Casablanca Risks

This centralized page, for all Casablanca projects, is aimed at identifying the risks as they are foreseen within the release life cycle.

A Risk that materialized becomes an Issue.

Status:

- Identified: a risk that has been identified, but has not yet been analyzed / assessed yet
- Assessed: an identified risk which currently has no risk response plan
- Planned: an identified risk with a risk response plan
- In-Process: a risk where the risk response is being executed
- Closed: a risk that occurred and is transferred to an issue or the risk was solved/avoided
- Not occurred: a risk that was identified but that did not occur
- Rejected: created and kept for tracking purposes but considered not to be used yet

Risk ID	Project Team or person identifying the risk	Identification Date	Risk (Description and potential impact)	Team or component impacted by the risk	Mitigation Plan (Action to prevent the risk to materialize)	Contingency Plan - Response Plan (Action in case of the risk materialized)	Probability of occurrence (probability of the risk materialized) High /Medium /Low	Impact High /Medium /Low	Status
1	Katel34	6/27/2018	CII Badging - Casablanca Release Criteria is about addressing test coverage (including JS) Therefore some projects might not pass their CII Badging.	Any Project team who has JS as part of their code and who will not have enough bandwidth	Find an alternative to the current proposal https://lists.onap.org/g/Onap-seccom /topic/cii_badging_passing_level /22721721?p=,,,20,0,0,0:: recentpostdate%2Fsticky,,, 20,2,0,22721721	If it is confirmed that the solution (https://lists.onap.org/g/Onap-seccom/topic/cii_badging_passing_level/22721721?p=,,,20,0,0,0::recentpostdate%2Fsticky,,,20,2,0,22721721) is the right way to move forward then we believe that we should split the JS test coverage into several phases that will be implemented across multiple ONAP releases depending on each project's bandwidth: Phase 1 – Setup the infrastructure Phase 2- Analyze the SONAR test coverage and build a plan to meet JS test coverage criteria Phase 3- Add test cases to meet the JS test coverage criteria	High	Low since agreement on the Mitigation Plan	**In-Process** **6/27/18 update:** Current proposal presente Subcommittee to provide a **7/25/18 update**: Proposal accepted by the test coverage is descoped release with the assumptio perform a pilot (setup infra test cases) as part of the C https://wiki.onap.org/displa /Languages+supported+fo **08/23/18 update**: **Closed** Agreement to close this ris

| 2 | Portal | 6/27/2018 | Policy, VID apps that use portal /sdk will be directly impacted under S3P for logging support from portal/sdk due to lack of resources; | Policy, VID, Portal | Requesting open community for resources who can help with logging in portal/sdk.

20181005: update Helped with exposing their HTTPS/SSL nodeport under

☑ OOM-1455 - new node port for Portal's HTTPS port CLOSED | Actively looking for resources to support the logging integration from Portal perspective. | High | High | Closed

- Sep 27 2018: Th is moved to Dubl

  🔲 LOG-534
  Alignment: Port
  CLOSED

- Aug 09 2018: Mi looking into the p changes needed logging perspecti portal/sdk can be Policy, VID and F As long as the lo in portal/sdk by A risk can be reduc "Medium" and wh consume the sdk be closed.
- 20180726: Log te /AT&T) will work policy on deploy alignment, aaf se

  🔲 LOG-5
  Alignment: containers

  for

  Logging Casa |

3	Portal	6/27/2018	Policy, VID, AAI, SDC will be impacted under Security for AAF role management support required from portal /sdk due to lack of resources;	Policy, VID, AAI, SDC, Portal	Requesting open community for resources who can help with AAF role management and CADI integration in portal/sdk.	SDC, Policy, VID teams agreed that they maintain both HTTP and HTTPs ports open, so that the Portal is not completely broken.	High	Medium	Closed

Closed column detail:

- **Sep 21 2018:** Th integrate with AA via REST as des detail. So the Po portal/sdk versio Casablanca and CADI is deferred
- **Sep 06 2018:** Po with AAF team (J and found few in however workarc and is being worl
  - Portal tea of integra in SDK to already ha communic User Role REST.
  - **To SDC,** We strong you start current ve 2.4.0 (av repository help with process. C integratior implemen at that poi just bump from 2.4.0 anticipatir the client

    Please no aware of t confirm:

    1. SC Us on toc ac ap brc Ca no Sy Au
    2. Ce Ma res inc an
- **Aug 09 2018:** Si Ramasubramani stepped up reque AAF - CADI risk. resources analyz commit for the E integration into p risk priority can b High to Medium.
  - Proposal: CADI inte to comple the work l by any res too late fo teams to same Cas the propo portal-sdk Casablan available depends AAF to pic then plan integrated teams in release).

#	Project	Date	Description	Affected	Impact	Mitigation			Status
4	Portal	6/27/2018	**OOM deployment is impacted if the DB scaling changes are not supported by Portal team; also the changes for simplification of etc/hosts entries impacts the OOM deployment which is not committed by Portal team so far due to lack of resources.**	OOM, Portal	**Requesting open community for resources who can help with deployment upgrades in Portal using OOM.**	OOM team is looking into the OOM integration related Portal JIRA items, we may expect some support or contribution, but not committed yet.	Medium	Medium	Closed • Sep 27 2018: In OOM Team new the common DB of 🔷 OOM-120 to use common **CLOSED** • Sep 06 2018: OO Khosla) working 🔲 OOM-116 common maria to address the a arts that can be u applications (in th • Aug 09 2018: OO into the OOM inte Portal JIRA items some support or committed yet. A the risk can be re Medium.
5	Policy	7/10/2018	Scale Out Use Case: Moving to Dmaap based API call to SO for Scale out. This API was for both VID and Policy to use instead of the REST call for simplicity.	Policy	It doesn't look like the SO team has any epic or user story for developing this work in their M1 planning template.	Fallback to using the current RESTful API to make the call - but this may not be sufficient to satisfy the Use Case.	High	High	The following JIRA was cr side: ⚡ SO-734 - SO must scaleout requests **CLOS** Seshu Kumar Mudiganti - of this work that your AT&T Pamela Dragosh - There is 676 created for the Scaleo 26 Jul 2018 Marking **Clos** during TSC.
6	OOM	7/24/2018	Helm Chart transfer of ownership to project teams.	Prevents project teams from owning helm charts for their components. But more importantly, prevents CI/CD.	Need LF to complete work started in Beijing (ticket # 53102) that addresses: ■ trigger builds per project instead of all projects once daily ■ build related Helm charts per project ■ publish Helm artifacts to LF hosted Helm repo 🔲 OOM-752 - LF support for Helm build job and repository **CLOSED** is blocking 🔲 OOM-1242 - Transfer helm chart ownership to remaining teams **CLOSED** Work has now started and meetings are ongoing - will be addressed shortly.		High	High	Assessed
7	CLAMP	7/19/2018	DCAE-DS service template and policy model not committed for Casablanca	DCAE-DS/SDC, CLAMP	need to agree at least on a design during Casablanca release. need to get commitment from SDC /DCAE-DS on development before 8/8, otherwise it will become a stretch goal for Casablanca	CLAMP will fallback on using just the blueprint for C.L distribution from DCAE-DS /SDC	High	Medium	**Closed** CLAMP will fallback on usi for C.L distribution from D(
8	**CLAMP**	7/19/2018	**Policy team not yet sure to support the full api needed for Guard policy**	**CLAMP, Policy**	**starting the work using the not final API version given by policy team. guard API is a stretch goal for Casablanca**	**CLAMP will support scale out using Beijing policy api + new payload to allow injection of SO parameter manually in CLAMP UI.**	**Medium**	**Low**	Closed **Pamela Dragosh - The understands and has s of doing the guard wo committed to doing th**

9	**APPC**	**7/25/2018**	**Decisions by team on ScaleOut use case for Casablanca is to have SO continue sending the configuration data via the payload, which means this is a test exercise for APPC. If decision is reversed later, then we will need to reassess do-ability based on timeline.**	**APPC, SO**	**Stick to original decision to have SO continue sending configuration data in the ScaleOut request payload.**	**Stick to original decision to have SO continue sending configuration data in the ScaleOut request payload.**	**Low-Medium**	**Medium**	**Closed** **1/8: Got confirmation t continue sending the c via the payload, which test exercise for APPC**	
10	**APPC**	**7/25/2018**	**The requirement for new traffic migration LCM API is not finalized**	**SDNC** **CCSDK**	**Agreement with Ajay: Traffic Migration use case will be planning: 1, Pull Ansible with RESTful server docker image from CCSDK/SDNC, 2, APPC sends request to Ansible server with string of playbook name. 3, VNF owner writes all information in playbook. 4, Ansible server sends RESTful request to VNF in order to do the traffic migration use case.** **Also in R3, APPC with owner of use case will define Traffic Migration LCM API, then implement the Traffic Migration LCM API in R4.**		**Low-Medium**	**Low-Medium**	**In Progress:** **DistrubuteTraffic meet**	
11	**OOF**	**7/25/2018**	**Changes to the ONAP Resource Data Model in R3**	**OOF**	**While OOF doesn't directly interact with SDC, it consumes the model information indirectly through SO/AAI (and passing the solution with some of this information back to SO), and will be impacted if the SO/AAI APIs (and key parts of the payload) change in R3. The chance of occurrence of the risk is low assuming that there will be no/minimal changes to the SO-OOF API and the VNF resource models in AAI when documenting the TOSCA models.**		**Low**	**Medium**	**Closed**	
12	SO	7/19/2018	ATT Ecomp 1806 code merge	SO	The code merge of the seed code of ATT 1806 is gettig delayed due to yang model changes. This if further delayed could be an issue for the SO deliverables for Casablanca.	If the code is not merged by July end time frame then we will need to drop the features for casablanca scope.	High	High	**Closed**	
13	SO	7/24/2018	Scale out feature is risky from SO side	SO	The detailed design and the E2E flows are not yet clear and needs to be finalised at the earliest for this feature to go through	The Usecase may not be able to make it in Casablanca without this clarity being bought.	Medium	High	closed	
14	VID	8/1/2018	Scale out requirements are not finalized	Scaling use case	Finalize requirements, or fallback to Beijing implementation of scaling out	Meeting today with Scott and Steve (SO)	Medium	Medium	**Closed**	
15	VID	8/1/2018	Need for AAF certification to implement HTTPS support	AAF integration			Medium	Medium	**Closed**	
16	CLAMP	8/10/2018	Need Policy API change to support Logging Specification 1.2	CLAMP, Policy	Try to get resources for the API change	CLAMP, Policy won't be 100% compliant with the spec, will still try to implement other parts	Medium	Medium	**Closed** this policy api used by CLA log spec given that Policy resources to implement it.	
17	Sparky-be	9/10/2018	Without AAF integration sparky can not launch on Https mode. Which means that portal also must launch in http to let sparky launch in http. This also means that CII requirements wont be meet by sparky	Sparky-be, AAI	Portal should be configured to launch using both http and https. When AAI-UI (sparky) needs to be launched portal should be opened on http mode.					

18	Policy	9/19/2018	HPA Use Case There were not enough resources given to support the HPA use case. Although Ericsson and AT&T covered the majority of the work, some parts of the development were not finished: CSIT, and S3P.	Policy	Utilize manual creation of policies as was done in Beijing.	Request Intel to provide resource to finish the work and drive testing for this.	High	Low	
19 done	Logging	10/02/2018	Release multiple 6 jars/1 war in single repo - issues with all or nothing build	logging only	https://lists.onap.org/g/onap-discuss/topic/release_procedure_for_repos/26675742?p=,,,20,0,0,0::recentpostdate%2Fsticky,,,20,2,0,26675742 This is the first release of logging with actual jar/war artifacts that may need to be in a 1:1 artifact/repo structure instead	work with LF to manually release each artifact by adjusting the pom structure for each artifact	medium	medium (our artifacts jars/war/docker/kubernetes) are for demo only and not used by any team in onap yet	LOG-715 - Release by RC0 CLOSED