

EUAG 2019-03-26 meeting minutes

- Attendees:
- Survey results: Compliance and Verification Program Survey and OVP beta program
- ONS NA and CVC joint meeting - unconference
- ONAP Use cases / functional requirements for the next release (R5, El Alto) David Perez Caparros
- ONAP consumption process - Round Table
- Chat log

Attendees:

Community: [Beth Cohen](#) [Ahmed El Sawaf](#) [Chuyi Guo](#) [Herbert Damker](#) [Ryan Hallahan](#) [Saad Ullah Sheikh](#) [David Perez Caparros](#) [Guy Meador](#) [Vincent Colas](#)

LFN: [user-20f1f](#) [Jim Baker](#) [Kenny Paul](#) [Heather Kirksey](#)

Survey results: Compliance and Verification Program Survey and OVP beta program

- [Heather Kirksey](#)
- Review the survey results
- VNF implementation, compliance testing, NFVI /VIM compliance tope responses
 - ☒ [Heather Kirksey](#) need confirmation on the algorithms - used surveymonkey stack ranking type]
 - ☒ [Heather Kirksey](#) look into providing the information as a list.
- 66% of responses said they were planning to use both HEAT and TOSCA templates
 - [Beth Cohen](#) believes that within a company different BUs may be using different models based upon history
 - [Herbert Damker](#) feels "HEAT is the language of today" and TOSCA will be the language of the future. Openstack is in use and currently uses Heat.
 - Q: is ONAP in production anywhere? A: [Ryan Hallahan](#) Yes, ONAP in production

ONS NA and CVC joint meeting - [unconference](#)

- Intention use the feedback from the EUAG to feed into roadmaps and inputs to the technical communities
- If EUAG members cannot attend, please consider sending a proxy
- Targeting Weds afternoon for meetup at ONS
- CANCELLED EUAG stand-alone unconference to focus attention on the CVC interactions

ONAP Use cases / functional requirements for the next release (R5, El Alto) [David Perez Caparros](#)

- ONAP looking for input from EUAG (Fall 2019) . [This week the ONAP R5 discussions have started, cul](#)
 - Currently under consideration : Scaling Backlog and Roadmap, Control-Loop backlog, and 5G Use cases
 - <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/Release+5+%28El+Alto+%29proposed+use+cases+and+functional+requirements>
 - <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/SP+priorities+for+Dublin>
 - [Ryan Hallahan](#) Dublin was well over-subscribed - need to get more developers active to knock out the list we already have
 - [Heather Kirksey](#) concerned over the lack of diversity on ONAP compliance projects -
 - [David Perez Caparros](#) would we have time for a survey before ONS?
 - [Kenny Paul](#) Much technical debt in ONAP, some are considering a tic/toc model to address this.
 - See [unconference](#) about the ONAP El Alto release hosted by [Catherine Lefevre](#)
- ☒ Get feedback from the ONAP TSC leadership on how to best provide EUAG priorities for El Alto [Jim Baker](#)

ONAP consumption process - Round Table

- Internal test/verification
- lifecycle of a single version
- internal repackaging/customizing
- [Ryan Hallahan](#) response on ONAP deployment process
 - Not all of ONAP used in production (subset of components) - focused on E-COMP components (Heat based flow)
 - not running ONAP "straight out of the box" but not really expected that anyone will
- [Beth Cohen](#) Wouldn't expect any telcomm to run ONAP right "out of the box"
 - AT&T had a couple year head start as E-COMP was internally developed BEFORE ONAP
- [Ryan Hallahan](#) Figuring out how to consume the new contributions from the community is the challenge.
 - Have a team merging and testing new contributions.
 - Have some AT&T specific contributions that are kept internal - 2 way merge
 - There a couple of projects that are only AT&T contributions that are easy to consume, and others that are very diverse that need to be merged into AT&T base on a ~weekly schedule
 - Cloning and merges can be automated but merge conflicts need to be addressed by hand obviously
 - want as much in the community as possible, but there are AT&T cloud specific that needs to be internally addressed

- Some refactoring and automation can help, don't think that human merges are avoidable.
- [Beth Cohen](#) Because Verizon is always "pulling" ONAP, the 2-way merge is not as much as an issue
- [user-20f1f](#) Expect some operators to consume ONAP directly from a vendor (turnkey) - expect to see the full spectrum of make/buy
- [Ryan Hallahan](#) Yes, pull/2-way merge is a legacy of how ONAP evolved AND internal cloud uniqueness
 - Tailor ONAP to the environment?
- [Heather Kirksey](#) What percentage of ONAP would be specific to your environment? What would be your goal? Realistic ideal?
- [Beth Cohen](#) always eval build vs. buy - if ~70% is buy then it makes sense and then work on customization

Chat log

08:30:16 From David Perez (Swisscom) : <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/Release+5+%28EI+Alto+%29proposed+use+cases+and+functional+requirements>

08:30:23 From David Perez (Swisscom) : <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/SP+priorities+for+Dublin>

08:37:04 From Kenny Paul (LFN) : <https://wiki.onap.org/display/DW/SP+priorities+for+Dublin>

08:47:20 From Herbert Damker (DT) to Jim Baker (LFN) (Privately) : in my statement above it should be "future" instead of "feature"