

System Verification and Validation Plan for Bridge Corrosion: A Chloride Exposure Prediction Model

Cynthia Liu

February 18, 2024

Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Feb 9, 2024	1.0	Initial release

Contents

1	Symbols, Abbreviations, and Acronyms	iv
1.1	Table of Symbols	iv
1.2	Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
2	General Information	1
2.1	Summary	1
2.2	Objectives	1
2.3	Relevant Documentation	1
3	Plan	1
3.1	Verification and Validation Team	2
3.2	SRS Verification Plan	2
3.3	Design Verification Plan	3
3.4	Verification and Validation Plan Verification Plan	3
3.5	Implementation Verification Plan	3
3.6	Automated Testing and Verification Tools	3
3.7	Software Validation Plan	3
4	System Test Description	4
4.1	Tests for Functional Requirements	4
4.1.1	Input Test - test_invalid_input	4
4.1.2	Intermediate Tests - test_model_calculation	7
4.1.3	Output Tests - test_output	8
4.2	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements	9
4.2.1	NFR: Reliability	9
4.2.2	NFR: Usability	9
4.2.3	NFR: Maintainability	10
4.2.4	NFR: Portability	10
4.2.5	NFR: Scalability	11
4.3	Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements	11
5	Unit Test Description	11
5.1	Unit Testing Scope	12
5.2	Tests for Functional Requirements	12
5.2.1	Module 1	12
5.2.2	Module 2	13

5.3	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements	13
5.3.1	Module ?	14
5.3.2	Module ?	14
5.4	Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules	14
6	Appendix	15
6.1	Symbolic Parameters	15
6.2	Usability Survey Questions	15

List of Tables

1	Verification and Validation Team	2
2	Coordinate input tests	4
3	Climate model input tests	5
4	Traffic model input tests	6
5	Test Case for Model Calculation	7
6	Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements	11

1 Symbols, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

1.1 Table of Symbols

symbol	unit	description
C_s	$kg/m^3/vehicle$	chloride on the bridge substructure
$C_{s_{air}}$	$kg/m^3/vehicle$	chloride sprayed and splashed per unit air volume per vehicle
h_{app}	m	daily water film thickness on the road
h_{total}	m	the total snowfall during a winter season
M_{app}	kg/m^2	deicing salts quantity applied per day
M_{total}	kg/m^2	total amount of deicing salts quantity over winter
SD_{total}	$kg/m^3/vehicle$	spray density kicked up by each passing truck
$SD_{total\ cl}$	$kg/m^3/vehicle$	mass of chloride ions per unit air volume
t_1	days	number of days with snowfall
t_2	days	number of days with snow melting

1.2 Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AADTT	Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic
BC	Bridge Corrosion
CI	Continuous Integration
FR	Functional Requirement
MG	Module Guide
MIS	Module Interface Specification
NFR	Non-functional Requirement
R	Requirement
SRS	Software Requirements Specification
T	Test
VnV	Verification and Validation

2 General Information

This document provides the road-map of the verification and validation plan for Bridge Corrosion (BC), and ensure the requirements and goals of the program mentioned in SRS. The organization of this document starts with the general information and verification plans, followed by the system test description for functional and non-functional requirements. Then, it includes the unit test which would not be filled in until after the MIS.

2.1 Summary

The software BC, provides predictive trends for chloride exposure based on user-input coordinates within the province of Ontario. The software utilizes climate and traffic models to build a chloride exposure database, and search for the trend when user input location data.

2.2 Objectives

The objective of this document is to build confidence in the software's correctness and increase its reliability. All functional requirements and non-functional requirements mentioned in SRS are tested. We will try to cover a usability test if we have time and resource. We also assume the climate and traffic models we generate online have been verified by their implementation team so their accuracy is ensured.

2.3 Relevant Documentation

The relevant documentation includes [Problem Statement](#) which is the proposed idea, [Software Requirements Specifications](#) which outlines the requirement of the software. It would also be related to VnV Report which is a conclusion for validation and verification after the software is developed.

3 Plan

The VnV plan begins by introducing the verification and validation team (section [3.1](#)), followed by the verification plans for the SRS (section [3.2](#)) and design (section [3.3](#)). Subsequently, the verification plans for the VnV Plan

(section 3.4) and implementation (section 3.5) are presented. In the end, there are sections on automated testing and verification tools (Section 3.6) and the software validation plan (section 3.7).

3.1 Verification and Validation Team

Name	Document	Role	Description
Dr. Spencer Smith	All	Instructor/ Reviewer	Review all the documents.
Mingsai Xu	-	Domain Expert	Provide theory support for the software.
Cynthia Liu	All	Author	Create all the documents, implement the software, and verify the implementation according to the VnV plan.
Phil Du	All	Domain Expert Reviewer	Review all the documents.
Hunter Ceranic	SRS	Secondary Reviewer	Review the SRS document.
Fasil Cheema	VnV plan	Secondary Reviewer	Review the VnV plan.
Fatemeh Norouziani	MG + MIS	Secondary Reviewer	Review the MG and MIS document.

Table 1: Verification and Validation Team

3.2 SRS Verification Plan

The SRS verification is done by peer review with classmates (Phil Du and Hunter Ceranic), giving suggestions by creating issues in Github. The author (Cynthia Liu) is responsible for reviewing and addressing the issues.

The SRS verification is also reviewed by Dr. Spencer Smith to offer any suggestions and feedbacks.

There is a [SRS checklist](#) designed by Dr. Spencer Smith available to use if desired.

3.3 Design Verification Plan

The design verification, including the module guide (MG) and module interface specification (MIS), will be verified by Phil Du and Fatemeh Norouziani. Dr. Spencer Smith will also review both documents. Reviewers will give feedbacks through Github issues and the author need to address them. The [MG checklist](#) and [MIS checklist](#) designed by Dr. Spencer Smith could act as a help for reviewers.

3.4 Verification and Validation Plan Verification Plan

The VnV plan is first created and verified by the author, then turns to the team members to give any suggests by Github issues. The reviewers will access the [VnV checklist](#) designed by Dr. Spencer Smith for reference.

3.5 Implementation Verification Plan

The implementation would be verified by testing the functional requirements and non-functional requirements in section 4. The unit tests will also be conducted as detailed in section 5. If possible, a code walkthrough could happen.

3.6 Automated Testing and Verification Tools

The first part of the software, generating the database through climate and traffic model, will be done in MATLAB. The second part of finding the data for the input location, will be done in R. The automated testing will be done in MATLAB and R correspondingly. During the coding, [mlint](#) and [lintr](#) will be used as a static code analysis. The Github Actions is used for continuous integration, that the CI work flow will run when new code is pushed to the repository. It will also run the CI tests and provide the results of each test in the pull request, so we can see whether the change in the branch introduces an error.

3.7 Software Validation Plan

Software validation plan is beyond the scope for BC as it may require additional time, expertise, and resources that are not available within the scope of the project.

4 System Test Description

4.1 Tests for Functional Requirements

Functional requirements for BC are given in [SRS](#) section 5.1. There are five functional requirements for BC, R1 is related to the input, R3 is related to the midway calculation, and the other requirements are corresponding to outputs. Section [4.1.1](#) describes the input tests related to R1, and section [4.1.2](#) describes the test related to R3. The output test related to other requirements is discussed in section [4.1.3](#).

4.1.1 Input Test - test_invalid_input

This section covers R1 of the SRS which includes the input coordinates check for the software. This section also cover the dataset inputs that developers input from models to the software. In most of the cases, the dataset in the models are valid as they have been verified by their developers, but the test cases here still include the scenarios where data may be missing or invalid.

Functional tests - Input tests - Coordinate

Input (°)		Output	
<i>longitude</i>	<i>latitude</i>	valid?	Error Message
278.9699	44.46539	Y	NONE
278.9699	41.197	N	Input position not inside Ontario
-84.34	44.46539	N	Input position not inside Ontario
-81.0301	44.46539	Y	NONE
-74.3	45.2	Y	NONE
278.9699		N	Missing latitude
	44.46539	N	Missing longitude

Table 2: Coordinate input tests

1. test-input-coordinate

Control: Automatic

Initial State: Uninitialized

Input: The input column in Table 2.

Output: The output column in Table 2.

Test Case Derivation: The input coordinate need to be a location inside Ontario. The software produces error message for the invalid inputs, for the valid inputs, it will proceed to next step. [\[Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS\]](#)

How test will be performed: The author will create test cases and run automatic test by R.

Functional tests - Input tests - Models

Input (°)			Output	
h_{total}	t_1	t_2	valid?	Error Message
183.9371	109	76	Y	None
194.6057	367	255	N	t_1 and t_2 must be less than 365
119.62	53	-30	N	t_1 and t_2 need to be positive
	109	76	N	Data missing for h_{total}
183.9371		76	N	Data missing for t_1
183.9371	109		N	Data missing for t_2

Table 3: Climate model input tests

1. test-input-climate

Control: Automatic

Initial State: Uninitialized

Input: The input column in Table 3.

Output: The output column in Table 3.

Test Case Derivation: This test case is used when inputting the climate models, the software will try to find the data needed for the software. If there is no such data it will produce error message. It will also produce error message if there is such data but it is invalid.

How test will be performed: The author will pick the sample test case from the model (as in Table 3) and create automatic test by R.

Input (°)		Output	
<i>AADT</i>	<i>AADTT</i>	valid?	Error Message
20176	433	Y	NONE
152	8095	N	<i>AADTT</i> should be less than <i>AADT</i>
	152	N	Data missing for <i>AADT</i>
8095		N	Data missing for <i>AADTT</i>

Table 4: Traffic model input tests

2. test-input-traffic

Control: Automatic

Initial State: Uninitialized

Input: The input column in Table 4.

Output: The output column in Table 4.

Test Case Derivation: This test case is applicable when entering climate models into the software. The software will attempt to locate the necessary data. If the required data is not found, it will generate an error message. Similarly, if the data exists but is invalid, the software will also generate an error message.

How test will be performed: The author will pick the sample test case from the model (as in Table 4) and create automatic test by R.

4.1.2 Intermediate Tests - test_model_calculation

This section covers R3 of the SRS which includes the check for the middle calculation of the software to generate the database of the software. There are six steps over the calculation process following section 4.4 in [SRS](#) as the following.

- Step 1: Calcualte the quantity of deicing salts applied per day with snowfall.
- Step 2: Calcualte the thickness of melted water per day with snow melting.
- Step 3: Calculate the water sprayed and splashed by one truck.
- Step 4: Calculate the chloride ions sprayed and splashed by one truck.
- Step 5: Calculate the chloride ions sprayed and splashed by all vehicles in one winter season.
- Step 6: Calculate the deposition of deicing salts on the surface of the bridge substructure.

Test case	Input from Model	Input from Previous Steps	Expected Output
Step 1	$M_{total} = 7.42, t_1 = 106$	n/a	$M_{app} = 0.07$
Step 2	$h_{total} = 206.2145, t_1 = 106$	n/a	$h_{app} = 1.945$
Step 3	n/a	$h_{app} = 1.945$	$SD_{total} = 97.96$
Step 4	n/a	$SD_{total} = 97.96, M_{app} = 0.07, h_{app} = 1.945$	$SD_{total\ cl} = 0.00216$
Step 5	$AADT = 1730, AADTT = 103, t_2 = 76$	$SD_{total\ cl} = 0.00216$	$C_{s_{air}} = 21.7983$
Step 6	n/a	$C_{s_{air}} = 21.7983$	$C_s = 18.668$

Table 5: Test Case for Model Calculation

Functional tests - Intermediate tests - Model Calculations

1. test-calculation

Control: Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: The input columns in Table 5. The input are selected from the models or the result value from previous steps.

Output: The output columns in Table 5. The test case is considered to pass if the epsilon between the actual output and the expected output is within a specified threshold. The detail of threshold will be determined later in the development.

Test Case Derivation: The table shows one sample calculation for the chloride exposure. The expected value in the output column is determined using the equation provided by Mingsai et al ([1]). At each step, the test case verifies if the calculation for the corresponding step is accurate. If it is, the test proceeds to the next step.

How test will be performed: The automatic test will be performed by R. There will be assert function for each step, and there will be more test cases rather than the one in the table.

4.1.3 Output Tests - test_output

This section covers R2, R4, R5 of the SRS which includes the check for the final outputs.

Functional tests - Output tests - Chloride exposure

1. test-output-exposure

Control: Automatic

Initial State: Uninitialized

Input: Coordinate

Output: If the input coordinate is within Ontario, it will return a series (length of at lease ten) of two decimal points data showing the chloride exposure at that location.

Test Case Derivation: This test case cover the R2 and R5 of the SRS. The test will be done by checking the length of the output and the precision after decimal points. The expected value should be within the data constraints in the 4.4.7 section of [SRS](#).

How test will be performed: The automatic test will be performed by R.

2. test-output-verification

Control: Manual

Initial State: Uninitialized

Input: Chloride exposure data

Output: True or False.

Test Case Derivation: This test case cover the R4 of the requirement. It compared the chloride exposure data that the software generates with the real world data for verification. The test result will be true if the derivation is within a threshold. The detail value of the threshold will be determined during development.

How test will be performed: Manually compare it with the real world data from previous year.

4.2 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

Non-functional requirements for BC are given in [SRS](#) section 5.2. There are five non-functional requirements for BC, which are described in the following sections correspondingly.

4.2.1 NFR: Reliability

Reliability The reliability of the software is tested through the test for functional requirements in section 4.1.2 and the unit testing in section [5](#).

4.2.2 NFR: Usability

Usability

1. test-usability

Type: Manual with potential users

Initial State: The software is set up and ready for testing.

Input/Condition: None

Output/Result: Survey result about the user experience with the software.

How test will be performed: Observe real users as they perform tasks with the software. Ask them to fill out a survey on their experience, including ease of use, intuitiveness, and any challenges encountered. The survey could be find in [6.2](#)

4.2.3 NFR: Maintainability

Maintainability

1. test-maintainability

Type: Code walkthrough with potential developers

Initial State: None

Input/Condition: None

Output/Result: Feedback from fellow classmates or team members in Table [1](#).

How test will be performed: Show the code and the other documents to fellow classmates/potential developers, ask them to explain the code to the author and see how much they could understand. Gather any feedback or questions they have.

4.2.4 NFR: Portability

Portability

1. test-portability

Type: Manual

Initial State: None

Input/Condition: None

Output/Result: Result of compilation.

How test will be performed: Manually run the system on multiple versions of browser and operating system to see if it is successful.

4.2.5 NFR: Scalability

Scalability

1. test-scalability

Type: Automatic

Initial State: The software is set up and ready for testing.

Input/Condition: Increase the workload by adding more data.

Output/Result: Different response time on how the software handles the increased workload.

How test will be performed: Record the response time for the software when given increasing amount of dataset, evaluate the different response time.

4.3 Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements

	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	NFR1	NFR2	NFR3	NFR4	NFR5
Test 4.1.1	X									
Test 4.1.2			X							
Test 4.1.3		X		X	X					
Test 4.2.1						X				
Test 4.2.2							X			
Test 4.2.3								X		
Test 4.2.4									X	
Test 4.2.5										X

Table 6: Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements

5 Unit Test Description

This section will be filled in after the MIS (detailed design document) has been completed.

[This section should not be filled in until after the MIS (detailed design document) has been completed. —SS]

[Reference your MIS (detailed design document) and explain your overall philosophy for test case selection. —SS]

[To save space and time, it may be an option to provide less detail in this section. For the unit tests you can potentially layout your testing strategy here. That is, you can explain how tests will be selected for each module. For instance, your test building approach could be test cases for each access program, including one test for normal behaviour and as many tests as needed for edge cases. Rather than create the details of the input and output here, you could point to the unit testing code. For this to work, your code needs to be well-documented, with meaningful names for all of the tests. —SS]

5.1 Unit Testing Scope

[What modules are outside of the scope. If there are modules that are developed by someone else, then you would say here if you aren't planning on verifying them. There may also be modules that are part of your software, but have a lower priority for verification than others. If this is the case, explain your rationale for the ranking of module importance. —SS]

5.2 Tests for Functional Requirements

[Most of the verification will be through automated unit testing. If appropriate specific modules can be verified by a non-testing based technique. That can also be documented in this section. —SS]

5.2.1 Module 1

[Include a blurb here to explain why the subsections below cover the module. References to the MIS would be good. You will want tests from a black box perspective and from a white box perspective. Explain to the reader how the tests were selected. —SS]

1. test-id1

Type: [Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Automatic, Static etc. Most will be automatic —SS]

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:

2. test-id2

Type: [Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Automatic, Static etc. Most will be automatic —SS]

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:

3. ...

5.2.2 Module 2

...

5.3 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

[If there is a module that needs to be independently assessed for performance, those test cases can go here. In some projects, planning for nonfunctional tests of units will not be that relevant. —SS]

[These tests may involve collecting performance data from previously mentioned functional tests. —SS]

5.3.1 Module ?

1. test-id1

Type: [Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Automatic, Static etc. Most will be automatic —SS]

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

[Provide evidence that all of the modules have been considered. —SS]

Reference

1. Mingsai Xu, Yuxin Zheng, Cancan Yang (2024). Assessing Highway Bridge Chloride Exposure at a Provincial Scale: Mapping and Projecting Impacts of Climate Change. [Manuscript in preparation].

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

- From one to five and five being the most satisfied, how would you rate your overall experience using the software?
- Were the instructions clear and easy to understand. If no, please explain why.
- Did the software include all the features you expected? If no, what additional features would you like to see?
- From one to five and five being the most satisfied, how would you rate the speed and responsiveness of the software?

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

Appendix — Reflection

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

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. Please answer the following questions:

1. 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 etc. You should look to identify at least one item for each team member.
2. 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?