

Present:

- Konstantin Ryabitsev - technical director LF
- Google: Han-Wen Nienhuys, Dmitri Vyukov, David Gow, Brendan Higgins
- Jonathan Corbet - LWN
- Christian Brauner - Canonical
- Shuah Khan - LF
- Greg KH
- Johan Holvold
- Kevin Hilman, KernelCI
- Veronika Kabatova - Red Hat/CKI CI
- Rafael Wysocki - intel
- Sasha Levin
- Frank Rowand
- Daniel Diaz - Linaro LKFT CI
- Daniel Vetter - intel
- Steven Rostedt
- Wolfram Sang
- Anasse Astier - freebox (?)

Consensus:

- Current situation is suboptimal/problematic
- CI folks
- Patchwork streamlines workflow; lot of activity now. Dormant for years, but now improving.
- Konstantin: patches: no attestation; no security. Easy to slip in vulns
- Linus checks sigs, but subsystem maintainers don't.
- Konstantin: proposes minisign signatures.
- How realistic is this? (Steven).
- How big is the key? Ed25519 are short keys.
- Identity tracking? PGP giving up on key signing. TOFU.
- (unhearable)
- KR: signify/minisign background.
- PGP
- KR: Want it to be part of git.
- PGP signatures are attachments. Attachments are easily stripped from message.
- KR: want to archive history
- Complex patch doesn't get in immediately, because patches need comment rounds, then spoofing gets exposed.
- Greg: base tree information will be great.
- Konstantin wants to put it into Git.
- Base tree
 - Discuss base commit
 - Hanwen: SHA1 is opaque too

- KR: Linus complains that Changeid is equivalent to messageid, not so much opaqueness.
 - Hanwen: suggest to add a public URL to the base tree
 - Base goes into email; --base option git-format-patch.
 - Must become a requirement
 - Put into check-patch
 - Similar to signed-off
 - Not mandatory, andrew morton not using git. RFC patches also don't need it.
- Gateways:
 - Point to tree, send from system
 - Inside corporations, HTTPS.
 - Adopt [Gitgitgadget](#) from github; creates mail patches from a GH repo.
 - Command line tool
 - Figuring out who to send this to.
 - Automation defeats attestation goal.
 - KR: should just build gitgitgadget for kernel.
- How to know whom to send patch to?
 - So much cruft in maintainers file.
- Interaction git-format-patch and config is tricky.
- Dmitrii Vyukov:
 - Can have a server to do this
 - KR: don't want centralized infrastructure
 - Dmitrii: but gitgitgadget is the same?
- (14:35): feeds.
 - Human consumable information
 - Kernel.org can aggregate all the feeds, and can tell what CIs are still missing.
 - CI mail has logs, but the results are transient
 - Kernel.org can archive all these data.
 - Will be a lot of data, but want to start with feed.
 - Needs a common structured format to understand what all CI systems have done.
 - Attestation
 - Steven: could record the acks/reviewed-by.
- 2nd part of discussion: tooling.
 - Lore 200 Gb.
- [lost a lot of conversation here]
- Patchwork:
 - Has a web interface
 - Can run locally.
 - Inbox vs patchwork
 - Patchwork with approvals from different maintainers.
 - ...
 - KR: write local command to work with patchwork.

- KR: daniel uses gitlab, some people want to use gerrit
 - KR: wants to have a feed of data.
 - Mail from gerrit/gitlab, usually is noisy.
 - Tool can consume that feed.
 - Libc mailing list, still struggling
- Hanwen: Funding for tooling? Does Linux Foundation build the bridges, or do tool owners (gerrit, gitlab) have to do it?
 - Linux Foundation can go to companies to ask for funding
 - KR trying to get consensus so we can ask for resources & funding as a group.
 - Let people use tools, sourcehut, gitlab, gerrit
- KR: Lore.kernel.org:
 - Want to be able to search all over all data, gerrit, kernel etc. (like code search)
 - Find all the patches that touch XYZ
- Devs can miss reviews because people don't know where reviews happen.
 - KR: have a bot that will respond on behalf if maintainer has no gerrit account.
 - KR: long time initiative: want to move to SSB.