LF NETWORKING

LFN Developer & Testing Forum

LF NETWORKING

LFN Developer & Testing Forum

ONAP Transformation

Magnus Buhrgard, Ericsson

Anti-Trust Policy Notice

- Linux Foundation meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of the Linux Foundation to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of, and not participate in, any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.

- Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at Linux Foundation meetings and in connection with Linux Foundation activities are described in the Linux Foundation Antitrust Policy available at http://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrustpolicy. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of the Linux Foundation, feel free to contact Andrew Updegrove of the firm of Gesmer Updegrove LLP, which provides legal counsel to the Linux Foundation.

Agenda

- Recap from D&TF in Porto and ONAP Mainstream + my reflections

- Reflections & Discussion

- Explore possible ways forward given changing circumstances

- Identify actionable tasks

Agenda

- **Recap from D&TF in Porto and ONAP Mainstream + my reflections**

- Reflections & Discussion

- Explore possible ways forward given changing circumstances

- Identify actionable tasks

Background & Analysis

ONAP was create over 5 years ago, with a very ambitious vision to create a commonly acknowledged open-source automation platform for the telecom community

— Initiated and endorsed by many CSPs

— Gained rapid support from vendors

Although not realizing the full vision, ONAP has accomplished a lot:

— First open-source community in Telecom Management

— Operators and Vendors working together

— Delivering valuable software to the community

— Providing an environment for collaboration on use cases

— Establishing a reference architecture for modern management systems and providing a vocabulary for such systems

However, we believe that ONAP is not adopting rapidly enough to changing circumstances

ONAP Challenges (disputed)

— The value is in the components that ONAP produces, not so much in the "Platform"
  — Most users take components from ONAP and integrate it with their own platform

— ONAP is structured to deliver a platform
  — Puts a heavy burden on the community and require wide involvement from LF staff
  — Results in complex/sizeable project management and long lead-times and a perception of a heavy monolith
  — Cost of engagement is high, both regarding membership fee and own work

— ONAP contributions have become skewed
  — Code contribution has decreased, and effort is in a small number of projects
  — Several projects are dormant or unsupported
  — Getting volunteers for some key positions is proving increasingly difficult

— Focus in ONAP is moving away from where the real value is

— Successful open-source projects tend to focus on a limited set of specific use cases. ONAP is too multi-faceted

— In contrast O&M open-source in general is popular, flourishing, and heavily used and new initiatives pop up
  — Nephio, Camara

Requirements Reviews

- Since ~Honolulu:

- Most use cases/features presented are continuation -> the scope of the proposed work is fairly well known and little (if any) cross-uc alignment required

- Low attendance to reviews; usually REQ officer(s), the involved community members, the ones waiting to present their uc/feature on the same call

- For continuation use cases the more relevant questions tend to be on architecture implications -> ARC review

➢ **A question to the community: could we consider streamlining our release proposed work review?**

Opportunities for ONAP

— Expands on its position as the reference platform architecture for Network Automation systems
  — Increased alignment with SDOs and other open-source projects
  — Certification

— Provides reference implementations for the application of technologies that standards organizations are not suited to describe

— Delivers valuable components for the reference architecture to the Telecom Management and wider community

— Supplies an ecosystem that allows the community to trial Network Automation applications for their domains

— Provides common support for component development and community trials
  — Build environment
  — Guidelines on security, APIs, logging, metrics that components can use
  — Support for trial environments based on community needs

Suggested Conclusions

1. Not less interest now but the community is as strong as the size/value of contributions. It is natural that the number of code contributors decrease as the project continues.

2. The value of ONAP is moving from the platform to the components – *disputed*

3. Provide common support for component development and community trials
   - Build environment
   - Guidelines on security, APIs, logging, metrics that components can use

4. Supply ecosystem that allows the community to trial Network Automation applications for their domains

5. Important in the community to share the experience and offer help to others. Some companies that use code but don't contribute. How to engage the community more?

6. Streamline the requirement process (review vision and roles of Req and Arch SC together)

7. Work on the value argumentation: reference architecture?/key components?/convince-your-boss-kit?

8. Establish user group

9. Demos to a larger audience

10. Seek collaboration with other open-source projects: CNCF, EMCO, LF Edge, Akraino

11. Strive for becoming an integral part of initiatives such as the 5G Super blueprint and Open RAN

Input to ONAP Mainstream group

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
seshu kumar m	seshukumar.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

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

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

- A user group should not be an exclusive club
  - 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
  - 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.

Quality Code is King ... and more

- An open-source project is ultimately about producing useful code
  - Robust, well reviewed and tested
  - Well documented
  - Security
  - Including "global requirements"
  - Hardened through user feed-back

- 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

Sense of urgency – my reflection

- ONAP is challenged
  - Getting bashed in the industry – even at the ONE Summit
  - Managers in member companies – moving people to new assignments
  - People focusing on the next new thing
  - Not likely that we can attract a large number of new contributors – may change later

- Suggested actions
  - Right-size the ambition level
  - Be opportunistic regarding use cases → SMO (O-RAN)
  - Modularize
  - Create autonomous projects – abandon the platform releases → "traditional" open-source
  - "Umbrella" activity to drive collaboration, global requirements and best practices

The ONAP Potluck

- "Dishes" could come in different shapes and forms
  - Code
  - Testing
  - Documentation
  - Method and process improvements
  - LFN fee
  - Business intent to use ONAP code ?
  - ….

- Participants share recipes and learn from each other

- There is no "à la carte" menu

- Free lunch is a possibility, but it is beneficial for open-source consumers to engage in the community

Wikipedia:
A **potluck** is a communal gathering where each guest or group contributes a different, often homemade, dish of food to be shared.

Agenda

- Recap from D&TF in Porto and ONAP Mainstream + my reflections

- **Reflections & Discussion**

- Explore possible ways forward given changing circumstances

- Identify actionable tasks

Agenda

- Recap from D&TF in Porto and ONAP Mainstream + my reflections

- Reflections & Discussion

- **Explore possible ways forward given changing circumstances**

- Identify actionable tasks

Agenda

- Recap from D&TF in Porto and ONAP Mainstream + my reflections

- Reflections & Discussion

- Explore possible ways forward given changing circumstances

- **Identify actionable tasks**