

2023-03-20 Architecture WG Meeting Notes

Date

20 Mar 2023

ZOOM Meeting Information:

Monday, March 20, 2023, at 11:30am PT/2:30pm ET

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/7904999331>

Meeting ID: 790 499 9331

Antitrust Policy Notice

Linux Foundation meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of the Linux Foundation to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of, and not participate in, any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.

Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at Linux Foundation meetings and in connection with Linux Foundation activities are described in the Linux Foundation Antitrust Policy available at <http://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrust-policy>. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of the Linux Foundation, feel free to contact Andrew Updegrave of the firm of Gesmer Updegrave LLP, which provides legal counsel to the Linux Foundation.



Attendees:

[Nathan Southern](#)

[Ken Sayers](#)

[Jeff Braswell](#)

[Allen Thompson](#)

[Mason Wagoner](#)

[Faheem Zakaria](#)

[Joseph Nibert](#)

[Justin Cimino](#)

[Tsvetan Georgiev](#)

[Yanko Zhelyazkov](#)

[Aashish Shrestha](#)

[Brian Mills](#)

David Reale

Agenda:

- Update on ND POC (KenS)
- MS Hurricane Zeta POC Architecture Discussion (KenS)
- Update on openIDL Testnet (Jeff Braswell)
- Update on Infrastructure Working Group
- Architecture Decision Capture Template (KenS) - Discussion
- AOB:
- Future Topics:

Notes:

I. Introductory Comments

A. Welcome to attendees

B. LF anti-trust statement

II. Business

A. Ken Sayers - North Dakota proof of concept

1. Finished the second round of reports - in the hands of the DOI
2. Same results as the first round
3. Feedback provided to the carriers was not integrated into this - they didn't have an opportunity to fix data issues where needed and if applicable.
4. Still moving fwd successfully - DOI ready to take the next steps but still defining what these will be

B. Ken Sayers - Mississippi Zeta POC.

1. No new news - still in internal discussions with the carrier
2. Still seeking the approval to move forward

C. Jeff Braswell - Test Net Update

1. Senofi is finishing their migration to the newer platform using HL Fabric - some of loose ends on this tied up. This will be central platform moving forward that will accept carrier test data.
2. Peter is out this week but a call out has gone to carriers to have data prepared; this may be sent in before Antley returns
3. An initiative is also ongoing to try to engage Hanover; this is the next step to demonstrate use of the test net and it will move the team a step closer to the production phase.
4. Also interest from Ken in using the data AAIS has
5. Much will happen in the next few weeks

D. Jeff Braswell - Infrastructure Working Group Update

1. Consolidation of the code base
2. Decision about doing a merge versus a clean branch with the latest code; the IWG chose the latter to avoid disturbing the ongoing work.
3. Moving toward organization of repositories into manageable elements distinguishing major subsystems.
4. IWG is also investing the time to bring infrastructure partners up to speed on the work Senofi has done on HL Fabric operator - to accommodate this, the team is organizing calls in which information can be shared for the Chainyard people.

E. Ken Sayers - Architecture Decision Capture Template

1. RRDMWG - a discussion arose about specific practices that might or might not be adopted re: managing the schemas of the database.
2. It was requested that we document said architectural decisions in some consistent way
3. Today's discussion concerns how said decisions are recorded. One example: HL Fabric. How was it chosen? What role is it filling? This question has arisen many times - we need to be prepared and resourced (resourceful) when it is asked. This will also ensure a consistency of response.
4. The first step: deciding how architectural decisions are captured (a meta decision about making decisions)
5. Options to be explored today and consensus sought.
6. Decisions to be made
 - a. How do we capture decisions? Where do we keep them? And how do we govern them?
 - i. Common thinking in the past: if decisions are not so controversial they need less consensus.
 - ii. However, more controversial decisions need clarity on what, who was part of the decision, how was it reached?
 - iii. Options for where to put it? (e.g., Github)
 - iv. The governance of it (How do we manage the acceptance of an architecture decision as part of our architecture?)
 - v. Suggestion: JB - as a test case, the group could start with something like the decision to use MongoDB ahead of PostgreSQL.
 - vi. KS: would prefer to start out with the documentation method before diving into the tech decisions themselves - i.e., the basic process of doing it with the tool and the discussion points.
 - vii. Request to group for options - suggestion from Ken wrt adrgithub.io ('ADR' - **Architectural Design Records**) - a process that captures architecture decisions, maintains them in a repository. Can only become difficult if there is more than one repository for a given project. Also a potential issue that non-developers aren't necessarily all familiar with Github.

- viii. To Ken the most valuable aspect and the most pertinent to openIDL's needs is the template provided at <https://adr.github.io/madr/> (Markdown Any Decision Records) - a template for capturing architectural decisions in markdown. Lightweight format, documentation for it, a template that is available. Basically laid out as a main page (in wiki). In confluence, you can click on the decisions individually to see what they are. Contents of MADR are fairly straightforward - goes through the following:
 1. status
 2. date
 3. deciders
 4. consulted
 5. informed
 - ix. Suggestion arose that a repository might be advantageously created that is specifically for documentation apart from the other repositories.
 - x. Documents must be easy to manage - so a light markdown based implementation is preferable - editing without downloading (possible in Github) - leaving a record in the repository.
 - xi. Questions to group about other options (other than ADR/MADR) they would consider.
 1. Faheem: ADRs are great, but it also depends on the degree the documentation is done - (how granular?) - possible to lose the picture if you do too many ADRs
 2. Faheem: @ hanover - two templates: a technology selection template (opposing forces, requirements, options, costs - similar to adr - then you make a recommendation). Similar to adr but at a higher level. They also use standard documentation templates, diagram-heavy, etc., to walk through architecture.
 - xii. It was stressed that consequential/pivotal architectural decisions are the ones that most need to be documented
 - xiii. Ken asked Faheem if it would be possible to share the Hanover's templates, and Faheem agreed to look into this.
 - xiv. Goal in working with ADR: end with dozens of these not hundreds.
 - xv. No additional templates or processes suggested.
 - xvi. Ken suggested that we start with ADR perhaps supplemented with additional fields added by Faheem from his experience at the Hanover, and then start trying to flesh out secondary and tertiary areas of the form, such as 'Technology Selection Template' and 'Document Template.'
- b. Wrt decision of where to put records - will go into wiki for now, perhaps can be put into github later.



Time	Item	Who	Notes

Documentation:

Notes: (Notes taken live in Requirements document)

Recording: