

Verification and Validation Report: MES-ERP

Team #26, Ethical Pals

Sufyan Motala

Rachid Khneisser

Housam Alamour

Omar Muhammad

Taaha Atif

March 9, 2025

1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Date 1	1.0	Notes
Date 2	1.1	Notes

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
T	Test

[symbols, abbreviations or acronyms – you can reference the SRS tables if needed —SS]

Contents

1	Revision History	i
2	Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms	ii
3	Functional Requirements Evaluation	1
4	Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation	1
4.1	Usability	1
4.2	Performance	1
4.3	etc.	1
5	Comparison to Existing Implementation	1
6	Unit Testing	1
6.1	Testing Approach	1
6.2	Unit Test Cases	2
6.3	Edge Cases Tested	3
7	Changes Due to Testing	4
7.1	Bug Fixes	4
7.2	User Feedback and Enhancements	4
7.3	Performance and Security Improvements	5
8	Automated Testing	5
9	Trace to Requirements	5
10	Trace to Modules	5
11	Code Coverage Metrics	5

List of Tables

1	Sample Unit Test Cases	2
---	----------------------------------	---

List of Figures

This document ...

3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

4.1 Usability

4.2 Performance

4.3 etc.

5 Comparison to Existing Implementation

This section will not be appropriate for every project.

6 Unit Testing

Unit testing was conducted using a combination of automated and manual testing to ensure key functionalities worked as expected. The primary objectives were:

- Verify that critical features, such as reimbursement submissions and approvals, group creation, and user management work correctly.
- Identify and resolve potential errors early in the development cycle.
- Ensure that the system remains stable after modifications.

6.1 Testing Approach

The team used **Jest** for automated testing of frontend logic and API calls, and **manual testing** for real-world scenario validation. The approach included:

- Writing unit tests for key functions such as group creation, deletion, and authentication handling.

- Conducting manual test runs where team members acted as users submitting and approving reimbursement requests.
- Gathering feedback from a small group of MES student leaders who tested the platform and provided insights.
- Running scenario-based testing sessions to simulate real-world usage, such as handling multiple reimbursement requests at once.

6.2 Unit Test Cases

The test cases covered core functionalities, including validation checks and API interactions:

Table 1: Sample Unit Test Cases

Test Case	Expected Output
Create a group with a unique name	Group is successfully created
Attempt to create a group with an existing name	System displays an error message
Unauthorized user attempts to access group management	Access is denied with error message
Delete a group with no assigned users	Group is successfully deleted
Attempt to delete a group with assigned users	System prevents deletion and notifies the user
Handle failed database connection during group fetch	Error is logged, and fallback UI is displayed
Register a new user with valid credentials	User is successfully created and logged in
Attempt to register with an existing email	System displays an error message
Login with correct credentials	User is authenticated and redirected to the dashboard
Login with incorrect credentials	System displays an error message

Continued on next page

Table 1 – *Continued from previous page*

Test Case	Expected Output
Assign a role to a user	User is successfully assigned the role
Remove a role from a user	User no longer has the role permissions
Attempt to assign an invalid role	System displays an error message
Submit a payment request with valid details	Request is successfully submitted
Submit a payment request missing required fields	System displays an error message
View all payment requests as an admin	Admin sees all requests
View only personal payment requests as a user	User sees only their own requests
Attempt to approve a request without proper permissions	Access is denied with an error message
Update request status successfully	Request status is updated
Handle failed database connection when fetching requests	Error is logged, and fallback UI is displayed

6.3 Edge Cases Tested

- Submitting a reimbursement request without required fields.
- Uploading incorrect file formats for receipts.
- Attempting to create a duplicate group.
- Handling multiple users modifying the same data simultaneously.
- Ensuring database rollback occurs when a transaction fails.
- Registering a user with an invalid email format.
- Assigning multiple roles to a user and verifying access control.

- Submitting a payment request with an incorrect amount format.
- Preventing unauthorized users from updating request statuses.
- Ensuring bulk request approvals work correctly.

7 Changes Due to Testing

Based on the testing process and feedback from users, the following modifications were made to the system:

7.1 Bug Fixes

- Fixed an issue where reimbursements submitted without attachments were still being processed.
- Addressed a bug where users could submit duplicate requests.
- Resolved a login issue where incorrect error messages were displayed.
- Fixed a bug where request status updates were not properly reflected in the UI.
- Added the ability for users to be in multiple groups.

7.2 User Feedback and Enhancements

- Improved the **receipt upload system** by making the file upload process clearer.
- Enhanced **audit logging** for better tracking of request status changes.
- Added a clearer role management interface to reduce confusion when assigning roles.
- Improved user experience by adding filters to search for specific payment requests.

7.3 Performance and Security Improvements

- Implemented basic input validation to prevent incorrect data submissions.
- Reduced system load times by optimizing database queries.
- Strengthened authentication by enforcing stricter password requirements.
- Enhanced role-based access control to prevent unauthorized modifications.

8 Automated Testing

9 Trace to Requirements

10 Trace to Modules

11 Code Coverage Metrics

References

Appendix — Reflection

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

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. Which parts of this document stemmed from speaking to your client(s) or a proxy (e.g. your peers)? Which ones were not, and why?
4. In what ways was the Verification and Validation (VnV) Plan different from the activities that were actually conducted for VnV? If there were differences, what changes required the modification in the plan? Why did these changes occur? Would you be able to anticipate these changes in future projects? If there weren't any differences, how was your team able to clearly predict a feasible amount of effort and the right tasks needed to build the evidence that demonstrates the required quality? (It is expected that most teams will have had to deviate from their original VnV Plan.)