



**ALLSEEN
ALLIANCE**

Core Working Group Meeting

The contents of this document, and the interfaces described, and all the information herein, are the result of collaborative discussions by the Core Working Group. This summary documents the final consensus of the team.



**Reminder:
This call is being
recorded**

Antitrust Compliance Notice

- AllSeen Alliance meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of AllSeen Alliance 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 AllSeen Alliance meetings and in connection with AllSeen Alliance activities are described in the AllSeen Alliance Antitrust Policy. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of AllSeen Alliance, feel free to contact Lee Gesmer or Andrew Updegrove, of the firm of Gesmer Updegrove LLP, which provides legal counsel to AllSeen Alliance.

Agenda

- Dave Thaler asked:
 - About data could include vendor extensions
 - Josh pointed out that there was a discussion in the context of the IRB mail list
 - Consensus was that was the intent
 - Config map contains at least one field that is also in About info
 - If something is in the config map does it need to be in the About data also?
 - Given it may be a vendor extension, it should really be up to vendor what they do
 - Names of Vendor extensible fields: is there a naming convention?
 - Consensus is that the naming convention for extensions (vendor in particular) should use the reverse DNS convention like interface names
- Code transition: need to do code squash
 - Marcello: Talk to PD on why this would be necessary.
- Release status?
 - Bug status
 - Possible slip due to OSU contract resolution: **resolved!**
- AI: Affinegy team to review existing test cases for new features or updated components (TestLink)

OSU RB16.10 Test Status – 10/12/16

Priority	Test Plan	Total	Remaining	Passed	[%] Pass	Failed	[%]	Blocked	[%]	Previous Week	Completed [%]
	16.10 Android Platform [ARM]	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
High	16.10 Android Platform [ARM64]	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	16.10 iOS Platform	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
High	16.10 IPv6 only, NameService and IOP	55	48	7	13%	0	0	0	0	0	13%
	16.10 Linux	78	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	16.10 Name Service tests IPv4/IPv6	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	16.10 OpenWRT Platform	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	16.10 OSX Platform	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
High	16.10 SC Core Tests	117	24	75	64%	14	12%	4	3%	79%	80%
High	16.10 TC Core Tests	33	22	8	24%	2	6%	1	3%	21%	33%
	16.10 Windows Platform	86	79	6	70%	1	1%	0	0	8%	8%
		523	405	96	18%	17	3%	5	1%	20%	23%

- OSX test plan needs adjustment to validate iOS emulator in OSX.
- Testing drive to of 10/20 is at moderate risk. Contract issues distracted from testing and Carrie has been out sick.
- Contracts have been signed; testing is continuing without delay.



Thank You

Follow Us On      

- For more information on AllSeen Alliance, visit us at: allseenalliance.org & allseenalliance.org/news/blogs