

Raw notes from the ONAP-ETSI NFV workshop held on 22 March 2022

Disclaimer: The answers and comments recorded in this document represents individual opinions expressed during the meeting rather than a consensus view.

Q1: Can you further explain the purpose and contents of the following ASD attributes?

- **Deployment Item Information Element**
- **asdExtCpd Information Element**
- **enhancedClusterCapabilities Information Element**

[A]

deployment Item: serves two purposes: 1) ability to describe the orders of deployment artifacts, 2) ability to specify the type of the artifact

asdExtCpd: provides means to describe target deployment connectivity beyond what is described in the Helm charts. Provides information to connect the VNF to other NS constituents

enhancedClusterCapabilities: provides inputs to deploy or select specific clusters with the capabilities required by the NF

Q2: On enhancedClusterCapabilities:

clusterLabels: Is this attribute intended to specify requirements for special capabilities or is it intended to associate a label to cluster? If the former case applies, the first sentence in the description is misleading while if the latter case applies it unclear why this information is included in the ASD. If the former case applies, is this attribute it equivalent to IFA011 mcioConstraintParams and/or requestAdditionalCapabilities (in Vdu)?

requiredPlugin: Is this equivalent to IFA011 extendedResourceRequests (in OsContainerDesc)?

[A]

clusterLabels specify requirements and are not equivalent to mcioConstraintsParams

requiredPlugging is not equivalent to IFA011 extendedResourceRequest.

Q3: What is the status of the TOSCA definitions

in <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/Application+Service+Descriptor+%28ASD%29+Resource+Data+Model> ?

[A] TOSCA type definitions are intended for use for the PoC. They have not been extensively discussed by the MODCOM. The actual standardization of the type definitions and the selection of the data model language for the ASD are for further study.

The Packaging Format is a proposal under discussion in the MODCOM.

Q4: Is there a direct value mapping between the asd general properties and similar asdInNsd properties (e.g. descriptor_id)

[A] At this stage asdInNsd is just a proposal for use during the PoC. It has not been discussed in MODCOM or CNF TF.

Q5: One of the design goals for the ASD is to minimize overlap between the contents of the K8S manifest files and this additional descriptor. Why does this require a specific IM? One could think that whether an information item is contained in a K8S manifest file or in an additional (TOSCA-based) descriptor is a DM issue.

[A] ASD IM and packaging are to support ONAP CNF Journey, <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/TSC+Task+Force++Cloud+Native>

Q6: One of the design goals for the ASD is to minimize overlap between the contents of the K8S manifest files and this additional descriptor. Why does this require a specific IM? One could think that whether an information item is contained in a K8S manifest file or in an additional (TOSCA-based) descriptor is a DM issue.

[A] Yes, for example, information related to VNF snapshotting, VNF coordination interface, etc.

Q7: Is the ASD really technology independent? there are several references to K8S in the IM (e.g. resourceMapping in asdExtCpd)

[A] The ASD is intended to be technology-independent, but the description of some information elements is misleading and will be revised.

Q8: At the 1st workshop it was said that the ASD will support the CNF “direct model”. Can you elaborate on this?

[A] The CNF “Direct Path” project uses Helm charts without an associated VNFD and without any NFV-MANO functional block. It was stated in the past that the project roadmap may consider adopting the ASD IM and packaging, since it seems to complement well their approach. The details are for further study.

Q9: Will the changes made to SOL004 be proposed to ETSI? Will the new 5G non-MANO-artifact mentioned at the 1st workshop be registered?

[A] It is premature to say whether changes to SOL004 will be proposed to ETSI as they are still under discussion in the MODCOM. For non-MANO artifacts, they will probably be registered as ONAP did for previous similar cases.

Q10: Will the ASD model keep changing with Helm's version update? For example, if an ASD attribute is accepted by a certain Helm version, does it mean the attribute will be removed from the ASD model?

[A] The design enables the ASD and the Helm version to evolve independently. ASD has schema versioning. Whether to remove an attribute from the ASD because it becomes available in the Helm charts will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

Additional comment

ASD relation to VNFD: there doesn't seem to be any relation between ASD and VNFD. The ASD is not even used for LCM beyond the requirements for the initial deployment and the pointer to the Helm charts.