ONUG Software-Defined Security Services
Feb 2, Meeting Notes

Nick Lippis:

Opened the discussion via the following two thoughts:
1) Need to think about picking a date or a timeframe to get vendors involved again in this process- are we at that point yet? Likely not quite yet, but something to keep in mind going forward.
2) Hearing from vendor community that they want to work on something that is really meaningful for ONUG. And, they're looking to ONUG for direction and leadership. So, for instance, in the SD-WAN space, what are the basic interoperability elements that the vendors can all start to work on - eg a new standard or set of features or open source code that they can get started on. Need to communicate this to them so they can allocate resources - vendors will be receptive to this.

Chris Hoff/Nick:
Keep in mind that we are all about developing and delivering a framework that represents the aggregated voice of the end-user execs collected here in this WG, and see how that sits with the vendors (letting the chips fall where they may, so to speak), then determine where the gaps are - whether we're covering software only or a combination of s/w and h/w

If capabilities exist already, take advantage to them; don't be afraid to exclude things that may already exist - this is ours to define

Jim Noble

Indicates he may be coming at all of this from a different perspective. In his view: the vendors are not being leaders in this area. That is: S/W- defined reality "X" is already here, but vendors are by and large not providing tools, not driving SDN; there is no overarching orchestration available. Vendors not as solid on SDN as
they need to be. Concerned instead about the immediate bottom line, selling h/w as previously. Thus, Cisco, et al, are missing the mark on defining/forging ahead with SDN. Calls it a "failing" on the vendors' part. So up to ONUG to be the leaders here. If we want what we say we want, we will have to lay it out for the vendors.

Discussion followed among the small group of team members in attendance, but nothing expressed was contrary to Jim's point above (at least not to this set of ears!). Rather, the points made all reinforced the need for leadership, precision, clarity on the WG's part.

ChrisH and Others:

Fundamental issue: in the current state of affairs, how best to deploy security effectively? We lack the ability to choreograph, or direct the orchestra - ie somehow more than "simple" orchestration is needed. (It seems that we need to clarify exactly what we are looking for on this count - is there really a difference between being able to direct an orchestration and "choreographing" a set of policies and procedures - or are these differences simply semantics? MClark: As we've said on similar questions, leverage the use cases to flesh this out.)

Again, general agreement that we need to define *exactly* the problems we're trying to solve, and the features/functionality we want to see delivered.

We're all suffering daily from the fact that controls available on the physical side are lacking on the virtual side and making sense of the whole picture is nigh on impossible.

In terms of use cases, talk about what we want and also what we DON'T want. Just as important to do both. Don't expect vendors to interpret our use cases "properly" if they're not sufficiently detailed and clear on both the want/don't counts.
Nick:

- Cut down number of use cases
- Address the key issues
- Get to voting on the ones we really care about most
- Use the results to really focus our energies going forward

Adam Forch:

- Look for the key themes that emerge
- Combine where possible
- Make sure we have the input we need to combine and pare down the total number - eliminate duplication and overlaps
- Tailor our language to make the cases as efficient as possible
- Use the format set out by Charlotte and used by previous WG's - problem solved, benefits
- Renumber the use cases
- Focus on getting the above sorted out so we can put it all back "out there" and get some additional "color" to get things set up for the voting process

**Chris H will ping MClark to move into "use case" compilation mode
- Nick and others concur
- After this next pass at compilation, we may want to move to another collaboration platform like Google Docs (?) to go into so-called "slicey dicey" mode (!)
- See MClark's notes from the 2/25 meeting to review use cases submitted to date