

# 2022 LFN Workshop - Program framework, targeted projects and next step

## Topic Leader(s)

- [Olivier Smith](#)

## Topic Description

75m,

- Map out an Infra Platform and Compliance Framework

## Topic Overview

- Can we map out Anuket RA and RC activities to address CNF workload requirements and tests?
- What aspects are important to CNF testing and compliance?
- What aspects will be important to CNF orchestration (testing and compliance)?
- Projects that can help us progress and address gaps/issues?

## Slides & Recording



No slides

## Minutes

Copied from the previous session:

- features – missing multiple network interfaces
- Network API is missing in Kubernetes. Some vendors have added management of networking (OpenShift),
- Low latency in compute and memory- radio side needs dictate in some cases
- API-s
- Descriptors
- Management of CNF-s
- PaaS features
- CNF Conformance – CNCF and Anuket are both creating Conformance programs. Should we align them? They are both under the LF umbrella. Anuket is Telco focused, CNCF has both telco and other types of conformance testing. Answer is that we DO need to align the efforts.
- Other standards – 3GPP for example. Need to be coordinated

The main people working on RA2 and RC2 have been infrastructure, so don't have as much an understanding RA-2 of what is required to support a networking workload.

Multi-tenancy

Service chains

RM Chapter 3 introduces SFC ([https://github.com/cnft-n/CNTT/blob/master/doc/ref\\_model/chapters/chapter03.rst#service-function-chaining](https://github.com/cnft-n/CNTT/blob/master/doc/ref_model/chapters/chapter03.rst#service-function-chaining)) but we never got to developing the requirements

Day 0-Day 1 Templates are very difficult because none of the vendors have a standard way to deploy. Two issues, vendor interoperability (both deployment and production) and just block and tackle of deploying a single workload and lack of standard tools across vendors. The telcos and infrastructure vendors are experiencing the pain, but why are the workload vendors less engaged? Are they not experiencing the pain as well? Workload vendors are going to put their limited resources into new features, not lifecycle and deployment tools.

[Pankaj Goyal](#) Do we need a standard way to deploy or that all deployment tools utilize a standard workload package? So, can we specify a standardized deployment package? – YES!!!

There are many stakeholders to this very large gap. The answer does NOT need to be ONAP!

The lifecycle interoperability requirements need to start in RM – the Anuket Reference Model. Started to work on it, but needs more work. The requirements need to flow into RA RC conformance testing.

RA2 issue: <https://github.com/cnft-n/CNTT/issues/2511>

ONAP ASD page: <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/Application+Service+Descriptor+%28ASD%29+and+packaging+Proposals+for+CNF>

O-RAN ASD page: <https://oranalliance.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/OAMWG/pages/2331476228/Common+Application+LifeCycle+Management+Work>

RC2?

## Action Items

