

Please note: the following CNTT Questions and Responses documented below are as of 2019-10-11 @ 1900 UTC. Additional comments will be reviewed and responded to at next Gov call and addressed in an overall plan of action.

Introduction

The founding members of Common NFVI Telco Taskforce (CNTT) are AT&T, Vodafone, Verizon, Deutsche Telecom, and Orange. The new CNTT structure discussed below was undertaken by a few of the founding member companies to address our ability to scale, garner momentum, and plan for the future of CNTT as outlined in our 3rd Technical Workshop in Antwerp, Belgium in September 2019.

Based on the initial plan developed in Antwerp, a new CNTT structure was proposed. At the time of publication, the intent of this 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.

Although the CNTT Structure has had some community feedback incorporated into the latest iteration, we agree that this initial CNTT structure does not fully address all the supporting detail and feedback rightfully pointed out by the community via online and emailed feedback. To close this gap, a working group shall be formed to create a longer-term CNTT operational manual to further refine and detail CNTT processes and procedures. It is estimated it will take 4-6 weeks to complete this effort.

In the interim, the latest iteration of the *CNTT Structure 2019-10-16 ppt doc*, shall be considered as the *interim process structure and procedures* to work with and utilize, i.e. as the current CNTT operating manual.

Below we have included all comments to date, as of October 11, 2019 @ 1900 UTC, a summary response by category, and a draft outline of content by category for the longer-term CNTT operations process and procedure manual.

Categories

- Onboarding (Mark)
- Organizational Structure and Works Streams (Jim)
- Governance, Technical, Work Stream Nomination and Selection (Rabi)
- Voting and Approval (Rabi)
- Relationship to GSMA and LFN (Jim and Mark)

This response was developed by the current Governance and Technical Steering Committee leads from AT&T, Orange, Telstra, Verizon and Vodafone - along with proposed next steps.

Comments & Responses (by category)

I. Organizational Structure and Work Streams

Comments

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. (Note: to be defined in Overall Structure of CNTT)*
2. *I might have missed this: What is the relationship of the WSLs to the already existing OPNFV and OVP activities? (Note: to be defined in Community Relationships and Alignments)*
3. *Re: Org structure - We probably need further explanation about the relationship between sub teams of dev/ops/compliance under RM/RA/RI, e.g. what is the relationship between RA dev and RI dev? (Note: To be defined in Development Process)*
4. *Re: Org structure - We are a little bit worried that this many groups may fragment the community too much (number of meetings, etc.). One way could be to combine RA1 Core and RA1 Ops, RA2 Core and RA2 Ops, RI1 Core and RI1 Dev. Shouldn't RI and RC groups be represented in OPNFV directly, using the already existing structures there instead of in CNTT? (Note: To be defined in Overall Structure of CNTT.)*
5. *Re: Gov structure - We agree, that the boxes at the bottom include the tasks for a governance structure. We are wondering if rather than splitting the responsibilities it wouldn't be better to have a Governance Steering team with joint responsibility of the tasks. (Note: To be defined in Overall Structure of CNTT.)*
6. *Re: Gov WS scope - When we split the governance work into 6 pieces, we need to define how do we make decisions within the governance. Does that mean we will have the WS make decisions on the certain work listed, or we will have a larger "governance" team where people can 'vote'? We also need to define at what level should each different thing be reviewed and make decision. e.g., for a technical choice of a certain version of software, should we make the decision at the certain team in RA/RM/RI? or should we go to TS, or should we go to board? With the structure here, we only know how many characters we have in the governance, however we still lack of certain decision process. (Note: To be defined in Decision-Making Approach)*
7. *Re: Gov WS scope - After read through the slides, I realize there is a decision process, which ends only at the TS level. Then how do we expect the TS to work with Governance? Probably the decision process between TS and Gov should also be defined? (Note: To be defined in Decision-Making Approach)*
8. *Re: Technical WS structure - For the RI team, I see logo for OPNFV there, and there are also logo for OpenStack and CNCF in the RA team. Then how should we define our relationship with these opensource projects? How should we work with there TSC? e.g., OPNFV is now having a different release cycle from CNTT, how should RI team follow this? (Note: To be defined in Community Relationships & Alignments)*
9. *Re: technical WS structure - I think the logos were intended to show a OpenStack AND Kubernetes based RA. OPNFV will need to drive fixes upstream when required and should develop relationships with the TSCs of the key upstream projects when appropriate. OPNFV release cycle timing can be*

tuned at a later time, I do not think this is an immediate issue. *(Note: To be defined in Development Process.)*

10. *Re: Technical Steering - creating parallel/overlapping technical steering bodies is a recipe for disaster. OPNFV and OVP (RI and RC respectively) have existing technical steering. CNTT technical steering should focus on the RM/RA ONLY - and then drive the LFN efforts through the existing structures. (Note: To be defined in Community Relationships and Alignments)*
11. *Re: Technical Steering - I understand that CNTT RI work-streams are a "mirror" for OPNFV CNTT-RI project but this may be confusing for new contributors and any overlap is likely to cause problems. It would be simpler to create clean distinction to say all RI work happens in OPNFV including RI technical oversight. RI requirements and priorities come from CNTT RAs and governance body. I think this in line with above comments. (Note: To be defined in Community Relationships and Alignments)*
12. *Re: Technical Steering/Roadmap - Providing roadmap inputs to OPNFV and OVP is great - it's a contribution to the existing planning and commitment delivery process. (Note: To be defined in Community Relationships and Alignments)*
13. *Re: Contributions Process - Qiao Fu How many TSLs do we expect? If there is only one (or two, counting the co-lead), I would expect huge workload for TSL. I am worried it would be impossible for the TSL to go through all the details of each submission of PR in each different streams, which eventually will make the approval just a process...(Note: To be defined in Overall Structure of CNTT)*

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.

Next Steps – (Outline of Process and Procedure Doc Contents)

- Overall structure of CNTT
 - As relates to LFN/OPNFV, GSMA, CNTT Committees and Work Streams
- Development Process
 - Scoping
 - HL Inputs, Outputs, and Handoffs
 - Release Cadence
 - Release Approval Process
 - Community Relationships and Alignments
 - CNTT Responsibilities vis-à-vis LFN community
 - CNTT Responsibilities vis-à-vis Other Communities
- Related Methods and Tools
 - Assess alternatives opportunities for collaboration as supplemental approaches to online meetings

II. Governance, Technical Steering & Work Stream Nominations / Selections

Comments

14. *How is the technical steering selected? Is that comprised of the WSL leads? (Note: To be defined in Lead / Co-Lead Nomination and Selection Process)*
15. *Identification & documentation of "Participants": The ToR provides for certain privileges to be given to "Participants" in CNTT. Section 1.c states the following:*
 - a. *"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. (Note: To be defined in Participant Status)*
16. *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. (Note: to be defined partially in Lead/Co-Lead Nomination and Selection and Overall CNTT Structure)*
 - *Max & Min on each committee? (see Overall CNTT Structure)*
 - *Length of term? – per release, annual, etc.(see Terms)*
 - *Are these limited to the "voting representative" of each organization or can others hold seats? (see Voting Rules)*
 - *What decisions do each of these bodies own? (see Voting Privileges)*
 - *Are there any limits or caps of any kind?... seats held by the same company, etc.(see Voting Privileges)*
17. *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. (Note: to be defined in Overall Structure of CNTT)*
18. *Re: Gov Lead/Co-Leads - how do we select Lead/co-Lead. If there is only one candidate, that should be fine. But what will happen when we have multiple candidates? What will happen in open-source community is we will have a vote. Then we have to define who has the right to vote? And how long will the lead/co-lead serve for one term? I can think of the complicated process in OPNFV TSC charters which define the voting procedures. (Note: to be defined in Lead/Co-Lead Nomination and Selection Process)*
19. *Re: Gov Lead/Co-Leads - Just out of interest, what is the term limit for the different WSL positions. (Note: To be defined in Lead/Co-Lead Selection Process)*

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, Verizon, Deutsche Telecom, and Orange for the sake of continuity. (Note: to be defined in Nomination and Selection Process)
- **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, Verizon, Deutsche Telecom, and Orange for the sake of continuity. (Note: to be defined in Nomination and Selection Process)
- **Size of Committee and Works Stream Leads** – Proposed minimum of 2 leads; maximum of 4 leads (Note: to be defined in Nomination and Selection Process)
- **Length of Term of Committee and Work Stream Leads** – Proposed through 12/31/2020 (Note: to be defined in Nomination and Selection Process)
- **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. (Note: to be defined in Nomination and Selection Process)

Next Steps – (Outline of Process and Procedure Doc Contents)

- Participant Status
- Lead / Co-Lead Nomination and Selection Process
 - Nomination and Selection Process
 - Governance and Technical Steering Committee Leads/Co-Leads
 - Workstreams Leads/Co-Leads
- Onboarding package for all future new company and individuals who join CNTT.
- Related Methods and Tools

III. Consensus-Based Decision Making

Comments

20. 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.? (Note: To be defined in Voting Privileges and Voting Rules)

21. 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. (Notes: To be defined in Overall structure of CNTT)
22. 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? (Note: to be defined in Overall Structure of CNTT)
23. 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)? (Note: to be defined in Community Decision-Making Process)
24. 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. (Note: To be defined in Community Decision Making Process)
25. Re: Technical Steering - From my understanding, TS will be almost the same as TSC in OPNFV. If I understand this right, I would further think lots of future decision making effort will happen in TS level. If this is true, we need to be careful with the TS member. Who can be one of the member, who has the right to vote (or give +1 for git review)? OPNFV begin with one representative one company, then turn into community selected TS members after we have enough active contributors and also people are well aware of each one's contribution to the community. (Note: To be defined in Community Decision-Making Process)
26. Re: Contribution Process/Decisions - Such decision process is different from the other open-source projects, such as OPNFV. So for CNTT-RI project, should we follow OPNFV's rule when developing codes in OPNFV, and follow CNTT rule when developing documents in CNTT? Same problem may occur in other communities as well. (Note: To be defined in Community Decision-Making Process)

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, Verizon, Deutsche Telecom, and Orange for the sake of continuity.

Next Steps - (Outline of Process and Procedure Doc Contents)

- Requirements | scope for items that require consensus, votes and approvals
- Community Decision-making Process
 - Consensus Criteria
 - If No Consensus Arrived At
 - Voting Privileges & Rules
- Related Methods and Tools
 - Assess tooling options to conduct voting, manage voting windows, and store artifacts

IV. Relationship to LNF/OPNFV and GSMA

Comments

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

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.

Next Steps

- None at this time

Appendix

CNTT Gov Email List 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.





2. 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.?
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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?
6. 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 (thru 19:00 UTC 2019-10-11)

Slide #	Material	Feedback: comments, questions
2	Organizational Structure 	<p>e.g. Jonathan Beltran - (comment, questions)</p> <p>@fuqiao We probably need further explanation about the relationship between sub teams of dev/ops/compliance under RM/RA/RI, e.g. what is the relationship between RA dev and RI dev?</p> <p>Gergely Csatari , Jonne Soininen : We are a little bit worried that this many groups may fragment the community too much (number of meetings, etc). One way could be to combine RA1 Core and RA1 Ops, RA2 Core and RA2 Ops, RII Core and RII Dev. Shouldn't RI and RC groups be represented in OPNFV directly, using the already existing structures there instead of in CNTT?</p>
O3	Governance Work Streams and Structure 	<p>Gergely Csatari , Jonne Soininen : We agree, that the boxes at the bottom include the tasks for a governance structure. We are wondering if rather than splitting the responsibilities it wouldn't be better to have a Governance Steering team with joint responsibility of the tasks.</p>
4	Governance Works Streams Leads/Co-Leads 	<p>Qiao Fu how do we select Lead/co-Lead. If there is only one candidate, that should be fine. But what will happen when we have multiple candidates? What will happen in open-source community is we will have a vote. Then we have to define who has the right to vote? And how long will the lead/co-lead serve for one term? I can think of the complicated process in OPNFV TSC charters which define the voting procedures...</p> <p>Phil Robb +1</p> <p>Gergely Csatari , Jonne Soininen : Just out of interest, what is the term limit for the different WSL positions.</p>
5	Governance Work Stream Scope 	

<p>6</p>	<p>Governance Work Stream Scope</p> 	<p>Qiao Fu When we split the governance work into 6 pieces, we need to define how do we make decisions within the governance. Does that mean we will have the WS make decisions on the certain work listed, or we will have a larger "governance" team where people can 'vote'? We also need to define at what level should each different thing be reviewed and make decision. e.g., for a technical choice of a certain version of software, should we make the decision at the certain team in RA/RM/RI? or should we go to TS, or should we go to board? With the structure here, we only know how many characters we have in the governance, however we still lack of certain decision process.</p> <p>Qiao Fu After read through the slides, I realize there is a decision process, which ends only at the TS level. Then how do we expect the TS to work with Governance? Probably the decision process between TS and Gov should also be defined?</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Technical Work Streams and Structure</p> 	<p>Qiao Fu For the RI team, I see logo for OPNFV there, and there are also logo for OpenStack and CNCF in the RA team. Then how should we define our relationship with these opensource projects? How should we work with there TSC? e.g., OPNFV is now having a different release cycle from CNTT, how should RI team follow this?</p> <p>Jim Baker I think the logos were intended to show a OpenStack AND Kubernetes based RA. OPNFV will need to drive fixes upstream when required and should develop relationships with the TSCs of the key upstream projects when appropriate. OPNFV release cycle timing can be tuned at a later time, I do not think this is an immediate issue.</p>

<p>8</p>	<p>Technical Steering</p>  <p>Slide 8 -...ering.pdf</p>	<p>Qiao Fu From my understanding, TS will be almost the same as TSC in OPNFV. If I understand this right, I would further think lots of future decision making effort will happen in TS level. If this is true, we need to be careful with the TS member. Who can be one of the member, who has the right to vote(or give +1 for git review)? OPNFV begin with one representative one company, then turn into community selected TS members after we have enough active contributors and also people are well aware of each one's contribution to the community.</p> <p>Jim Baker I Fu Qiao is right - creating parallel/overlapping technical steering bodies is a recipe for disaster. OPNFV and OVP (RI and RC respectively) have existing technical steering. CNTT technical steering should focus on the RM/RA ONLY - and then drive the LFN efforts through the existing structures.</p> <p>Trevor Cooper I understand that CNTT RI work-streams are a "mirror" for OPNFV CNTT-RI project but this may be confusing for new contributors and any overlap is likely to cause problems. It would be simpler to create clean distinction to say all RI work happens in OPNFV including RI technical oversight. RI requirements and priorities come from CNTT RAs and governance body. I think this in line with above comments.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Deciding on Technical Roadmap</p>  <p>Slide 9 ...dmap.pdf</p>	<p>Jim Baker Providing roadmap inputs to OPNFV and OVP is great - it's a contribution to the existing planning and commitment delivery process.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Technical Work Streams Leads/Co-Leads</p>  <p>Slide 10 ...Leads.pdf</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>RM Technical Works Streams Scope</p>  <p>Slide 11 ...cope.pdf</p>	

12	RA 1 Technical Works Streams Scope  <small>Slide 12...cope.pdf</small>	
13	RA 2 Technical Works Streams Scope  <small>Slide 13...cope.pdf</small>	
14	RI 1 Technical Works Streams Scope  <small>Slide 14...cope.pdf</small>	
15	RC Technical Works Streams Scope  <small>Slide 15...cope.pdf</small>	Cédric Ollivier: Could we get additional details about these workstreams? I haven't seen any first draft/meeting in Antwerp.

<p>16-24</p>	<p>Contributions Process - See document CNTT Structure</p>	<p>Cédric Ollivier:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I would proposed 2 committers only from 2 different companies excluding the author's one. (1 committer could be considered depending on the number of contributors).</p> <p>Qiao Fu How many TSLs do we expect? If there is only one (or two, counting the co-lead), I would expect huge workload for TSL. I am worried it would be impossible for the TSL to go through all the details of each submission of PR in each different streams, which eventually will make the approval just a process...</p> <p>Qiao Fu Such decision process is different from the other open-source projects, such as OPNFV. So for CNTT-RI project, should we follow OPNFV's rule when developing codes in OPNFV, and follow CNTT rule when developing documents in CNTT? Same problem may occur in other communities as well.</p>
<p>25-27</p>	<p>Meeting Structure - See document CNTT Structure</p>	