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# A diagram of a computer Description automatically generated A diagram of a computer network Description automatically generated

From Intel/Thijs: Send to us 27/11 revised 17/12 (stored in repo/Misc).

Things to discuss:

* In the INTEND project architecture, should the Intent Manager(s) (IM) be the INTEND Tools or should they manifest themselves to be separate entities (as in your figure)?
* According to TM Forum, it is possible with a hierarchy of Intent Managers (and there will most likely be such a hierarchy (business, service, resource => refinement of intents)
* Further, if we are to follow the TM Forum way of looking at this, the communication between Intent Owners (often an Intent Manager further “up” in the hierarchy) and an Intent Manager is always an Intent (following the Intent ontology, and the Intent Common Model (ICM) of the ontology is mandatory). The ICM contains one Target and at least one Expectation (DeliveryExpectation, PropertyExpectation, ReportingExpectation). The target could be set to a tool in INTEND.
* The figure below should probably include reporting going back (up) to the intent owner. This is needed to handle lifecycle of intents.
* Which tool is handling the lifecycle of intents, or is it federated/distributed between tools?

We suggested this alternative, aligned with TM Forum:
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It represents a very simplified version (open-loop) of lifecycle management and is probably not sufficient for all AI4Data use-cases since it implies manual steps if changes are needed. In truly fire and forget scenarios, this might however be sufficient for those use-cases (omitting the manual steps).

* Specify the intent as a static, predefined goal.
* Ensure the intent aligns with system capabilities and operational constraints.
* Configure the system to execute the intent as a static rule or schedule.
* **Manually** assess if the intent remains relevant and effective over time.
* **Manually** update the intent if requirements change or retire it if no longer needed.

Note that in this open-loop lifecycle management scenario “ReportingExpectations” are in many cases not present in the original intent since they, at least for lifecycle management purposes are not relevant due to the fire and forget semantic.

A more sophisticated scenario like this figure illustrates is probably more likely to be fitting for UC3:
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In this scenario the lifecycle management could be envisioned to be something like this:

* Define and capture the high-level goal or outcome desired by the user.
* Translate the high-level intent into actionable sub-intents or policies that can be understood by the underlying systems.
* Negotiate if (chain of) intents can be accepted
* **Implement the translated intent.**
* **Continuously monitor the system to ensure the intent is being met.**
* **Continuously refine and optimize the intent's implementation to adapt to changing conditions.**
* **Enable dynamic updates to the intent as business needs or external conditions change.**
* **Conclude or deactivate the intent when it is no longer needed.**

In this scenario, “ReportingExpectations” are needed since closed-loop management of the intent lifecycle is performed.

# Implementation of intent lifecycle

Should lifecycle management be viewed as a separate piece of functionality, or should it be federated between the INTEND tools? The figure below illustrates a scenario where it is regarded as a separate functionality.
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As can be seen from the figure above, persistency (storage) of intents and intents reports is needed. In this figure it is illustrated as knowledge graphs in a knowledge graph database (i.e. Neo4Jj or GraphDB), since this is what TM Forum is promoting. Regardless of decisions related to: if lifecycle management is to be regarded as a separate functionality or an intrinsic part of all INTEND tools, the repository could be regarded as a central repository storing state for intent and intent reports related to the intent lifecycle management.

## First step, a Minimal Viable Product for intent lifecycle management

Let us start experimenting with a knowledge graph implementation of intent and intent reporting state. How should intents be represented in a knowledge graph? How should intent reports be modelled? How should lifecycle events be modelled? How should a closed-loop management strategy be implemented on top of the knowledge graphs?

### Step 1 Define a few simple intents

Create a few simple intents expressed following the Intent Common Model ontology defined by TM Forum. As a start, pick one of them and store it as triples in a Knowledge Graph (decide on which knowledge graph to use: Neo4j, GraphDB, ….). The selected intent should have at least one ReportingExpectation for metrics that can be used to see if the intent is being met by the underlying system.

### Step 2 Define a way to simulate and represent intent reports

Find out how to represent the intent reporting as triples in a knowledge graph. Simulate the sending/reception of ReportingExpectation events.

### Step 3 Define a closed-loop algorithm

Create a simple closed-loop algorithm that at defined intervals checks to see if the intent is being met. If it is, nothing needs to be done. If it is not, decide what to do about it… The checking is based on intent reports that is forwarded from the underlying system (as per the ReportingExpectation). In its simplest form this could be something like this for network QoS intents:

* Make a query to retrieve all reports for all metrics that the intent should be measured over (e.g. get all latency reports)
* Check if the intent metric is met (e.g. Does all reports indicate that latency is met?)

### Step 4 Redefine the intent

Find out how to redefine the intent when it is not met (negotiation?). What is involved here?

### Step 5 What did we learn?

Will the intent manager have to have separate threads to handle the closed-loop lifecycle management for all intents?

Do we need to have cross-cutting actions to see if there are conflicting events?

Do we need to model the capabilities of the underlying system (metrics), i.e. create a digital twin?