

2021-08-11 5G-xHaul Meeting notes

11 Aug 2021 | 2am PDT | 5am EDT | **09:00 UTC** | 10:00 BST | 11:00 CEST | 12:00 EEST | 14:30 IST | 17:00 CST | 18:00 JST |

Web Conference:

<https://thorsten-heinze-telefonica-de.webex.com/thorsten-heinze-telefonica-de/j.php?MTID=m849236edb092dff10071725f5b8839f>

Invited:

- **Andrea Delmonte**
- **@Andreas Lattoch**
- **@Alexander Wenk**
- **Daniela Spreafico**
- **Daniel Perez Calvo**
- **Danilo Pala**
- Eduardo Yusta
- Hubing
- Hsudarsa
- Jorge Lopez
- Istvan Vencz
- Jasper Yang
- Leo
- Ma Yong
- **Michael Binder**
- **Nader Zein**
- Paul Parva
- Pawel Krecicki
- **Petr Juncik**
- **Prathiba Jeevan**
- **Roberto Servadio**
- Shuzhan
- Thomas Seitz
- Thomas Schulze
- Tian Zhu
- **Thorsten Heinze**
- Yossi
- Zhang Dong

Info to:

- **Tracy Van Brakle**

Goals

- going forward

Mailings

- <https://groups.google.com/a/opennetworking.org/g/wireless-transport?pli=1>

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

Discussion items

| Time | Item | Who | Notes |
|-------|-------------|-----|--|
| 00:00 | chair topic | | no update |
| 00:05 | Admin | | Next meetings 2021-08-18: Martin Skorupski 2021-08-25: Martin Skorupski 2021-09-01: Martin Skorupski 2021-09-08: Martin Skorupski |

| | | | |
|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 00:50 | MAC Example | @Andre as Lattoch | <p>Real world MAC example</p> <p>From Andreas:</p> <p>An additional status attribute from the MAC Bridging Table is needed:</p> <p>The MAC-Addresses learned on a MAC-interface and managed in the switch MAC-Bridging table. The input- and output-mac-interface have the same bridge domain. The bridge domain could be a VLAN or other groupings.</p> <p>The attached example show a filtered MAC Bridging Table with bridge domain filtered by VLAN on two switches that are connected via Air-Interface.</p> <p>https://wiki.opennetworking.org/download/attachments/265093121/MAC-Example.pptx?api=v2</p> <p>Option 1: (based on the description above)</p> <p>LTP MAC-PAC Status learned-mac-addresses</p> <p>Note: LTP (MAC) has an association to a physical interface</p> <p>This option could be associated with VLAN IDs based in server/client relations between the LTPs</p> <p>MAC is server of VLAN - current modeling</p> <p>MAC-IF server VLAN-IF (switch port) part of many VLAN-FC (vlan-id)</p> <p>Option 2: (based on implementations of some devices)</p> <p>FC ->VLAN-FC-PAC (vlan-id) Status learned-mac-addresses (type: mac-address; physical-port-reference)[*]</p> <p>Option 3:</p> <p>FC ->VLAN-FC-PAC (vlan-id) VLAN-FC-PORT-PAC Status learned-mac-addresses (type: mac-address)[*]</p> <p>The association to physically port goes via the reference from FC port to VLAN-IF.</p> <p>Option 4:</p> <p>A table of learned-mac-address, vlan-id, physical-port-reference on MAC-FD level (like aging time).</p> <p>A central place for reducing requests by applications.</p> <p>Note: due to its dynamic nature changes such changes must not be notified.</p> <p>update from 2021-08-10 IF-meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would be the assumption about the length of the learned mac-addresses per VLAN-ID? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avq ~13 mac-address PER entire switch • max ~250 mac-address PER entire switch (exception case) • avq ~13 mac-address PER VLAN-ID • max ~ 150 mac-address PER VLAN-ID • What is the behavior of the aging time (reset timer)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer: (open) <p>Notification requirement for learned mac-address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ??? use need vs pollution of DCN ??? - not answered yet - depends on that aging time behavior. <p>How to model?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MAC-FC with MAC-FC ports (option 3) - a lot of objects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is this possible for 150 mac-addresses on the device? ▪ MAC-FD (option 4) <p>New question?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What would be mediator implementation - polling for the cases no notification on the devices? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ idea - RPC to get the learned mac-addresses in the next x min - no notification expected in that case. |
| | END OF THE MEETING | | |

| | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 00:15 | Synchronization | @Alexander W enk @Prathiba | <p>Current status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UML-to-yang - synch_Pac - to generate a yang ▪ create a workspace - with new - specify/augmentation to the core-model-1.4 ▪ there is a need to create a "new" UML-project <p>First try to generate yang model-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some manually modification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ stereotype "experiment" - update of OpenModelProfile ▪ then some issues found by pyang <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ duplicate of attributes - same attribute but different description ▪ issue on a class which is not required - maybe we simply remove it from yang generation ▪ feedback by Thorsten - UML/YANG header info missing <p>See feedback from Kam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://github.com/openBackhaul/core/wiki/2021-06-22-Interface-call#synchronization-model <p>Info from 2021-07-06:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alexander is going to create issues based on the feedback by vendors ▪ done: https://github.com/openBackhaul/synchronization/issues <p>Next step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ conversion to yang |
| 00:30 | relation between planning and actual data from the network | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning identifiers <??-> network managed object identifiers • detailed problem description?? |
| 00:00 | Mediator Instance Manager | Thorsten Heinze | <p>Pre- Discussion happened yesterday</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ info send by Thorsten on Monday 2021-05-17 ▪ in addition Thorsten will send the "background discussion slide".... <p>Mediator Instance Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the protocol? NETCONF or REST or RESTCONF or ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working Assumption: not decided ▪ SIAE would like to decide based on efforts after analysis. ▪ UML include the "service" - but not the operational and maintenance layer ▪ YAML (OpenAPI3) UML (papyrus) YANG <p>2021-05-25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any questions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ no questions <p>2021-06-16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ please see "App layer on top of the SDN controller" above. |

Action items