Verification and Validation Report: Sayyara

Team 3, Tiny Coders
Arkin Modi
Joy Xiao
Leon So
Timothy Choy

February 24, 2023

1 Revision History

Table 1: Revision History

Date	Developer(s)	Change
February 22, 2023	Arkin Modi	Add Automated Testing Section

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
Τ	Test
CI	Continuous Integration
CD	Continuous Deployment

Contents

1	Revision History	i
2	Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms	ii
3	Functional Requirements Evaluation	1
4	Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation 4.1 Usability	1 1 1 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
11	Appendix11.1 Reflection	2 2
${f L}$	ist of Tables	
	1 Revision History	i
${f L}$	ist 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
- 7 Automated Testing

All automated testing was carried out by Jest, a JavaScript testing framework. Each module has its own corresponding test file located within the "test" folder. The "test" folder has the same structure as the "src" folder, creating a one-to-one mapping of a module and its corresponding test. For example, the module "src/server/services/userService.ts" has its tests located in "test/server/services/userService.ts". There are two Jest test runs, with the only difference being whether the testing environment is connected to a real database or not (i.e., whether the database needs to be seeded or mocked in each test case). As part of the CI/CD pipeline, the full test suite is run and information regarding pass/fail and code coverage is reported on every pull request to the main branch and to every push to the main branch.

- 8 Trace to Requirements
- 9 Trace to Modules
- 10 Code Coverage Metrics

11 Appendix

11.1 Reflection

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

1. 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.)