

**Attendees:** Andrea Pinnola (Telcom Italia), Brian Smith (Bell Canada), Bryan Sullivan (AT&T), Cecilia Corbi (Telcom Italia), Hajime Miyamoto (KDDI), Junjie Tong (China Unicom), Karim Rabie (STC), Kenichi Ogaki (KDDI), Kodi Atuchukwu (Vodafone), Masanori Miyazawa (KDDI Labs), Morgan Richomme (Orange), Randy Levensalor (CableLabs), Samer Salah Mahoud (STC), Serge Manning (Sprint), Steven Wright (AT&T), Tetsuya Nakamura (CableLabs), Gerald Kunzmann (DOCOMO)

Joining from The Linux Foundation: Brandon Wick, Min Yu

**Agenda:**

- Antitrust
- Minutes Approval
- EUAG Roster
- EUAG Survey Review
- Pain Point Review: Security & Policy
- Pain Point Review: Portability
- EUAG Actions Needed
- Meetings Calendar
- AOB

**Minutes:**

- Meeting minutes from the last meeting were approved.
- EUAG Roster: Attendees welcomed Andrea from Telecom Italia as the newest member.
- EUAG Survey Review:
  - The idea of surveying the EUAG on scenarios was initiated in Barcelona and discussed during the November meeting. The survey discussion progressed further with the need to include questions on releases, installers, projects, and documentation, as now is a good time to gather feedback in order to focus the EUAG's efforts on key areas going into 2017. Members are asked to dedicate 15 minutes to complete the survey and the results will be discussed in a future call.
  - Steven walked through the survey questions. For Q13, Brandon clarified that the 10 pain points members will be asked to rate by importance to them were chosen because of their relative detail and activity on the wiki. Pain points not included in the survey will still be analyzed by the group in 2017.
  - There was a suggestion to add a survey question(s) on the Compliance and Verification Program (CVP). Brandon noted a community-wide interest in a compliance program based on the results of a survey that was conducted during the summer. However, there are still open questions about the value the CVP brings and the implications of leveraging an OPNFV trademark and logo. Attendees agreed that it's important to gather feedback on CVP from the end user perspective. Tetsuya took the action item of sending an email via the EUAG mailing list with the current governance document. Members are encouraged to share their feedback by noon Friday, December 16.
  - Attendees generally agreed that the survey results need first to be reviewed and discussed internally within the EUAG before sharing more broadly.

- Pain Point: Security and Policy:
  - Bryan commented that OPNFV currently doesn't address the common security needs when building artifacts that are used in the CI process.
  - Brian noted a large body of work already done on security in ETSI and that security is not addressed in the Linux kernel itself. He recommended OPNFV, as an upstream project, push forward this aspect.
  - Morgan demonstrated how Security Scanner, a project started in the Colorado release, works and noted that the project draws on NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) recommendations. He commented that the security mechanism is in place but could use improvement and recommended expanding it to all scenarios.
  - Steven encouraged members to think about if the current security project is meeting the needs of the operators. He agreed that more consistency across installers and expansion across scenarios and configurations would be valuable. He asked members to capture these dimensions on the wiki in order to provide feedback to the technical community to ensure a path to a more secure OPNFV platform.
- Pain Point: Portability
  - Steven presented VNF compatibility with hardware and scalability of deployment as two key issues. He asked if small scale, such as an enterprise CPE application, is well represented in Pharos activities. He also asked how OPNFV is dealing with deployment challenges due to diverse options of devices produced by different manufacturers, upgrades, and etc.
  - Morgan commented that there is currently no tool that evaluates an infrastructure's compatibility with Pharos. He noted that an intern is working on a Pharos qualification tool but commented that additional resources are needed if this is identified by the operators as a priority. Multi-site testing might be possible by the OPNFV Summit.
  - Steven agreed that a tool to validate hardware compatibility before installment would be valuable and recommended to flesh it out and state the problem more clearly on the wiki in order to argue for resourcing.
  - In addition to compatibility and tooling, Randy asked if the group would also prioritize the performance issue around how many users you can get per node. Steven commented that the portability pain point may well be translated into multiple user stories and that it includes both process and basic functionality. Members are asked to flesh out this pain point on the wiki and to work with the Pharos infrastructure team in the future.
- Actions Needed
  - Please continue to add pain points, flesh out existing pain points, and create EPIC statements on the wiki.
- Meeting Schedule

- The meeting schedule for 1H2017 was shared. The schedule currently includes two F2F meeting opportunities: one in April at the Open Networking Summit, and one in June at the OPNFV Summit in Beijing.
- Other F2F meeting opportunities at industry events were briefly discussed. Steven would like to explore additional F2F opportunities and will check in with the OPNFV staff members about funding and best practices.