

# ONAP EUAG Survey

The purpose of this survey is to solicit input from the LFN EUAG to ONAP

---

## General

The Service Provider you represent in EUAG: \_\_\_\_\_ (For the rest of this document, please read “company” as “the service provider you represent”)

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Your Organization within the service provider: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Please choose which best describes your company’s strategic approach to ONAP (Please try to represent the entire company, not just your organization within it)

- We try to stay on top of what is going on, as we do for any other major industry initiative. We are mostly observing with no intention to actively contribute currently.
- We see the potential in ONAP, but currently we feel it is missing critical pieces that will make it usable in our network
- We like the ONAP concept but feel it is not mature enough for us to make a decision regarding using it in our network
- We are committed to leverage some components of ONAP for our network service. We are currently making some progress towards this.
- We are committed to have ONAP as the main orchestrator in our network. We started deployment already, either in a lab or production.

---

Please rate how you perceive the following ONAP characteristics and functional areas

	1 Disappointing	2	3	4	5 Exceptional	No opinion
<b>Stability</b> How do you perceive the expected availability of the ONAP system if it the current version were to be deployed in your network						
<b>Performance</b> What is your assessment of ONAP’s capability to handle the expected loads in your network						

<p><b>Use cases</b></p> <p>Are the use cases supported by ONAP match the ones you expect to deploy? If not, do you see a clear path to implementing your use cases? Do you feel use cases are 'hardwired'?</p>						
<p><b>Ease of deployment</b></p> <p>Do you think the effort required to deploy ONAP is reasonable? Are the system requirements reasonable?</p>						
<p><b>Ease of use</b></p> <p>Is ONAP addressing the operational needs of the various departments within your company?</p>						
<p><b>Delivering on promise</b></p> <p>Does ONAP have the potential to solve real problems in your company (such as, but not limited to, OpEx reduction, time to market and competitiveness, better network control and response to faults, etc.)</p>						
<p><b>Standard and industry initiative alignment</b></p> <p>Alignment with MEF, ETSI-NFV, TMForum, TOSCA, etc.</p>						
<p><b>External APIs</b></p> <p>Does ONAP have enough APIs to integrate with existing systems in my network</p>						
<p><b>Extensibility</b></p> <p>As defined in <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Extensibility">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Extensibility</a></p>						

---

For any items that you ranked low in the table above, how do you think ONAP should improve?

*(Examples: "Offer better packaging to enable us to pick and choose modules", "Include more use cases so we can be confident ours are covered", "Improve GUI to address needs of people in our company", "More APIs so we can integrate with external systems", "Increase security", "Remove 'hardwired' use-cases")*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

When thinking about "ONAP modularity", what best describes your expectations?

- Ability to deploy only a subset of the modules that address our needs.
- Having enough APIs and pluggable components such as orchestrators, controllers, protocol plugins and applications.
- Having a design paradigm that can facilitate the evolution of the platform in an incremental fashion to guarantee successful implementation of a network automation framework that addresses operator's needs.
- Having a looser coupling with the ONAP use cases and supporting more generic use cases.

What are the required changes in ONAP to make it more modular?

*(Examples: "Reduce inter-dependency between modules", "Better choice of use cases", "Provide plugin creation examples and SDKs")*

---

---

---

---

If you do see a need for using only a subset of the modules in ONAP, which are the ones you would like to use?

*(Examples: "ONAP Pre-onboard function", "ONAP Design function", "ONAP run time function", "ONAP run time function with application configuration", "ONAP Analytics function", "ONAP closed loop function")*

---

---

---

If you don't have plans to deploy ONAP, what could make you change your mind? If you already plan to deploy in the future, what could cause an acceleration of such plans

*(Examples: "Significant improvement in stability", "Better support of my use cases", "Other operators going first")*

---

---

---

---

---

How important is it for ONAP to support containerized network functions (Network functions that run on Docker or Kubernetes rather than on virtual machines)?

- This is a “must have” from day one and we will not even consider using ONAP without it.
- ONAP should take this industry trend into consideration but currently we can manage without it for the next release or two.
- Most of our vendors have not yet provided their network functions in containerized form so we do not need such support in the foreseeable future.
- Containers are currently not suitable for Service Provider network functions due to their unique performance and security requirements and ONAP should not waste effort on such support.

---

In what ways do you believe you and your company could help ONAP become better suited for your needs?

- We can have our network operations people provide some requirements and guidelines for ONAP
- We have potential ONAP users that may prioritize existing requirements for features
- We deployed/planning to deploy ONAP in our lab or network and already have a set of suggestions for improvement
- We have some internal/external orchestration requirements documents that we would like the ONAP community to consider as input

---

How do you think your company can incentivize vendors to actively participate and support ONAP?

*(Examples: “Offer ONAP integration labs”, “Work jointly on use cases”)*

---

---