

2020-03-18 - [CNTT - RM Workstream Master] Agenda and Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Please add your name in here:

1. [Kelvin Edmison](#) (Nokia)
2. [Ahmed El Sawaf](#) (STC)
3. [Unknown User](#) (shostak)
4. [Pankaj Goyal](#) (AT&T)
5. [Karine Sevilla](#) (Orange)
6. [Tomas Fredberg](#) (Ericsson)
7. [Ulrich Kleber](#) (Huawei)
8. [Unknown User](#) (nickchase) (Mirantis)
9. [Tom Van Pelt](#) (GSMA)
10. [Gergely Csatori](#) (Nokia)
11. [Trevor Cooper](#) (Intel)
12. [Petar Torre](#) (Intel)
13. [Al Morton](#) (AT&T)
14. [Toshiyasu Wakayama](#) (KDDI)

Special Notes:

- Given the limited time available, we will focus on identifying issues/actions/next steps, but **not solving them right now**
- **Weekly RM meetings are intended to**
 - Identify owners for new Issues
 - Track open Issues
 - Address technical issues that cannot be resolved online (i.e. resolve stalls)

Agenda:

- [Linux Foundation Anti-Trust Policy Notice](#)
- [GSMA Anti-Trust Policy Notice](#)
- Agenda bashing
- **Open Issues**
 - Remained at ~25 [Open RM issues with no linked PR](#).
- **Guidelines for host hardware selection**
 - Slides from Prague
 - Should these be included in the RM Appendix (to be informative but not normative)
- **RM Chapter 8 removal/discussion**
 - Slides from Prague
 - Should these be included in the RM Appendix (to be informative but not normative)
- **Open questions**
 - <TBD>
- **New Business**
 - Can the RM meeting move 1 hr earlier?
 - This had been explored previously, but conditions have changed (i.e. preceding RC meeting using same zoom bridge)
 - ✓ [Kelvin Edmison](#) to explore this option.
 - Answer: yes, it can move. This was determined too late to re-schedule this meeting, but re-scheduling will take effect for next week.

Actions:

- General
 - ✓ Walter Kozlowski to create Etherpad for Networking Fabric discussions for post-Baldy release
 - ✓ Walter Kozlowski call the first meeting for the Networking Fabric topic

Minutes:

- Discussion on the Host hardware selection slides
 - Strong opinions on preserving operator choice of hardware platforms and configurations
 - Points raised that some operators have extremely good tools about workload placement/platform usage, etc and that such guidelines would impair them
 - Decision taken to not introduce this into the RM.
- Discussion led from there into performance characterization/performance predictability
 - Discussion led to a point where RM did not specify performance at all, but RC tests are specified sufficiently well to raise and characterize performance differences per NFVI subsystem
 - Decision that for now, no test tools will be specified in RM, and that RC test scenarios will be used to characterize and report the performance of an NFVI.
- RM Chapter 8 removal discussion did not occur due to time constraints.