

ONAP Transformation

Input from the ONAP Mainstream mail conversation
+ some of my own reflections

onap-mainstream@lists.onap.org

onap-mainstream@lists.onap.org | [Home](#)

I would like your view on which topics we should focus on. This is my proposal (in no special order):

1. How to supply an ecosystem that allows the community to trial Network Automation applications for their domains?
2. How to strengthen the components in ONAP to be useful stand-alone, i.e. without the full ONAP platform?
3. Streamlined requirement process
4. Value argumentation - Convince-your-boss-kit
5. Need for a user group
6. External collaboration
7. How/where to demo for larger audiences

Members of onap-mainstream@lists.onap.org

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Pawel Pawlak | p.pawlak@f5.com |
| Ram Krishna Verma | ram_krishna.verma@bell.ca |
| Fiachra Corcoran | fiachra.corcoran@est.tech |
| Jill Lovato | jlovato@linuxfoundation.org |
| Byung-Woo Jun | byung-woo.jun@est.tech |
| Amy Zwarico | amy.zwarico@att.com |
| N.K. Shankaranarayanan | nk.shankar@stl.tech |
| Chaker Al-Hakim | ca2853@pm.me |
| Marc Fiedler | marc.fiedler@telekom.de |
| D'Alessandro Alessandro Gerardo | alessandro.dalessandro@telecomitalia.it |
| sesu kumar m | sesukumar.mudiganti@windriver.com |
| Haiby, Ranny | rhaiby@linuxfoundation.org |
| Lukasz Rajewski | lukasz.rajewski@t-mobile.pl |
| Perala, Timo (Nokia - FI/Espoo) | timo.perala@nokia.com |
| Liam Fallon | liam.fallon@est.tech |
| Magnus Buhrgard | magnus.buhrgard@ericsson.com Mod |
| Kenny Paul | kpaul@linuxfoundation.org Owner |

Which topics resonated?

2. **How to strengthen the components in ONAP to be useful stand-alone, i.e. without the full ONAP platform?**

- AKA ONAP Modularity
- Components should/could be targeted to become standalone
- We should discuss feasibility

3. **Streamlined requirement process**

- Low hanging fruit and no external dependencies
- Reduce the unnecessary admin burden
- Important when combined with ONAP Modularity (components to work standalone and part of platform)

1. **How to supply an ecosystem that allows the community to trial Network Automation applications for their domains?**

- “ONAP-in-a-box” – getting people familiar with the entire ONAP platform
- Also an echo-system of people that are willing to review, support

- Also suggested not trying to prioritize but to create a plan and use the topics as a check list
- Need to “refresh” ONAP SC – preserving what works well and augmenting where necessary

5. Need for a user group

- “I think a "user group" should not be an exclusive club with only a single constituency, like the old LFN EUAG that welcomed mostly operators. The user group I had in mind should consist of:
 - Vendors who intend to use ONAP as part of their commercial products
 - System Integrators who plan to make ONAP part of their service offerings
 - SaaS providers who will use ONAP to orchestrate their platform
 - Developers who are consuming ONAP as an upstream project
 - And...yes...Members of Telecom operators who are deploying ONAP in their networks”
- User group requirements are welcome BUT should not be the only source of truth
- Important to continue with requirements and use cases from the developer community
- A chance to hear from those who benefit from ONAP but are not day-to-day active in the community
- Reach out to people who used to be active in ONAP

Some ideas (food for further discussions in Seattle):

- Requirement (use case) SC → **Users SIG** and add the user categories listed above
- Create a “**Release SIG**” with all PTLs + open to the community: PTL weekly meeting and release tracking
- Rebrand **Architecture, Modeling, Security** subcommittees as SIGs

6. External Collaboration

- Consider other Orchestrators (e.g. Nephio, EMCO) - provide a high-level view of how they relate to (complement) ONAP
- A large area of relevance for ONAP is that many components map to the O-RAN SMO, which has gained a lot of interest during the last two years. ONAP does not feature much in O-RAN Alliance and O-RAN SC discussions.
- O-RAN SC and ONAP are both in LFN
- Important to seize the opportunity when operators and vendors start seeing the need for better specification and open-source work for the SMO.
- Perhaps it is worth fostering participation from universities since open-source makes things easy for students and faculty to participate.

Adding to the list of topics

8. How to develop the community?

- An open-source project depends on the contributions of the community. Without that process and structure are irrelevant.

9. Contributor influence

- Contributors have no direct influence on key decisions taken by the TSC.
- Global requirements are dependent on developer support.
- People have started to avoid pushing feature requirements and use cases, focusing on one-component level contributions and PoCs – to avoid complex process.

10. Awarding the contributors

- Finally, we have badges

11. Development of a complex platform requires a core team

- Support for newcomers and potential users
- Drive implementation of non-functional requirements
- Documentation and simplification of the installation process

12. Tools

13. Training and certification, FAQ

14. Overlap in the LFN portfolio

- Some are symptoms and others are root causes
- Free up the agenda in TSC meetings to deal with strategic technology issues properly

ONAP Value Proposition and Stakeholders

How does Operators, vendors and contributors view the value and role of ONAP?

Stakeholders

- Contributors of code - “Code is King”
 - Mostly employees
 - Design leaders
- LFN members
 - Paying a fee
 - Open-source champions
- Users of ONAP code and/or platform
- Authorities / Federal Agencies
 - European commission: OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE STRATEGY 2020 – 2023, Think Open
 - DARPA
- Users and promoters of ONAP artifacts – architecture, terminology, components

ONAP history

- Initiated and promoted by CSP higher management – connection to business
- Influenced by corporate “control” culture, rather than traditional open-source WoW

Quality Code is King ... and more

- An open-source project is ultimately about producing useful code
 - Robust, well reviewed
 - Well documented
 - Security
 - Including “global requirements”
 - Hardened through user feed-back
- ONAP has also changed the industry’s perception of Automation
 - Defacto standard
 - Architecture
 - Terminology
 - Interfaces
- Compare with CNCF, IETF etc
 - Technology leadership → impacting vendors and CSPs strategies (not only fact based)
 - Dedicated contributors (people participate unless managers stop them)
 - Strong culture - almost religious ?
 - Disparate design but with a common thread