2019-09-04 - [CNTT - RM - Ch 8] Agenda and Meeting Minutes

Wednesday August 28, 2019

Attendees:

Please add your name in here:

- MICHAEL FIX (AT&T)
- Kelvin Edmison (Nokia)
- Rajamani Rajesh (Spirent)
- Mark Shostak (AT&T)
- Qiao Fu (China Mobile)
- Toshiyasu Wakayama (Toshi, KDDI)
- Justin Higa (Spirent)

Agenda:

- **Informational.** Zoom change 9/11
- **Sections 8.1-8.3.** No open issues/feedback.
- **Overall Status (CNTT Gov, 9/5)**
  - Following status will be provided / read at the CNTT Gov call Thursday
    - Developing content - in progress for Ch 8
    - Follow-up CNTT > OPNFV > CVC alignment discussions planned for 04 Sep 2019
    - Test Case Gap Assessment (8.7.9) - email 9/4-9/5 socializing test category/case recommendations, soliciting feedback 11 Sep 2019
      - Add service/service-configuration (Cedric)
      - SPOC is Murtuza Khan (to collect input/feedback)
      - Spirent to provide additional test case feedback to Murtuza (Rajesh)
    - Formal OPNFV Proj Proposal
      - ☑ Draft complete 8/22
      - ☑ Entered into OPNFV 8/23
      - ☑ CNTT Gov review 8/29, Feedback due 9/8
      - ☐ OPNFV Community Review 09 Sep 2019 , Feedback due 16 Sep 2019
      - ☐ OPNFV TSC Vote/Approval 17 Sep 2019
    - ❓Exploring Need for Ref Implementation Lab
      - **Potential RI recommendation**
        - 8 servers = 4 compute + 3 control + jump host
          - supports parallel host profile/failover testing
          - supports rack failover scenarios
        - Logical separation across 2 racks, if not physical
        - 2nd environment desired for concurrent testing of different RIs/RMs = so, 16 servers altogether, across 4 racks
        - Same geographical location
      - **Questions:**
        - Is a 2nd env necessary? - recommended, absolute
        - If so, is there a need to separate two labs for GeoR testing? recommended, absolute
        - Are 4 computes and 3 control nodes sufficient? Are there any concerns? (similar to Pharos) - recommended

- **Open Issues**
  - Issue log
    - For Botrange: 236, 217, 207, 161, 159
    - Remaining: 216, 166, 164, 163, 162 - WIP
    - https://github.com/cntt-n/CNTT/issues?utf8=%E2%9C%93&q=is%3Aissue+is%3Aopen+8+in%3Atitle
  - Issue #217 - Define Verification / Validation
    - https://www.softwaretestingmaterial.com/verification-and-validation/
    - http://softwaretestingfundamentals.com/verification-vs-validation/
    - In software testing, verification and validation are the processes to check whether a software system meets the specifications and that it fulfills its intended purpose or not. Verification and validation is also known as V & V. It may also be referred to as software quality control.
    - **Verification: (Static)**
      - **Verification is verifying the documents**
      - **Verification** is the process, to ensure that whether we are building the product right i.e., to verify the requirements which we have and to verify whether we are developing the product accordingly or not.
      - Activities involved here are Inspections, Reviews, Walk throughs
    - **Validation: (Dynamic)**
      - **Validation is to validate the actual and expected output of the software**
      - **Validation** is the process, whether we are building the right product i.e., to validate the product which we have developed is right or not.

- Activities involved in this is Testing the software application

Differences

Criteria	Verification	Validation
Definition	The process of evaluating work-products (not the actual final product) of a development phase to determine whether they meet the specified requirements for that phase.	The process of evaluating software during or at the end of the development process to determine whether it satisfies specified business requirements.
Objective	To ensure that the product is being built according to the requirements and design specifications. In other words, to ensure that work products meet their specified requirements.	To ensure that the product actually meets the user's needs and that the specifications were correct in the first place. In other words, to demonstrate that the product fulfills its intended use when placed in its intended environment.
Question	Are we building the product *right*?	Are we building the *right* product?
Evaluation Items	Plans, Requirement Specs, Design Specs, Code, Test Cases	The actual product/software.
Activities	- Reviews - Walkthroughs - Inspections	Testing

-
  - **Certification:** https://users.ece.cmu.edu/~koopman/des_s99/verification/ - **Verification/Validation/Certification**
    - Certifications include adherence to, and demonstrated proficiency with, planning, development, requirements, verifying, validating, and logistics for communications
    - Generally, standards imposed to provide evidence of skill level, and delivery competence
    - Certifications in software testing are difficult and often based on the methodology, development, and demonstrated performance
    - Issue #236 - Add Interoperability Checks as Exit Criteria
    - Issue #161 - Add Test Case Descriptions and Purpose
      - e.g. Openstack Compute Component - validations
- **Discuss | Review Sections 8.4-8.6**
  - 8.4: What is missing for life-cycle management?
  - 8.5: Current OVP and CVC process. Anything missing?
- **Walk-on Items**
  - None
- **Next Steps**
  - Project Proposal - OPNFV Community & TSC
  - Continued Documentation Revisions & Reviews

Actions:

- **9/4 Meeting**
  - ☐ **Owner: All** Requesting all team members to review/comment on 8.6 between 9/3-9/11, for discussion 9/11.
    - https://github.com/cntt-n/CNTT/blob/chapter08/doc/ref_model/chapters/chapter08.md
  - ☐ **Owner: Mike Fix (AT&T)** - Verify Validation/Verification/Certification is consistent with CVC verbiage
  - ☐ **Owner: Murtuza Khan (AT&T)** - Add additional test case descriptions
  - ☐ **Owner: Kyle Greenwell (Verizon) -** generate a PR to merge w/ Master
- **8/28 Meeting**
  - ☑ **Done!** Add Labels to GitHub Issues to help with Search (**Owners: All, but primarily Mike, Kyle**) (recommendation from Kelvin, Nokia)
  - ☑ **Done - but, added to 8.7.9!** Add Murtuza Khan assessment of Test Cases/Harness (in relation to Functest) on Wiki page under consideration (**Owner: Murtuza K**)
  - ☑ **Done - but, need contributor support to assess.** Add {Name} XCI --> include to Etherpad installer project gap analysis done (**Owner: Mike Fix**; will also inform CNTT internal Ch 8 team on 8/28 about the new Installer effort needing review)
  - ☑ **Owner: ALL** Requesting all team members to review/comment on next sections 8.4-8.6 (changed to 8.5) by 9/3 **for discussion 9/4.**
    - https://github.com/cntt-n/CNTT/blob/chapter08/doc/ref_model/chapters/chapter08.md