



EGI-InSPIRE

UMD QUALITY CRITERIA v5

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Document identifier: | EGI-QC-V5-GridSAM.doc |
| Date: | 26/04/2013 |
| Document Link: | https://documents.egi.eu/document/1153 |

Abstract

This document describes the Quality Criteria that all software of the UMD distribution must meet.



Copyright notice

Copyright © Members of the EGI-InSPIRE Collaboration, 2010. See www.egi.eu for details of the EGI-InSPIRE project and the collaboration. EGI-InSPIRE (“European Grid Initiative: Integrated Sustainable Pan-European Infrastructure for Researchers in Europe”) is a project co-funded by the European Commission as an Integrated Infrastructure Initiative within the 7th Framework Programme. EGI-InSPIRE began in May 2010 and will run for 4 years. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, and USA. The work must be attributed by attaching the following reference to the copied elements: “Copyright © Members of the EGI-InSPIRE Collaboration, 2010. See www.egi.eu for details of the EGI-InSPIRE project and the collaboration”. Using this document in a way and/or for purposes not foreseen in the license, requires the prior written permission of the copyright holders. The information contained in this document represents the views of the copyright holders as of the date such views are published.

Document Log

| Issue | Date | Comment | Author/Partner |
|-----------|------------|---|----------------|
| v0.1 | 02/11/2010 | First draft | Enol Fernández |
| v1.0 | 03/11/2010 | Changed Management, Traceability and Monitoring section | Enol Fernández |
| v1.1 | 03/11/2010 | Added Probe description in GEN_MON_1 | Enol Fernández |
| v1.2 | 11/11/2010 | Some formatting update | Enol Fernández |
| v1.3 | 31/01/2011 | Better test specification | Enol Fernández |
| 1.4 | 09/02/2011 | Review of criteria | Enol Fernández |
| 2 DRAFT 1 | 24/06/2011 | Preparation of new release | Enol Fernández |
| 2 | 02/08/2011 | Reorganisation, added new criteria. | Enol Fernández |
| 3 DRAFT 1 | 13/10/2011 | First draft of release 3 | Enol Fernández |
| 3 DRAFT 2 | 24/01/2012 | Second draft of release 3 | Enol Fernández |
| 4 DRAFT 1 | 21/05/2012 | First public draft of release 4 | Enol Fernández |
| 4 DRAFT 2 | 23/07/2012 | Second public draft of release 4 | Enol Fernández |
| 5 | 10/20/2013 | Release 5 | Enol Fernández |



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Documentation..... | 5 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_1..... | 5 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_2..... | 6 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_3..... | 7 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_4..... | 8 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_5..... | 9 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_6..... | 10 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_7..... | 11 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_8..... | 12 |
| | GENERIC_DOC_9..... | 13 |
| 2 | Software Distribution | 14 |
| | GENERIC_DIST_1 | 14 |
| | GENERIC_DIST_3 | 15 |
| 3 | Software Features | 16 |
| | GENERIC_SOFT_1..... | 16 |
| | GENERIC_SOFT_2..... | 17 |
| 4 | Service Criteria | 18 |
| 4.1 | Service Management..... | 18 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_1..... | 18 |
| 4.2 | Service logs..... | 20 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_2..... | 20 |
| 4.3 | Service Monitoring | 20 |
| 4.4 | Service Accounting | 20 |
| 4.5 | Availability, Reliability and Scalability..... | 21 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_3..... | 21 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_4..... | 22 |
| 4.6 | Service Configuration | 23 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_5..... | 23 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_6..... | 24 |
| | GENERIC_SERVICE_7..... | 25 |
| 5 | Security..... | 26 |
| | GENERIC_SEC_1 | 26 |
| | GENERIC_SEC_3 | 27 |
| 6 | Miscellaneous | 28 |
| | GENERIC_MISC_1 | 28 |
| 7 | Authentication..... | 29 |
| 7.1 | Authentication Credentials..... | 29 |
| | AUTHN_CRED_1..... | 29 |
| | AUTHN_CRED_2..... | 30 |
| | AUTHN_CRED_3..... | 31 |
| 7.2 | Authentication Protocols..... | 32 |
| | AUTHN_PROTO_1..... | 32 |
| 7.3 | Delegation Interface..... | 33 |
| | AUTHN_DELEG_1 | 33 |
| 8 | Authorisation..... | 34 |
| 8.1 | Policy Definition..... | 34 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| 8.1.1 | Service Based Authorisation (Not Using Argus) | 34 |
| | AUTHZ_PCYDEF_3 | 34 |
| | AUTHZ_PCYDEF_4 | 35 |
| 8.2 | Policy Enforcement | 36 |
| | AUTHZ_PEP_2 | 36 |
| | AUTHZ_PEP_3 | 37 |
| 9 | Job Execution | 38 |
| 9.1 | Job Execution Interface | 38 |
| | JOBEXEC_IFACE_1 | 38 |
| 9.2 | Job Submission tests | 39 |
| | JOBEXEC_JOB_1 | 39 |
| | JOBEXEC_JOB_2 | 40 |
| | JOBEXEC_JOB_3 | 41 |
| 9.3 | Execution Manager Support | 42 |
| | JOBEXEC_EXECMNGR_1 | 42 |
| | JOBEXEC_EXECMNGR_2 | 43 |
| | JOBEXEC_EXECMNGR_3 | 44 |
| 9.4 | Availability/Scalability | 45 |
| | JOBEXEC_AVAIL_1 | 45 |
| | JOBEXEC_AVAIL_2 | 46 |
| | JOBEXEC_AVAIL_4 | 47 |
| 10 | Parallel Job | 48 |
| 10.1 | Submission of parallel jobs | 48 |
| | PARALLEL_JOB_1 | 48 |
| | PARALLEL_JOB_2 | 49 |
| | PARALLEL_JOB_3 | 50 |
| 11 | Information Model | 51 |
| 11.1 | Information Model Schema | 51 |
| | INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_1 | 51 |
| | INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_2 | 52 |
| | INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_3 | 53 |
| 12 | Monitoring Probes | 54 |
| 12.1 | Service Probes | 54 |
| | MON_PROBE_GENERIC_1 | 54 |
| | MON_PROBE_GENERIC_2 | 55 |
| 12.1.1 | Job Execution Capability Probes | 56 |
| | MON_PROBE_JOBEXEC_1 | 56 |
| 13 | Accounting Capability | 57 |
| 13.1 | Generation of Accounting Records | 57 |
| | ACC_JOBEXEC_1 | 57 |
| 14 | Client Tools | 58 |
| 14.1 | Generic client tools criteria | 58 |
| | CLIENT_TOOLS_1 | 58 |
| | CLIENT_TOOLS_2 | 59 |
| 15 | References | 60 |

1 DOCUMENTATION

Services in UMD must include a comprehensive documentation written in a uniform and clear style. All Quality Criteria described below may be met by a single document that contains all the requested sections.

| Functional Description | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_1 |
| Description | All products must provide a document with a brief functional description of the product. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products |
| Input from Technology Provider | Document (or link) with a general description of the product that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Purpose of the product• Capabilities meet by the product |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The document should exist and contain the requested information. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: clarified the required documentation |

| Release Notes | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_2 |
| Description | All products must provide a document with the release notes. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products |
| Input from Technology Provider | Document (or link) with release notes of the product. They must include major the changes in the product: bug fixes, new features. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The document should exist and contain the requested information. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | |

| User Documentation | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_3 |
| Description | All products must provide a document describing how to use it. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products with end-user tools and services. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Document (or link) with user guide describing the functionality of the software and how to use it. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The document should exist and contain the requested information. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | |

| Online help (man pages) | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_4 |
| Description | All products with end user command line tools must include man pages or online help. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products with command line tools. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Man pages with information about the usage of commands. If man pages are not available, comprehensive help options must be included with the command with information about the usage (i.e. -h/--help option) |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Online help should be available (man pages or command line help). Command line help should give meaningful cues (i.e., only a list of single-letter options is not sufficient) If both command line help (-h option) and man pages are provided they must be mutually consistent (describe the same set of options and their meaning). |
| Related Information | GGUS ticket # 73214 |
| Revision Log | V3: Tighten wording to avoid situations as described in GGUS #73214 |

| API Documentation | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_5 |
| Description | Public API of product/appliances must be documented. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products with public API. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Documentation (or link) of the API of the product. The documentation <i>should</i> cover all the existing public functionality of the API. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The document should exist and contain the API documentation. If the product implements a well-known or standard API, any missing functionality must be documented. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: review of the description |

| Administrator Documentation | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_6 |
| Description | Products must provide an administrator guide describing installation, configuration and operation of the system. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products managed by an administrator. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Documentation (or link) with requested documentation. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The document should exist and contain the requested information. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | |

| Service Reference Card | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|---|---------|--|---------------|---|------|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Description | For each of the services that a product runs, document its characteristics with a reference card. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandatory | NO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicability | All products that need services for operation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Input from Technology Provider | Documentation (or link) with requested documentation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>The document must exist and contain the following information for each service:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">ServiceName</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Description</td> <td>Description of the service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Init scripts</td> <td>List of init scripts for the service, expected run levels</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Daemons</td> <td>List of daemons needed for the service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Configuration</td> <td>List of configuration files used by the service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Logs</td> <td>List of log files used by the service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open ports</td> <td>List of ports the service uses</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cron</td> <td>List of crons used by the service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other information</td> <td>Any other relevant information about the service.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | ServiceName | | Description | Description of the service | Init scripts | List of init scripts for the service, expected run levels | Daemons | List of daemons needed for the service | Configuration | List of configuration files used by the service | Logs | List of log files used by the service | Open ports | List of ports the service uses | Cron | List of crons used by the service | Other information | Any other relevant information about the service. |
| ServiceName | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Description | Description of the service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Init scripts | List of init scripts for the service, expected run levels | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daemons | List of daemons needed for the service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Configuration | List of configuration files used by the service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Logs | List of log files used by the service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Open ports | List of ports the service uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cron | List of crons used by the service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other information | Any other relevant information about the service. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Related Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revision Log | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Software License | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_8 |
| Description | Products must have a compatible license for using them in the EGI Infrastructure |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Product License (link or document). |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Pass: if the license is available and is compatible with the EGI infrastructure.</p> <p>For Open Source products, compatible licenses are those accepted by the Open Source Initiative and categorized as “Popular and widely used or with strong communities”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apache License, 2.0 (Apache-2.0) - BSD 3-Clause "New" or "Revised" license (BSD-3-Clause) - BSD 3-Clause "Simplified" or "FreeBSD" license (BSD-2-Clause) - GNU General Public License (GPL) - GNU Library or "Lesser" General Public License (LGPL) - MIT license (MIT) - Mozilla Public License 1.1 (MPL-1.1) - Common Development and Distribution License (CDDL-1.0) - Eclipse Public License (EPL-1.0) <p>Other licenses accepted by the Open Source Initiative and listed as “Special Purpose” are compatible with the infrastructure (when applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Educational Community License - IPA Font License (IPA) - NASA Open Source Agreement 1.3 (NASA-1.3) - Open Font License 1.1 (OFL-1.1) <p>Any other license, and non Open Source products will be evaluated by the verification team in coordination with the Operations Community.</p> |
| Related Information | Open Source Initiative Licenses by Category: http://www.opensource.org/licenses/category |
| Revision Log | V2: Moved from Software Release to documentation. |

| Release changes testing | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_DOC_9 |
| Description | Changes in a release of a product must be tested. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Tests (or documentation for the test results) for relevant changes described in the product release notes, including bug fixes and any new features. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Pass if the TP provides documentation of the tests performed to certify the release quality. The documentation <i>should</i> describe tests (and tests results) for all the changes included, especially bug fixes.</p> <p>The granularity of the testing documentation will be determined per release basis. In the case of missing tests, the verifier will decide if the provided information is enough to trust quality of the changes introduced in the software.</p> |
| Related Information | MS503: Software Provisioning Process |
| Revision Log | <p>V2: Better specification of the pass/fail criteria. Moved to documentation criteria</p> <p>V3: improvement of the pass/fail criteria.</p> <p>V4: better wording after IGE review, turned into NOT mandatory.</p> |

2 SOFTWARE DISTRIBUTION

| Source Code Availability | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DIST_1 |
| Description | Open Source Products should provide their source code. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All Open Source Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Source code repository or source distribution of product with building documentation. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Open source products must publicly offer their source code and the license with the binaries. Build documentation (or link to it) should be available. Ideally, automatic or continuous build procedures exist. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: Changed ID (previously GENERIC_REL_2) V4: Merged GENERIC_DIST_1 and GENERIC_DIST_2 & Turned into not mandatory |

| Binary Distribution | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_DIST_3 |
| Description | Products must be available in the native packaging format of the supported platform. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Binary distribution of product in the native packaging format of the supported platform (RPM, DEB, ...) |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Binary packages using the standard packaging format of the OS (i.e. RPM, DEB...) must be provided for all the supported OS and/or architectures. - Packages must be signed by the TP - Packages <i>should</i> follow OS packaging policies (e.g. names of packages, <u>use of filesystem hierarchy</u>, init scripts). Any deviance from the policies must be documented. - Second level dependencies (i.e. software not provided by the TP in their repository) must be provided by the OS distribution or standard OS repositories (EPEL in SL5 & SL6). In the case of needing a different version for a specific package or packages from other repositories, the verifier will decide whether to accept or not the packages depending on the reason given for such dependencies on external packages. |
| Related Information | Verification reports from EMI release 1. #1357: Middleware use standard file locations GGUS #82417: https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=82417 |
| Revision Log | V2: Turn to mandatory, better description to avoid problems found in verification. Changed ID (previously GENERIC_REL_5) V4: Added requirement for signed packages. |

3 SOFTWARE FEATURES

| Backwards Compatibility | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_SOFT_1 |
| Description | Minor/Revision releases of a product must be backwards compatible. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Products must maintain backwards compatibility between releases of the same major version. Ideally, TP provides tests to assure the backwards compatibility of the product. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | All the changes in a minor or revision release <i>must</i> be backward compatible (test should be done with previous releases of clients within the same major version). Any new features should not introduce changes in the previous features. |
| Related Information | MS503: Software Provisioning Process IGE QC |
| Revision Log | |

| New features testing | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_SOFT_2 |
| Description | Verification should cover testing of new features and bug fixes. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Release notes with changes in the software. The verifier will review each of the changes and check its correctness (whenever possible) |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | New features and bug fixes specified in the release notes work as documented. Some new features may not be tested if they are not relevant to the main capability of the product. |
| Related Information | MS503: Software Provisioning Process IGE QC |
| Revision Log | |

4 SERVICE CRITERIA

4.1 Service Management

UMD products should have mechanisms for managing them, monitoring their status and tracing actions they perform on the system. Ideally, these should be also available remotely, allowing operators to react timely to problems in the infrastructure. This generic criteria for services is the minimum set of service related

| Service control and status | |
|----------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_1 |
| Description | Services run by the product must provide a mechanism for starting, stopping and querying the status of the services. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products that use services for operations. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Input from Technology Provider | Start/stop mechanism for each of the services following OS conventions. Ideally, provide a test suite for the mechanism as described below. |
| Test Description | Pre-condition Service is started Test Start service Expected Outcome No action taken, show a message stating the service is already started. |
| | Pre-condition Service is stopped Test Start service Expected Outcome Service is started, show a message when it is started. |
| | Pre-condition Service is started Test Stop service Expected Outcome Service is stopped, show a message stating the service is stopped. |
| | Pre-condition Service is stopped Test Stop service Expected Outcome No action taken, show a message stating the service is already stopped. |
| | Pre-condition Service is stopped Test Check service status Expected Outcome Show a message stating the service is stopped. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Service is started</p> <p>Test Check service status</p> <p>Expected Outcome Show a message stating the service is started.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Services run by the product must provide a mechanism for starting, stopping and querying the status of the services following the OS init scripts conventions (e.g. for Linux Distributions, check http://refspecs.freestandards.org/LSB_3.1.0/LSB-Core-generic/LSB-Core-generic/inisrptact.html). They must work properly in all the cases described above.</p> <p>If the OS provides tools for configuring the services (chkconfig in RH based distros), these <i>should</i> work out of the box with the init scripts of the services</p> |
| Related Information | <p>#2274: Service under RH following SystemV init system</p> <p>#1201: Homogeneity in service control.</p> |
| Revision Log | <p>V3: Added related information, fix test conditions.</p> |

4.2 Service logs

| Log Files | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_2 |
| Description | All services should create log files where the service administrator can trace most relevant actions taken. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products that use services for operations. |
| Input from Technology Provider | List of logs generated by the service (the reference card of service should already include them) |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | List of logs is provided. They should follow the OS conventions for location and format so they can be treated with the standard tools of the OS (log rotation, collection with syslog, ...) |
| Related Information | This criterion may be further specialized in the specific criteria for each product/capability determining which information must be logged or number/types of logs. #1357: Middleware use standard file locations |
| Revision Log | V2: Review of the criteria. V4: Added related information |

4.3 Service Monitoring

All services in the EGI Infrastructure should provide monitoring probes that can be executed automatically by the EGI monitoring framework (based in Nagios). The probes should check the service responsiveness and correctness (good replies for typical requests).

Particular monitoring probes are defined at the Specific Quality Criteria document for Operations tools. The probes that apply to all capabilities (generic probes) are identified as MON_PROBE_GENERIC_xx. For specific capabilities there might exist other probes that are described in the same document.

4.4 Service Accounting

All services in the EGI Infrastructure should provide ways of recording the use of resources within the infrastructure. The Accounting Capability described in the Operations Capabilities Criteria document specifies the criteria for the different appliances.

4.5 Availability, Reliability and Scalability.

The EGI Infrastructure depends on the uninterrupted performance of the installed software. All products should provide a reliable operation and should be able to handle growing amounts of work in a graceful manner. Specific criteria for the availability, reliability or scalability of appliances may be also defined in the criteria documents for each of the capabilities.

| Service Reliability | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_3 |
| Description | Services must maintain a good performance and reliability over long periods of time with normal operation. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products that use services for operations. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Long running unattended operation test measuring performance of the product. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Product is properly configured.</p> <p>Test Start service and measure performance during operations.</p> <p>Expected Outcome No significant performance degradation is observed in the system.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Service must not show performance degradation during a 3-day period. The most important parameters to check are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stable memory usage • throughput and/or response times remain stable during the period of activity (they should be as good or better than at the beginning of the test for similar requests) |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: detailed pass/fail criteria |

| Service Robustness | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_4 |
| Description | Services should not produce unexpected results or become uncontrollable when taxed beyond normal capacity. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products that use services for operations. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Assure that the services taxed beyond normal capacity do not produce unexpected results or become uncontrollable. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Services taxed beyond normal capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should not become unresponsive to normal start/stop operations • must be able to start after a forceful stop • must not expose (potentially sensitive) memory contents to other processes • must not leave sensitive data in world-readable files • must not accept connections that would be refused under normal operating conditions |
| Related Information | TST_2 from IGE Quality Assurance. |
| Revision Log | |

4.6 Service Configuration

| Automatic Configuration | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_5 |
| Description | Products that provide tools for configuration (yaim) that covers typical deployments must assure tools work as documented. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Products with automatic configuration tools |
| Input from Technology Provider | Tests of the automatic configuration tool (yaim) in typical deployment scenario. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the product can be configured as documented with the provided tool. Resulting configuration must prepare the product for operation without extra manual configuration steps (unless clearly documented). |
| Related Information | Yaim: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/YAIM UMD 1.0.0 Verification Reports. |
| Revision Log | V3: Removed the requirement for keeping manual configurations. |

| Default Password Configuration | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_6 |
| Description | Products should not use default passwords. If the service needs a password, it must be generated randomly or force the admin to introduce one. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products with passwords. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Configuration should never have default passwords. If there is an automated configuration generator (e.g. yaim) it must request the user to set one or generate a random one. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | No default passwords are used for configuration of services. |
| Related Information | SVG Advisory 1414: https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SVG:Advisory-SVG-2011-1414 |
| Revision Log | |

| Default Configuration | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_SERVICE_7 |
| Description | Default configuration of the service should be <i>usable</i> . |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Documentation on the default values of any optional configuration parameters. Default values for those values reasonable for the normal operation of the service in a standard installation. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the documentation of the default values of the optional configuration parameters is available and the service runs with those default values (in a standard installation). |
| Related Information | VOMS mass user suspension (RT #3585) |
| Revision Log | |

5 SECURITY

| World Writable Files | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | GENERIC_SEC_1 |
| Description | Products must not create world-writable files or directories. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | World-writable files and directories are dangerous since they allows anyone to modify them, several vulnerabilities in recent years have been due to world writable files and directories being present when they should not be. Technology Provider must assure that they software do not produce world writable files in order to prevent new vulnerabilities being introduced in the future. Ideally a test that checks that those files do not exist should be provided. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Service correctly configured and started</p> <p>Test Check the existence of world writable or unowned files in the system.</p> <p>Expected Outcome No world writable or unowned files exist.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The product should not create world-writable files or directories. If any world-writable files are needed for the normal operation of the service, these should be documented. Logs and config files must not be world-writable. |
| Related Information | Proposed by the EGI SVG RAT to prevent new vulnerabilities in the future. |
| Revision Log | V1.3 Changed test description. V4: improved pass/fail criteria. |

| Passwords in world readable files | |
|--|--|
| ID | GENERIC_SEC_3 |
| Description | Service password must not be stored in world readable files. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All products with passwords. |
| Input from Technology Provider | If the product uses passwords stored in files, those files must not be world readable. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | No passwords are stored in world readable files. |
| Related Information | SVG Advisory 1414: https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SVG:Advisory-SVG-2011-1414 |
| Revision Log | |

6 MISCELLANEOUS

| Bug Tracking System | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | GENERIC_MISC_1 |
| Description | TP must enrol as 3 rd level support in the EGI Helpdesk. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | All Products. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Technology Providers must enrol in GGUS as 3 rd level support for the products verified by the Quality Assurance team of EGI. Any further integration with TP-specific bug tracking software is entirely up to the Technology Provider. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if Technology Provider enlisted as 3 rd level support in GGUS. |
| Related Information | IGE QC |
| Revision Log | |

7 AUTHENTICATION

An authentication token that is strongly bound to an individual must be applied consistently across the software used within the production infrastructure. The authentication system should be capable of supporting a delegation model.

7.1 Authentication Credentials

| X.509 Certificate support | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | AUTHN_CRED_1 |
| Description | Primary authentication token within the infrastructure is the X.509 certificate and its proxy derivatives. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Authentication Appliances. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for X.509 certificate (and proxy derivatives) as credential token for authentication. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the appliance is able to use X.509 certificates as authentication token. The appliance <i>should</i> also support proxy derivatives. |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] |
| Revision Log | |

| SHA-2 Certificate support | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | AUTHN_CRED_2 |
| Description | SHA-2 certificates should be accepted by middleware. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Authentication Appliances. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for certificates and proxies with SHA-2 cryptographic hash functions. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the appliance is able to use SHA-2 certificates as authentication token. Information on how to get and test with SHA-2 certificates is available at [R 2] |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] Support for SHA2 proxies RT #3078 |
| Revision Log | |

| RFC Proxy support | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | AUTHN_CRED_3 |
| Description | RFC proxies should be accepted by middleware. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Authentication Appliances that |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for RFC proxies as credential tokens for authentication. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the appliance is able to use RFC proxies as authentication token. Information on how to create RFC proxies is available at [R 2] |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] |
| Revision Log | |

7.2 Authentication Protocols

| TLS/SSLv3 Support | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | AUTHN_PROTO_1 |
| Description | TLS/SSLv3/v2 with client-side authentication must be supported. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Authentication Appliances. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for accessing resources through protocols that are secured using SSL or TLS (e.g. plain socket, or https connections). If the component exposes a WebService that requires authentication, it should use the X.509 certificates/proxies with the https protocol. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the product uses SSL or TLS for accessing it. For the current releases of UMD, products still using GSI authentication (with httpg for WebServices) may be accepted, <u>this exception may be dropped</u> in future releases of the criterion. |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] |
| Revision Log | V2: Added GSI (httpg) exception for products that have not yet transitioned V4: changed from AUTH_IFACE_1 to AUTH_PROTO_1. |

7.3 Delegation Interface

| Delegation Interface | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | AUTHN_DELEG_1 |
| Description | Delegation of credentials must be provided using one of the supported delegation interfaces: GridSite or Globus 4. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Authentication Appliances that provide (require) delegation. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Delegation implementation that includes all functionality of the GridSite or Globus 4 interfaces. Correct handling for erroneous input. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the delegation interface is tested and works as expected. Appliances must support at least one of the following interfaces: GridSite delegation or Globus 4 delegation. |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] GridSite Delegation [R 34] Globus Delegation [R 35] |
| Revision Log | V2: Merged AUTHN_DELEG_1 & 2. |

8 AUTHORISATION

8.1 Policy Definition

8.1.1 Service Based Authorisation (Not Using Argus)

| Ban User/Group of users | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | AUTHZ_PCYDEF_3 |
| Description | Administrators must be able to define policies that ban users (black list). |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Authorisation Appliances without PAP (Argus) |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for banning of single user (defined by a DNs) or by a set of users (defined by role/group attributes or FQANs). |
| Test Description | Pre-condition Configured system. Test Ban policy for user/group. Test access for user/group. Expected Outcome Ban policy is correctly enforced. |
| | Pre-condition Configured system. Banning policy for user/group defined Test Unban user/group. Test access for user/group. Expected Outcome User/group is allowed. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the banning policies can be defined and enforced at least for users, ideally support role/groups attributes for defining policies. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V4: better wording, not mandatory since for some service only white list policies can be defined. |

| Allowed users definition | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | AUTHZ_PCYDEF_4 |
| Description | Administrators must be determine which users/groups are allowed in the system |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Authorisation Appliances without PAP |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for allowing users/groups of users in the system. Support for defining allowed users (determined by DNs) or groups (defined by a set of role/group attributes or FQANs). |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Configured system.</p> <p>Test Allow user/group access into system. Test access for user/group.</p> <p>Expected Outcome User/group is allowed in the system.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the banning policies can be defined and enforced at least for individual users, ideally support role/groups attributes for defining policies. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: Restricted policy definition to allowing access (full control of policy is expected in Argus like systems) V4: reviewed wording |

8.2 Policy Enforcement

| User Mapping | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | AUTHZ_PEP_2 |
| Description | The authorisation capability should provide mapping of authorized users to local accounts. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Authorisation Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for mapping of users to local accounts; with/without VOMS attributes (or any other role/group attributes schema agreed), and with/without pool accounts. The preferred mapping mechanism is the gridmap dir using gridmapfiles for defining the mappings. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Configured system. No previous mapping for user.</p> <p>Test Accepted authorisation.</p> <p>Expected Outcome GID/UID of the mapping returned. Primary group determined by role/group attributes if available. For gridmap based mapping, new entry in grid map is created.</p> |
| | <p>Pre-condition Configured system. Previous mapping for user existing.</p> <p>Test Accepted authorisation.</p> <p>Expected Outcome GID/UID of the previous mapping returned.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Pass if the mapping is performed as defined in the AuthZ appliance (e.g according to a gridmapfile).</p> <p>The use of pool accounts is desirable, although the criteria can pass if not supported.</p> <p>The verifier may accept other mapping mechanisms after discussion within the verification team.</p> |
| Related Information | <p>UMD Roadmap [R 1]</p> <p>Argus [R 37]</p> |
| Revision Log | V4: removed FQAN references, relaxed pool account support. |

| Integration with authorisation appliances (ARGUS) | |
|--|--|
| ID | AUTHZ_PEP_3 |
| Description | Services should be able to use external authorisation appliance (ARGUS) |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Services requiring authorisation |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for using an authorization appliance that applies the authorization policies and returns a mapping to a local account. The preferred authorization appliance is ARGUS. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the service is able to get authorization and authentication from correctly configured authorization appliance (ARGUS) |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] Argus [R 37] |
| Revision Log | |

9 JOB EXECUTION

9.1 Job Execution Interface

Currently, there are different interfaces considered for the Job Execution Capability, although not interoperable several of them co-exist in the EGI Infrastructure. The implementations must support, at least, one of the interfaces listed.

| Job Execution Interface | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | JOBEXEC_IFACE_1 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances must support (at least one of) the interfaces currently in production in the EGI Infrastructure or identified by the UMD Roadmap |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Implementation of one of the Job Execution Interface as defined in the UMD Roadmap. Ideally, a complete test suite of the Job Execution interfaces supported by the appliance. The test suite must include tests for all the documented functions, and for all functions, check both correct and invalid input and with valid and invalid credentials. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials.</p> <p>Test Test all interface functionality, with correct/incorrect input and with valid and invalid credentials.</p> <p>Expected Outcome Log of all the operations performed. All the documented functions work as documented. Errors/exceptions should be generated as documented.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>The Job Execution Appliance that claims to support an interface must pass complete tests for that interface (provided by the TP or by the verification team). If the API is not completely supported, this must be documented. The test suite must be executed without errors.</p> <p>At least one of the following interfaces must be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARC-CE gridFTP [R 11] • CREAM [R 12] • EMI-ES [R 13] • Globus GRAM5 [R 14] • OGSA BES [R 16] • UNICORE UAS [R 18] |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] |
| Revision Log | V2: unification of several criteria regarding interfaces into this one. V3: removed DRMAA as possible interface. |

9.2 Job Submission tests

The following tests propose example job descriptions using the gLite JDL format for the specification of jobs. These examples are just used for illustrative purposes. Each appliance should execute the tests using their native format.

| Simple Job | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | JOBEXEC_JOB_1 |
| Description | Execute a simple job in the appliance. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the submission of a job with no input or output files. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system)</p> <p>Test Job submission of simple job: Executable = /bin/sleep; Arguments = "120";</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job finishes correctly. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the test passes correctly. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: merged JOBEXEC_*_JOB_1 into this criterion. |

| Simple Job with input/output files | |
|---|--|
| ID | JOBEXEC_JOB_2 |
| Description | Execute a simple job in the appliance that uses both input and output files. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the submission of a job with input or output files. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system) Non-empty files “myfile”</p> <p>Test Job submission for job with input and output files: Executable = "/bin/ls"; Arguments = "-l"; StdOutput = "std.out"; StdError = "std.err"; InputSandbox = {"myfile"}; OutputSandbox = {"std.out", "std.err"};</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job finishes correctly; output contains the listing of the directory including the input file with correct size. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the test passes correctly. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: merged JOBEXEC_*_JOB_2 into this criterion. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Cancel Job | |
| ID | JOBEXEC_JOB_3 |
| Description | Cancel a previously submitted job. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the cancellation of a job. Job cancelling must be possible for all different states that the job may be, e.g. cancel the job when it's running or cancel the job when it's already done. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system)</p> <p>Test Job Submission and then cancellation. Possible description for job: Executable = "/bin/sleep"; Arguments = "20m";</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job is submitted and then cancelled correctly. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job. The job must be removed from the execution manager.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the appliance is able to cancel jobs for any previous state of the job. If the job is in the execution manager system, it should be completely removed, especially if it's running. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: merged JOBEXEC_*_JOB_3 into this criterion. Added clarification |

9.3 Execution Manager Support

These QC refer to the interaction of the Job Execution Capability with the underlying execution manager (usually a LRMS) for the work items submitted.

| Not Invasive Deployment | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | JOBEXEC_EXECMNGR_1 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances should not introduce any modifications to the underlying execution manager or to the operations of the resources. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Description of all needed, if any, modifications on the local resources in order to deploy the Job Execution Appliance. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Any modifications must be documented, especially invasive ones. Modifications to consider are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of additional software at the WN is permitted as long as no extra services are run permanently at the WN. • Require the deployment of extra (shared) filesystems • Modification of the local submission mechanism of jobs (e.g. require the modification of prologue/epilogue scripts of the batch system) • Require the creation of extra user accounts or add special privileges to a specific account. • Require inbound or outbound connectivity |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: added inbound, outbound connectivity. Relax Pass/Fail criteria |

| Job Management | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | JOBEXEC_EXECMNGR_2 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances must support the creation and management of work items to an execution manager. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | <p>Appliances must be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • create new jobs • retrieve the status of the jobs submitted by the appliance • cancel jobs • optionally, hold and resume jobs <p>The Appliance may perform these operations for individual jobs or for set of jobs in order to improve its performance (e.g. for retrieving the status instead of querying each of the individual jobs, do a single query for all jobs submitted for the appliance)</p> |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Configured system</p> <p>Test Create new job(s) in execution manager</p> <p>Expected Outcome New job(s) is created in the execution manager; id of job(s) returned</p> |
| | <p>Pre-condition Previously submitted job(s)</p> <p>Test Cancel job(s) in execution manager</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job(s) is cancelled successfully.</p> |
| | <p>Pre-condition Previously submitted job(s)</p> <p>Test Query status of previously submitted job(s)</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job (s) status is correctly fetched</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Pass if the Appliance correctly manages jobs in the underlying execution manager. Tests must be executed (and pass) for each of the execution managers the appliance supports. All appliances should provide support for, at least one, of the following systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torque/PBS • LSF • SGE/OGE • Slurm <p>Optionally, the appliance may support a <i>fork</i> execution manager (spawning processes in the appliance host)</p> |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: Major rewrite of criterion specification. |

| Information Retrieval | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | JOBEXEC_EXECMNGR_3 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances must be able to collect information from the underlying execution manager. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the information retrieval from execution manager. Information should be returned as a valid GlueSchema representation. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Configured system</p> <p>Test Get information from execution manager</p> <p>Expected Outcome Representation of the current information from the execution manager is generated.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Pass if the Appliance produces information for each of the supported execution managers. The information must include all mandatory attributes of the Computing Element related entities in GlueSchema. All appliances should provide support for, at least one, of the following systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torque/PBS • LSF • SGE/OGE • Slurm <p>Optionally, the appliance may support a <i>fork</i> execution manager (spawning processes in the appliance host)</p> |
| Related Information | Information Capabilities QC |
| Revision Log | |

9.4 Availability/Scalability

| Service Redundancy | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | JOBEXEC_AVAIL_1 |
| Description | More than one Job Execution Capability implementation should be able to access a single execution manager concurrently. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Documentation on how to use more than one appliance instance accessing the same execution manager (if any special consideration must be taken into account) Test of concurrent access to same execution manager from at least two instances. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition More than one appliance instance configured to use the same execution manager</p> <p>Test Submission of jobs to all configured appliances</p> <p>Expected Outcome Jobs are executed without problems; they are not mixed up in any situation.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the documentation specifies the configuration steps for using more than one instance in the same execution manager. Tests passes correctly |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: Required documentation, changed ID |

| Self Disabling Mechanism | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | JOBEXEC_AVAIL_2 |
| Description | The Job Execution Capability should detect high load conditions and self-disable the job submission in order to maintain the quality of the service. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Self-disable mechanism under high-load scenarios. Ideally, stress test for the service that triggers a self-disabling mechanism. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Correctly configured service.</p> <p>Test Introduce high load into machine, submit job.</p> <p>Expected Outcome High load situation is detected, job submission request is not allowed and message is sent to client.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the test executes as expected. The high load level should be configurable (e.g. CPU load > x, swap usage > y...) |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | Changed ID |

| Timely Job Status Updates | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | JOBEXEC_AVAIL_4 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances should be able to report the job status within a reasonable time frame since the events that originate those statuses even in situations of high load |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Appliance must be able to report the status of the submitted jobs without big delays from the event that originates the status change (e.g. mark the job as running/done once the job enters the running/done status in the local batch system). Ideally TP provides a test for the service that asserts that the appliance is able to report immediately the job statuses under high load conditions (big number of concurrent jobs changing status) |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the appliance reports the new status in a maximum of 10 minutes after the event that generated the status change. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V4: improved Pass/Fails Criteria |

10 PARALLEL JOB

10.1 Submission of parallel jobs

The following tests propose example job descriptions using the gLite JDL format for the specification of jobs. These examples are just used for illustrative purposes. Each appliance should provide the tests using their native format.

| Simple parallel job submission | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | PARALLEL_JOB_1 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances that also provide the Parallel Job Capability must allow users to submit a job requesting more than one execution slot. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances with Parallel Job Capability. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the submission of parallel job, requesting more than 1 slot. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system)</p> <p>Test Job submission: Executable = "/bin/sleep"; CPUNumber = 4; Arguments = "20";</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job finishes correctly. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job. Correct number of slots are allocated</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Test is executed correctly. Mapping of slots to machines/cores not relevant for the test. |
| Related Information | #1391: Support for parallel jobs in JDL. |
| Revision Log | V2: Unified PARALLEL_JOB_1, 3 & 4 into this criterion. |

| Single machine parallel job submission | |
|---|---|
| ID | PARALLEL_JOB_2 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances that also provide the Parallel Job Capability should allow users to submit a job requesting more than one execution slot in a single machine. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances with Parallel Job Capability. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the submission of parallel job, requesting more than 1 slot in a single machine and for a complete machine. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system)</p> <p>Test Job submission: <code>Executable = "/bin/sleep";</code> <code>NodeNumber = 1;</code> <code>SMPGranularity = 4;</code> <code>Arguments = "20";</code></p> <p>Expected Outcome Job finishes correctly. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job. Correct number of slots are allocated in a single machine</p> |
| | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system)</p> <p>Test Job submission: <code>Executable = "/bin/sleep";</code> <code>NodeNumber = 1;</code> <code>SMPGranularity = 4;</code> <code>WholeNode = True;</code> <code>Arguments = "20";</code></p> <p>Expected Outcome Job finishes correctly. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job. Complete machine with the requested slots is allocated.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Test is executed correctly. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: Unified PARALLEL_JOB_2 & 5. |

| Fine grained mapping parallel job submission | |
|---|---|
| ID | PARALLEL_JOB_3 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances that also provide the Parallel Job Capability should allow users to submit a job requesting a combination of slots per physical machine. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances with Parallel Job Capability. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Support for the submission of parallel job requesting specific configurations of slots in several machines. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Valid user credentials (and delegation if needed in the system)</p> <p>Test Job submission: Executable = "/bin/sleep"; NodeNumber = 5; SMPGranularity = 2; Arguments = "20";</p> <p>Expected Outcome Job finishes correctly. Unique Identifier for the submitted jobs, status log of the job. Correct number of slots is allocated.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Test is executed correctly for different combinations (e.g.: N processes in N different hosts, N processes in a single host, N processes per host in K hosts, K number of complete hosts with at least N slots) |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V2: Unified PARALLEL_JOB_2 & 5. |

11 INFORMATION MODEL

11.1 Information Model Schema

| GlueSchema Support | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_1 |
| Description | Resource information exchanged in the EGI Infrastructure must conform to GlueSchema. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Information Model Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Resource information published by Information Discovery Appliances must conform to the GlueSchema v1.3. |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition None.</p> <p>Test Check that information published conforms to GlueSchema 1.3. The suggested tool for testing the conformance is the GlueValidator [R 26]</p> <p>Expected Outcome Information conforms to GlueSchema.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Information published must be available in GlueSchema v1.3 Ideally the Technology Provider should assure this by a test suite of the appliances. |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] GlueSchema v1.3 [R 24] GlueValidator [R 26] |
| Revision Log | V2: Merged INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_* into this criterion. Rephrasing. V4: Added reference to Glue Validator |

| Middleware Version Information | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_2 |
| Description | The middleware version must be published in the resource information. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Information Model Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Resource information published by Information Discovery Appliances must include the version of the middleware. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Middleware version of service is published correctly by the service. |
| Related Information | Requirement #1378 |
| Revision Log | |

| GlueSchema 2.0 Support | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | INFOMODEL_SCHEMA_3 |
| Description | Resource information exchanged in the EGI Infrastructure must conform to GlueSchema. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Information Model Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | Resource information published by Information Discovery Appliances should conform to the GlueSchema v2.0 |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition None.</p> <p>Test Check that information published conforms to GlueSchema 2.0. The suggested tool for testing the conformance is the GlueValidator [R 26]</p> <p>Expected Outcome Information conforms to GlueSchema.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Information published must be available in GlueSchema v2.0 Ideally the Technology Provider should assure this by a test suite of the appliances. |
| Related Information | UMD Roadmap [R 1] GlueSchema v2.0 [R 25] GlueValidator [R 26] |
| Revision Log | |

12 MONITORING PROBES

The Monitoring Capability executes a set of probes defined by the operations community. These probes *should* be provided by the TP for each product.

12.1 Service Probes

| Certificate Lifetime Probe | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | MON_PROBE_GENERIC_1 |
| Description | Provide a monitoring probe that assures that the host certificate lifetime for the service is valid. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All products that use host certificates |
| Input from Technology Provider | Certificate Validity Probe. The probe should only use the public interface of the service and run integrated in the monitoring infrastructure of EGI |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | The QC will pass if the TP provides with the service a probe for checking the certificate lifetime. This probe may be provided also indirectly as part of other probes. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V1.1 Added probe description. V2: Simplified description |

| Service Probe | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ID | MON_PROBE_GENERIC_2 |
| Description | Provide monitoring probes that test the functionality of the service |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | All Services |
| Input from Technology Provider | Monitoring probe that tests that the service provides the expected functionality. The probe should only use the public interface of the service and run integrated in the monitoring infrastructure of EGI. The exact tests to perform for each service are determined by the operations community. For the current probes specification check the SAM documentation [R 32] |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Probes must exist, they must be integrated with the EMI monitoring infrastructure and provide the expected functionality. |
| Related Information | SAM documentation [R 32] |
| Revision Log | |

The criteria described in the next sections make reference to probes that are used by the EGI Operations community to monitor the Infrastructure. The specific appliances must support the execution of these probes.

12.1.1 Job Execution Capability Probes

| Job Execution Probe | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | MON_PROBE_JOBEXEC_1 |
| Description | Provide monitoring probes that test the functionality of Job Execution Capability |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Job Execution Appliances |
| Input from Technology Provider | CE probes as described at: https://tomtools.cern.ch/confluence/display/SAM/CE |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Probes must exist and behave as expected in the probe documentation. |
| Related Information | SAM documentation [R 32] |
| Revision Log | |

13 ACCOUNTING CAPABILITY

The use of resources within the e-Infrastructure must be recorded for understanding usage patterns by different user communities and by individuals within their communities.

13.1 Generation of Accounting Records

| Job Execution Appliances Accounting | |
|--|---|
| ID | ACC_JOBEXEC_1 |
| Description | Job Execution Appliances must generate accounting records for all the actions of the users into the local resources. |
| Mandatory | YES |
| Applicability | Accounting Appliances for Job Execution Capability (APEL) |
| Input from Technology Provider | <p>The Job Execution Capability must generate accounting records for the actions of the users into the local resources (jobs submitted to the underlying execution manager). These records must include, at least, the following information for all the jobs submitted to the system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User DN • VO • Job start execution time • Job end execution time • SPECint information • CPU & Wall Time • Number of slots/CPU's used by the job <p>The generation of accounting records must be available for the execution managers supported by the Job Execution Capability implementations.</p> |
| Test Description | <p>Pre-condition Configured system.</p> <p>Test Creation of accounting records</p> <p>Expected Outcome Accounting records for the jobs submitted to the execution manager through the Capability.</p> |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | Pass if the accounting records are generated correctly for all execution managers supported. The generation of the records should not compromise the availability and reliability of the system. |
| Related Information | |
| Revision Log | V4: Minor rephrasing |

14 CLIENT TOOLS

14.1 Generic client tools criteria

| Command line options coherency | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | CLIENT_TOOLS_1 |
| Description | Client commands for the same product should have a coherent set of options. |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Client Tools |
| Input from Technology Provider | Client command tools for a given product with coherent options between them (e.g. configuration file is always specified with <code>-c</code> option, <code>vo</code> with <code>-vo</code> option) Ideally, coherency with other product command line clients. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | All the command tools for a given product must have a coherent command line options. Semantically common options for two commands must have the same syntax. |
| Related Information | Requirement #1780 |
| Revision Log | |

| Error Messages | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ID | CLIENT_TOOLS_2 |
| Description | Error messages provided by the service should be clear and facilitate the solution of those errors by users or service administrators |
| Mandatory | NO |
| Applicability | Client tools. |
| Input from Technology Provider | Any error in the client tools must produce a clear error message. A possible solution/cause for it should be given. |
| Pass/Fail Criteria | <p>Pass if the errors provided by the client tools always produce a descriptive message. Errors without any message (unless a quiet option is specified) will make the criterion to fail.</p> <p>Ideally the following info is also documented/shown for all errors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error code • Error source (internal module or remote resource (specify it explicitly)) • Cause of error (syntax error, module malfunctioning, configuration problem, network error, other (specify it explicit)) • Type (critical, informative) • Possible solution |
| Related Information | Requirements gathered in MS305 related to resubmission of jobs, and information provided in error messages. |
| Revision Log | |

15 REFERENCES

| | |
|-------------|--|
| R 1 | UMD roadmap: https://documents.egi.eu/public/ShowDocument?docid=100 |
| R 2 | QC Test Notes: https://wiki.egi.eu/w/index.php?title=EGI_Quality_Criteria_Testing |
| R 3 | Web Services Data Access and Integration – The Relational Realisation (WS-DAIR) Specification, Version 1.0 |
| R 4 | Web Services Data Access and Integration – The XML Realization (WS-DAIX) Specification, Version 1.0 |
| R 5 | OGSA-DAI: http://www.ogsadai.org.uk/ |
| R 6 | gLite LFC: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/GliteLFC |
| R 7 | AMGA: http://amga.web.cern.ch/amga/ |
| R 8 | AMGA WSDL: http://amga.web.cern.ch/amga/soap_wsdaire.html |
| R 9 | AMGA streaming API: http://amga.web.cern.ch/amga/protocol.html |
| R 10 | AMGA Metadata Queries: http://amga.web.cern.ch/amga/queries.html |
| R 11 | A. Konstantinov, ARC Computational Job Management Component – A-REX, NORDUGRID-TECH-14 |
| R 12 | CREAM: http://grid.pd.infn.it/cream/ |
| R 13 | EMI-ES: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/EmiExecutionService |
| R 14 | GRAM5: http://www.globus.org/toolkit/docs/latest-stable/execution/gram5/ |
| R 15 | OGF DRMAA: http://www.drmaa.org/ |
| R 16 | OGSA Basic Execution Service v1.0: http://www.ogf.org/documents/GFD.108.pdf |
| R 17 | QCG-Broker: http://www.qoscosgrid.org/trac/qcg-broker |
| R 18 | UNICORE UAS: http://www.unicore.eu/unicore/architecture/service-layer.php#anchor_uas |
| R 19 | gLite WMS: http://web.infn.it/gLiteWMS/ |
| R 20 | SAGA-CORE-WG: A Simple API for Grid Applications (SAGA) v1.0 (GFD.90) |
| R 21 | SAGA (A Simple API for Grid Applications): http://saga.cct.lsu.edu/ |
| R 22 | Instrument Element: http://www.dorii.eu/resources/adaptation:middleware:IE |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| R 23 | DORII (Deployment of Remote Instrumentation Infrastructure) Project: http://www.dorii.eu/ |
| R 24 | GlueSchema Specification v1.3: http://glueschema.forge.cnaf.infn.it/Spec/V13 |
| R 25 | GlueSchema Specification v2.0: http://www.ogf.org/documents/GFD.147.pdf |
| R 26 | Glue Validator: https://tomtools.cern.ch/confluence/display/IS/GLUEValidator |
| R 27 | JMS (Java Message Service Specification) 1.1: http://www.oracle.com/technetwork/java/jms/index.html |
| R 28 | AMQP (Advanced Message Queuing Protocol): http://www.amqp.org/confluence/display/AMQP/Advanced+Message+Queuing+Protocol |
| R 29 | OASIS WS-Notification: https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=wsn |
| R 30 | Nagios Config Generator: https://tomtools.cern.ch/confluence/display/SAM/NCG |
| R 31 | My EGI portal: https://tomtools.cern.ch/confluence/display/SAM/MyEGI |
| R 32 | SAM Probes Documentation: https://tomtools.cern.ch/confluence/display/SAM/Probes |
| R 33 | Accounting Portal: http://accounting.egi.eu/ |
| R 34 | GridSite Delegation Protocol: http://www.gridsite.org/wiki/Delegation_protocol |
| R 35 | Globus Delegation Service: http://www.globus.org/toolkit/docs/4.0/security/delegation/ |
| R 36 | European Policy Management Authority for Grid Authentication (EuGridPMA): http://www.eugridpma.org/ |
| R 37 | ARGUS Authorization Service: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/AuthorizationFramework |
| R 38 | XACML: http://docs.oasis-open.org/xacml/2.0/access_control-xacml-2.0-core-spec-os.pdf |
| R 39 | Hydra encrypted file storage: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/DMEDS |
| R 40 | gLite FTS: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/GLiteFTS |
| R 41 | SRM v2.2: http://www.ggf.org/documents/GFD.129.pdf |
| R 42 | S2 Test: http://s-2.sourceforge.net/ |
| R 43 | SRM-Tester: https://sdm.lbl.gov/twiki/bin/view/Software/SRMTester/WebHome |
| R 44 | Lcg-utils: http://grid-deployment.web.cern.ch/grid-deployment/documentation/LFC_DPM/lcg_util/ |
| R 45 | Lcg-utils test suite: http://glite.cvs.cern.ch/cgi- |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | bin/glite.cgi/org.glite.testsuites.ctb/UI/tests/test-lcg-utils.sh?view=markup |
| R 46 | Open Cloud Computing Interface WG, OGF, http://www.ggf.org/gf/group_info/view.php?group=occi-wg |
| R 47 | Virtualization Management (VMAN), DMTF http://www.dmtf.org/standards/vman |
| R 48 | StratusLab http://stratuslab.eu/ |
| R 49 | StratusLab MarketPlace Technical Note TN-Marketplace (V3.0) |