

Guidelines for the SWT-SWL-B Report

*Prof. Dr. Gerald Lüttgen · Ms. Ons Seddiki, M.Sc.
Winter Semester 2016/17*

Language

The report shall be written in English or German.

Format

The report shall be printed on A4 paper, use a double-sided, single-spacing page format with reasonable margins (at least 15mm and at most 30mm to the left and right) and employ font *Computer Modern* or *Times* in size 12pt. All pages shall be numbered.

Structure & Content

The report's structure shall be the one of this document. In particular, the report shall contain a title page, a table of contents, a list of figures, all sections and subsections of this document, a bibliography, and an appendix with the final product backlog. Further appendices may be added as needed.

In the sequel, the expected content of each section is summarized in italics. It is strongly recommended that you use this document's \LaTeX sources as a template for your group's report.

Expected Number of Pages

The report shall be 30–50 pages *of text* in length. This excludes the title page, the table of contents, the table of figures, the bibliography, all appendices and the Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung, as well as all figures, diagrams and code excerpts/listings.

Figures & Diagrams

Each figure, diagram or code excerpt/listing/table shall be easily readable and have a number and caption that also appears in the list of figures/tables. See Figure 1 and Table 1 as examples.



Figure 1: Example figure.

Table 1: Example table

| Section number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Expected. no. of pages | 2–3 | 6–12 | 5–8 | 10–15 | 4–7 | 3–5 |

References

Citations shall be marked in square brackets by an alphanumeric author-year system, e.g., [?, ?] and [?]. Make sure that all sources are referenced properly and all bibliography entries are complete.

Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung

All group members shall sign the *Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung* (Declaration of Proper Academic Conduct) on the report's last page.

Please do not forget to justify in your report all technical and non-technical aspects of your group's conduct of the software development project.

Report

SWT-SWL-B Software Engineering Lab

Winter Semester 2016/17

Group A

| | | |
|-----------------|----------|----------|
| Frank Keßler | 1742945 | SoSySc/4 |
| Andreas Köllner | 17420191 | AI/7? |
| Jan Martin | 1796943 | AI/5 |
| Simon Meyer | 1785554 | WI/5 |
| Tobias Schwartz | 1738195 | SoSySc/6 |

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. G. Lüttgen

Version: February 2, 2017

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Project Organization | 5 |
| 1.1. Goal of the Software | 5 |
| 1.2. Organisation of the Group | 7 |
| 1.3. Project Blast-off | 7 |
| 2. Requirements | 13 |
| 3. Architecture & Design | 14 |
| 4. Realization | 15 |
| 4.1. Sprint Overview | 15 |
| 4.2. Sprint No. 1 | 16 |
| 4.3. Sprint No. 2 | 18 |
| 4.4. Sprint No. 3 | 19 |
| 4.5. Sprint No. 4 | 20 |
| 4.6. Sprint No. 5 | 21 |
| 5. Quality Assurance | 22 |
| 6. Project Review | 23 |
| 6.1. Development Process | 23 |
| 6.2. Team Work | 23 |
| 6.3. Lessons Learned | 23 |
| A. Product Backlog | 24 |
| B. Additional Material | 26 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| 1. | Example figure. | 2 |
| 2. | Stakeholder map | 9 |
| 3. | Context diagram | 10 |
| 4. | High level architecture | 11 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Example table | 2 |
| 2. | Distribution of work | 7 |
| 3. | Glossary | 10 |
| 4. | Risk analysis | 12 |
| 5. | List of user stories | 13 |
| 6. | User Story number 18: XML Parsing | 16 |
| 7. | User Story number 9: Test Run Selection | 16 |
| 8. | User Story number 12: Store XML in classes | 17 |

1. Project Organization

In this section we describe the overall goal of the project, the internal organisation and work distribution of our group, and our activities during the Blast-off of the project.

1.1. Goal of the Software

In this subsection we describe the goal of the Test Data Analyser (TDA). The TDA is developed for medatixx GmbH & Co. KG, a company that develops software for medical practices. TDA is an application to help software developers and testers at medatixx to analyse test data of their software. Purpose, advantage, and measurement are the three parts of which the goal of TDA is made of.

Purpose

During the development of their software, medatixx uses a sequence of builds, i.e. (pre-)release versions of the software. To ensure the quality of their product, each build is tested via a number of unit tests which are defined and executed on the classes of the corresponding build. The collection of these unit tests, their classes and the build they belong to, and their results is called a test run. TDA shall support the analysis of these test runs to help medatixx to discover builds with classes that are problematic to test.

To do so, TDA shall extract the necessary information from the test run XML files provided by medatixx, analyse the information in different ways including the usage of the Apriori algorithm and visualise the results of the information analysis.

Advantage

The TDA provides new and more detailed information on the tests of different builds. It highlights the classes with the highest failure percentage of a specific test run. It shows the evolution of a class by visualising its failure percentages over multiple test runs. By using the Apriori algorithm it shows possible associations between different classes. It offers an easy method to compare the tests of a specific class in different test runs.

With the additional information the TDA is making available for testers at medatixx, they get new insight into their testing methodology and the overall test quality is improved.

Measurement

Due to the easily accessible information on test runs and the discovered associations between classes, the resolution of failed classes and their corresponding unit tests will be accelerated by 50 %.

1.2. Organisation of the Group

Table 2: Distribution of work

| Name | Responsibilities | Principal Artefacts | Work Time |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Andreas | Identify user stories | User story cards | 5 |
| Andreas | Create stakeholder map | stakeholder map | 3 |
| Andreas | StAXParser | Methods for parsing | 10 |
| Andreas | Preparing paper prototype | Paper prototype | 6 |
| Andreas | Create high level architecture diagram | High level architecture diagram | 4 |
| Andreas | Documenting Sprint 2 | Sprint 2 wiki | 3 |
| Andreas | Directory browser in GUI | Corresponding methods | 3 |
| Andreas | Tree view and handling for imported test runs | Corresponding methods | 11 |
| Andreas | Testing of classes in package logic without Parser, Analyzer | JUnit tests | 12 |
| Andreas | Create use case diagram | use case diagram | 7 |
| Andreas | Exception handling in StAXParser | Corresponding methods | 2 |
| Andreas | Documentation of Model | Javadoc in Model | 2 |
| Andreas | Documentation of Logic classes | Javadoc in Logic | 8 |
| Andreas | Author of chapter 1 | Chapter in project report | 10 |
| Andreas | Author of chapter 4.1 | Chapter in project report | 3 |
| Andreas | Author of chapter 4.2 | Chapter in project report | 12 |
| Total Andreas | | | total |

1.3. Project Blast-off

The Project Blast-off is the most important activity to decide whether or not to go ahead with a project. It is used to gather

information on the project and make sure that it is viable and well founded.

Before we defined our goal for the project, we agreed that every member of our group should read and understand the project brief until our first official meeting. In our first meeting we collectively went through the requirements and every single described scenario. After making sure we were all on the same page and understood the content, we defined our goal of the whole project as described in subsection 1.1.

We continued by going through it again and highlighting epics and first user stories. In further cycles we worked on detailing them and lastly started on finding adequate tasks for the now written cards. Those tasks were not yet assigned to individual persons, as we still wanted to have the option to allocate them according to one's time and knowledge on the described topic later on. Soon first challenges arose when it came down to connecting tasks with one adequate user story. It appears that some tasks are used for many user stories, because they describe core functionalities and therefore have to be implemented in order to make the rest working. Then again, sometimes it was just difficult to assign a specific task to a user story at all, because it described a mandatory functionality that just wasn't covered by any adequate user story and creating one seemed not to be possible. We decided to discuss our concerns in the first meeting with the client.

During further discussion we identified the stakeholders of the project as shown in the stakeholder map in figure 2.

As you can see in figure 2 medatixx GmbH & Co. KG is listed as customer and client, since they use the TDA as an inhouse application. The typical users or normal operators of TDA are software testers and developers at medatixx.

In the next step we thought about the boundaries of our system, i.e. the scope of the work. As shown in figure 3, the TDA only has one indirect interface to adjacent systems. That interface is used by medatixx to provide the XML files from which TDA extracts the necessary information. We visualised this connection in the following




Figure 2: Stakeholder map

context diagram.

After we defined the scope of work of the TDA we discussed which architecture and design patterns we could use for our system. Also first ideas for specific classes and interfaces arose. Gladly, all of us had already visited the DSG-AJP-B course in previous semesters and so we could all contribute equally to the discussion without too much additional explanation of any named techniques. Since we have to deliver a GUI application in Java, we decided on a standard model-view-controller pattern. The corresponding high level architecture diagram is shown below in figure 4.

In the next step we constructed a central glossary to minimize misunderstandings in our communication and make sure to understand the language of the client.

The last task of sprint 0 was to conduct a risk analysis. Most likely we have to deal with sickness of individual persons every now and then. We try to limit the impact of this by good group communication, shared responsibilities and documentation. Also it is

Scope of the work area




Figure 3: Context diagram

Table 3: Glossary

| Term | Meaning |
|--------------------|--|
| Test run | A collection of unit tests of one specific build |
| Failure percentage | Failure percentage of class C = (Number of failed unit tests for class C) / (Total number of unit tests for class C) |
| TDA | Test Data Analyser (the program to be developed) |
| Problematic class | Class with a high test failure percentage |

likely that the client changes the specifications along the way, what we're going to cope by building adaptable software with loose coupling and high cohesion. The risks with the highest impact would be someone leaving the project or the complete loss of all our data. We are going to deal with this with shared responsibilities and backups, respectively. A complete and detailed risk analysis is shown in table 4.




Figure 4: High level architecture

Table 4: Risk analysis

| Risk | Coping | Likelyhood | Impact |
|---|---|------------|--------|
| Someone leaves the project | Shared Responsibilities | <10% | Severe |
| Complete data loss | Back ups | 5% | Severe |
| Usage of prohibited packages | Regular checks, test on external IDE | 10% | High |
| Sick team member | Shared responsibility, documentation | 50% | Medium |
| Client changes specifications | Adaptable software (loose coupling & high cohesion) | 50% | Medium |
| Unprecise specification (missing examples) | Communication with client | 20% | Medium |
| Research stories far more complex than expected | Do research early, conservative planning | 5% | Medium |
| Differing visions (unnecessary development) | Regular internal communication | 30% | Medium |
| Lab PCs insufficient for testing/development | Write performant code | 5% | Low |

2. Requirements

(Approx. 6–12 pages of text.) Frank

Document and analyse the software's functional requirements, non-functional requirements and development constraints. In particular, state whether a requirement is derived from the project brief, is an assumption made by your group, or has been added by the client. You may apply any documentation and analysis technique taught in module SWT-FSE-B or from the requirements engineering literature, including techniques based on user stories, use cases and prototyping. Properly reference and justify all employed techniques.

This section shall also include a table containing an overview of all user stories. Use Table 5 as a template, and order the stories regarding their ID (story number). Name the source of the story: project brief (PB), the client (C), or other sources. You can use the stories' name+ID in the sequel to refer to a certain story.

Table 5: List of user stories

| ID | Name | Size | Source | Sprint |
|----|------|------|--------|--------|
| : | : | : | : | : |

3. Architecture & Design

(Approx. 5–8 pages of text.) Tobias

Describe both the architecture and the design of your software. Illustrate its architecture and design using appropriate UML diagrams. Motivate its architecture and design in the light of design principles and possible alternatives. Also highlight any use of architectural patterns and design patterns. Pay special attention to justifying all design decisions taken.

4. Realization

4.1. Sprint Overview

In this subsection a quick overview of all Sprints is given, including the vision underlying each Sprint.

By the end of Sprint 1 TDA should be able to parse the XML files provided by the client into our internal data structure. Furthermore a first paper prototype of TDA should be created to demonstrate our vision of TDA to the client. This way we wanted to make sure, that we understood the project and that he approves of our design decisions.

In Sprint 2 our goal was to display the information we parsed into our data structure in a GUI. The user should be able to select one or more XML files and the TDA presents a table of one chosen test run, containing all tested classes and their failure percentage. The table is sorted in decreasing order of the failure percentage and the classes with the highest failure percentage are highlighted.

During Sprint 3 our goal was to display a chart that visualises the evolution of the failure percentage of a class over all loaded test runs. Furthermore we wanted to implement the Apriori algorithm to perform a dependency analysis on failed classes. During this Sprint we received the change request from the client which had to be worked into our system.

In Sprint 4 we wanted to rework the Apriori algorithm, since our first implementation was not very efficient. We also wanted to display the results of the Apriori algorithm in our GUI. Furthermore the implementation of our first additional usage scenario should be finished. The additional functionality should enable the user to compare a class in 2 different testruns and see how the outcome of its unit tests have changed.

During Sprint 5 our goal was to finalise our system so that we could present a rounded and finished product to the client. We also wanted to come up with an additional usage scenario for the client, which enables him to further analyse his test runs.

4.2. Sprint No. 1

(Approx. 2–3 pages of text.) Andy

Sprint Planning

State the goal of and the user stories chosen for this sprint (sprint backlog). Detail the tasks that your group derived from each user story, and provide the names of the team members allocated to each task.

Our goal for Sprint 1 was to implement the StAX parser to offer the basic functionality of parsing the given test run XML files into our internal data structure to the client.

We also wanted to design a first paper prototype of our system, so that we could get a first feedback on our design decisions.

Our Sprint backlog for this Sprint contained three user stories: # 18 XML Parsing, # 9 Test Run Selection and # 12 Store XML in classes. Additionally we created one research story for this Sprint, belonging to the StAX parser and its functionalities.

The tasks we derived from our user stories can be found in the following tables.

Table 6: User Story number 18: XML Parsing

| Task number | Task description | Assigned to |
|-------------|--|------------------------|
| 18.1 | Create package structure for project | Frank |
| 18.2 | Create parser class | Frank |
| 18.3 | Find elements in XML file | Tobias, Frank, Andreas |
| 18.4 | Implement parsing functionality | Tobias, Frank |
| 18.5 | Store parsed information in data structure | Tobias, Frank, Andreas |

Table 7: User Story number 9: Test Run Selection

| Task number | Task description | Assigned to |
|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | |

Table 8: User Story number 12: Store XML in classes

| Task number | Task description | Assigned to |
|-------------|---|-------------|
| 12.1 | Identify classes to represent information stored in XML files | all |
| 12.2 | Create class TestData | Jan |
| 12.3 | Create classes TestRun, TestedClass and UnitTest | Simon |

Noteworthy Development Aspects

Describe and justify the development approach taken and the artefacts produced in this sprint (e.g., prototypes). State any peculiarities of this sprint, such as peculiarities regarding (i) adopted development practices, (ii) encountered obstacles, (iii) questions that arose and needed clarification possibly from the client, or (iv) important aspects regarding — or changes to — your software architecture, your algorithms or your techniques applied to solve a technical problem.

Sprint Review

Describe the product increment produced in this sprint. Compare the achieved increment with the sprint goal and the user stories that were chosen for this sprint. Give a brief summary on your group's retrospective, including changes to the product backlog and also to the development process and/or techniques that you installed after the sprint in order to overcome any identified obstacle.

4.3. Sprint No. 2

(Approx. 2–3 pages of text.)

Sprint Planning

Noteworthy Development Aspects

Sprint Review

4.4. Sprint No. 3

(Approx. 2–3 pages of text.) Jan

Sprint Planning

The goal for Sprint 3 was to finish and merge the LineChart visual output that missed the Sprint 2 deadline, as well as the implementation the Apriori Algorithm. For the purpose of creating a working Apriori Implementation, a research story with unknown size was assigned.

Noteworthy Development Aspects

Sprint Review

The original intent for Sprint 3 was to implement both the LineChart visual output that missed the Sprint 2 deadline and the Apriori Algorithm. For this purpose, development time was allotted to research , and some trial and error was expected on both user stories. While the GUI implementation of the Chart proved to be easier than expected, the Apriori development did not. Mid Sprint, the Group received the Change Request, and, after analysing the new requirements, it was evident that the planned Apriori implementation would have to be significantly changed after the Change request would be merged in. Thus we decided to prioritize the implementation of the treeview necessary for the adapted Apriori both in the program logic and the GUI.

4.5. Sprint No. 4

(Approx. 2–3 pages of text.)

Sprint Planning

Noteworthy Development Aspects

Sprint Review

4.6. Sprint No. 5

(Approx. 2–3 pages of text.)

Sprint Planning

Noteworthy Development Aspects

Sprint Review

5. Quality Assurance

(Approx. 4–7 pages of text.)

Describe and justify the different quality assurance techniques that your group has applied alongside the project's conduct, including the INVEST criteria for the user stories, SMART criteria for the tasks derived from user stories, unit tests for your code, and others.

Illustrate your approach to quality assurance by giving relevant examples for each employed technique. Finally, do not forget to evaluate your software's interfaces (including the GUI).

6. Project Review

(Approx. 3–5 pages of text.) Simon

6.1. Development Process

How well did your group's development process work, and why? Did the process change between sprints? In addition, compare and contrast the SCRUM process as practised by your group to (i) 'the' textbook SCRUM process [?] and (ii) the other software development processes presented in module SWT-FSE-B. Could your group's development process be improved, and by which means?

6.2. Team Work

How well did your team work together? Was the distribution of work and the communication among team members effective? Was the communication with the client effective?

6.3. Lessons Learned

What would you change if you could re-start the project, regarding the employed techniques, the conduct of the project and any other matters that you consider relevant? What should stay the same?

A. Product Backlog

*Insert the final product backlog that includes **all** user stories of your project (cf. front and back sides of your story cards). Order the stories in the backlog regarding the sprint in which they were completed.*

Stories completed in Sprint 1

Include stories that were completed in the first sprint.

Stories completed in Sprint 2

Include stories that were completed in the second sprint.

Stories completed in Sprint 3

Include stories that were completed in the third sprint.

Stories completed in Sprint 4

Include stories that were completed in the fourth sprint.

Stories completed in Sprint 5

Include stories that were completed in the fifth sprint.

Not completed Stories

Include stories that were not completed by the end of the project.

Other Stories

Include here stories that were split or combined and do not appear above.

B. Additional Material

If needed, insert any additional material, e.g., larger diagrams or longer excerpts of source code, in this and possibly further appendices. Properly reference all appendices from the report's main part.

Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung

Alle Unterzeichner erklären hiermit, dass sie die vorliegende Arbeit (bestehend aus dem Projektbericht sowie den separat abgelieferten digitalen Werkbestandteilen) selbständig verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt haben.

- Frank Keßler

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Ort/Datum | Unterschrift |
|-----------|--------------|

- Andreas Köllner

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Ort/Datum | Unterschrift |
|-----------|--------------|

- Jan Martin

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Ort/Datum | Unterschrift |
|-----------|--------------|

- Simon Meyer

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Ort/Datum | Unterschrift |
|-----------|--------------|

- Tobias Schwartz

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Ort/Datum | Unterschrift |
|-----------|--------------|