Business Requirements of Certification

Malcolm Woodman M R Woodman Consulting



CAPE-OPEN 2019 Annual Meeting, Amsterdam, October 2019

Overview

Levels of certification

- Options
- Strengths & Weaknesses
- Business Models
 - Options
 - OPC Foundation Certification
 - Establishing the cost
- Draft Certification Process
- Delivery of Test Suite

Discussion



□ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality

- Demonstrates that implementation meets the standard and <u>should</u> provide interoperability with other software which also passes the same tests
- Needs test harnesses available



- □ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality
- □ Stand-alone testing of features and best practice
 - For example, generate a list of features for each of the following categories:
 - Flash types (PT, PH,)
 - Pure component properties
 - Mixture properties
 - If software assumes "mass" if not "mole", advise better to check for both
 - Allows the end-user to determine (by inspection) if the software <u>could</u> meet their business requirements



- □ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality
- □ Stand-alone testing of features and best practice
- One-to-one testing of software A with software B
 - Against generic test scenarios
 - Demonstrates that specific combinations of CAPE-OPEN compatible software will interoperate

- But only against the generic test scenarios
- Requires both A and B to be installed on the same machine



- □ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality
- Stand-alone testing of features and best practice
- One-to-one testing of software A with software B
- One-to-one testing of Software A with software B to meet specific (current) business requirements of a single enduser
 - Guarantees (?) end-user requirements will be met
 - Requires both A and B to be installed on the same hardware
 - Business requirements are likely to be end-user confidential



□ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality

- Strengths
 - Improves likelihood of successful interoperability
 - Quick
 - Can be done by vendor or CO-LaN
 - PMC testing can be automated
- Weaknesses
 - Reliant on coverage and reliability of test harness
 - PME testing can only be automated by each vendor independently
 - Doesn't guarantee interoperability between Software A and B
 - CO-LaN needs funding to develop and maintain test harnesses
 - CO-LaN needs funding to review test reports and grant certificate



- □ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality
- □ Stand-alone testing of features and best practice
 - Strengths
 - Improves likelihood that software will meet end-user business requirements
 - PMC testing can be automated
 - Can be done by vendor
 - Weaknesses
 - PME feature requirements depend on scope of PME
 - Difficult to automate testing of PME
 - PMC written for specific purposes may not necessarily meet "normal" best practice
 - If a PMC does not provide a "best practice" feature, some PMEs may still be able to interoperate with it if they provide a work-around
 - Additional development of test harness required, higher cost for CO-LaN



- □ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality
- □ Stand-alone testing of features and best practice
- One-to-one testing of software A with software B
 - Strengths
 - Guarantees the combination will interoperate in pre-defined generic scenarios
 - Weaknesses
 - Time consuming, therefore expensive
 - Only tests against generic scenarios
 - Both Software A and B need to be installed on the same hardware



- □ Stand-alone testing of interface functionality
- Stand-alone testing of features and best practice
- One-to-one testing of software A with software B
- One-to-one testing of Software A with software B to meet specific (current) business requirements of a single enduser
 - Strengths
 - Guarantees that combination will meet the end-user requirement
 - Weaknesses
 - Time-consuming, therefore expensive
 - Needs to be repeated for every new business requirement with different functionality

- Both Software A and B need to be installed on the same hardware
- Business requirement likely to be confidential



□ CO-LaN Full members fund all costs

- Would either need to increase number of full members, or increase annual fee per member
- No barrier to certification for vendors
- Why should the small number of end-users actively participating in CO-LaN fund certification for the entire CAPE-OPEN community?



www.colan.org

CAPE-OPEN 2019 Annual Meeting, Amsterdam, October 2019

- □ CO-LaN Full members fund all costs
- Charge all Associate Members an annual fee, which includes certification
 - Encourages all vendors to certify, as they are paying for it anyway
 - Spreads the cost amongst a large(r) group
 - Some Associate members do not have any software that requires certification



- **CO-LaN Full members fund all costs**
- Charge all Associate Members an annual fee, which includes certification
- □ Annual fee for all vendors signing up for certification
 - Fee level needs to be low enough to not be a barrier for (especially) small vendors and research organisations
 - CO-LaN Associate Members / Full Members receive a discounted rate
 - Fee level based on size of organisation? Complex, difficult to define "size" of each organisation in an equitable way
 - Actual level of fee would depend on number of vendors signed up for certification and the required budget



- **CO-LaN Full members fund all costs**
- Charge all Associate Members an annual fee, which includes certification
- □ Annual fee for all vendors signing up for certification
- □ Charge for test harness software
 - Very similar to annual fee?
 - But income level more variable than with an annual fee?
 - Would need to charge for each new version of software to ensure a continuous income stream

www.colan.org

Incompatible with open source software?



- **CO-LaN Full members fund all costs**
- Charge all Associate Members an annual fee, which includes certification
- □ Annual fee for all vendors signing up for certification
- Charge for test harness software
- Charge individual vendors for all CO-LaN time spent on certification
 - Cover man-hour and software costs with a single charge
 - Assumes that CO-LaN spends a significant time that can be allocated to an individual vendor in certification process
 - Only therefore applicable if one-to-one testing of software by CO-LaN?



Business Models – OPC Foundation

□ Aims

- Compliant with the OPC specifications
- Interoperable with other OPC products from other vendors
- Robust, reliable and able to recover from lost communications, etc.
- Usable, by following universally accepted best-practices
- Efficient in managing resources (CPU, memory, disk space etc.)
- □ Certification undertaken by OPC, via "Certification Lab"
- OPC endorses Interoperability Workshops

Business Model

- Charging for test software
 - Free to members, charge for non-members
- Daily rate for final certification:
 - Corporate Members: US\$950 per day
 - Logo-members: US\$1900 per day



Business Models – Establishing the cost

- Development/maintenance of CO-LaN provided test software
 - CO-LaN cost
- Performing tests on specific implementations and (if required) developing PME test procedures
 - Vendor cost
 - Vendor may choose to do in-house or employ a contractor
- **CO-LaN review of test reports and granting of certification**
 - CO-LaN cost
- One-to-one testing of Software A with Software B
 - Vendor or end-user cost
 - CO-LaN may choose to provide an independent testing environment
 - but the cost would be charged to the vendor or end-user company requesting the testing



Business Models – Establishing the cost

- Development/maintenance of CO-LaN provided test software
 - CO-LaN cost
- Performing tests on specific implementations and (if required) developing PME test procedures
 - Vendor cost
 - Vendor may choose to do in-house or employ a contractor
- **CO-LaN review of test reports and granting of certification**
 - CO-LaN cost
- One-to-one testing of Software A with Software B
 - Vendor or end-user cost
 - CO-LaN may choose to provide an independent testing environment
 - but the cost would be charged to the vendor or end-user company requesting the testing
 - **CO-LaN needs funding for items in red**

CO-LaN will not aim to make a surplus on certification



(Draft) Certification Process

Vendor downloads test suite and tests their software

- Can be used during software development
- Vendor runs test suite on final "frozen" version, generates report and submit to CO-LaN
 - Test Report will contain a hierarchy of results:
 - Test successful
 - Tested interface / property not implemented
 - E.g. entropy, TS flash, heat of formation
 - Interface /property must not be mandatory
 - Test failed
 - Including missing mandatory interfaces

Vendor requests certification from CO-LaN



(Draft) Certification Process (cont.)

CO-LaN reviews reports and confirms that

- Tests were performed in the correct way
- No critical failures have been reported
- Certificate (for example Self-Tested Thermo PMC) can be granted
- Test results need to be published

Questions:

- Test report may require sanitisation before publishing?
- Test report should be
 - freely available to everyone?
 - Only available to CO-LaN members?
 - Available to non-members via a fee?
- □ Note that CO-LaN provides Certification Approval:
 - For the specific version of the software tested
 - For specific version of the test suite
 - For the CO interfaces implemented in the software
 - Up to the vendor as to which versions of their software they test



Delivery of Test Suite

- CO-LaN currently has insufficient resource to deliver & maintain the Test Suite necessary for Certification
- Request for Bids
 - For additional contractor
 - To support all of:
 - CAPE-OPEN Logging and Testing Tool (COLTT) and associated installer

- Type library, Primary Interop Assemblies (PIA) and associated installer
- Certification self-test suite
 - Software and installers



Delivery of Test Suite – Skills required

- □ Knowledge of the CAPE-OPEN standards
- □ Software installation, in particular
 - Windows Installer
 - WiX Scripting
- □ Understanding of 32-bit and 64-bit Windows registry
- I.NET / .NET assembly language
- The languages used in the development of the software to be supported (C++ / C# / Microsoft IDL)
- □ Software testing and debugging



Delivery of Test Suite – Current Status

- □ RfB closed on 30th September 2019
- Only 2 responses
 - Neither of which have time available to fulfil the entire role
- Next steps?
 - Accept one or both of the responses to the RfB
 - Ask if anyone else at the Annual meeting is able to submit a response, even though we are now after the closure deadline
 - Issue the RfB to a wider community, for example the general software developer community, even if they have no CAPE-OPEN experience or knowledge of the standards



Thank You!



www.colan.org

CAPE-OPEN 2019 Annual Meeting, Amsterdam, October 2019