

Test Plan Document

Michele Madaschi Lidia Moioli Luca Martinazzi

January 31, 2016

Contents

Introduction	2
1.1 Scope and purpose	2
Function Points	3
2.1 Complexity and cost evaluation	3
2.1.1 Internal Logic File	3
2.1.2 External Interface File	4
2.1.3 External Input	4
2.1.4 External Output	4
2.1.5 External Inquiry	4
COCOMO II	5
Schedule and resources allocation	6
4.1 Gantt's diagram	6
Risk evaluation	8
5.1 Risk evaluation and avoidance	8

Introduction

1.1 Scope and purpose

In this document we want to give an overall description of the project planning of *My Taxi Service*. We will:

1. identify deliverables and deadlines
2. estimate the total effort required
3. analyze possible risks and contingency plans

Function Points

In order to evaluate the cost of the project we have to identify the function points and estimate the complexity of each one. To each point we assign a weight referring to this table:

Function types	Weight		
	Simple	Medium	Complex
External Input	3	4	6
External Output	4	5	7
External Inquiry	3	4	6
Internal Logic File	7	10	15
External Interface File	5	7	10

Internal Logic File : users (guest, taxidriver and passenger), ride, sharedride, taxiqueue

External Interface File : gps coordinates, map service

External Input : login, logout, request, reserve, delete, reserve shared, accept call, refuse call, report, taxi available, taxi not available, change settings

External Output : message (eta, no taxi message)

External Inquiry : see profile, see active ride list

2.1 Complexity and cost evaluation

2.1.1 Internal Logic File

According to our previous specification (explained in the RASD and DD documents), users and ride have to store few informations, thus we can adopt the simple cost weight for those ones. On the other hand, sharedride and taxiqueue have to store a dynamic list, that require more attention, so we adopt a medium cost weight.

$$4 * 7 + 2 * 10 = 48 \text{ FPs} \quad (2.1)$$

2.1.2 External Interface File

The interactions with gps coordinates and the map service are very simple, because we need to gather few information from them, so we adopt a simple weight for both of External Internal Files.

$$2 * 5 = 10 \text{ FPs} \quad (2.2)$$

2.1.3 External Input

All external inputs are simple action that involves a few number of entities, therefore we can adopt a simple weight cost for all of them.

$$12 * 3 = 36 \text{ FPs} \quad (2.3)$$

2.1.4 External Output

Sending eta requires to access the map service that calculate, on its own, the appropriate value, so we adopt a simple cost weight for message.

$$2 * 4 = 8 \text{ FPs} \quad (2.4)$$

2.1.5 External Inquiry

The profile requires only to send some fields saved in the current user, while the active ride list requires to scan the ridehistory and check its status (active or not). Therefore, we adopt a simple cost weight for the former, and a medium cost weight for the latter.

$$1 * 3 + 1 * 4 = 7 \text{ FPs} \quad (2.5)$$

2.1.6 Overall

In summary we have $\text{FPs} = \sum_{i=1}^5 \text{FP}_i = 109$

COCOMO II

Schedule and resources allocation

4.1 Gantt's diagram

[illegible]

Risk evaluation

5.1 Risk evaluation and avoidance

Risk	Probability	Effects
1.Key staff are ill at critical times in the project	Moderate	Serious
2.Changes to requirements that require major design rework	Moderate	Serious
3. Loss of data	Low	Catastrophic
4. Poor collaboration among team members	Moderate	Serious

Risk	Strategy
1.	Each member is aware of the job done by other components so that he can re-view/finish the task if someone gets sick
2.	Pay attention and if needed ask for clarification
3.	Keep all material synchronized with Github
4.	Keep in good relationship and talk about the project issues