

2020-04-01 5G-xHaul Meeting notes

Date

01 Apr 2020

Attendees

- Danilo Pala
- Roberto Servadio
- Daniela Spreafico
- Thorsten Heinze
- @Pawel Krecicki
- Michael Binder
- Yossi
- Martin Skorupski

(please feel free to correct, update your names 😊 Thank you very much!!!)

Info to:

- Nader Zein
- Tracy Van Brakle
- Dragos Dosan
- Martin Skorupski

Goals

- going forward

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
0min	chair topic		no update
30min	HTTP response code	Thorsten Heinze	<p>Update by Lumina:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New ODL implementation is according RFC8040• mapping int32 - int64 - string <p>https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7951 chapter 6.1</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>A value of the "int64", "uint64", or "decimal64" type is represented as a JSON string whose content is the lexical representation of the corresponding YANG type as specified in Sections 9.2.1 and 9.3.1 of [RFC7950].</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>The reason comes from the JavaScript specification:</p> <p>https://developers.google.com/discovery/v1/type-format</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>For example, a 64-bit integer cannot be represented in JSON (since JavaScript and JSON support integers up to 2⁵³). Therefore, a 64-bit integer must be represented as a string in JSON requests/responses. So the type property will be set to "string", but the format property will be set to "int64" to indicate that it is a 64-bit integer.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>PM counters needs int64. Application developer issue no issue in xml, App developer must know how to RestConf using json and xml.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Models will not change - int64 is required.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>Models will not change - int64 is required.</p>

00:26		@Pawel Krecicki	<p>ODU presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ two representations ▪ top level vs actual equipment <p>No decisions and discussions were made for connector in the past.</p> <p>How should be ODU models - options</p> <p>ODU is a separated box top level equipment . independent equipment with no dependency to IDU</p> <p>ODU is managed by IDU actual equipment</p> <p>Proposal (under development):</p> <p>ODU presentation as SFP actual equipment ("virtual" slot holder with ODU as equipment)</p> <p>IF port holder vs connector</p> <p>RF port is sitting on ODU</p> <p>AI: Questions to the vendors</p> <p>What are the advantages and drawbacks of the ODU presentation in a SFP like way?</p> <p>Instantiation procedure like wire-equipment?</p>
01:05	Admin		<p>Decision:</p> <p>summer: 2am ONF time 11:00 CEST 12:00 Israel summer time 17:00 China</p> <p>winter: 2am ONF time 11:00 CET 12:00 Israel standard time 18:00 China</p> <p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>2020-04-08: 2am ONF time 11:00 CEST 12:00 Israel summer time 17:00 China</p> <p>AI Martin: update meeting invitation</p>
0min	Admin		<p>Next meetings</p> <p>2020-03-25: Martin Skorupski</p> <p>2020-04-01: Martin Skorupski</p> <p>2020-04-08: Martin Skorupski</p> <p>2020-04-15: Martin Skorupski</p>

Omin	UUID	<p>core-model allows definition of both Logical Termination Points (interfaces), but also connections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forwarding Domain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either connections inside the same device • connections outside devices • Link: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any type of link, not only microwave • Forwarding Construct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concrete forwarding between two or more LTPs / ports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unidirectional / bidirectional <p>core-model is also suitable for representing entire Networks, not only a Device</p> <p>this means that Universally Unique IDs are required</p> <p>Devices cannot get the UUIDs from outside, they need to be generated by the device, and cannot be overwritten from outside</p> <p>Devices are unaware by their surroundings (the network), so it cannot know if a UUID is already used by some other interface in other devices</p> <p>IETF defines how to create UUIDs, and the core-model references this RFC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we need UUIDs for documenting the network • we cannot write the UUIDs in the device, the device needs to create it • the device does not have a network wide view • this is needed because of the Planning the network <p>Possible solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the device generates whatever, the IDs are retrieved and a mapping table is maintained • we prescribe a method/algorithm that is implemented in the device for creating UUIDs (which become predictable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using some prefix which is known during the implementation time of the device - (e.g. MAC address of the Management interface); vendor sends info about Order no. and MAC addr. to the operator and the Planning will be done with these prefixed values less complex than a field technician configuring the prefix on the device with some dongle • fixed UUID with prefix and postfix <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use the Device name instead of the MAC addr. • clean-up application that handles the changing of MAC addresses <p>Out of time, we need to follow up: proposal, next week Tuesday 09:00 CET</p>
------	------	--

Action items