

# System Verification and Validation Plan for Software Engineering

Team 8 – Rhythm Rangers

Ansel Chen  
Muhammad Jawad  
Mohamad-Hassan Bahsoun  
Matthew Baleanu  
Ahmed Al-Hayali

November 4, 2024

## Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Date 1	1.0	Notes
Date 2	1.1	Notes

[The intention of the VnV plan is to increase confidence in the software. However, this does not mean listing every verification and validation technique that has ever been devised. The VnV plan should also be a **feasible** plan. Execution of the plan should be possible with the time and team available. If the full plan cannot be completed during the time available, it can either be modified to “fake it”, or a better solution is to add a section describing what work has been completed and what work is still planned for the future. —SS]

[The VnV plan is typically started after the requirements stage, but before the design stage. This means that the sections related to unit testing cannot initially be completed. The sections will be filled in after the design stage is complete. the final version of the VnV plan should have all sections filled in. —SS]

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Symbols, Abbreviations, and Acronyms</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>General Information</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	Summary . . . . .	1
2.2	Objectives . . . . .	1
2.3	Challenge Level and Extras . . . . .	1
2.4	Relevant Documentation . . . . .	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1	Verification and Validation Team . . . . .	2
3.2	SRS Verification Plan . . . . .	3
3.3	Design Verification Plan . . . . .	4
3.3.1	Client Application Design Verification . . . . .	4
3.3.2	Server Networking Design Verification . . . . .	4
3.3.3	Server Compute Design Verification . . . . .	5
3.3.4	Server Storage Design Verification . . . . .	5
3.3.5	External Service APIs Design Verification . . . . .	5
3.3.6	Featurizer Design Verification . . . . .	6
3.4	Verification and Validation Plan Verification Plan . . . . .	6
3.5	Implementation Verification Plan . . . . .	6
3.6	Automated Testing and Verification Tools . . . . .	7
3.7	Software Validation Plan . . . . .	7
<b>4</b>	<b>System Tests</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Tests for Functional Requirements . . . . .	8
4.1.1	Area of Testing1 . . . . .	8
4.1.2	Area of Testing2 . . . . .	9
4.2	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements . . . . .	9
4.2.1	Area of Testing1 . . . . .	9
4.2.2	Area of Testing2 . . . . .	10
4.3	Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements . . . . .	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Unit Test Description</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	Unit Testing Scope . . . . .	10
5.2	Tests for Functional Requirements . . . . .	10
5.2.1	Module 1 . . . . .	10

5.2.2	Module 2 . . . . .	11
5.3	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements . . . . .	11
5.3.1	Module ? . . . . .	11
5.3.2	Module ? . . . . .	12
5.4	Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules . . . . .	12
<b>6</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1	Symbolic Parameters . . . . .	13
6.2	Usability Survey Questions? . . . . .	13

## List of Tables

[Remove this section if it isn't needed —SS]

## List of Figures

[Remove this section if it isn't needed —SS]

# 1 Symbols, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

symbol	description
T	Test

[symbols, abbreviations, or acronyms — you can simply reference the SRS  
(Author, 2019) tables, if appropriate —SS]  
[Remove this section if it isn't needed —SS]

This document ... [provide an introductory blurb and roadmap of the Verification and Validation plan —SS]

## 2 General Information

### 2.1 Summary

[Say what software is being tested. Give its name and a brief overview of its general functions. —SS]

### 2.2 Objectives

[State what is intended to be accomplished. The objective will be around the qualities that are most important for your project. You might have something like: “build confidence in the software correctness,” “demonstrate adequate usability.” etc. You won’t list all of the qualities, just those that are most important. —SS]

[You should also list the objectives that are out of scope. You don’t have the resources to do everything, so what will you be leaving out. For instance, if you are not going to verify the quality of usability, state this. It is also worthwhile to justify why the objectives are left out. —SS]

[The objectives are important because they highlight that you are aware of limitations in your resources for verification and validation. You can’t do everything, so what are you going to prioritize? As an example, if your system depends on an external library, you can explicitly state that you will assume that external library has already been verified by its implementation team. —SS]

### 2.3 Challenge Level and Extras

[State the challenge level (advanced, general, basic) for your project. Your challenge level should exactly match what is included in your problem statement. This should be the challenge level agreed on between you and the course instructor. You can use a pull request to update your challenge level (in TeamComposition.csv or Repos.csv) if your plan changes as a result of the VnV planning exercise. —SS]

[Summarize the extras (if any) that were tackled by this project. Extras can include usability testing, code walkthroughs, user documentation, formal proof, GenderMag personas, Design Thinking, etc. Extras should have already been approved by the course instructor as included in your problem statement. You can use a pull request to update your extras (in TeamComposition.csv or Repos.csv) if your plan changes as a result of the VnV planning exercise. —SS]

## 2.4 Relevant Documentation

[Reference relevant documentation. This will definitely include your SRS and your other project documents (design documents, like MG, MIS, etc). You can include these even before they are written, since by the time the project is done, they will be written. You can create BibTeX entries for your documents and within those entries include a hyperlink to the documents. —SS]

Author (2019)

[Don't just list the other documents. You should explain why they are relevant and how they relate to your VnV efforts. —SS]

## 3 Plan

[Introduce this section. You can provide a roadmap of the sections to come. —SS]

### 3.1 Verification and Validation Team

- *Ansel Chen*: Joint responsibility for client application testing; joint featurizer algorithm testing.
- *Muhammad Jawad*: Joint featurizer algorithm testing.
- *Mohamad-Hassan Bahsoun*: Joint responsibility for client application testing; external service API interface testing; joint featurizer algorithm testing.
- *Matthew Baleanu*: Unit testing for compute; joint featurizer algorithm testing.

- *Ahmed Al-Hayali*: Establish testing infrastructure; Maintain testing infrastructure; Functional testing for server storage; Server networking interface testing; joint featurizer algorithm testing.
- *Supervisor/Dr. Martin v. Mohrenschildt*: Featurizer algorithms validation and limited verification runthroughs.
- *Stakeholders*: Participate in usability testing, acceptance testing, and offer limited design validation input.

### 3.2 SRS Verification Plan

The following approaches will be used for SRS verification:

- Formal reviews with the supervisor
- A checklist that will be given to the supervisor and any peer reviewers. It will also serve as a guide for the developers of the system
- Using feedback from grading to create new checklists and update existing checklists
- Ad-hoc reviews from peers and other teams in the course

This is the initial SRS checklist that reviewers will use. It will be updated as reviews are performed:

- ☐ Does each functional requirement have a detailed and accurate description, rationale and fit criteria?
- ☐ Is each requirement (both functional and non-functional) relevant and necessary?
- ☐ Are all functional requirements traceable to at least one use case?
- ☐ Are all fit criteria unambiguous and verifiable?
- ☐ Have all issues opened by reviewers been closed?



### 3.3 Design Verification Plan

The design verification will ensure that each component of the system meets the requirements outlined in the Software Requirements Specification (SRS). Verification will occur through systematic reviews, testing, and validation checklists tailored to each component.

#### 3.3.1 Client Application Design Verification

User-facing component for inputting track information and displaying system output.

**Verification Approach** The verification will proceed as we:

- Conduct usability testing with users to assess ease of input and clarity of output.
- Review design documents to ensure UI/UX aligns with requirements.

**Checklist** The design is considered verified if the:

- ☐ User can input track information without errors.
- ☐ System output is clear and comprehensible.
- ☐ User feedback is collected and assessed.

#### 3.3.2 Server Networking Design Verification

Represents communication between the server and external components, e.g., between the client application and external service APIs.

**Verification Approach** The verification will proceed as we:

- Review network architecture to confirm it supports required protocols.
- Test for successful data transmission between components.

**Checklist** The design is considered verified if:

- ☐ All intended connections are established.
- ☐ Data loss during transmission is within acceptable limits.
- ☐ Network security measures are implemented and verified.

### 3.3.3 Server Compute Design Verification

Component responsible for processing user requests and issuing featurization and data access requests.

**Verification Approach** The verification will proceed as we:

- Review processing algorithms for efficiency.
- Conduct code reviews to ensure best practices are followed.

**Checklist** The design is considered verified if the:

- ☐ Processing time is optimized for expected load.
- ☐ Code is clean and adheres to project standards.
- ☐ Edge cases are handled appropriately.

### 3.3.4 Server Storage Design Verification

Represents the database for storing data.

**Verification Approach** The verification will proceed as we:

- Review database schema against the SRS.
- Test data retrieval and storage for accuracy.

**Checklist** The design is considered verified if the:

- ☐ Schema supports all required data types and relationships.
- ☐ Data retrieval times meet performance criteria.
- ☐ Data integrity is maintained during transactions.

### 3.3.5 External Service APIs Design Verification

Represents integration with external services like Spotify or Deezer.

**Verification Approach** The verification will proceed as we:

- Review API documentation for compliance.
- Test integration for successful data exchange.

**Checklist** The design is considered verified if:

- ☐ All API endpoints are functional as expected.
- ☐ Data that is exchanged is accurate and formatted correctly.
- ☐ Error handling for API failures is in place.

### 3.3.6 Featurizer Design Verification

Handles the featurization process.

**Verification Approach** The verification will proceed as we:

- Review featurization algorithms for correctness.
- Test output against known input cases to validate accuracy.

**Checklist** The design is considered verified if:

- ☐ All features are correctly extracted from input data.
- ☐ Featurization time is within acceptable limits.
- ☐ Results match expected outputs for test cases.

A group discussion will be held bi-weekly to review the verification process and address any outstanding issues. Feedback from classmates will be incorporated throughout the development process, especially during review sessions.

## 3.4 Verification and Validation Plan Verification Plan

[The verification and validation plan is an artifact that should also be verified. Techniques for this include review and mutation testing. —SS]

[The review will include reviews by your classmates —SS]

[Create a checklists? —SS]

## 3.5 Implementation Verification Plan

[You should at least point to the tests listed in this document and the unit testing plan. —SS]

[In this section you would also give any details of any plans for static verification of the implementation. Potential techniques include code walk-throughs, code inspection, static analyzers, etc. —SS]

[The final class presentation in CAS 741 could be used as a code walk-through. There is also a possibility of using the final presentation (in CAS741) for a partial usability survey. —SS]

### **3.6 Automated Testing and Verification Tools**

[What tools are you using for automated testing. Likely a unit testing framework and maybe a profiling tool, like ValGrind. Other possible tools include a static analyzer, make, continuous integration tools, test coverage tools, etc. Explain your plans for summarizing code coverage metrics. Linters are another important class of tools. For the programming language you select, you should look at the available linters. There may also be tools that verify that coding standards have been respected, like flake9 for Python. —SS]

[If you have already done this in the development plan, you can point to that document. —SS]

[The details of this section will likely evolve as you get closer to the implementation. —SS]

### **3.7 Software Validation Plan**

[If there is any external data that can be used for validation, you should point to it here. If there are no plans for validation, you should state that here. —SS]

[You might want to use review sessions with the stakeholder to check that the requirements document captures the right requirements. Maybe task based inspection? —SS]

[For those capstone teams with an external supervisor, the Rev 0 demo should be used as an opportunity to validate the requirements. You should plan on demonstrating your project to your supervisor shortly after the scheduled Rev 0 demo. The feedback from your supervisor will be very useful for improving your project. —SS]

[For teams without an external supervisor, user testing can serve the same purpose as a Rev 0 demo for the supervisor. —SS]

[This section might reference back to the SRS verification section. —SS]

## 4 System Tests

[There should be text between all headings, even if it is just a roadmap of the contents of the subsections. —SS]

### 4.1 Tests for Functional Requirements

[Subsets of the tests may be in related, so this section is divided into different areas. If there are no identifiable subsets for the tests, this level of document structure can be removed. —SS]

[Include a blurb here to explain why the subsections below cover the requirements. References to the SRS would be good here. —SS]

#### 4.1.1 Area of Testing1

[It would be nice to have a blurb here to explain why the subsections below cover the requirements. References to the SRS would be good here. If a section covers tests for input constraints, you should reference the data constraints table in the SRS. —SS]

#### Title for Test

##### 1. test-id1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State:

Input:

Output: [The expected result for the given inputs. Output is not how you are going to return the results of the test. The output is the expected result. —SS]

Test Case Derivation: [Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS]

How test will be performed:

##### 2. test-id2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State:

Input:

Output: [The expected result for the given inputs —SS]

Test Case Derivation: [Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS]

How test will be performed:

#### 4.1.2 Area of Testing2

...

### 4.2 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

[The nonfunctional requirements for accuracy will likely just reference the appropriate functional tests from above. The test cases should mention reporting the relative error for these tests. Not all projects will necessarily have nonfunctional requirements related to accuracy. —SS]

[For some nonfunctional tests, you won't be setting a target threshold for passing the test, but rather describing the experiment you will do to measure the quality for different inputs. For instance, you could measure speed versus the problem size. The output of the test isn't pass/fail, but rather a summary table or graph. —SS]

[Tests related to usability could include conducting a usability test and survey. The survey will be in the Appendix. —SS]

[Static tests, review, inspections, and walkthroughs, will not follow the format for the tests given below. —SS]

[If you introduce static tests in your plan, you need to provide details. How will they be done? In cases like code (or document) walkthroughs, who will be involved? Be specific. —SS]

#### 4.2.1 Area of Testing1

##### Title for Test

1. test-id1

Type: Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Static etc.

Initial State:

Input/Condition:

Output/Result:

How test will be performed:

2. test-id2

Type: Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Static etc.

Initial State:

Input:

Output:

How test will be performed:

#### **4.2.2 Area of Testing2**

...

### **4.3 Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements**

[Provide a table that shows which test cases are supporting which requirements. —SS]

## **5 Unit Test Description**

### **5.1 Unit Testing Scope**

### **5.2 Tests for Functional Requirements**

#### **5.2.1 Module 1**

1. test-id1

Type:

Initial State:

Input:

Output:

Test Case Derivation:

How test will be performed:

2. test-id2

Type:

Initial State:

Input:

Output:

Test Case Derivation:

How test will be performed:

3. ...

### 5.2.2 Module 2

...

## 5.3 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

### 5.3.1 Module ?

1. test-id1

Type:

Initial State:

Input/Condition:

Output/Result:

How test will be performed:



2. test-id2

Type: Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Static etc.

Initial State:

Input:

Output:

How test will be performed:

### 5.3.2 Module ?

...

## 5.4 Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules

## References

Author Author. System requirements specification. <https://github.com/...>, 2019.

## 6 Appendix

This is where you can place additional information.

### 6.1 Symbolic Parameters

The definition of the test cases will call for SYMBOLIC\_CONSTANTS. Their values are defined in this section for easy maintenance.

### 6.2 Usability Survey Questions?

[This is a section that would be appropriate for some projects. —SS]

## Appendix — Reflection

[This section is not required for CAS 741 —SS]

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Lifelong Learning.

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?
2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?
3. What knowledge and skills will the team collectively need to acquire to successfully complete the verification and validation of your project? Examples of possible knowledge and skills include dynamic testing knowledge, static testing knowledge, specific tool usage, Valgrind etc. You should look to identify at least one item for each team member.
4. For each of the knowledge areas and skills identified in the previous question, what are at least two approaches to acquiring the knowledge or mastering the skill? Of the identified approaches, which will each team member pursue, and why did they make this choice?