

2021-03-04 - [Anuket RA2] - Meeting Agenda and Minutes

Attendees:

- [Riccardo Gasparetto Stori](#) (Vodafone)
- [Gergely Csatari](#) (Nokia)
- [Pankaj Goyal](#) (AT&T)
- [Karine Sevilla](#) (Orange)
- [Peter Woerndle](#) (Ericsson)
- [Suman Kumar](#)(Samsung)

Agenda and Minutes:

- Antitrust notices
 - [Linux Foundation Anti-Trust Policy Notice](#)
 - [GSMA Anti-Trust Policy Notice](#)
- Walk-in items
 - RM 5.0 alignment - [delta here](#)
 - alignment with 3.8 - can be broken down into labeling ([Riccardo Gasparetto Stori](#) to create issue and track) and controller/APIs /interfaces (likely a number of gaps - another issue)
 - Not all controllers for accelerators may be in scope - do we need to specify the interface if the accelerator is not part of the infrastructure?
 - Likely overlap with RA1 - problem space is overlapping
 - add issue to align with the whole RM security chapter
 - align with chapter 8 - track with issue - may need to change or relax (or add exceptions) to ch2 requirements - also need to track as flavours with labels
 - chapter 9 - discuss whether Cluster LCM should be part of the scope, and if so, how (eg should we constrain a solution or not, to what level should we specify its properties...)
 - PROS: useful for operators, provides guidance to reference implementation, may help direct vendors to existing standards
 - CONS: no immediate impact on workloads, may constrain
 - <https://github.com/cnnt-n/CNTT/issues/2068> - do we need more profiles? RAN CaaS?
 - need to differentiate between Profiles and Flavours,
 - need to differentiate between workload profiles vs infrastructure/node profiles
 - [Pankaj Goyal](#) : Operators are generally against proliferation of profiles
 - Profiles segment/partition the infrastructure: nodes belonging to different profiles are managed separately
 - [Gergely Csatari](#): too much optionality in profile specs, gives too little assurance to users
 - [Riccardo Gasparetto Stori](#) Hierarchical profiles: flavours as sub-profiles?
 - [Pankaj Goyal](#): need to maximise capacity - segmenting infrastructure with mono-dimensional profiles leads to waste of capacity when workloads are forced to choose a set partition to be allocated onto at runtime
 - need to rename the network-intensive profile to something else as it's misleading - eg basic vs advanced?
- AOB & Project review
 - <https://github.com/cnnt-n/CNTT/projects/10>
- Permanent FYI
 - CNF Working Group within CNCF - <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YFimQftjkTUsxNGTsKdakovP7cJtJgCTqVih2kwJORsc/edit>
 - This also incorporates the previous requirements gathering exercise
- Actions/Next steps

Meeting Recording