

Ampersand Event-Condition-Action Rules

Test Plan

Yuriy Toporovskyy, Yash Sapra, Jaeden Guo

Table 1: Revision History

Author	Date	Comment
Yuriy Toporovskyy	27 / 10 / 2015	Reorganized document
Yuriy Toporovskyy	27 / 10 / 2015	Initial version - template

Contents

1	General Information	1
1.1	Purpose	1
1.2	Objectives	1
1.3	Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Symbols	2
2	Plan	3
2.1	Software Description	3
2.2	Test Team	3
2.3	Test Schedule	3
3	Methods and constraints	4
3.1	Methodology	4
3.2	Test tools	4
3.2.1	Static Typing	4
3.2.2	Formal verification	4
3.2.3	Random Testing	4
3.2.4	Unit Testing	5
3.3	Requirements	5
3.3.1	Functional requirements	5
3.3.2	Non-Functional requirements	5
3.4	Data recording	6
3.5	Constraints	6
3.6	Evaluation	6
4	System Test Descriptions	7
T1	ECA rule executing “All” subclauses	7
T2	ECA rule with empty PA clause	8
T3	ECA rule clause	8
T4	EFA System Compatibility	9
T5	EFA Pure Function	10
T6	EFA User Feed Back	11
T7	EFA Code Walk-through	12
T8	EFA Mock Trial	13
T9	arg2	14

Chapter 1

General Information

1.1 Purpose

This document outlines the test plan for ECA for Ampersand, including our general approach to testing, system test cases, and a specification of methodology and constraints. This test plan specifically targets our contribution to Ampersand, namely ECA – elements of Ampersand, such as design artifact generation, will not be tested.

1.2 Objectives

Preparation for testing

The primary objective of this test plan is to collect all relevant information in preparation of the actual testing process, in order to facilitate this process.

Communication

This test plan intends to clearly communicate to all developers of ECA for Ampersand their intended role in the testing process.

Motivation

The testing approach is motivated by constraints and requirements outlined in the Software Requirements Specification. This document seeks to clearly demonstrate this motivation.

Environment

This test plans outlines the resources, tools, and software required for the testing process. This includes any resources needed to perform automated testing.

Scope

This test plan intends to better describe the scope of our contribution, ECA, within Ampersand.

1.3 Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Symbols

SRS Software Requirements Specification. Document regarding requirements, constraints, and project objectives.

ECA Rule Event-Condition-Action Rule. A rule which describes how to handle a constraint violation in a database. See SRS for details.

HUnit A Haskell library for unit testing. See TODO: ref test tools

QuickCheck A Haskell library for running automated, randomized tests. See TODO: ref test tools

Chapter 2

Plan

2.1 Software Description

Ampersand is a software tool which converts a formal specification of business entities and rules, and compiles it into different design artifacts, as well as a prototype web application.

This prototype implements the business logic in the original specification, in the form of a relational database with a simple web-app front-end.

A particular class of relational database violations can be automatically restored; the algorithm for computing the code to fix these violations is called AMMBR [Joo07]. This class of violations is realized within Ampersand as ECA rules – our contribution to Ampersand will add support for ECA rules, in both the Ampersand back-end and the generated prototype.

2.2 Test Team

The test team which will execute the strategy outline in this document is comprised of

- Yuriy Toporovskyy
- Yash Sapra
- Jaeden Guo

2.3 Test Schedule

Chapter 3

Methods and constraints

3.1 Methodology

3.2 Test tools

3.2.1 Static Typing

Programming languages can be classified by many criteria, one of which is their type systems. One such classification is static versus dynamic typing. Our implementation language, Haskell, has a static type system. Types will be checked at compile-time, allow us to catch errors even before the code is run, reducing the errors that need to be found and fixed using testing techniques.

3.2.2 Formal verification

A part of our project deals with generating source code annotated with the proof of derivation of that source code, which will act as a correctness proof for the system. In particular, when we generate code to restore a database violation using ECA rules, then the generated code will have a proof associated with it, which details how that code was derived from the original specification given by the user.

3.2.3 Random Testing

Random testing allows us to easily run a very large number of tests without writing them by hand, and also has the advantage of not producing biased test cases, like a programmer is likely to do.

We will be using QuickCheck [hac] for random testing. The existing Ampersand code base using QuickCheck for testing, therefore, using QuickCheck has the added benefit of easier integration with the existing Ampersand code base.

QuickCheck allows the programmers to provide a specification of the program, in the form of properties. A property is essentially a boolean valued Haskell function of any number of arguments. QuickCheck can test that these properties hold in a large number of randomly generated cases. QuickCheck also takes great care to produce a large variety of test cases, and generally produces good code coverage [hac].

3.2.4 Unit Testing

Unit testing is comprised of feeding some data to the functions being tested and compare the actual results returned to the expected resultd. We will be using HUnit for unit testing of the new source code in Ampersand. HUnit is a library providing unit testing capabilities in Haskell. It is an adaption of JUnit to Haskell that allows you to easily create, name, group tests, and execute them.

3.3 Requirements

3.3.1 Functional requirements

The functional requirements for ECA for Ampersand are detailed in the SRS; they are also briefly summarized here. Our implementation must

- F1** provably implement the desired algorithm.
- F2** accept its input in the existing ADL file format.
- F3** produce an output compatible with the existing pipeline.
- F4** be a pure function; it should not have side effects.
- F5** not introduce appreciable performance degradation.
- F6** provide diagnostic information about the algorithm to the user, if the user asks for such information.

3.3.2 Non-Functional requirements

The functional requirements for ECA for Ampersand are detailed in the SRS; they are also briefly summarized here. Our implementation must

- N1** produce output which will be easily understood by the typical user, such as a requirements engineer, and will not be misleading or confusing.
- N2** be composed of easily maintainable, well documented code.
- N3** compile and run in the environment currently used to develop Ampersand.
- N4** annotated generated code with proofs of correctness or derivations, where appropriate.
- N5** automatically fix database violations in the mock database of the prototype.

3.4 Data recording

3.5 Constraints

3.6 Evaluation

Chapter 4

System Test Descriptions

Many test cases use domain specific language to indicate inputs and outputs, for both clarity and brevity. This includes the syntax and semantics of ECA rules and Abstract SQL. For the full syntax and semantics of these , as well as related definitions, see section 1.3.

T1 ECA rule executing “All” subclauses

Test type	Dynamic, white box, automated
Schedule	Term 2
Requirements	F1

Input

The input is an ECA rule of the form:

On $\text{Ins}(\Delta, r_0)$ **Do** **All**($\text{Ins}(e_1, r_1), \text{Ins}(e_2, r_2)$)
where $r_0, r_1, r_2 ::= \text{Atomic Relation}$
 $e_1, e_2, \Delta ::= \text{Expression}$

Output

The output is an abstract SQL function of the form:

```
f (delta, r_0):  
  INSERT INTO <r_1_table> VALUES <e_1_query>;  
  INSERT INTO <r_2_table> VALUES <e_2_query>;
```

Input

ECA rules of the input format are generated using QuickCheck, converted to abstract SQL, then compared against the expected output format using HUnit.

T2 ECA rule with empty PA clause

Test type	Dynamic, white box, automated
Schedule	Term 2
Requirements	F1

Input

The input is an ECA rule of the form:

On {**Ins/Del**}(Δ, r_0) **Do Nop**
where $C_0, C_1 ::= \text{Concept}$
 $r_0 ::= \text{Atomic Relation}$

Output

The output is the empty abstract SQL statement; that is, a statement of the form:

`f (delta, r_0): {} \\ Do nothing`

Input

ECA rules of the input format are generated using QuickCheck, converted to abstract SQL, then compared against the expected output format using HUnit.

T3 ECA rule clause

Test type	Dynamic, white box, automated
Schedule	Term 2
Requirements	F1

Input

The input is an ECA rule of the form:

On $\{\text{Ins/Del}\}(\Delta, r_0)$ **Do** $\text{Ins}(e_0, \mathbb{I}_{C_0})$
where $C_0 ::= \text{Concept}$
 $r_0 ::= \text{Atomic Relation}$
 $e_0 ::= \text{Expression}$

Output

The output is an abstract SQL statement of the form:

f (delta, r_0):
{INSERT INTO/DELETE FROM} <C_0_Population> VALUES <e_0_query>;

where C_0_Population is the table corresponding to \mathbb{I}_{C_0} .

Input

ECA rules of the input format are generated using QuickCheck, converted to abstract SQL, then compared against the expected output format using HUnit.

T4 EFA System Compatibility

Test type	Functional
Schedule	Dec 2015
Requirements	F3

Input

ADL File Input 1:

Based on the Rule: Only members who have relevant experience may apply for this job

Using Sets: JOBS-AVAIL, APPLICANTS, EMPLOYEES-WITH-RELEVANT-EXPERIENCE

With ECA rules:

ADL Files Input 2:

Based on the Rule: Only members who have relevant experience may apply for this job

Using Sets: JOBS-AVAIL, APPLICANTS, EMPLOYEES-WITH-RELEVANT-EXPERIENCE

With ECA rules: APPLICANTS must be a member of both EMPLOYEES-WITH-RELEVANT-EXPERIENCE AND have a relation to (i.e. applied for) JOBS-AVAIL

Output

EFA User Output for Input 1:

Reading <file>.adl..

Generating..

Rules Done..

Sets Done..

No Errors

No Violations

EFA User Output for Input 2:

Reading <file>.adl..

Generating..

Rules Done..

Sets Done..

ECA Rules Done..

No Errors

No Violations

Output

Two different version of the same script is given as input, the first is without ECA rules the second is with ECA rules that this project adds. Both of these scripts should pass through the Ampersand generator without causing errors or violations. If the second script which contains ECA rules successfully passes through each part of Ampersand then the new additions generated by EFA is compatible with the old Ampersand system.

T5 EFA Pure Function

Test type Dec 2015

Schedule F4

Requirements Two conditions must hold for a function to be considered a pure function 1. The fu

Input

The input is an ECA rule of the form:

ECA = {Condition that triggers action: Insertion of <new field into table>,
 Change that initiated trigger: Insertion of <e2> into current data scheme,
 Action to be done : \forall
 {(take the difference of the previous result of the expressions
 (take result of intersection of the returned result
 (composition of the result
 (Simple declaration of the result of the conversion
 (convert expression e2 using the identity relation
 of e1
)
)
 with e1)
 with e1)
 with e1 where e1 is another expression))}
 }

Output

asdfasdf

T6 EFA User Feed Back

Test type	Functional
Schedule	January 2016
Requirements	F6,N1

Brief Explanation Concerning Context

Only those who are qualified can be cast into roles, the actor must have relevant experience.

Input

The input shall be ECA rules specifying invariants that must be maintained throughout the program.

Example concerning how roles are cast for a theater performance:

User Input:

RULE "who's cast in roles" : cast; instantiates —- qualifies;comprises MEANING "an Actor may appear in a Performance of the Play only if the Actor is skilled for a Role that the Play comprises "

EFA INPUT:

```
ECA = {
    ECA Trigger: if cast member does not have relevant experience or enough experience
    ECA Violation: lack of experience
    ECA Action: Remove actors without enough relevant experience
}
```

Output

User feed back if file has no errors:

Reading file theatreCasting.adl..

Done.

Done.

User feed back if file has errors:

Reading file theater.adl

Error(s) found:

Type error, cannot match:

the concept "Role" (Tgt of qualifies)

and concept "Performance" (Src of instantiates)

if you think there is no type error, add an order between concepts "Role" and "Performance".

Error at symbol () in file theater.adl at line 26 : 44

=====

No declarations match the relation: actor

Error at symbol () in file theater.adl at line 26 : 62

=====

ECA Rule Violation:

Error at Rule declaration and structure in file theater.adl at line 33 : 41

Error: Structure and Meaning do not match

T7 EFA Code Walk-through

Test type	Non-functional
Schedule	January 2016
Requirements	N2

Brief Explanation

Input and output are not available for this test, as it requires each member of the design team to walk through the code line by line to check if it is easy to understand by another programmer and well documented. If it is easy to read and understand but not only the individual who wrote it but those around them, then it should be easy to maintain.

T8 EFA Mock Trial

Test type	Non-functional
Schedule	First Week of February 2016
Requirements	N5

Brief Explanation

The design team shall create a mock database and fill it with relevant data. EFA will be tested to see if it is able to automatically fix data violations on a the mock database before any trials will take place in the real world.

Input

ECA Rules:

ECA = {

ECA Trigger: if cast member does not have relevant experience or enough experience

ECA Violation: lack of experience

ECA Action: Remove actors without enough relevant experience

}

Output

connect to mock database..

if <relevant experience> in <this table>

is under <this amount>,

remove <person> from table.<applicants>

T9 arg2

Test type arg3

Schedule arg4

Requirements arg5

Input

Output

Bibliography

- [hac] QuickCheck: Automatic testing of Haskell programs. <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/QuickCheck>. Accessed: 2015-10-29.
- [Joo07] Stef Joosten. AMMBR: A Method to Maintain Business Rules. 2007.