Politecnico di Milano
A.A. 2017-2018
Software Engineering II project

Travlendar+

Acceptance **T**est
Document
V1

Mirko Mantovani (893784), Matteo Marziali (893904)

January 14, 2018

Contents

1 Analyzed project

1.1 Project info

The project analysed is **EventMI** developed by: Guglielmo Manneschi and Andrea Mecchia.
The link to the private repository containing code and documentation is:
https://github.com/nondecidibile/ManneschiMecchia

1.2 Documents considered

The documents we took into consideration when analysing and testing the application are:

- **ITD:** from which we found the implemented requirements/functionalities.
- **RASD1.1:** from which we found all the requirements and checked the coherence with the ones that were actually implemented.

2 Installation Setup

Since the last version of the application was already remotely deployed and the group provided users with public access to it at the address page: http://eventmi.date, we avoided the installation on our machines and preferred to concentrate the little time we had on performing a thorough testing of the requirements they implemented.
The installation manual seems clear though, even if a installation guide based on a more widespread operating system, such as Windows, would have been better.

3 Acceptance Test Cases

3.1 Login/Signup

Implemented requirement	Notes
R1: Registration	Accomplished
R2: Login	Accomplished

Table 1: Req table

3.2 Event CRUD operations

Implemented requirement	Notes
R3: The insertion of new event in the calendar.	Accomplished. See Additional notes.
R4: Modification of an event.	Accomplished
R5: Deletion of an event.	Accomplished
R7: Warning creation.	Partially accomplished Everything works fine excepts for a minor bug. We made a test case consisting in inserting a meeting from 22.00p.m. to 23.00p.m. in Busto Arsizio and a meeting from 2.00a.m. to 3.00a.m. in Puglia on the following day, obviously the insertion should be prevented due to the impossibility to cover the distance between the meetings in just 3 hours, but this doesn't happen, the second meeting is accepted by the system.

Table 2: Event table

3.3 Routes

Implemented requirement	Notes
R8: The identification of the best mobility option for a transfer, according to user preferences and other external factors.	Accomplished

Table 3: Mobility table

3.4 Creation and management of flexible breaks

Requirements relative to goal G3 which is: "Ensure that appointments and related trasfers dont preclude a persons daily breaks, such as lunch break."

Implemented requirements	**Notes**
R11.1 Adding a break specifying a time interval and a minimum duration	Correct
R11.2 Modify a break specifying a time interval and a minimum duration	Correct
R11.3 Delete a break	Correct

Table 4: Breaks: R11

Implemented requirements	Notes
R12 The system must organize the transfers so that all the minimum durations of the breaks are respected, or show a warning in the other case.	**Partially correct** In particular: it's not very clear what organizing the transfer means, we believe the semantics of this requirement is that the system has to be able to, at meeting insertion time, either determining whether the inserted meeting does not overlap with the break in a way such that it is impossible for the break to actually happen (in order to be able to be scheduled, the break has to be of at least the minimum specified length), or to determining if the inserted break overlaps with the already inserted meetings and would not be able to be properly scheduled. With respect to this the following minor bugs have been detected during the testing phase: • If the event is created before the break, the system does not detect the unfeasibility of the break scheduling: as test case I created a meeting from 17:00 to 18:00 then I created a break from 17:00 to 18.10 with a minimum time of 20 minutes, the system does not tell the user in any way the incompatibility of the event and the break. • Extending the above point, if I create a meeting that overlaps again with the break, even if the break is already created, the system does not tell me it is not compatible and lets the user create it. As test case from the above point state I created an event from 18:05 to 19:00 and the outcome is the creation of the event without warnings. • Another important thing to notice is that when considering the feasibility of a break, the minimum duration time is considered summing up all the time slices left free inbetween the meetings overlapping with the break, this could mean that for instance one could create a lunch break that has to last for at least half an hour from a certain starting time to and ending time, and then creating some events into this time range leaving small bunches of minutes between the events, and as long as the sum of all the small pauses sums up to more than thirty minutes the system would not complain about that and would let you split a lunch in several and distant moments.

Table 5: Breaks: R12

3.5 Travel mean preferences

Implemented requirement	Notes
R14: Some settings regarding the navigation profile, such as choosing the preferred means of transport	Partially accomplished The unique preference the user can manage regards the travel means and in particular a prevalence order of them. This leads to a low level of customization for the users. Moreover the prevalence order prevent a user avoiding to adopt a specific travel mean, indeed it is not excluded but at most it is placed below other transports.

Table 6: Nav table

3.6 Use cases

In this section we check that all use cases presented in the RASD matches the implementation.

Use Case	Exit Condition	Exceptions
Registration	Correct	Correct
Login	Correct	Correct
Add event to calendar	Correct	Correct
Edit an event in the calendar	Correct	Correct
Removing an event from the calendar	Correct	Correct
Recompute transfer for an event	Incorrect: It displays an error: "recompute not allowed over insecure network", yet the application is not present in a secure domain (https)	Incorrect: It is stated no exceptions presents where instead an exception is always presented
Transfer notication	Not implemented	Not implemented
Dene a new break	Correct	Correct
Modify a break	Correct	Correct
Delete a break	Correct	Correct
Add a preferred mean of transport	Correct	Correct
Select a navigation prole	Not implemented	Not implemented

Table 7: Use cases tests

4 Additional notes

- **Remark about meeting insertion**
  Even if the meeting insertion requirement is practically satisfied and the related goal accomplished, i.e. the operation can be done properly, we noticed that the application allows a conceptually wrong usage of this function, indeed it is possible to schedule meeting also backward in the past. However, considering that meetings in the past are obviously unfeasible, this kind of possibility should be prevented to the user, in fact it may cause slowdowns or efficiency issues, for example in case of a huge number of appointments are registered in the calendar.

5 Appendix

5.1 Effort spent

- Matteo Marziali working hours: $\approxeq$ 5 hours
- Mirko Mantovani working hours: $\approxeq$ 5 hours