Attendees: Chris Donley, Georg Kunz, Kodi Atuchukwu, Lincoln Lavoie, Rabi Abdel, Steven Wright, Trevor Cooper
Joining from The Linux Foundation: Heather Kirksey, Kenny Paul, Min Yu

Committee's LFN Staff Support Change
- Welcome Kenny Paul, Program Manager for ONAP, to help support the Committee.

Labs Strategy (Lincoln)
- The LFN Preferred Labs Program (LFN PLP) will be overseen by this Committee. This includes defining the requirements and the application process for the preferred labs as well as the audit and disqualifications process of these labs. The list of such labs will be posted and maintained by The Linux Foundation.
- Steven asked if any testing fees or commercial terms will be covered by LFN PLP. Lincoln noted that labs will have a commercial agreement with vendors using the testing services, including testing fees, but that activity is out of scope for the Program and not an area that we should be involving ourselves with.
- On qualifications, a Preferred Lab shall 1) have an active membership in LFN; 2) be an active participant in one of the LFN Technical Projects; 3) actively participate in this Committee or the Dovetail Project; 4) provide services in a nondiscriminatory, professional manner, protecting the credibility of the LFN Projects, the Compliance and Verification Program, and the PLP; and, 5) demonstrate testing competence in at least one program. Continued participation requires meeting the criteria on an ongoing basis.
- The attendees agreed that a Terms and Conditions document needs to be developed by the LF legal team for the labs to agree to in order to participate in the PLP, and this is separate from, but similar to, the Terms and Conditions that vendors need to sign in order to participate in the LFN Compliance and Verification Program.
- There was a discussion about how specific the labs strategy document needs to be to define the lab's infrastructure to support the testing. Lincoln noted that the labs need to demonstrate their expertise when applying for the program and maintain the infra on an ongoing basis; he recommended against defining the specifics about HW version or vendor or market specific HW variant in this document. Chris suggested an addendum to define project-specific requirements. Heather noted that the technical projects and testing community need to be involved in defining the minimum performance bar requirements if this program includes performance testing in the future.
- On the application process, a lab can initiate the process by contacting the Committee Chairs and providing documentation for requirements and a set of test results for review. There was a brief discussion if an approved lab's application materials should be made publicly available. Steven thought having the materials publicly available would be helpful for other labs to see what acceptable documentation forms are and for the labs' customers to see what resources are available at the lab, although he acknowledged that this information is generally available at the lab's own website as well.
- Employees from Preferred Labs are expected to serve as results reviewers as part of the requirement of actively participating in this Committee and contributing to LFN.

- A clarification was made that preferred labs should apply to, and be approved for, specific compliance testing, e.g. OPNFV Verified Program, or VNF-oriented program.
- There was a discussion about how the LFN Compliance Program portal could potentially serve as the canonical depository for passed implementations if the labs submit vendors' testing results to the Program. Heather noted this would be useful to show the adoption of the Program. Lincoln expressed some concerns as this could get sensitive and uncomfortable if the results have to be associated with the vendors' names. Since formal approval and awarding of the Program's mark still comes from this Committee, without disrespecting the vendor's preference for confidentiality and interfering the lab's internal processes, the labs could encourage vendors to submit results for formal review and the granting of the mark. Chris and Steven still noted that it would be helpful to have usage statistics during the annual audit of the Preferred Labs.
- There was also a suggestion about adding a non-compete clause. Trevor expressed some concern about this rule; he noted it's more important to focus on having a high value and quality program than having the non-compete rule to prevent a lab from offering a competing program. Steven suggested having ongoing dialogues with the labs will help prevent this from happening. And the attendees noted that the proposed requirement that the Preferred Labs should actively participate in the LFN community and this Committee would create the needed avenue for dialogues.
- Suggestions and feedback from the attendees of today's call have been incorporated into the version posted on the [Lab Strategy](#) of the Committee's wiki page and sent via the mailing list. Committee members are asked to review and provide feedback. More time will be dedicated to this topic on the next call to get the baseline text approved.

OVP Results Approval for Ericsson
- Ericsson's OVP results received two favorable reviews from WindRiver and Huawei via the mailing list.
- Ericsson's product, Ericsson Cloud Execution Environment, received the final approval by the LFN CVC to receive the OPNFV Verified mark.

AoB
- A follow-up call will be scheduled between Chris/Lincoln/Steven/Heather/Lincoln to come up with a timetable on launching the VNF-oriented program.