

# Discussion and Brainstorming Page for Governance Topics

- Organization Structure Exercise
  - What do we produce?
    - Reference Models
    - Reference Architectures
    - Reference Implementations
    - Reference Conformance Documentation
    - Test Frameworks
    - Specific Test Cases (Do we need to divide btwn benchmarking and functional?)
    - Conformance Programs – Links to CVC Need to be Considered
    - Proof of Concepts
    - Other Development Projects
    - Tooling Activities and Projects
    - Additional Activities – Doing the Journey Together
  - TSC Composition/Roles/Expectations
    - TSC Composition – Short-Term – Interim/Startup TSC
    - TSC Composition – Long-term/Steady State
  - External Relationships (LFN Projects and External)
  - Conformance Program (OVP) Considerations

## Organization Structure Exercise

In the comments section please discuss your thoughts in the context of the follow questions:

1. Is this function needed in the new organization?
2. How do you see the function fitting in the organization? (example: Is Oversight a role in a Business Coordination or is it a separate function unto itself?)
3. What dependencies exist between the functions?
4. What other discussion points can you offer regarding the Function?

on the FUNCTIONS (not groups) listed below

- Business Coordination
- Oversight
- TSC
- Marketing
- Release Mgmt
- Work intake ([Al Morton](#) what is this called in OPNFV? Answer: The Requirements Working Group, which is part of our JERMA Release Process)
- Specifications
- Development
- Resource-matching

## What do we produce?

Based on Trevor's comments below and some of last week's conversation, this can be a space to talk about what we produce and why. The How is really up to the TechOps TF, but I do think we need to wrestle with the what. And to repeat what was discussed last week, "We need to improve the ability to on-board infrastructure and network services" or some version of that is what we're trying to accomplish at the highest level.

### Reference Models

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

### Reference Architectures

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

### Reference Implementations

- Purpose/Value
- Goals

- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Reference Conformance Documentation

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Test Frameworks

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Specific Test Cases (Do we need to divide btwn benchmarking and functional?)

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Conformance Programs – Links to CVC Need to be Considered

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Proof of Concepts

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Other Development Projects

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Tooling Activities and Projects

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## Additional Activities – Doing the Journey Together

- Purpose/Value
- Goals
- Non-goals
- Dependencies/Interactions

## TSC Composition/Roles/Expectations

A place to brainstorm next level-down considerations based on outcomes from the above section. This is not meant to dictate specifics of elections policies and procedures but what rather we expect of any governing or oversight body.

## TSC Composition – Short-Term – Interim/Startup TSC

When new projects starts or in the immediate aftermath of a merger, most projects elect to have a "start-up" or "interim" TSC, where the TSC has different election procedures for a constrained period of time. An example with which we are all familiar is when new stand-alone projects start, their TSCs usually consist of the founding platinum members of the organization (ONAP, OPNFV, FD.io, ODL, and TF(?) all followed this model). Over time the TSC migrates to a fully democratic model, elected by the community according to its agreed election procedures. Since OPNFV and CNIT are both established, a modified and accelerated version of this model can likely be used.

Rationale: Although the meld process is helping the communities get to know one another, many of the individual contributors and PTLs/workstream leads don't know very many people in the other group, which makes general voting across both groups for a single TSC challenging in the short term. In addition, both groups are likely to want to feel that they have representation as the group gets off the ground and forms a cohesive whole. A TSC that is overly weighted in one direction may cause hard feelings in the less represented community. Finally, this TSC will be unique in that one of its primary job will be to see the Meld fully realized – i.e., that what put down on paper really happens in practice and that we create a successful, unified group that operates as one project. This TSC will need to lead us to build a strong culture together across all the contributors of all the work.

Proposal:

- Choose "Meld" TSC size (15?) - **Decision? 15 members?**
- Allocate 8 seats to one group and 7 to the other
  - As close to half and half as possible
  - Flip a coin to determine which one is slightly larger?
  - Election timeline?
  - Quorum Requirement
- Change the voting criteria - a 2/3 majority?
- Determine a process to fill those allocated seats. I see two options:
  - Each TSC votes amongst its existing members to determine who serves on the "Meld" TSC
  - Each community runs a vote according to its existing procedures to fill its seats from the existing TSC members
  - Note that one community could go one path the other could go the other
  - Also note that it's possible that not every existing TSC member may want to serve on the "Meld" TSC as its responsibilities may be different than steady state – one first step could be to assess interest and volunteers
  - Decision?: **Each Existing TSC Plus CNTT Gov will vote among themselves for the MELD interim TSC membership?**
- It may be possible to shorten the election cycle compared to the full annual election
- Decide the term of the "Meld" TSC
  - Long enough to effect the full merge
  - Finite
  - Ideally aligned with steady state annual election cycle
  - Suggestion: When Steady state annual election (Aug-Sept.) but no later than 30 Dec 2021

Consensus as of week of Oct 19

- 15 member TSC
- Each existing TSC will select from its own members those that will join the interim TSC (CNTT may also involve the governance committee)
- Term to end when 2021 elections are held but to last no longer than through dec 31 2021
- Outstanding
  - How many seats from which org?
  - Election timeline

## TSC Composition – Long-term/Steady State

Considerations

- Size
- Roles, responsibilities, desired skillsets
- Eligibility (Fair, quantifiable, transparent) – may be that this is a topic for the Tech Ops group?
- Composition (Are all seats generally elected seats?)
- Officers (currently a chair and vice chair for OPNFV, single chair for CNTT) [Scott Steinbrueck](#) and [Walter Kozlowski](#) are CNTT TSC co-chairs, are they not?

## External Relationships (LFN Projects and External)

A place to brainstorm next level-down considerations based on outcomes from the above section. **What** are the types of relationships we need to build with external organizations? **How** do we want to build them? **What metrics** do we use to measure success? What are our 2021 **priorities** ?

## Conformance Program (OVP) Considerations

Fundamentally, this is the end goal of much of the merged group's activities, so a very strong relationship and understanding of requirements with CVC is extremely important.