

# 2020-01-08 5G-xHaul Meeting Notes

## Date

08 Jan 2020

## Attendees

- [Martin Skorupski](#)
- [Thorsten Heinze](#)
- [Nader Zein](#)
- [Michael Binder](#)
- [Tracy Van Brakle](#)
- [Yossi](#)
- [Daniela Spreafico](#)
- [Danilo Pala](#)
- [Shawn Ying](#)
- [Roberto Servadio](#)

## Goals

## Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
			more persons, than just Martin should be able to open the GoToMeeting  Candidates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Roberto</li><li>▪ Tracy</li><li>▪ Nader</li></ul>
0min	chair	@all	no update

30min	Issues	Thorsten Heinze	<p>See email of Thorsten about issues with attributes:</p> <p>1. The current implementation of our CurrentPerformance classes are inheriting the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• object-class</li> <li>• name-binding</li> <li>• packages</li> <li>• allomorphs</li> </ul> <p>Does anybody know what they are for?</p> <p>Do we need them?</p> <p>Are there any opinions about deleting them from all the tech.spec. models?</p> <p><b>Summary of the discussion:</b> not needed</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> - attributes should be removed.</p> <p>2. Our CurrentPerformance classes are also inheriting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• operational-state</li> <li>• administrative-state</li> </ul> <p>It seems rather clear that these attributes are at the wrong place.</p> <p>The content should be represented in the model, but are they redundant?</p> <p>Are there any opinions about how to proceed with these attributes?</p> <p><b>Summary of the discussion:</b> not needed for this object class - there attributes for pm in  - PAC-Configuration (administrativeState is performanceMonitoringIsAvail) and  - PAC-status (operationalState is performanceMonitoringIsOn)</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> - attributes should be removed.</p>
20min	Interface Validator	Thorsten Heinze	Demo for Interface Validator

## Action items

- Martin Skorupski: make sure that the meeting can take place in future
- Martin Skorupski : rename project goes to Lyndon