

2020-12-02 5G-xHaul Meeting notes

Date

02 Dec 2020 | 6am PST | 6am EST | **10:00 UTC** | 11:00 CET | 12:00 EET | 15:30 IST | 18:00 CST | 19:00 JST |

Web Conference:

<https://thorsten-heinze-telefonica-de.webex.com/join/andreas.lattoch.external>

Attendees

- Alex Stancu
- @Andreas Lattoch ★
- Alok Surve
- Daniela Spreafico ★
- Danilo Pala ★
- Daniel Perez Calvo ★
- Andrea Delmonte ★
- Eduardo Yusta ★
- Hubing
- Hsudarsa
- Jorge Lopez
- Istvan Vencz ★
- Jasper Yang
- Leo
- Ma Yong
- Michael Binder ★
- Nader Zein ★
- Paul Parva
- Pawel Krecicki
- Petr Jurcik
- Prathiba ★
- Roberto Servadio ★
- Shuzhan
- Thomas Seitz
- Tian Zhu
- Thorsten Heinze ★
- Yossi ★
- Zhang Dong
- Martin Skorupski ★

Info to:

- Tracy Van Brakle

Goals

- going forward

(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 |
| 00:00 | Admin | | Next meetings 2020-12-02: Thorsten Heinze 2020-12-09: Martin Skorupski 2020-12-16: ??? 2020-12-23: ??? |
| 00:05 | INFO: Demo Day | Martin Skorupski | 2020-12-03 16:00 CET- 18:00 CET Joint PoC "Proof of Concept" O-RAN/OSC/ONAP ZOOM session: https://zoom.us/j/436210993 ; Note that Zoom is being used to accommodate participants from O-RAN member companies who have LFN credentials but may not have (may not need) O-RAN Atlassian accounts. O-RAN-SC: C-Release: https://wiki.o-ran-sc.org/x/D4w_AQ |

| | | | |
|-------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 00:10 | In VlanInterface historical-performance-data attribute name to be corrected | Thorsten Heinze | <p>The following issue incl. proposal has been introduced</p> <p>https://github.com/openBackhaul/vlanInterface/issues/24.</p> <p>Decision has been scheduled for 9th of December.</p> |
| 00:25 | Firmware | @Eduardo Yusta | <p>Eduardo explained his proposal about how to describe firmware (https://groups.google.com/a/opennetworking.org/g/wireless-transport/c/3BJHnPa5PRU) and addressed a couple of questions to the vendors.</p> <p>Vendors gave details about their implementations.</p> <p>Thorsten explained two different ways of modeling Eduardo's proposal.</p> <p>AP Thorsten Heinze: List attributes in Excel and send Excel to vendors to mark supported attributes.</p> <p>AP all vendors: Respond until Monday e.o.b. so discussion about way of modelling can be continued on Tuesday 8th of December</p> |
| | End of the meeting | | |
| | Discussions to be continued: | | |
| 00:00 | VLAN FC creation | Thorsten Heinze | <p>Creation of objects</p> <p>S1 use case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ new VLAN must be configured ▪ VLAN FC needs to be created ▪ generation of IDs for local-ids and uuids ▪ Up to know the idea is that the Device is the master of object identification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ main reason: mediator alignment/synchronization with the device ▪ Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ first LTP for VLANs must be created with a given identifier ▪ second FC for VLAN is created with a given identifier ▪ minimum requirement for FC(VLAN)-uuids <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ unique within the ForwardingDomain(VLAN) device ▪ 3 proposals by E// <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ VLAN-ID FC identifier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ drawback - same id for different object times (not universal unique) - unique "only" per device/object-type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ so not a big limitation ▪ specific pattern for identifier values, to indicate that the server will later sign the final value <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Example: :NEW: ▪ NetConf client needs to accept in the response a different identifier at least must re-synch ▪ Similar tasks expected for the NetConf Server ▪ netconf:merge vs netconf:create <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in both cases the identifier must be given ▪ NetConf server will use the given identifier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ seems to be impacting NetConf Server Platform implementations ▪ Define a specific VLAN-FC-Creation RPC Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RPC for entire object creation (except the identifier) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Device can then define the final identifier ▪ Object Creation Notification required for the VLAN-FC (as in all other cases too) ▪ two procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ create empty FC first, then add later the interfaces references ▪ give interface reference as property to the creation RPC ▪ ▪ Alternative: RPC to get the next valid identification value <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ function generateVlanFCuuid(parameter: vlanId) <p>new proposal by SIAE:</p> <p>In order to provide to the application the "next" uuid an option could be the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Add in the model in the section "status" the "next-uuid" parameter 2) In case this "next-uuid" is influenced by some value: add in the section "configuration" the corresponding "influencer" values <p>i.e. with reference to the VLAN creation, in VlanFd we could have something like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In section "configuration": "next-vlan-fc-vlan-id" - In section "status": "next-vlan-fc-uuid" |

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------|---|---|
| 00:00 | Issues in General | Thorsten Heinze Martin Skorups ki | INFO: https://github.com/openBackhaul/core/wiki/summary-of-issues |
| 00:00 | Firmware | @Eduar do Yusta | <p>Use case discussion challenging the model proposal:</p> <p>Please see updated slides (thanks Eduardo).</p> <p>https://wiki.opennetworking.org/download/attachments/265093121/201102-TEF-working-document-FirmwareModeling.pptx?api=v2</p> <p>Feedback from vendors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • working assumption: (running) Firmware pointing to (actual) Equipment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assumption <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 banks (logical structure of firmware) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on running bank list of firmware <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some of the unused those wont have an associations to (actual) Equipment • Question: is the "top-level" firmware a "bank"? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • software packages 1 and 2 bank 1 and 2 or active/inactive top-level firmware. • Consideration: firmware without software package • SIAE: option to implement in addition also pointer from Equipment to Firmware <p>Firmware inventory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UML and yang creation <p>Firmware operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ download, activation, upgrade, downgrade ▪ terms and definitions, needed before UML and yang |
| 00:00 | Reboot | Martin Skorups ki | <p>As a result of the discussion about Firmware, their might be a need for a "restart" trigger.</p> <p>The "software activation trigger" usually also leads to a "restart" but with new software, which a "restart" reboots using the currently running software.</p> <p>Other terms for the same? or similar? function:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ cold start (Power down, power up; traffic loss for sure) ▪ warm start (restarting software - may have - may not have traffic loss) ▪ reboot - this term should not be used as it is not clearly defined/used <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (factory) reset (configuration is lost) - not a field/remote-controller operation LCT operation should not be covered in your API models <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is a "cold start/warm start" trigger beneficial on ControlConstruct level only? ▪ Is a "cold start/warm start" trigger beneficial on Equipment level only? There are devices offering such options: ▪ both? <p>General reboot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ cold start / warm start on device level |

| | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------|---|
| | @Eduardo Yusta | License Management | <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are License be updated during life time of the device? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer: yes - there are such cases, particularly for feature enhancements or for later enabling a license - xPIC may come later, when the second link is deployed. • Understanding association between License Firmware, LTP, Hardware, Features/Function? • Do all devices require a license? • Is a "feature-key" a "License" - from functional point: yes • What kind of License types needs to be supported - Software, Hardware, Interface, LTP, Capacity, Features, Function, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frist idea: focus on interface-capabilities <p>First proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ControlConstruct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LicenseList <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • License <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name • Type • Description • key (value; hash to be checked against, ...) • additional-configuration - (e.g. max capacity is xyz MBit/s) • State: activated; expired, no-active, • pointing to "something" <p>2020-11-18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ further introduction of the last slide: https://wiki.opennetworking.org/download/attachments/265093121/201102-TEF-working-document-FirmwareModeling.pptx?api=v2 ▪ collection of ideas / use cases driving a model are ongoing. |
| 00:00 | PureEthernetStructure, HybridMwStructure | Daniela Spreafico | <p>Please see email_</p> <p>Please see related issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PureEthernetStructure #19 • HybridMwStructure #22 (alarms) • HybridMwStructure #19 (currentPerformance) • HybridMwStructure #18 (PM types) <p>Please confirm by email to Martin Skorupski by end of this week (Nov6) that keeping FM and PM for xyzStructure is ok?</p> <p>Status: positive feedback to keep it as it is:</p> <p>Decision: we keep xyzStructure as they are and close the issues above.</p> |
| 00:00 | Centralize RMON counters | Roberto Servadio | <p>RMON counter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RMON counter in ETH-Container, while others are in MAC-Interface ▪ Open question: Where centralize the RMON counter ▪ Working assumption: All RMON counters should be part of the EthernetContainer_PAC (Status and PerformanceMonitoring) ▪ Next Step: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ update related ETH and MAC issues in OpenBackhaul for final proposal ▪ AI Martin Skorupski consolidate proposed solutions <p>Update:</p> <p>Support is welcome to consolidate with respect to RMON</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://github.com/openBackhaul/ethernetContainer/issues ▪ https://github.com/openBackhaul/macInterface/issues |

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 00:00 | Layering discussion (FCs, FDs etc.) | Thorsten Heinze | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will publish in wiki the latest slide which is the result of discussions: <div data-bbox="667 184 1170 684" style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 10px; text-align: center;">  slides to be published.pptx </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • link to the contribution: 2020-09-16 5G-xHaul Meeting notes • Continue discussion from last week • Question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1x VLAN FD and 2x VLAN FC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on MAC interfaces • 1:1 between VLAN-IF-LTP and EthernetContainer-LTP • 1x physical only one MAC-Interface? • MacSwitch attributes: mac-address-learning, aging-time - are such attributes sufficient to instantiate a new FD/FC objects. • MacFC could give a better overview - further clarifications <p>Agenda: 2020-09-30</p> <p>Discussion and agreement about the following proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Link to email with the proposal <p>Discussion</p> <p>The following aspects are proposed to be decided by the 5G-xhaul subproject.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ForwardingDomain shall be interpreted as a Potential for Forwarding (e.g. SDH Matrix). [sko] Potential: something which allows the creation of "forwarding" based in the FD:LTP - The ForwardingConstruct shall be interpreted as an Actual Forwarding (e.g. Connection between two VC-12 endpoints at the SDH Matrix). [sko] Actual: configured Forwarding – check operational states and traffic flow - There might be 0 .. * ForwardingConstructs inside a ForwardingDomain. [sko] ok <p>Discussion on dependencies between LTPs, FD, FC and between the layers will continue...</p> <p>Agenda: 2020-10-07</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Last week we started discussing a HUB presentation using FD and FCs: but there are several ways to represent a HUB: Depending on the chosen representation there are different consequences. ... (see attachment: link) |
|-------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|

Action items