Maintenance Process

Proposal

March 2020

Goal of this Proposal

- Define a clear maintenance process for trustedfirmware.org projects
 Initially for TF-A and TF-M (might extend to OP-TEE, ...)
- Define key developers roles within the project
- Enlarge maintainership to developers outside of Arm
- Document the code review process
 - Set expectations for contributors and reviewers
 - Define who does what
- Define a life cycle for platform support
- Start a discussion within the community

Roles, Rights and Responsibilities

Contributor

• Default role

Code owner

- Responsible for specific module(s)
- Self-nominated or elected by their peers

Maintainer

- High level view, ensure changes adhere to project's architecture
- Have merges rights
- Elected by their peers (meritocracy basis)
- Cumulative with code owner role

Life Cycle of a Patch

- 1. Patch is submitted for review. Changes *n* modules.
- 2. Patch author adds reviewers:
 - 1 code owner per module
 - 1 maintainer
- 3. Code owners review and approve the patch.
- 4. Maintainer review and approve the patch.
- 5. Maintainer merge the patch in the tree.

Life Cycle for Platform Support

- Platform support involves maintaining:
 - Code (e.g. API breakages)
 - Tests
 - Documentation
 - OpenCl
- Define several levels of support
 - Fully supported
 - Limited support
 - Orphan
 - Out of date
 - Deprecated
- Users know what is supposed to work on a platform
- Define a process to deal with deprecated platforms

Open Questions

- Allow self-review?
- Process to fast-track patches

References

• Proposal

https://developer.trustedfirmware.org/w/collaboration/project-maintenance-proposal/

arm

Thank You Danke Merci 谢谢 ありがとう Gracias Kiitos 감사합니다 धन्यवाद תודה

arm

arm

The Arm trademarks featured in this presentation are registered trademarks or trademarks of Arm Limited (or its subsidiaries) in the US and/or elsewhere. All rights reserved. All other marks featured may be trademarks of their respective owners.

www.arm.com/company/policies/trademarks