

[09:58:51] <julieng> [14:49:54] juergen_gross: We need to have a tag for those e-mails (or a new mailing list). So they can be filter easily.

[09:58:51] <julieng> [14:50:02] Otherwise they go unnoticed.

[09:58:51] <julieng> [14:51:24] juergen_gross: Thank you for the dates, glad to see this does not clash with my holidays plan :)

[09:58:51] <juergen_gross> [14:53:50] julieng: what about "[Process]" as tag?

[09:58:51] <julieng> [14:54:12] juergen_gross: That could work. I am about to answer to your e-mail with Lars + Committers in CC to get feedback.

[09:58:51] <lars_kurth> [14:57:06] I guess it depends on whether you want to filter more specifically. I would say [Release Management] or [Releases] would be a slightly more specific version

[09:58:51] <juergen_gross> [14:59:12] lars_kurth: yes, but if the concern is about not noticing such mails I'd prefer to have a tag usable for most of the admin/release-management/process related stuff.

[09:58:51] <juergen_gross> [14:59:59] We could use "[**]" for that, too, in order to just mark those mails as "important".

[09:58:51] <lars_kurth> [15:01:03] I like the idea of an important tag

[09:58:51] <juergen_gross> [15:01:08] Having a dozen or so new tags would suffer from the same problem: they would go unnoticed.

[09:58:51] <gwd> [15:03:32] Every mail is important, or it wouldn't have been sent.

[09:58:51] <gwd> [15:03:38] I mean, to the sender. :-)

[09:58:51] <lars_kurth> [15:03:59] juergen_gross: how about just using [important] and maybe in rare cases [urgent]. This would only work if we don't overuse the tags

[09:58:51] <lars_kurth> [15:04:51] gwd: of course, BUT I think we are talking about "important" to the community, not the sender

[09:58:51] <juergen_gross> [15:05:04] Right.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:05:07] or more precisely the "operation of the community"

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:05:28] lars_kurth: Anyone who sends mail to xen-devel thinks their mail is "important to the community", so they wouldn't have sent it.

[09:58:52] <juergen_gross> [15:05:36] After all it wasn't the sender who complained he didn't notice the mail ;-)

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:06:27] [Process] wouldn't hurt -- although I don't know why julieng would notice [Process] or [**]

or [IMPORTANT] more than just "Xen Development Update"

[09:58:52] <juergen_gross> [15:07:02] Knowing the tag allows for setting up a filter

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:07:37] He could set up a filter on "Xen Development Update", which is pretty consistently what you use.

[09:58:52] <juergen_gross> [15:07:44] And I guess this would apply to other mails as well, not only the Xen Development Update

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:08:00] OK, so using [important] is maybe the wrong approach. I don't mind about process, but I have reservations because "process" is perceived as boring. But we can educate people

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:08:14] gwd: We use "Xen 4.13 Development Update" so basically you need a new filter for each release.

[09:58:52] <juergen_gross> [15:08:45] I could switch to "Xen Development Update for 4.13"

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:08:54] gwd: My point here is we need to make this e-mail more visible. So it a more predicatble title would help anyone user to find it.

[09:58:52] <juergen_gross> [15:08:59] Just a matter of modifying my script.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:09:18] julieng: And my point is, I don't see how any of these changes will make it more visible.

[09:58:52] <juergen_gross> [15:09:21] Or "**** Xen 4.13 Development Update"

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:09:37] I like the idea of a tag better. It's clearer and less error prone and can be used say by jbeulich for requesting back-ports, ...

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:10:04] gwd: Because you can tell people to filter it if they cares about it. It stands out from xen-devel.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:10:05] Backports would be a good use of the tag as well.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:10:39] gwd: Then filter on "sender:Juergen Gross and subject-contains:Development Update"

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:10:45] julieng^

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:11:20] But release managers change. The other possibility is [announcement] which it kind of is

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:11:45] I wouldn't call an update an announcement.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:11:55] OK

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:11:58] gwd: That only works for that specific e-mail. How about things like branching, new RC...?

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:12:14] how about [action-needed]

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:12:26] or [community-action-needed]

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:12:42] lars_kurth: But the development update almost never needs action

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:13:03] lars_kurth: [community-update] ?

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:13:04] Except by the people needing to provide updates

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:13:17] on their work

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:13:38] lars_kurth: Right, which is a minority of people; so for *most* people, "action-needed" is false; and they're just going to learn to filter it out.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:13:48] OK

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:15:33] Since people want to filter on it, [PROCESS] or something like it seems like a reasonable approach.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:15:56] Or maybe [DEVELOPMENT]

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:16:00] juliebg: [community-update] is fine or [operational-update] or [ops-update] or [operations]. It's a little clearer than process

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:16:28] julieng: ^

[09:58:52] <royger> [15:16:49] I think most people just care about the dates, so might be good to place the schedule in a webpage somewhere, like: <https://www.freebsd.org/releases/11.3R/schedule.html>

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:17:22] We still need an email pointing to it

[09:58:52] <royger> [15:18:52] that would only track the schedule, not the projects so yes, the email would still be needed. But we could likely have tentative schedules for a couple of upcoming releases easily available for people, without having to go into the mailing list

[09:58:52] <jbeulich> [15:18:54] Or the other way around: Have the web page point at the most recent instance of the status mail, like e.g. gcc does.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:20:35] Well if julieng's main point was to be able to search for the answer instead of asking on IRC, I'm sure there are other ways.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:21:13] I think he wants "liveness" -- he wants mails like the development update (and maybe commit moratorium, branches, &c) to show up in his mailbox.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:21:46] But then what if someone wants development updates but *not* commit moratoria?

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:22:34] gwd: I think as long as the volume of the messages is low, that won't be an issue

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:24:16] jbeulich: I think the issue with the "canonical subject" you suggested is that it has not worked well. It's too easy to make a mistake

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:24:38] jbeulich: we dropped [important]

[09:58:52] <jbeulich> [15:25:11] Well, Juergen says he uses a script for sending - how would that risk making a mistake with the subject?

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:26:04] I missed that, but not all release managers have used scripts

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:26:18] lars_kurth: It's as easy to make a mistake adding [PROCESS] as it is to use the "wrong" canonical subject.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:26:26] Debian has debian-devel-announce as a list. We probably don't want to do that, but it does demonstrate that "development announcements" can be a different thing to "announcements" so maybe justifies "[announce]"

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:26:43] (on xen-devel)

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:27:19] That's what I originally proposed, but there was pushback. Ah these bike-shed issues.

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:27:41] gwd: And then you would have to filter all the canonical subject. It is probably less error-prone to have one tag than can be used all topics over N canonical subjects.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:27:44] One orthogonal thing I'd like to propose: since we're following the [PATCH] model, we should [CAPITALIZE] the tag, whatever it ends up being.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:28:25] Sure

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:28:52] julieng: OK; so how about 1) we include a tag, 2) for common things we have canonical subjects.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:29:33] That way people can whitelist or blacklist specific things they want to see, whichever is more effective.

[09:58:52] <julieng> [15:30:08] gwd: That works for me.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:30:41] I could tolerate with [OPERATIONS] if people prefer that one.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:31:42] You don't think the RM release updates are announcements ? They would be treated as such in Debian.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:32:12] They're announcements for people involved in development, certainly, so they shouldn't be in -announce.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:32:26] I could live with "operations" because it's sufficiently vague.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:32:37] But in my mind, things like RM updates (which happen pretty regularly) and say, Developer Summit announcements, are different things.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:32:45] "process" is clearly wrong because "commit moratorium because messing with repos" is hardly "process"

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:32:59] Developer Summit announcements to go xen-announce.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:33:16] Sure, but they also go to xen-devel, right?

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:33:29] Only because we copy everything from -announce to -devel.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:33:58] Oh, so if we stopped sending that kind of announcement to -devel, then everyone would need to actually subscribe to -announce to get it? :-)

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:34:13] I am not saying that RM announcements and Dev Summit announcements are the same thing or that they should be treated the same. I am saying they are both announcements.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:34:45] There is no need to subject line tag those because if someone complains they didn't see it we say "why are you not reading -announce"

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:35:06] And they are few enough that the noise in -devel from them is not really a problem.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:35:42] I'm only painting this bikeshed with you because I'm waiting for mkfs -> over there.

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:35:45] :-)

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:38:39] I don't think regular updates / reminders / prompts are announcements. But as long as it's not [IMPORTANT], I'm not terribly bothered.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:44:01] OK, so we agree on. Canonical messages with a CAPITALISED tag. Not [IMPORTANT], maybe [ANNOUNCE] or [OPERATIONS]

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:44:51] Objections against [PROCESS]

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:45:16] I agree with gwd that IMPORTANT is bad.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:47:30] How about I reply to the thread, and get people to vote on [ANNOUNCE] or [OPERATIONS] or [PROCESS] ... The one with the most votes wins

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:47:58] FPTP ? Approval voting or a Condorcet system surely :-).

[09:58:52] <Diziet> [15:48:25] More seriously, we already have the +1/+2 etc. thing, we should use that if we're voting.

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:48:33] +1

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:49:06] Indeed: that's what I was going to propose

[09:58:52] <gwd> [15:51:44] lars_kurth: But the +1/+2 isn't "most votes wins"; a -2 is a veto.

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:52:32] True. Sorry for being sloppy

[09:58:52] <lars_kurth> [15:53:01] OK. Let me do this now