

Codmon: A multi-platform modular test environment.

Berend van Veenendaal

March 3, 2014

TODO:Abstract

Preface

TODO: Preface, acknowledgements

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Background	4
1.2	Problem indication	4
1.3	Problem statement	4
1.4	Thesis outline	5
2	Codmon	6
2.1	Codmon Design	6
2.2	Codmon problems	6
3	Codmon 2.0	7
3.1	the road to Codmon 2.0	7
3.2	Codmon 2.0	7
3.2.1	The init.xml file	7
3.2.2	Version control	7
3.2.3	wrappers	7
3.3	experiments	7
4	Conclusion and related work	8

1 Introduction

This chapter will give an introduction about the Codmon 2.0 project by giving a brief description of background of my research and of the previous version of the Codmon project. It also describes the structure of the reminder of this thesis.

1.1 Background

In times when software projects become more and more complex, testing of this software becomes more and more important. Many software related problems are caused by lack of testing of the software [6]. One of the challenges of software engineering is to make sure that the software behaves in the same way on different platforms. Even when software is written in such a way that it can run on multiple platforms, there are still issues that must be dealt with, before one is able to run and test the software. Think about the configuration of the test environment or finding and installing all the prerequisite libraries etc etc.

1.2 Problem indication

Now days there are numerous test frameworks and test environments available. For example there is *Junit*[3] for Java-unit testing and *NUnit*[4] for C#-unit testing. There are also different environments like Hudson[1], [5], Jenkins[2] which can build a project and run a series of (unit) tests against this project. All of the frameworks and environments have both their advantages and disadvantages. One of the advantages of unit testing is that a software developer easily can add new *functional* unit tests. One of the disadvantages is that standard unit testing ignores non-functional tests like performance testing and the deployment of the software. Jenkins and Hudson, like Unit tests, also have their disadvantages. One of them is, although they both run on different platforms, in their usage they are not really platform independent. For example, If you want to make a connection from Hudson or Jenkins to a remote machine you do this by executing a shell script to be able to do this, a user must know in advance on which platform this script has to run. With this in mind you can see that, although it is possible to connect to different machines it is not a 100% platform independent environment.

1.3 Problem statement

The test frameworks and test environments mentioned in section 1.2 can be criticized on one or more aspects. What we are looking for is in fact, a combination of the positive aspects of the described frameworks and environments, without getting the undesirable aspects for free. So the big question is, is it possible to design a multi-platform, modular test environment? If the answer to this question is yes, if we manage to design such a test environment, is it also possible to design it in such a way that is user friendly and maintainable? To be able to answer the second question we first have to define what is meant with "*user friendly*" in this thesis, with user friendly we

mean that it must be possible to add easily both new test cases and software under test to the test environment. In other words a user must be able to add both new test cases and software to the test environment without knowing anything about the internal mechanisms of the test environment.

This thesis describes a multi-platform, user friendly modular test environment called Codmon 2.0. The Codmon 2.0 project provides users with a set of virtual machines, in which Codmon 2.0 is already installed and preconfigured. The purpose of the virtual machines is to make it as user friendly as possible. By doing it this way the only things a Codmon 2.0 user has to do are 1) add their project to the init.xml file. ant add the tests to a so called wrapper file. Both of these files will be discussed in more detail in sections 3.2.1 and ?? .

1.4 Thesis outline

Section 2 first describes the current Codmon framework. It starts with telling why the original Codmon was built. Then it continues with a description of the design of Codmon in section 2.1. Section 2.2 treats the problems of the current Codmon project. Section 3 describes the Codmon 2.0 project. This section starts with the a subsection called *The road to Codmon 2.0*. Here we explain the ideas that came into mind and how we got to the final Codmon 2.0 design. Section 3 describes the Codmon 2.0 project. It starts with a general description of the project followed by a detailed explanation of the different modules of Codmon 2.0. In Section 4 we discuss the results based on section 3.3. We end this section with a brief discussion of related work.

2 Codmon

Before we start describing the Codmon 2.0 we start with a description of the current Codmon framework. We first describe How Codmon works and why it is not good enough for the purposes mentioned in section 1.3.

2.1 Codmon Design

2.2 Codmon problems

3 Codmon 2.0

3.1 the road to Codmon 2.0

//TODO: Think of better subsection title!! //TODO: Explain ideas and road to solution

3.2 Codmon 2.0

//TODO: adapt Codmon 2.0 to new project name. //TODO: 2) Explain Solution, including why it's different then existing solutions (compare with solutions described in the problem indication)

3.2.1 The init.xml file

3.2.2 Version control

3.2.3 wrappers

3.3 experiments

4 Conclusion and related work

TODO: give answers to the questions from section Problem statement
TODO: Discuss related future work

References

- [1] "Hudson Documentation". <http://www.hudson-ci.org/docs/>.
- [2] "Jenkins Documentation". <http://jenkins-ci.org/>.
- [3] "JUnit". <http://junit.org/>.
- [4] "NUnit". <http://nunit.org/>.
- [5] "Winston Prakash". Introducing hudson.
- [6] "Masato Shinagawa" "Toshiaki Kurkova". Technical trends and challenges of software testing. *Science and technology trends*, 29, 2008.