Attendees: Andrei Kojukhov (Amdocs), Bruce Thompson (Amdocs), Chris Donley (Huawei), Dan Xu (Huawei), Eddie Arrage (Huawei), Ganesh Kadarkaraimuthu (Verizon), Georg Kunz (Ericsson), Lincoln Lavoie (UNH), Ryan Hallahan (AT&T), Steven Wright (AT&T), Tapio Tallgren (Nokia), Trevor Cooper (Intel), Yuan Yue (ZTE)
Joining from The Linux Foundation: Heather Kirksey, Min Yu

Introductions
- Chris welcomed the attendees to the LFN Compliance & Verification (LFN C&V) kick-off meeting, and a quick round of introductions of the attendees on today's call.
- The Linux Foundation Antitrust Compliance was reviewed.

LFN C&V Committee Charter/Role
- Chris walked the attendees through the LFN C&V Committee's charter/responsibilities that were approved by the LFN Governing Board at its last meeting. Chris emphasized that the LFN C&V Committee, chartered under the LFN Board, is an LFN member-only committee and that any changes to the current version of the approved Charter need to be recommended by the C&V Committee to the LFN Board for review and approval.
- Heather added that the LFN Board members at its last meeting expressed great excitement about the compliance/verification activities the Committee will be undertaking and considered these activities a very high priority for the LFN community.
- Yuan Yue brought up the desire from some LFN Board members for more operator representation on the Committee. Chris agreed that more participation from the service providers is valuable and needed. Chris noted that additional operators have expressed interest in joining the Committee and they are discussing who the representative will be.

Meeting Logistics and Expectations
- The mailing list compliance@lists.lfnetworking.org has been set up and is invitation-only. Anyone who wishes to join please contact Min <myu@linuxfoundation.org>.
- Regarding the meeting slot of 7-8AM PT every other Monday for the conference call, no serious conflict was noted other than some people may join late because it is right after the ONAP PTL call, which often runs overtime.
- Regarding the Committee's minutes and wiki, no objection was received to make minutes and most content of the wiki public. The desire is to keep things as open and transparent as possible but also to have the ability to keep sensitive topics such as certain governance issues and the appeal process private only to the C&V Committee member and the Board.
- Regarding the LFN Gerrit repro, the attendees agreed that it would be helpful to use Gerrit to track the changes/versions of the governance document and other program documents. Jenkins is not needed as revisions will be minor and more widely spaced out once the documents are settled and published. Because the test framework will be handled by the individual Project, the code will be under the repro associated with the Project's TSC. The LFN compliance program will have a public website similar to verified.opnfv.org, while the test results will be maintained by the back-office IT system.

Committee Leadership and Election

- Min went through the election process that the Linux Foundation staff will administer to elect the leadership position for the C&V Committee. Min noted that although multiple people from the same LFN member company can participate in the Committee as members, only one person from each organization will be eligible to vote in the election. Ray/Min will reach out to members to determine who the voting rep should be.
- There was a brief discussion if a Vice Chair position should be added given the expanded scope of the Committee and the need to drive more participation from the operator community. The group was in favor of electing both a Chair and Vice Chair to lead the activities of the Committee. The group recommended to hold off election until after the outreach efforts to get more operators involved.

Recap of OPNFV Verified Program
- Chris gave the recap of the key components of the OPNFV Verified Program (OVP) and noted that it would be helpful to re-use the governance structure, testing framework, and the IT infrastructure and operational processes to launch the LF compliance program.
- Trevor expressed the need to clearly define terms such as compliance, conformance, and verified so communities are operating from the same frame of reference.
- In response to Steven's question about who determines the semantics associated with the label, Chris said the TSC of each Technical Project will provide oversight over the test requirements, while the C&V Committee sets up the structure and provides coordination between various efforts at the LFN level to bring the program to market.
- Heather noted that the C&V Committee's immediate tasks should include extending what's been done in OVP to the LFN compliance program from the governance perspective, soliciting feedback from end users about their expectations and requirements, and defining the criteria for approving 3rd-party labs.
- There was a brief discussion that as the program expands it would be valuable for the vendors, end users, as well as the overall marketing of the LFN organization to have a public registry for vendors that have passed the compliance test. Whether this list will live on the individual Technical Project site or at the LFN level can be determined later.
- Steven asked if there will be any attempt to measure the usage of the program. Heather said it's worthwhile to define what the success metrics, with adoption of the program as one success metric, should be and how to measure them.

Operators' Priorities
- VNFs: Chris noted that initially this will be basic VNF packaging and functional testing.
- Standardized VIMs: The End User Advisory Group is working on defining a set of configurations for the VIMs common across operators, and the operators are interested in testing commercial products that can meet those requirements.
- Heather noted looking at compliance around SDN controller interfaces defined by ONAP as well as cloud native VNFs as the program looks towards the future.
- Steven pointed out that the ONAP community may be interested in a Powered-by type of program/mark, similar to what's done in OpenStack and ODL communities.
- The attendees agreed that the operators' requirements need to be heard and that this Committee should work with the various technical communities to define timeline, schedules, and roadmap.