Managing Unmaintained Component Dependencies in ONAP
Introduction

› Dependencies on unmaintained components represents a security and logistical risk for ONAP

› Although we have developed processes for lifecycle management of unmaintained projects, we haven’t really dealt with the issue of ongoing dependencies

› This week, a group of interested ONAP members began meeting to discuss how to handle these dependencies
Role of Requirements and Arch Subcommittees

- One possibility is to ask the requirements and arch subcommittees to update their review processes to include evaluating dependencies.
- If a project or proposed requirement has a dependency on an unmaintained component, then in order to continue:
  - The PTL or requirement owner must develop a plan and get approval from the arch subcommittee to remove the dependency.
  - The PTL or requirement owner must request an exception from the TSC.
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Evaluation takes place in:
- Req subcommittee for requirements.
- Arch subcommittee for projects
Benefits

› Makes issue more transparent to the TSC
› Requires the development of a credible plan, including a review process, for removing the dependency
› Creates “friction” for PTLs or requirement owners with dependencies on unmaintained components and incentivizes them to remove the dependency
Issues

› Plan depends on self-identification of dependencies. A tool would be preferable.

› What about legacy use cases that no longer have an “owner” but have dependencies on unmaintained components?

› The arch subcommittee has struggled to complete reviews by Milestone 2. Can they handle this additional workload?
Interested?

› Please join us on Mondays at 8 a.m. Pacific.
› Let me know and I will add you to the invitation.