

Release Management Consultation -

Hour 2:

- Milestones – Checkpoints w/set of requirements
 - RM - must determine and report to TSC or delegate
 - Too many milestones == too much overhead
 - Don't push documentation off to the end of the project
 - L3AFd follows OpenSSF best practices
 - More strict.
 - Every PR that affects docs has to come with the docs
 - So this cannot happen as long as we follow OpenSSF best practices.
 - Specify in release process.
 - L3AF does not have a Program Technical Lead (PTL)
 - Should the docs be amended to reflect the l3af process?
 - L3af only loosely fits into the framework
 - lite deck?
 - This process is too heavy for L3aFp
 - There is no requirement to follow everything in the deck.
 - 30 minutes left
 - Wait for last 30 minutes until the materials are available for consumption
-
- 2 hours in total are needed to complete the consultation/Training
 - Hour 2: 08/31
 - Community Release Manager
 - 1-2 people from community
 - RM for LFN Projects - David McBride
 - Dedicated RM does not scale - No RM is chaos - Find a middle ground
 - Need - a stable, effective, repeatable process.
 - Projects of projects - dependencies
 - chat: looks like the current L3AF "release process" (such as it is) is documented at https://github.com/l3af-project/governance/blob/main/docs/RELEASE_PROCESS.md. I'm guessing there are gaps we will hear about in this presentation.
 - L3AF is a project of projects: L3aF-arch, l3afd, epf program repo
 - Interop
 - 1 proj w/mult releases: for eg: Linux/Windows.
 - MUST adhere to release schedule
 - L3AF project: New, release every 10-12 weeks
 - Currently no releases
 - More mature - longer release periods
 - Linux kernel - 4 times a year
 - Signoff process
 - TSC is not necessarily responsible for regular release signoff
 - The task may be delegated to another body
 - Use the principle of minimum viable governance
 - What about the PR around release?

Action Items

Future Agenda Items