Service Modeling Discussion Calls ( Deprecated)

This page hosts information about discussion calls dedicated to service modeling during R2 release cadence.

More information about ongoing work targeting R3+ is hosted here: ONAP R3+ Service Modeling Discussion Calls
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Past calls

**20180330**

**Logistics**

Intercontinental Los Angeles Downtown, sponsored by Linux Foundation Network Echo Park Meeting Room 5th floor

Time: 8am-1pm

Meeting room: https://zoom.us/j/882442618

Part of the ONAP Friday morning modeling session in ONS 2018 (30 March 2018)

**Agenda**

0 Agenda bashing

*Service session*
1 Yangxu - Service IM Status and Observations
2 John - MEF MCM Proposal
3 Jianguo - ONAP R3 Service IM Proposal
4 Lingli - Service IM Usecase Proposal (Skipped for time limitation)
5 Discussion on next steps

*Resource DM session*
6 Michael - ONAP R3 Resource DM Proposal Feedback
7 Alex - Kicking off ONAP R2 Resource DM Open Issues (Skipped for time limitation)

**Onsite Participants**

Hui DENG , Xinhui Li, Lingli Deng , Seshu Kumar, Parviz Yegani, Alex Vul , John Strassner , Xu YANG

Anh Le , Thinh Nguyenphu , Michael Lando, Pawel Pawlak, Jianguo Zeng, Stephen Terrill, Seshu Kumar

Tal Liron, Yoav Kluger, Catherine Lefevre

**Meeting minutes**

1) R2 service modeling will be the same as R1 service modeling which is confirmed by SDC/SO/HPA/VNFSDK/AAI/VFC

2) R2 resource modeling will be based on clean version of wiki page, but will only implement part of the request from the use case

3) R3 DT resource DM have critical issue whether we are going to improve R2+ model or redesign a new DM for R3+

4) ONAP service model is broader than ETSI Network Service

5) Product/Offer is out of the scope of ONAP service model

6) The workshop made the following concensused suggestion:
   - Cardinality correction by John
   - Suggest to move to composite pattern instead of recursive aggregation
   - Decoration pattern is FFS
   - Terminology need to be defined (e.g. clarifications on service component as with the one in MEF)

**20180325**

Agenda
• ONAP R2+ service IM Discussion Review and Proposal
  Service IM layering framework (Lingli Deng)

• SDO Perspective
  MEF (Jack Pugaczewski)
  TMF (John Wilmes)
  ONF (Nigel Davis)

• ONAP R3 Service IM Proposals
  Service Order (Andy/Kevin) (Skipped as Andy is not online)
  Service Component: WAN Service Descriptor (Zhuoyao Huang & Nigel Davis)
  Service Component: Network Service Descriptor (Maopeng Zhang & Thinh)

• Priority and Planning Discussion
  The current status of service IM and my observations (Xu Yang) (Skipped for time limitation)
  Discussion (Partially covered during the flow of discussion)

Minutes
• ONAP R2+ service IM Discussion Review
  • Service IM layering framework (Lingli Deng)

• SDO Perspective
  • MEF (Jack Pugaczewski) - MEF API Development Approach provides an introduction to MEF LSO and proposed a tooling chain that triggered the discussion of common information model methods and strategies. It was agreed that the ONAP community can be used as a catalyst to promote CIM from vision to implementation between related SDOs of the Radeon. However, the ONAP's own design and implementation of the model is not tied to the existing specification or specification plan of the CIM or any other SDO. The ONAP model work is based on the developers' willingness to contribute, and the development of the version is the iterative design and organization cycle of the discussion. MEF models are still evolving and featured with the model-driven approach and usage of decorator pattern.
  • TMF (John Wilmes) The advantage of staying compatible with the legacy systems is highlighted from TMF SID modeling proposal. A mapping analysis of the ETSI NFV IFA model to the TMF SID in terms of the ETSI NFV vCPE use case is provided. It is suggested to supplement the ONAP service scenario with a service-level mapping analysis, add elaboration on the relationship between SID and openAPI, and submit to the next level discussion on Friday Workshop.
  • ONF (Nigel Davis) - ONF Modeling introduced the ONF modeling experience, and it is envisioned that the modeling for both resource and service would converge. Specific suggestions for WAN descriptor refinement based on ONF CIM and TAPI were presented. It is recommended that the follow-up continue to discuss the model design refinement offline.

• ONAP R3 Service IM Proposals
  • Service Order (Andy/Kevin) - Skipped for lack of presenter
  • Service Component:
    • Network Service Descriptor (Maopeng Zhang)
      • NSD IM: If no further comments on the NSD IM are received next week, it will move into the clean page.
      • NSD DM: R2 NSD Model as resource was discussed. SDC has supported NSD node definition, and more detail is needed discussed with SDC team. Thinh requests to accelerate the NSD data model
    • Service Component: WAN Service Descriptor (Zhuoyao Huang)
      • Nigel suggested 3 options for improvements to ONAP WAN model:
        Option 1 (Core overlay): Follow CIM concept, LC/XC is FC, import LTP and Link, node is FD but not NE.
        Option 2 (TAPI overlay): Follow TAPI concept, LC/XC/FC is connection, FC port and XC point replaced by CEP and NEP, import Topology.
        Option 3 (M.3100 overlay): Change some names for aligning with ONF IM concepts (following ITU-T Recommendation M.3100) better and keep the UML class topology of original WAN IM proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAN IM</th>
<th>Nigel suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forwarding</td>
<td>Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNC(Subnetwork Connection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC Port</td>
<td>CTP(Termination Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td>SN(Subnetwork)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC Route</td>
<td>SNCRoute(Subnetwork Connection Route)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XC Port</td>
<td>CTP(Connection Termination Point)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Priority and Planning Discussion
  - The current status of service IM and my observations (Xu Yang) - delayed due to time limitation
  - Discussion for follow-ups
    - Lingl provides customer-facing business scenarios as input for service model discussion and comparison by Tuesday;
    - For Friday workshop, each presenter (including SDOs/individuals) is expected to provide their respective proposal models and with the context of customer facing business scenario;
    - Based on which, the team is expected to develop a more clearly scoped target and collaborative pattern for R3+

20180321

**Agenda**
- Agenda bashing
- R2 Status summary and priority
- ONS workshop agenda
- R2 VNFD DM clean up discussion (added for R2 priority)
- Network Service Descriptor R2 Implementation Discussion
- Service Order Model (added to the agenda, but deferred to next meeting due to time limit)

**Minutes**
- Agenda bashing
  - Andy suggested to add service order model to the agenda.
  - Hui suggested to add VNFD DM discussion for finalizing R2 spec.
- R2 Status summary and priority
  - Agreed to continue work on nsd for R2 implementation, and defer WAN descriptor discussion for R3 discussion starting next call.
- And service order proposal to R3 discussion.
- ONS workshop agenda
  - Deng Hui suggest to
    1. Add project PTL to explain how they implement service today SDC, SO, A&AI
    2. YANGXU is presenting the relationship between SERVICE and network service
    3. Multi SDO presentation about service IM, tmf/mef/onap
    4. Offline to build tiger team to design service IM
  - Andy suggest to
    1. Add service order model
    2. Further Discuss NS
- Network Service Descriptor R2 Implementation Discussion
  - NS model as service component added in the R2.
  - Maopeng and Anatoly need to discuss more tosca grammar details related to NS model and update the NS model.
- Wrap up

20180313

**Agenda**
- Agenda bashing
  - WAN service IM/DM Proposal (Zhuoyao)
    - WAN (Service Component) IM
    - WAN (Service Component) DM
- Network Service Discussion
  - NetworkService Model Diagram (Maopeng)
  - Network service VL Discussion (Nagesha/Thinh)
- Wrap up

**Minutes**
- Agenda bashing
  - Added a time slot for Network service VL Discussion.
- WAN service IM/DM Proposal (Zhuoyao)
  - WAN (Service Component) IM
    - Need clarifications on relationship with ONF CIM and/or TAPI model.
  - WAN (Service Component) DM
    - Need clarifications on relationship with parallel TOSCA Data Modeling practice at ONF and avoid collision if possible (e.g. in terms of naming conventions)
- Network Service Discussion
Network Service Model Diagram (Maopeng)
Add reference to IFA 014 2.4.1 when appropriate. Need sync with SDC/VF-C for implementation plan in R2.

Network service VL Discussion (Nagesha)
Very briefly done due to time limit. Will provide wiki page contribution and kick off further discussion.

Wrap up

Recordings
- Audio
- Chat

20180307

Agenda
- Agenda bashing
- Service IM recap and update (Kevin/Lingli)
- Service DM proposal (Chuanyu/Maopeng)
  - Design-Time Data Model: Service
  - Design-Time Data Model: Service Component
  - Network Service Descriptor Proposal
- WAN service modeling proposal (Zhuoyao)
- Wrap up

Minutes
- Agenda bashing (Lingli)
  No comments received and proceeded with the proposed agenda.
- Service IM recap and update (Kevin)
  No update made to the clean version as agreed back in December F2F. (Kevin)
  Concerns raised about potential alignment conflicts with MEF service models, which would be discussed further in March F2F. (Mehmet and others)
- Service DM proposal (Maopeng)
  It is clarified that both network service and wan service are derived from service component. The network service as it currently represented is a simplified subset of Network Service as define by ETSI NFV, without VNFFG or Deployment Flavour etc. (Maopeng)
  UML class diagram for corresponding IM design was requested to be added. (Andy)
  More sophisticated design for virtual link might need to be considered for some service provider scenario, contribution to be expected in later discussion. (Thinh)
- WAN service modeling proposal (Zhuoyao)
  It is recognized as a good approach to proceed, suggest to add consideration for covering both intra-DC connectivity and inter-DC connectivity for underlay. (Gil & Andy)
- Wrap up
  All participants are encouraged to leave their comments to the wiki discussion pages for further discussion and better tracking.

Recording
- Audio
- Chat
- Audio and Video