Magnus Buhrgard

ONAP Technical Community Coordinator
– Generic Network Management

2022-March-31

▶ **3GPP TSG SA**

Liaison Statement

LS – ONAP TSC 2022-03-31

Source:	**ONAP**
Title:	Request to clarify whether there are IPR issues with using 3GPP terminology and information objects and names in code contributed to ONAP
Document for:	**Request for guidance, Discussion**

Introduction

ONAP is an open-source project for real-time, policy-driven orchestration and automation of network functions, hosted by the Linux Foundation. Designers often pursue standards compliant implementations.

Request for guidance

ONAP designers have expressed that it is presently unclear whether there are IPR issues with using 3GPP terminology and information objects and names in code contributed to ONAP.

We ask 3GPP to provide guidance on this matter.

Incentives for clarity and examples of potential issues

Clarity would be beneficial for 3GPP and the industry since:

(1) Using the standardized names will reinforce the use of 3GPP standards and avoid parallel tracks that would fragment the industry

(2) It will be possible to track standards compliance to the code in future products, which is important since an increasing part of the code base will constitute of open-source code.

N.B. This is not an attempt to solve the entire licensing issue, just this particular matter.

A specific case provided as example:

There is open-source project implementation work in ONAP in which there are messages sent between CU/DU and SMO, and they relate to:

(1) Yang models of CU and DU (3GPP 28.541)

---

(2) Performance measurements (3GPP 28.552)

Uncertainty will lead to designers avoiding 3GPP terminology etc, just to be on the safe side.

Related to (1) they would e.g. use *distributed-unit & administrative-state* to avoid any potential issues resulting from the use of *NRCellDU & administrativeState (3GPP 28.541)*. An example for (2) is the *DRB.UEThpDl* measurement.