



# ONAP Architecture Documentation in Read The Docs

Ciaran Johnston, Ericsson  
Tony Finnerty, Ericsson  
Jeff Van Dam, Ericsson  
Sofia Wallin, Ericsson

June 2020

# Architecture Documentation

- <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/Documenting+ONAP+Architecture>
- Each project description includes a “System Context” diagram similar to that defined in the C4 model (<https://c4model.com>)
- Exposed and consumed interfaces are described as lollipops in the diagram
- Each interface is numbered according to the project that exposes it
  - <project-abbreviation>E-<number>
- A table is included referring to the interfaces, describing their intent, their version and (ideally) linking to the current version of the swagger documentation
- Challenges:
  - Inconsistent content from each project
  - Does not correlate directly to the information in RTD
  - Not properly version controlled
  - Projects have not taken ownership of the content

# Read The Docs Documentation

- Version controlled restructured text documents stored in git and managed / owned by each project
- Includes (in some cases) an “Offered APIs” and “Consumed APIs” page under the component description
  - E.g. for [DCAE](#)
- Pages link to the specific swagger files (also stored in git)
- Interface pages can be brought together in an overall view: <https://docs.onap.org/en/elalto/guides/onap-developer/apiref/index.html>
- Proposal in REQ-386 to move API docs to Swagger:  
<https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/Developing+ONAP+API+Documentation>
- Current challenges:
  - No consistency across all projects
  - No description or version of the interface
  - No “System Context View” that is consistent per project

# Proposal for Next Steps

- Create a template for the [component documentation](#) to be included in the project documentation repository
  - Pick a project to try this out – e.g. policy
- Include in the template:
  - The System Context diagram – stored in the git repo as an uncompressed SVG (draw.io)
    - Include clickable links to the swagger docs in the diagram
    - Color-code interfaces which are exposed externally
  - A table describing the interfaces and referring to their versions
    - Refer to interface documentation (swagger docs)
- Define a template, try it out with a couple of projects and iterate
- If successful, roll out across the rest of the components

# Migrating from the Confluence to Read The Docs

- The process:

1. Clone repository from gerrit.onap.org
2. Create new directories if needed
3. Save diagram as an xml in the local repository
  1. Edit locally to add links
  2. Export as SVG in the local repository
4. Create rst file with data from Confluence and include the SVG
5. Test locally
6. Submit for review

- Currently 3 architecture overviews ready for review

- Policy
- SDC
- SO

- Challenges:

- Inconsistent structure of repositories
- Inconsistent structure of rst files

## Policy Architecture Overview (Local Test)

High Level Component Definition and Architectural Relationships

**Policy Architecture Overview**

Contents

- Policy Architecture Overview
- 1. Component Definition and Architectural Relationships
- 2. API Definitions
- 2.1a Exposed APIs
- 2.1b Consumed APIs

### 1. Component Definition and Architectural Relationships

The diagram illustrates the Policy Framework (Software System) at the center, which provides a logically centralized environment for the creation and management of policies. It is connected to various components:

- Information Sources:** DCAC (Software System), Other Systems (Software System), and AMM (Software System).
- Policy Administration:** Policy Administrator, PDE 2 Policy Management (PDE2), and PDE 3 Policy Design (PDE3).
- Policy Enforcement:** DCAC (Software System), DDE (Software System), and SDC (Software System).
- Action Targets:** Other Systems (Software System), SO (Software System), Consoles (Software System), and Single Ticket System (Software System).

### 2. API Definitions

#### 2.1a Exposed APIs

Interface Name	Definition	Capabilities	Version	Status	Featured Model(s)
PDE-5	Decision Query	Policy decisions are required by ONAP components to support the policy-driven ONAP architecture. Policy Decisions are implemented using the MACH and Open PDPs. The calling application is required to provide policy_id, rule_id, and other attributes in order for the PDP to return a correct decision.	1.0	production	Defined by policy
PDE-3	Policy Administration	Support CRUD of PDP groups and subgroups and to support the deployment and the cycles of Policy-based system (TOSCA Policy and Policy-based entities on PDP sub-groups and PDPs).	3.0.0	production	Embedded
PDE-4	Data Ingress	Listen on a DMAP topic.		production	Messages of interest are described in the policy logs. DMAP
PDE-1	Policy Type Design	Allows applications to create, update, delete, and query Policy Type entities so that they become available for use in ONAP for applications such as CLAMP.	3.0.0	production	None/policy.com
PDE-2	Policy Design	Allows applications (such as CLAMP and Integrated) to create, update, delete, and	3.0.0	production	None/policy.com

#### 2.1b Consumed APIs

Interface Name	Consumed By	Description
AMM	Policy Framework	Authentication and authorization
DMAP	Policy Framework	Policy Framework uses DMAP for SDC subscriptions and internal communication. Policies use DMAP as a transport for contextual information from various sources.
SDC	Policy Framework	Provisioning of CDS, Delivery of CDS
AM	Policy Framework	Enrich ingress data with topology information
SO	Policy Framework	Trigger orchestration actions (policy driven)
SDNC	Policy Framework	Trigger control actions (policy driven)
APPC	Policy Framework	Trigger any interfaces defined in a policy, for example, trouble ticketing
Other	Policy Framework	Trigger any interfaces defined in a policy, for example, trouble ticketing

End of Document

# Discussion ...

- Include this as a checkpoint in the review process
  - Keep the SVG approach
  - Need to compare previous and proposed version during review
- Review with the PTLs
- Relevant to the previous session on how we document these components within ONAP
- C4 level diagrams are good – need to look at the information flows as well
- Do the same presentation in the PTL call