

2019-06-10 CVC Meeting Minutes

Attendees

1. [Lincoln Lavoie](#)
2. [Rabi Abdel](#)
3. [Jim Baker](#)
4. [Fernando Oliveira](#)
5. Patric
6. Ramesh
7. [Trevor Lovett](#)
8. Ashok Kumar
9. [Trevor Cooper](#)
10. [Steven Wright](#)
11. [Shiby Parayil](#)

Agenda

- [Update on VNF Validation MVP status](#)
- [Approved Lab Submissions](#)
 - [CAICT](#)
 - [VoerEir](#)
- [DDF Sync](#)
- [NFVI Reviewer Training](#)
- [Any Other Business](#)

Minutes

Update on VNF Validation MVP status

- Had initial discussion with ONAP TSC. It was clear we needed to provide additional education on the LFN OVP programs, at large, and how the projects (ONAP, OPNFV, etc) certification programs roll-up to the CVC and common banded program (OVP).
- Added 1 additional session for OVP General programs during DDF, being lead by Heather.
- Jim raised a concern about member companies providing clear definition / instruction about the importance of the OVP programs. The current levels of focus don't seem to align with the board / survey input.

Approved Lab Submissions

- Reviewed the existing approved lab qualification documentation: [In-force Documents](#)
- Improvements for the application process at large:
 - Within the lab qualifications, should include additional documentation for the specific hardware available within the lab (i.e. number of servers, number of processor cores, RAM per server, disks per server, disk sizes, networking types and connectivity).
 - Should we require a external reference for the lab (i.e. a external participant of the lab)?
 - Should we require attendance during the CVC meeting review, to answer questions in real time?
 - [VoerEir](#) was able to present their applications, this seemed work very very well.
 - What level of activity (quantify) is required from the labs for the CVC or other projects? How is this documented? Attendance on CVC calls? Participation in N OVP reviews? Not "allowed" to reject a request (i.e. no review) a set of results (i.e. you've signed up to help review results).
 - Should we require lab's submit results through the Dovetail portal, so the review process is able to better align with the "normal" process that would follow for a vendor application?

CAICT

- Lab application is [attached](#).
- Lab Dovetail [results](#).
 - Note, these results still need review.
- Ran out of time, will send an email to collect additional questions/discussions for this lab application.

VoerEir

- Lab application is [attached](#).
- Lab Dovetail [results](#).
 - Note, these results still need review.
- Ran out of time on the call, will send a follow up email to ask for questions/discussions, and objections to approving [VoerEir](#) as a lab.

DDF Sync

- DDF event starts tomorrow.
- Multiple sessions on OVP and VNF testing.

NFVI Reviewer Training

- No reviewers shows up.

Any Other Business

- VNF Test Cases:
 - The VNFRQTS draft text for the instantiation test case description is available online at: <https://docs.onap.org/en/latest/submodules/vnfrqts/testcases.git/docs/OnboardInstantiateTests.html>
 - To comment either raise a bug report or click the "report issue" ribbon or email onap-discuss list