

## 3rd Meeting of the seL4 Technical Steering Committee

Fri, 12 Feb 2021, 15:30-17:00 AEST, by Zoom

### Attendance

TSC members present:

- June Andronick (JA)
- Matthew Brecknell (MB)
- Kevin Elphinstone (KE)
- Gernot Heiser (GH)
- Gerwin Klein (GK)
- Rafal Kolanski (RK)
- Ihor Kuz (IK)
- Corey Lewis (CL)
- Anna Lyons (AL)
- Kent McLeod (KM)

Reviewers present:

- Chris Guikema (CG)
- Jesse Millwood (JM)
- Axel Heider (AH)
- Yanyan Shen (YS)

Others present:

- Curtis Millar (CM)
- Jorge Pereira
- Nick Spinale
- Oliver Scott

### Minutes

#### 0. Action Items from last meeting

- testing infrastructure (AL, KM, GK, AH, YS): continue discussion on Discourse: has been happening, still in progress; AWS credits need further action
- gather volunteers for AWS verification setup by email (GK): done
- dev mailing list on discourse (IK, KM, AL): Ihor tried out a few things; still more to investigate and decision is pending
- introduce a "new to seL4 section" on Discourse (IK, KM, AL): **still open**
- write guidelines for what should be considered a bug in Jira/issues (BL): **still open**
- update RFC process description (GK): done

- set up discourse discussions before next meeting (GK): continuing

## 1. **When/how should Committer/Admin role change for people who have left D61 and had the role based on org membership**

So far, proof or kernel engineers at D61 automatically gain Committer role because they are supervised by someone from the TSC. Current process for leaving D61: Gerwin talks to everyone who leaves if they want to remain in the role; everyone so far had sufficient experience and trust to grant that role if desired.

Current process for non-D61: become committer by decision of TSC, leaving on request or decision of TSC.

KE: should discuss at TSC case by case

GE: why does D61 get automatic Committer role?

GK: because internal bitbucket access effectively grants them that level of access on foundation GitHub.

KM: bitbucket still has gatekeeping for PRs etc, same process as on GitHub

CM: once development has moved to GitHub, this issue will resolve automatically

MB: some inconsistency will remain, since people who are involved but have left (e.g. Yanyan) may be left with lower level of access than someone who is still at D61

GK: main issue is people leaving D61, looks like current process (case by case) is Ok for that, and will resolve when development is on GitHub. Can then resolve remaining inconsistencies by TSC decision.

## 2. **Endorsement process for training and products**

Feedback from members: put more value on opinion of trusted people like the TSC. Seems that we should not push for certification scheme yet; but rather keep gaining experience with more endorsements and get more feedback.

Certification would be a more in-depth check. Usually certification = for established standard; we have not set that standard yet; we can only assess technical expertise and community involvement.

Need externally known set of criteria; we have trainings as baseline eg AOS course; what is it about that course that makes it certifiable?

Endorsement allows us to say what is unique about a particular service. Certification would de-emphasise that.

### **Resolved:**

- certification premature; get more experience with endorsement

**ACTION:** (MB, KM, GK, JA, IK, GH):

- start (public) discussion on discourse, including criteria

## 3. **Changes to older seL4 versions**

AL: Discussed when established original release process; we do not commit to supporting changes to old versions. There should be a release documentation page that details this. If we do choose to back-port something, process should be: branch original; patch and tag as point release. Can consider branch releases on case by case.

CM: We can also do as for platform support: have someone in the community maintaining a particular old version if they wish.

KM: accepting patch updates might need bandwidth we don't have. One option is saying we'll support eg 5-6 changes, ie. give an upper bound.

GK: like the idea but hesitant to put up an actual number at this point.

Not a lot of instances of this yet, might change in the future, but no specific action needed. Process as described by AL is fine.

AH: need to set criteria for point release patches as base for approval.

GK: current criteria for point release patches are the same as for other patches, i.e. no special rules at this point. If this becomes common, we may want to set specific ones, but not yet.

#### 4. Discourse approval

Suggestion to switch off approval to join discourse, because it's a manual process so can take several days, and discourages people to join. Also unsure what to check to approve, guidelines would be good.

**Resolved:**

- try to switch off approval and see if leads to issues

**ACTION:** (AL)

- switch off once AL is made admin (only 5 admins allowed; for now includes IK, CM, Luke Mondy; decision to change Luke to Anna).

#### 5. Platform Owner proposal

Proposal was shared in meeting invite.

Change requests:

- Should add explicitly what the exit scenarios are: step down or not keeping to commitment.
- Should be explicit that by default platform ports are owned by Foundation.

Issue: how check commitment kept? Only at releases; if no way to run HW test on platform owner hardware: need to ask explicitly.

Suggestion that the list should be mention what is being checked and when.

**Resolved:** proposal accepted with above changes.

#### 6. RFC-6

<https://sel4.atlassian.net/browse/RFC-6>

Lot of discussion on the RFC; some agreement on things; main things not agreed on yet: definition of what build interface should be.

**RESOLVED:** Decision to break it up in smaller chunks; and keep this one open until covered by new ones. CM to lead.

#### 7. RFC-5

<https://sel4.atlassian.net/browse/RFC-5>

**RESOLVED:** pre-approval given, asking for implementation and example designed + use cases in documentation.

#### 8. **RFC-4**

<https://sel4.atlassian.net/browse/RFC-4>

No decision yet; continue the discussion.

#### 9. **Other Business**

- summit: start on discourse, then ping people (people interested IK, GK, maybe AL)
- if you think of anyone who should be a reviewer, please send suggestions to chair (GK)
- suggestion to partition meeting between admin and technical; can try to do admin at beginning

**Meeting closed 17:00 AEST**

#### **Summary of Actions**

- **MB, KM, GK, JA, IK, GH:** start (public) discussion on discourse, including criteria, on endorsement for training, products, companies
- **AL:** switch off approval requirement for joining discourse.

From previous meetings:

- **IK, KM, AL:** introduce a “new to sel4 section” on Discourse
- **BL:** write guidelines for what should be considered a bug in Jira/issues

#### **Acronyms**

**TSC** Technical Steering Committee of the sel4 Foundation

Minutes prepared by GK and JA