

# Verification and Validation Report: SFWRENG 4G06

Team 9, dice\_devs

John Popovici

Nigel Moses

Naishan Guo

Hemraj Bhatt

Isaac Giles

March 9, 2025

# 1 Revision History

Table 1: Revision History

Date	Developer(s)	Change
2025-03-09	John Popovici	Document format and reflection start
...	...	...

## 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	Unit Testing	1
6	Changes Due to Testing	1
7	Automated Testing	1
8	Trace to Requirements	1
9	Trace to Modules	1
10	Code Coverage Metrics	1

# List of Tables

1	Revision History . . . . .	i
---	----------------------------	---

# List of Figures

This document ...

### **3 Functional Requirements Evaluation**

### **4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation**

#### **4.1 Usability**

#### **4.2 Performance**

#### **4.3 etc.**

### **5 Unit Testing**

### **6 Changes Due to Testing**

[This section should highlight how feedback from the users and from the supervisor (when one exists) shaped the final product. In particular the feedback from the Rev 0 demo to the supervisor (or to potential users) should be highlighted. —SS]

### **7 Automated Testing**

### **8 Trace to Requirements**

### **9 Trace to Modules**

### **10 Code Coverage Metrics**

## 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?
  - Since we already had the VnV Plan in a completed state, we were familiar with both the product and the VnV process we were looking to undertake. (John P.)
2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?
  - This deliverable came near the end of the development process, when the game was mostly completed save some final features and bugs, meaning there was some lack in motivation due to the work being more maintenance based. There was additionally exams and other events during this time. To help resolve this, the extension to the due date was of help and meetings where we discussed the final steps and end goals were had to help us hunker down and get the work over with. (John P.)
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?

- The most significant element of this document that stemmed from speaking to the stakeholders of the project came through usability testing and playtesting feedback. As of 2025-03-09, 27 of 137 feature and bug issues on github stem from playtesting feedback. This feedback comes from external testing as we had internal testing and playtesting as well which generated issues. These issues addressed different elements of functional and nonfunctional requirements but especially led to the use of the section addressing changes due to testing. (John P.)
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.)
- ...