PEP 772 - Python packaging governance

Details

PEP 772	https://peps.python.org/pep-0772/
Discussion	https://discuss.python.org/t/pep-772-packaging-governance-process/79724
Authors	Barry Warsaw, Deb Nicholson, Pradyun Gedam
Status	Draft
Replaces	PEP 609 - Python Packaging Authority (PyPA) Governance

Why do we need a Council?

- PEP 609 mostly codifies existing informal policies, circa 2019

- Membership is project-oriented, not individual-oriented

- Can decide which projects are part of the PyPA

- Ambiguous relationship with the PSF's Packaging WG

- PyPA can only promote and consult on standards, not decide

- Bus factor == 1 for Python Steering Council standing delegations

Why do we need a Council?

- Elevate and publicize the critical importance of packaging to Python's success

- Greater diversity of experiences leading to more comprehensive solutions

- More voices contributing to the discourse

- Actively set agendas, priorities, and roadmaps for ecosystem evolution

- Spread the load and responsibilities for decision making

- Checks and balances through council elections

- Partner w/Steering Council, firing all cylinders together

PEP 772 solution

- Five member elected council; two cohorts elected biennially

- Constitutionally modeled after PEP 13 (with some differences)

- Mandate over packaging standards and packaging.python.org

- Authority to make binding decisions

- Disbands Packaging WG

- Relationship with PyPA to be mutually determined

- Steering Council updates standing delegations to Packaging Council

The "packaging community"

Initial voting members

- **PyPA members**: Anyone with the triage bit or commit bit, or at least one project in the PyPA organisation.

- **Packaging workgroup members**: Anyone who is listed on the Packaging WG charter will be moved into the Packaging community.

- **Interested core team members**: Any Python core team member who is willing to participate is welcome.

- **Wider community members**: ~~Non-profit~~ organisations that participate in packaging or working with new packagers. For example, PyOpenSci, NumFocus, Django, are encouraged to initially nominate up to seven members.

Open questions

Seeding the initial voting membership?

- *Voting Member* vs *Community Member*
- Representative of community and all stakeholders (tool makers, index administrators, package producers & consumers, etc.)
- Fair to open source, non-profits, for-profits, volunteers and paid
- Via PyPA vote (the current process)?
- Who, if anybody reviews the initial membership?
- 7 members from each org. Let the SC decide the orgs?
- Is 7 members per org too many or too few?
- Require commitment to follow standards?

What about adding new members for future elections?

Open questions

Effective Communication

- ○ Is DPO enough? Probably not.
- ○ There's also the PyPA Discord
- ○ Other forums & communities?
- ○ Regular updates from the PC?
- ○ 7 members from each org. Let the SC decide the orgs?
- ○ Is 7 members per org too many or too few?
- ○ Require commitment to follow standards?

Share resources with the Steering Council (meeting tools, scribes, DiR, PSF ED, etc.)

Show of Hands / Call to Action

Show of hands - general temperature of the room

Call to action

PEP 772 - Python packaging governance

Details

PEP 772	https://peps.python.org/pep-0772/
Discussion	https://discuss.python.org/t/pep-772-packaging-governance-process/79724
Authors	Barry Warsaw, Deb Nicholson, Pradyun Gedam
Status	Draft
Replaces	PEP 609

Thank you for your attention