

Please note: the following CNTT Questions and Proposed Responses documented below are as of 2019-10-07. Additional comments will be reviewed and responded to at next Gov call and addressed in an overall plan of action.

Introduction

The proposed Common NFVi Telco Taskforce (CNTT) structure was undertaken by a few of the founding member companies to address our ability to scale, momentum and future plans of CNTT as outlined in our 3rd Technical Workshop in Antwerp, Belgium in September 2019.

At the time of publication, the intent of this proposed structure was to provide opportunities for new community members to self-nominate into leadership roles as well as establish several parallel work streams to achieve scale and other goals outlined in Antwerp. We agree that the proposed CNTT structure lacked the supporting detail that some individuals rightfully pointed out in response to the structure.

This document includes all comments to date, as of October 8, 2019, plus a summary response for the following categories: Works Streams, Governance, Technical, Work Stream Nomination and Selection, Voting and Approval, and Relationship to GSMA and LFN. This response was developed by the existing Governance and Technical Steering Committee leads from AT&T, Orange, Telstra, Verizon and Vodafone - along with proposed next steps.

Work Streams

1. How do we make sure that the number of different groups does not start to fragment the activity too much? I'm slightly concerned that already the number of groups create already a big amount of meetings per week, which may be difficult to organize in the end.
2. I might have missed this: What is the relationship of the WSLs to the already existing OPNFV and OVP activities?

Proposed Response: Overall, CNTT works independently of OPNFV / OVP projects within LFN, but the Reference Implementation (RI) & Reference Compliance (RC) work streams of CNTT have been incorporated into a single (approved) project within OPNFV/OVP. While we are early in the formation of RI and RC work streams, the vision is that CNTT process and technology assets will be incorporated / ingested into future releases of OPNFV/OVP. As it relates to Work Stream Leads (WSLs) potential for fragmentation, it is one of the primary responsibilities of both the Governance and Technical Steering Committee's Leads to ensure each of the WSLs remain aligned and in sync. Lastly, we are looking into alternative approaches for online collaboration as a supplemental approach to meetings in order to allow individual contributors the means to work at their pace and time.

Proposed Next Steps:

- Document the overall structure of CNTT as it relates to LFN/OPNFV, GSMA, CNTT Committees and Work Streams
- Document the approval process for:
 - Release Content
 - Release Change Request

- Approvals
- Etc.
- Assess alternatives opportunities for collaboration as supplemental approaches to online meetings

Governance, Technical Steering & Work Stream Nominations / Selections

3. How is the technical steering selected? Is that comprised of the WSL leads?
4. Identification & documentation of “Participants”: The ToR provides for certain privileges to be given to “Participants” in CNTT. Section 1.c states the following:
5. “The CNTT is open to participation by any individual or organization that agrees to comply with these ToR (each such participant, a “Participant”). We need to identify the individuals and companies that “Agree” to comply with the ToR (do they need to sign something?), and document those entities as “Participants”. We have the “logo” slide and that may be enough. Documenting what the process is to become a “participant” would be helpful though.
6. What is the makeup of leadership bodies, and how is leadership selected? This pertains to the CNTT Governance Committee, TSC, Workstream leads and co-leads, Chapter leads, etc.
 - Max & Min on each committee?
 - Length of term? – per release, annual, etc.
 - Are these limited to the “voting representative” of each organization or can others hold seats?
 - What decisions do each of these bodies own?
 - Are there any limits or caps of any kind?... seats held by the same company, etc.
7. I would have strongly considered an open source model (see OPNFV) based on meritocracy instead of nominating people regarding the nature of their companies by laws. All contribution statistics (pull requests, bugs, and comments on pull/requests) are available from the beginning which eases selecting the best committers.

Proposed Response: After our 3rd Technical Workshop in Antwerp, it was recognized that the structure of CNTT needed to evolve to allow for a more diverse contributor and leadership model, while maintaining the speed and innovation that led to the delivery of our RM and first RA in under six months. To address this concern, the structure proposed in the October 3rd CNTT Governance meeting was the initial draft of the future structure. The proposed structure was left open for items referred to below to allow for an interim nomination and selection process due to several new member companies and individuals which just joined and/or becoming more actively engaged.

- **Participants** –Initially, when GSMA and LFN agreed to sponsor CNTT, the members of CNTT agreed to adhere to the ToR, but it is acknowledged that CNTT has not maintained that process and record keeping since the initial sponsorship.
- **Selection of Governance and Technical Steering Committee Leads** – Proposed self-nomination process for current term with a goal to have an even distribution between CSPs and Vendor Partners, but at a minimum at least one representative from the founding companies of AT&T, Vodafone and Orange for the sake of continuity.

- **Selection of Work Stream Leads** – Proposed self-nomination process for current term with a goal to have an even distribution between CSPs and its Vendor Partners. Where conflicts arise, the Governance committee will determine final selections, but at a minimum from at least one representative from the founding companies of AT&T, Vodafone and Orange for the sake of continuity.
- **Size of Committee and Works Stream Leads** – Proposed minimum of 2 leads; maximum of 4 leads
- **Length of Term of Committee and Work Stream Leads** – Proposed through 12/31/2020
- **Limits or Caps related to number of seats held by an individual or company** – Proposed No Limits at this time due to allow for continued momentum, continuity of CNTT vision and future planned deliverables.

Proposed Next Steps:

- Development and implementation of a process to ensure all participating companies and individuals agree to the ToR and continued maintenance of those records.
- Development of a future process to nominate, select, and set term limits for all Committee and Work Stream Leads.
- Document the proposed recommendations above along with an accompanying onboarding package for all future new company and individuals who join CNTT.

Voting and Approvals

8. Identify and document Participant “Voting Representatives”, and any “related companies”: Section 2.a of the ToR states that a participating organization can have as many representatives engaged in CNTT activities as it wants but only 1 person from each organization can vote. (i.e. the “Voting Representative”). We need to ask each Participant who their voting representative is and document that somewhere. Also, what would these “Voting Representatives” vote on; Governance Body makeup, “Release” milestones, nothing, etc.?
9. How is each of the documents produced determined to be finished (Reference Models, Reference Architectures, Validation/Compliance test suites, etc.)? How long is a comment period?, How are disagreements settled and documented? Who votes on the milestone being passed; all participants, or CNTT Governance Committee, or TSC, or ...)? I expect it may be different based on the document.
10. How is the introduction and acceptance of a new Reference Architecture accomplished? What is the process by which some participants bring forward a new RA for consideration? What should they document as part of the review/evaluation phase? How long should other participants have to review and comment on the new RA proposal? Are resource commitments involved? Who votes to determine if the proposal meets the criteria to be included as a new RA?
11. Finally, if we decide that questions like the ones above need to be answered and documented, what body votes/approves the resulting policy and process document(s)?
12. I disagree with the current 2 operators + 2 vendors requirements to merge changes even if I understand we can improve the process sometimes wrong during Botrange. It seems falsy to ask for 4 committers to merge a pull regarding the number of current active committers (ratio 1:1?). Then I consider once again that selecting the nature of company is not right from a meritocracy.

Proposed Response: To date, given CNTT was a startup Open Source Community it's been effective to approve and vote on all subject matter using a quorum & majority vote concept. As the CNTT community expands and evolves, it is recognized that additional structure with clearly defined processes are required to vote on and approve releases, key initiatives, and other significant decisions within the community . As an interim process, we propose to continue to use quorum & majority vote on decisions, Dissention should be managed through the issues, reviews, and feedback. In situations where alignment / agreement cannot be reached, a simple majority vote will be called with 1 vote per company, with at a minimum at least one representative from the founding companies of AT&T, Vodafone and Orange for the sake of continuity.

Proposed Next Steps:

- Define requirements | scope for items that require votes and approvals
- Define community voting privileges | rules
- Development and implementation of a voting and approval process
- Assess tooling options to conduct voting, manage voting windows, and store artifacts

Relationship to LNF/OPNFV and GSMA

13. What is the relationship of CNTT management structures (tech steering, gov steering) to the LFN management structures like TSC, MAC, etc.?

Proposed Response: The LNF is sponsor of the CNTT and is governed by the ToR. In addition, CNTT's Reference Implementation (RI) and Reference Certification (RC) workstreams are an approved project within OPNFV/OVP.

Proposed Next Steps: None

Appendix – Original Comments

Soininen, Jonne (Nokia - FI/Espoo) <jonne.soininen@...>

Oct 4 #107

Hello everybody,

Thank you very much for clearly working hard on the new governance model. It is clear that a lot of good work has gone into it! It is really good to bring more structure and visibility to the structure to the work and taking the path towards all parties being on equal footing in the project. This is really welcome and I think we're on the way towards something great.

I was still left with a couple of questions for clarification that I didn't have time to ask yesterday. Therefore, I thought I would ask the questions here and not to wait to the next meeting. I'm sorry if I missed something in the presentation and I'm asking something obvious:

- 1) How do we make sure that the number of different groups does not start to fragment the activity too much? I'm slightly concerned that already the number of groups create already a big amount of meetings per week, which may be difficult to organize in the end.
- 2) I might have missed this: What is the relationship of the WSLs to the already existing OPNFV and OVP activities?
- 3) How is the technical steering selected? Is that comprised of the WSL leads?
- 4) What is the relationship of CNTT management structures (tech steering, gov steering) to the LFN management structures like TSC, MAC, etc?

Phil Robb

Oct 4 #108

Hello CNTT Governance Community:

Similar to Jonne, I have some questions regarding the policy and processes that support the operations of CNTT. I too am happy with the rapid progress that this group has made in a short period of time. As we continue to ramp though, I think it would be good to discuss and document that next level of "rules of engagement" so that all new, and existing participants have a common understanding of what the CNTT operating policies and processes are.

In particular, there are pointers within the Terms of Reference[0], the Reference Model[1] and Reference Architecture[2] documents that mention "Members", "Participants", "Voting Participants" and a variety of process milestones that require agreement of some form before progressing. However, the specifics of participation, voting, make up of various decision bodies, etc. has not been discussed, agreed-upon, and documented to the best of my knowledge. This email is intended to begin a discussion of those topic areas to determine if, or when & how we would want to address them. If members of this Governance body feel that answers to the questions below are not adequately documented and should be, then maybe we can add this as an agenda item to an upcoming Governance call to discuss how we could proceed.

1. Identification & documentation of “Participants”: The ToR provides for certain privileges to be given to “Participants” in CNTT. Section 1.c states the following:

“The CNTT is open to participation by any individual or organization that agrees to comply with these ToR (each such participant, a “Participant”).

We need to identify the individuals and companies that “Agree” to comply with the ToR (do they need to sign something?), and document those entities as “Participants”. We have the “logo” slide and that may be enough. Documenting what the process is to become a “participant” would be helpful though.

1. Identify and document Participant “Voting Representatives”, and any “related companies”: Section 2.a of the ToR states that a participating organization can have as many representatives engaged in CNTT activities as it wants but only 1 person from each organization can vote. (i.e. the “Voting Representative”). We need to ask each Participant who their voting representative is and document that somewhere. Also, what would these “Voting Representatives” vote on; Governance Body makeup, “Release” milestones, nothing, etc.?

1. What is the makeup of leadership bodies, and how is leadership selected? This pertains to the CNTT Governance Committee, TSC, Workstream leads and co-leads, Chapter leads, etc.

- Max & Min on each committee?
- Length of term? – per release, annual, etc
- Are these limited to the “voting representative” of each organization or can others hold seats?
- What decisions do each of these bodies own?
- Are there any limits or caps of any kind?... seats held by the same company, etc.

1. How is each of the documents produced determined to be finished (Reference Models, Reference Architectures, Validation/Compliance test suites, etc.)? How long is a comment period?, How are disagreements settled and documented? Who votes on the milestone being passed; all participants, or CNTT Governance Committee, or TSC, or ...)? I expect it may be different based on the document.

1. How is the introduction and acceptance of a new Reference Architecture accomplished? What is the process by which some participants bring forward a new RA for consideration? What should they document as part of the review/evaluation phase? How long should other participants have to review and comment on the new RA proposal? Are resource commitments involved? Who votes to determine if the proposal meets the criteria to be included as a new RA?

1. Finally, if we decide that questions like the ones above need to be answered and documented, what body votes/approves the resulting policy and process document(s)?

[0] https://github.com/cntt-n/CNTT/blob/master/GSMA_CNTT_Terms_of_Reference.pdf

[1] https://github.com/cntt-n/CNTT/tree/master/doc/ref_model

[2] https://github.com/cntt-n/CNTT/tree/master/doc/ref_arch

CNTT Structure Feedback Page Comments

Oct 4 v

Cédric Ollivier:

I would have strongly considered an opensource model (see OPNFV) based on meritocracy instead of nominating people regarding the nature of their companies by laws. All contribution statistics (pull requests, bugs, comments on pull/requests) are available from the beginning which eases selecting the best committers.

I disagree with the current 2 operators + 2 vendors requirements to merge changes even if I understand we can improve the process sometimes wrong during Botrange. It seems falsy to ask for 4 committers to merge a pull regarding regarding the number of current active committers (ratio 1:1?). Then I consider once again that selecting the nature of company is not right from a meritocracy.