	fukawi2	for example, IMHO openssh should be installed as part of our 'base' install, but it is not strictly *required*
01:18:11	fukawi2	but the majority of server installations would want/need this
01:18:34	lordmetroid	Should we have a system for proposing a package
01:18:54	triplem	feature requests in bugs.archserver.org ?
01:18:56	lordmetroid	And the rest of the TUs can give an input whether or not to include the package
01:19:02	jowilkin	LordMetroid: I think for now it is proposed on tuser's list and needs to be seconded by another TU
01:19:16	fukawi2	yes
01:19:26	triplem	1

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:19:31	jowilkin	but we need to reach some "critical mass" of packages before this should be required it seems
01:19:50	fukawi2	then if it can be included in the APP, then either a dev nominates it in the APP, or a user requests it in the bug tracker then a tu can nominate it in the APP referring to the bug tracker
01:19:50	jowilkin	we are close i think, but like a couple months ago this process was not feasible because of the rate at which we needed to add packages
01:19:52	triplemi	do think we are still discussion two different parts
01:20:29	triplem	right, we have added all the "needed" packages and their dependency.
01:20:42	lordmetroid	having a hyperlink in the APP entry to the feature request should make that very easy
01:21:01	triplem	until now, now we are going to add eg. ruby and stuff, so where to put it, in which version to integrate it ...
01:21:01	fukawi2	yes, as a "supporting reason for addition" or something
01:21:24	fukawi2	IMHO, everything such as ruby should just be put in [server-extra]
01:21:31	triplem	right.
01:21:45	triplem	but where to put then something like phpmysql?
01:21:52	triplem	server-extra? server-community?
01:21:58	triplem	server-...?
01:22:01	lordmetroid	And all server, database, application software in server-community
01:22:04	fukawi2	extra for now I think
01:22:15	jowilkin	so we are basically making server-extra where things like libraries, programming languages, language bindings, etc go?
01:22:35	triplem	then server-extra will house basically everything.
01:22:35	jowilkin	i think we should rename server-community and possibly server-extra if we go this route
01:22:44	fukawi2	I think the differentiation is too difficult to do is that way
01:22:47	triplem	jowilkin: +1
01:23:07	fukawi2	perhaps the differentiation could be community is for architecture independant packages
01:23:31	triplem	server-extra is then server-applications and server-community is then server-???
01:23:37	lordmetroid	Having databases, servers and applications in server-community doesn't make much sense so I think it would be appropriate with another name
01:23:38	fukawi2	eg, phppgadmin goes in community, but pgadminIII goes in extra
01:23:51	triplem	why?
01:23:58	triplem	does not make sense
01:24:01	jowilkin	i dont understand that distinction
01:24:09	jowilkin	partially because i dont know what either of those packages is :P
01:24:10	fukawi2	I don't know.... I'm just trying to make the differentiation process clear-cut
01:24:43	fukawi2	phppgadmin is all php based, so it doesn't matter if you install it on 32 or 64 bit, but pgadminIII is a binary package so it has to be compiled for each arch
01:24:49	fukawi2	matter*
01:24:51	triplem	all server/daemons, languages go in server-extra, all applications, which run on those go into server-community
01:24:59	ras0ir	why not rename server-community with server-misc?
01:25:10	triplem	misc is too common i think
01:25:17	jowilkin	i like triplem's idea

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:25:26	jowilkin	but then rename both repos
01:25:28	fukawi2	so where does a package that includes both a daemon and a web interface to that daemon go? (eg, ntop)
01:25:45	fukawi2	that's a poor example, but kinda valid
01:25:50	jowilkin	i think that would be community
01:25:50	triplem	can you separate those?
01:26:08	triplem	something like e.g. svn or git?
01:26:10	fukawi2	no -- ntop has it's own web server as part of the daemon
01:26:17	jowilkin	daemons it seems are basically just apps and should go into community
01:26:38	jowilkin	if they are built against some libraries, those should be in extra
01:26:41	triplem	hm, so apache is just another daemon as well, isn't it?
01:26:58	triplem	no, i think e.g. mysql should be in extra as well.
01:27:27	jowilkin	i guess the distinction is that things in extra are heavily used by many packages in community
01:27:36	jowilkin	things in community are not used by other packages
01:27:37	triplem	guys it is getting really late for me, probably we should all make up our minds and discuss this tomorrow/today later
01:27:50	triplem	sure
01:27:54	fukawi2	do we even need community? why not everythin in extra?
01:28:11	jowilkin	i dont think we need community
01:28:17	fukawi2	what is the benefit to the end user in having extra *and* community?
01:28:18	triplem	i think that extra will then be a whole pool with a galore of packages
01:28:46	fukawi2	is there any situation where the end user is likely to want extra and not community, or vice-versa?
01:28:51	jowilkin	i think maybe move this discussion to forum and get on to next point on agenda
01:29:04	lordmetroid	We ain't going to get the embraced AUR packages any special treatment anyway like ArchLinux does
01:29:08	fukawi2	ok.... triplem, do you want to start a thread on the forum?
01:29:12	lordmetroid	so a community may be unnecessary
01:29:15	triplem	think about installation isos installing e.g. LAMP, these should then contain only a group and all there dependencies, right now the whole repo is on the cd
01:29:34	triplem	sure.
01:29:58	fukawi2	!action triple create forum thread to continue discussion of our repo structure
01:29:58	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'triple' to follow up: create forum thread to continue discussion of our repo structure
01:30:04	jowilkin	it would be nice to make the forum more active anyway, i think people may come to the website and decide the project is not very active since the forum is not
01:30:15	fukawi2	jowilkin: agreed
01:30:24	lordmetroid	agreed
01:30:49	ras0ir	1
01:30:51	fukawi2	as far as adopting packages, for now we will continue with ad-hoc additions as each dev sees appropriate.... eventually we will move to a nomination procesds through the APP
01:31:04	lordmetroid	1
01:31:10	fukawi2	done
01:31:17	fukawi2	!topic Package Sign-Off Process
01:31:17	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Package Sign-Off Process'
01:31:31	triplem	sign-off is pretty much already discussed IMHO
01:31:44	fukawi2	http://wiki.archserver.org/index.php/Release_Process

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:31:45	lord-taco	http://wiki.archserver.org/index.php/Release_Process = "Release Process - ArchServer Wiki"
01:31:54	jowilkin	it is slightly different for existing packages than adding new packages
01:31:57	fukawi2	this can probably be integrated into a mor formal process in the APP also
01:32:15	fukawi2	triplem: this is for moving a package from [testing] to it's proper repo
01:32:25	lordmetroid	I like to keep it all in the APP, makes it all nice and simple
01:32:54	fukawi2	yes -- that is my vision for the APP... a central authority for package management from nomination through to maintenance :)
01:33:01	triplem	fukawi2: still the sign-off is IMHO the same, so no TU for adoption requiried though
01:33:34	jowilkin	the signoff is slightly less important in our case than in AL because package bumps should only be minor changes
01:33:50	fukawi2	I think it should ultimately perhaps require 3 devs to sign-off moving out of [testing] where as nomination only requires a nominator and 1 other dev to sponsor adoption
01:33:53	jowilkin	the main thing is to make sure the packages run basically before pushing them to repo
01:34:04	fukawi2	and STABLE
01:34:23	lordmetroid	fukawi2: a package bump is a new release of the lts for example, right?
01:34:40	lordmetroid	as the linux team patches it for more stability and security
01:34:45	fukawi2	I think it's actually more important than in AL... people expect minor (and major) breakages in AL... I would like to think that AS users can crontab pacman -Syu and trust it not to break
01:35:06	lordmetroid	So would I
01:35:06	jowilkin	I think relates to what our policy will be on patching as well, AL does not patch basically, we need to patch
01:35:09	fukawi2	(not that we would recommnd cronning that update)
01:35:18	fukawi2	yes
01:36:24	lordmetroid	So we are going to try to write patches for security and stability for upstream, or what do the AS team patch?
01:36:40	fukawi2	for now, can we say sign-off is done on the tusers mail list, by 1 dev requesting sign-off, and (at least) 2 other devs sign-off after testing it themselves?
01:36:52	jowilkin	LordMetroid: that is related to a later meeting agenda point, maybe we can put it off until then
01:36:53	triplem	okay then. the sign-off of version bumps is then slightly more conservative then the process for additions
01:36:54	lordmetroid	sounds good
01:36:57	triplem	makes total sense
01:37:04	ras0ir	1
01:37:04	fukawi2	and this process it moved to the APP once sbnet can code it in?
01:37:04	lordmetroid	1
01:37:14	lordmetroid	1
01:37:16	fukawi2	done deal
01:37:16	triplem	-1
01:37:19	fukawi2	no?
01:37:20	triplem	sorry +1
01:37:23	jowilkin	lol
01:37:23	fukawi2	oh, cool :)
01:37:24	lordmetroid	triplem: you do not like it?

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:37:35	ras0ir	lol
01:37:43	triple	sorry, it is already quite late, my finger slept on the key ;-)
01:37:44	fukawi2	!action sbnet investigate writing a package nomination and adoption module for the APP
01:37:44	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'sbnet' to follow up: investigate writing a package nomination and adoption module for the APP
01:37:53	triple	follow up: http://bbs.archserver.org/viewtopic.php?pid=476#p476
01:37:54	lord-taco	http://bbs.archserver.org/viewtopic.php?pid=476#p476 = "ArchServer Project :: Forums / Repo Structure"
01:37:57	fukawi2	!action sbnet investigate package sign-off process for the APP
01:37:57	^ lord-taco	*** ACTION POINT: 'sbnet' to follow up: investigate package sign-off process for the APP
01:38:18	fukawi2	!topic Tracking Upstream Bugs and Patches
01:38:18	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Tracking Upstream Bugs and Patches'
01:38:24	jowilkin	thats alot for sbnet, hopefully once he gets code in git we can help with it
01:38:25	triple	probably these are too much tasks for sbnet ;-)
01:38:35	triple	m1
01:38:44	lordmetroid	triple: that is why we should help him
01:38:52	jowilkin	ok this point was my idea, and relates to our patching policy
01:39:01	lordmetroid	I know PHP as well
01:39:01	fukawi2	the action is only to investigate and work out how much work is required :)
01:39:10	ras0ir	well, im following CVEs and some bugtraq lists for security
01:39:19	fukawi2	then we can discuss sharing the workload of actually doing it :)
01:39:23	fukawi2	!topic Tracking Upstream Bugs and Patches
01:39:23	{ lord-taco	*** NEXT TOPIC: 'Tracking Upstream Bugs and Patches'
01:39:46	lordmetroid	^ So we are going to try to write patches for security and stability for upstream, or what do the AS team patch?
01:39:47	jowilkin	ras0ir, maybe we can list our sources for bugs and such on the wiki somewhere
01:39:47	fukawi2	triple: I think this and the next topic can be held over to next meeting ?
01:40:05	triple	sure.
01:40:29	ras0ir	jowilkin: sure, i'll create a page for it on wiki
01:40:29	triple	thanks guys
01:40:31	fukawi2	LordMetroid: can we hold this till next meeting or a forum thread for now please?
01:40:35	lordmetroid	sure
01:40:43	lordmetroid	forum would be good think
01:40:55	jowilkin	that's fine with me too
01:41:00	fukawi2	our next meeting could perhaps be a bit earlier? does anyone have any objects to that?
01:41:07	triple	np
01:41:10	lordmetroid	np
01:41:13	triple	and a little shorter as well
01:41:16	triple	;-)
01:41:18	fukawi2	perhaps an hour earlier for the benefit of triple / faelar etc
01:41:19	ras0ir	:P
01:41:24	jowilkin	what does earlier mean when we are all in different time zones?

ArchServer Meeting Minutes
5th May 2010 11.00pm UTC

Time (UTC)	Nick	Message
01:41:43	lordmetroid	earlier is the same wherever you are
01:41:50	triplemg8	now.
01:41:53	fukawi2	earlier is relative :P
01:41:55	lordmetroid	good night triplem
01:41:56	jowilkin	well what i mean is it could push it to middle of the night for someone
01:42:00	ras0ir	triplem: thanks, g'nite :)
01:42:01	fukawi2	thanks for staying up triplem :)
01:42:03	jowilkin	but moving by 1 hour is fine here
01:42:18	ras0ir	yeah it's fine for me as well :P
01:42:26	fukawi2	we will hold off everything else until next meeting :)
01:42:30	fukawi2	thanks everyone!
01:42:33	lordmetroid	I got no problem with earlier
01:42:34	fukawi2	good night triplem
01:42:34	jowilkin	maybe not on friday as well
01:42:38	ras0ir	it's already 3.42 am xD
01:42:42	fukawi2	!close-meeting