

Meld Ops and Org 2020-11-05 Meeting notes

Date

05 Nov 2020

Attendees

- [Jim Baker](#) [Heather Kirksey](#) [Scot Steele](#) [Beth Cohen](#) [Al Morton](#) [David McBride](#) [Qiao Fu](#) [Toshiyasu Wakayama](#) [Ulrich Kleber](#) [Georg Kunz](#) [Trevor Cooper](#) [William Diego](#) [Maza Jonne](#) [Soininen Lincoln](#) [Lavoie Ildiko](#) [Vancsa sunku](#) [ranganath Phil](#) [Robb Tom](#) [Van Pelt](#)

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	
10min	Interim TSC Election plans	Scot Steele	
20min	Release artifact discuss and agree	Mark Beierl	Deferred for Mark Beierl presence
10min	Business coordination function <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scope and life span• How to get involved	Scot Steele	Follow up needed after defintion 12 Nov 2020
20min	Release process and naming <ul style="list-style-type: none">• same name for spec release and test release?<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ Spec rel FOO has a RC release 6mo later also called FOO◦ OR RC release FOO_1..FOO_n implement the Spec FOO	Jim Baker David McBride	
10min	Role of Installers	Trevor Cooper	
10min	Conformance projects - what they deliver	Trevor Cooper	Defer for Release Artifacts disussion
2min	Proposed Wiki Structure	Jim Baker	

Notes

Interim TSC plans

- OPNFV providing 8 members from the seated TSC as selected by the active community members
- CNTT will wait for completion of the OPNFV proposed interim TSC membership
 - Look for equitable distribution of seats between operators and vendors for Anuket TSC
- This is for a INTERIM TSC ONLY - not a permanent change

Business Coordination Function

- Expect a short term function - up to two years. Can continue as needed.
- Volunteer staffed - likely to be the same folks that are staffing the Anuket MeldMarketing
- Focused on the initial project spin-up. Eventually absorbed by MAC function
- [Trevor Cooper](#) Please write down the scope and responsibility of this function
 - CNTT equates Governance to Business Coordination
- Notes from [Scot Steele](#)
 - Strategy, Participant interface; On-boarding, escalation point for complex, inter-related issues; Virtual Conference mgmt, other Admin tasks, Coordination with other projects, Recruitment

Release Process and Naming

- Key problem statement: How do we use naming to unify the specification versions with subsequent releases of the RC?
- [Georg Kunz](#) Joint release planning between the spec developers and the RC developers could address this.
- [Trevor Cooper](#) It's dependency management.
 - RC project does not equal the OVP program
 - RC develops test cases and tools to test RA requirements - unlikely to ever deliver 100% of the requirements - MUST be decoupling and independent projects
- [Lincoln Lavoie](#) RC is a work stream of individual projects - not a single entity
 - Perhaps RC should handle the traceability and coverage mapping - by definition it will lag the specification version
 - What is the stated goal of the lag?
 - The specifications are a monotonically increasing list (moving target)
 - RC may not always track the increase in feature sets

- [David McBride](#) propose decoupling of specification and RC releases
 - Likewise use different naming to avoid assumptions of RC fully implementing a specific RA version
- [Lincoln Lavoie](#) RA/RM release Q1 and Q3, RI/RC release on Q2 and Q4
 - 4 releases per year: 2 spec focused and 2 test focused
 - RC must provide 100% coverage of RI - for whatever features that are implemented in the RI
- [Georg Kunz](#) There will always be a gap/offset
- [Heather Kirksey](#) Could create a longer release process that just makes the spec a milestone in a longer release cycle.
- [Al Morton](#) Community is asking for more synchronized processes
 - 3 month is not sufficient for developing response to the specifications - far shorter than prior OPNFV releases
 - Possibly overlap the last 3 months of spec dev with first 3 months testing development
- [David McBride](#) Concern is development of specifications will outpace the development of tests
- [Jim Baker](#) FOCUS is first 3 months of 2021

Role of Installers

- [Trevor Cooper](#) Role of installers has been an issue in the history of OPNFV
 - Proposed statement: Installers are NOT a part of a release. They are a tool to create an RI
 - OPNFV Jerma has one installer: Airship - it is unclear that this installer meets all the needs of the community
- [Georg Kunz](#) Installers may be released as a part of "RI"
 - How many installers and sets of components (RIs) does Anuket want to support?
 - Would prefer ONE RI to pool resources
- [Trevor Cooper](#) Airship project is a stand-alone tool - it doesn't deliver a RI
 - RI is delivered as a cookbook or method for deploying the RI
- [Georg Kunz](#) Would like to use an RI in the internal testing process for commercial xNFs
- [Trevor Cooper](#) Propose deferring the decision to the Release Artifacts discussion
- [Al Morton](#) There are many ways to end up with a RI as defined by the RA and validated as correct by RC