

11 Testing Validation Plan

2025-10-19

Contents

1	Testing & Validation Plan	2
1.1	Vision-Based Pick and Place Robotic System	2
1.2	Document Control	2
1.3	1. Introduction	3
1.3.1	1.1 Purpose	3
1.3.2	1.2 Scope	3
1.3.3	1.3 Test Levels	3
1.4	2. Test Strategy	3
1.4.1	2.1 Testing Pyramid	3
1.4.2	2.2 Test Approach	3
1.5	3. Unit Testing	4
1.5.1	3.1 Objectives	4
1.5.2	3.2 Test Cases (Examples)	4
1.5.3	3.3 Coverage Goals	5
1.5.4	3.4 Test Execution	5
1.6	4. Integration Testing	5
1.6.1	4.1 Objectives	5
1.6.2	4.2 Test Cases (Examples)	5
1.6.3	4.3 Test Environment	6
1.7	5. System Testing	6
1.7.1	5.1 Objectives	6
1.7.2	5.2 Test Scenarios	6
1.8	6. Performance Testing	7
1.8.1	6.1 Objectives	7
1.8.2	6.2 Test Cases	7
1.8.3	6.3 Load Testing (API)	8
1.9	7. Safety Testing	8
1.9.1	7.1 Objectives	8
1.9.2	7.2 Test Cases	8
1.9.3	7.3 Safety Certification	8
1.10	8. Acceptance Testing	9
1.10.1	8.1 Objectives	9
1.10.2	8.2 Acceptance Criteria	9
1.10.3	8.3 User Acceptance Test (UAT) Procedure	9

1.10.4 8.4 Acceptance Test Report Template 9

1.11 9. Regression Testing 10

1.11.1 9.1 Objectives 10

1.11.2 9.2 Regression Suite 10

1.12 10. Test Environment & Tools 10

1.12.1 10.1 Test Environments 10

1.12.2 10.2 Test Tools 11

1.13 11. Test Data Management 11

1.13.1 11.1 Test Data Sets 11

1.13.2 11.2 Test Data Versioning 11

1.14 12. Defect Management 12

1.14.1 12.1 Defect Lifecycle 12

1.14.2 12.2 Defect Severity Levels 12

1.14.3 12.3 Defect Tracking Tool 12

1.15 13. Test Metrics & Reporting 12

1.15.1 13.1 Key Metrics 12

1.15.2 13.2 Test Reports 13

1.16 14. Test Schedule 13

1.17 15. Roles & Responsibilities 13

1.18 16. Risks & Mitigation 13

1.19 17. Appendices 14

1.19.1 Appendix A: Test Case Templates 14

1.19.2 Appendix B: Test Data Samples 15

1.19.3 Appendix C: References 15

1 Testing & Validation Plan

1.1 Vision-Based Pick and Place Robotic System

1.2 Document Control

Item	Details
Document Title	Testing & Validation Plan
Version	1.0
Date	2025-10-18
Status	Draft
Author(s)	QA Lead, Test Engineer
Approvers	Tech Lead, Project Manager

1.3 1. Introduction

1.3.1 1.1 Purpose

This document defines the comprehensive testing and validation strategy for the vision-based pick-and-place robotic system, ensuring:

- **Functional correctness:** System performs as specified
- **Performance:** Meets cycle time, accuracy, throughput targets
- **Safety:** Complies with ISO 10218, ISO/TS 15066
- **Reliability:** 99.5% uptime target
- **User acceptance:** Satisfies end-user requirements

1.3.2 1.2 Scope

In Scope:

- Unit testing (individual modules/functions)
- Integration testing (module-to-module interfaces)
- System testing (end-to-end workflows)
- Performance testing (latency, throughput, stress)
- Safety testing (E-stop, collision detection, force limiting)
- Acceptance testing (customer sign-off)
- Regression testing (after changes)

Out of Scope:

- Penetration testing (covered in Security Plan)
- Long-term reliability testing (>6 months, post-deployment)
- Field testing at customer sites (deployment phase)

1.3.3 1.3 Test Levels

Level 1: Unit Tests (Developer-driven, pytest, gtest)

↓

Level 2: Integration Tests (Module interfaces, ROS2 launch tests)

↓

Level 3: System Tests (End-to-end workflows, simulation + hardware)

↓

Level 4: Acceptance Tests (Customer requirements, real environment)

1.4 2. Test Strategy

1.4.1 2.1 Testing Pyramid

Acceptance (10%) ← Few, slow, expensive

System (20%)

Integration (30%)

Unit (40%) ← Many, fast, cheap

Rationale: More low-level tests (fast feedback), fewer high-level tests (high confidence).

1.4.2 2.2 Test Approach

Test Level	Approach	Environment	Tools
Unit	White-box, code coverage	Dev machine	pytest, gtest, coverage.py
Integration	Black-box, interface contracts	Dev + CI/CD	ROS2 launch_testing, mock services
System	Black-box, end-to-end scenarios	Simulation (Gazebo) + Real hardware	Manual + automated scripts
Performance	Benchmark-driven, metrics	Real hardware	JMeter, Locust, custom profilers
Safety	Compliance-driven, audit	Real hardware + safety setup	Manual inspection, cert tools
Acceptance	Requirement-driven, UAT	Customer environment	Customer- defined tests

1.5 3. Unit Testing

1.5.1 3.1 Objectives

- Verify individual functions/classes work correctly
- Achieve >80% code coverage
- Fast execution (<5 min for full suite)
- Run on every commit (CI/CD)

1.5.2 3.2 Test Cases (Examples)

1.5.2.1 3.2.1 Vision Pipeline Test: Object Detection - Input: Image with 1 red cube
- Expected: Bounding box at (x=320, y=240, w=100, h=100), confidence >0.9 - **Assertion:** `python detections = detector.detect(image) assert len(detections) == 1`
`assert detections[0].class_name == "cube" assert detections[0].confidence > 0.9`

Test: Pose Estimation - Input: RGB-D image, object mask - **Expected:** 6DoF pose (x,y,z,qx,qy,qz,qw) - **Assertion:** `python pose = estimator.estimate_pose(image, mask)`
`assert abs(pose.position.z - 0.5) < 0.01 # Object at 50cm height`

1.5.2.2 3.2.2 Grasp Planning Test: Grasp Sampling - Input: Object pose, point cloud - **Expected:** List of 10 grasp candidates - **Assertion:** `python grasps = planner.sample_grasps(pose, cloud)`
`assert len(grasps) >= 10 assert all(g.quality > 0.5 for g in grasps)`

1.5.2.3 3.2.3 Motion Planning Test: IK Solver - Input: Target pose (x=0.5, y=0.2, z=0.3, roll=0, pitch=/2, yaw=0) - **Expected:** Joint angles [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], IK success=True - **Assertion:** `python joint_angles, success = ik_solver.solve(target_pose)`
`assert success == True assert len(joint_angles) == 6 # Verify FK(IK(pose))`
`== pose fk_pose = fk_solver.compute(joint_angles) assert np.allclose(fk_pose, target_pose, atol=0.001)`

1.5.3 3.3 Coverage Goals

Module	Target Coverage	Current	Gap
vision_pipeline	85%	TBD	TBD
grasp_planner	80%	TBD	TBD
motion_planner (custom code)	90%	TBD	TBD
task_orchestrator	75%	TBD	TBD
Overall	80%	TBD	TBD

1.5.4 3.4 Test Execution

Command:

```
colcon test --packages-select vision_pipeline grasp_planner
colcon test-result --all --verbose
```

CI/CD Integration: - GitHub Actions runs tests on every PR - Fail CI if coverage <80% - Report coverage to Codecov.io

1.6 4. Integration Testing

1.6.1 4.1 Objectives

- Verify modules communicate correctly (ROS2 topics, services, actions)
- Test data flow between subsystems
- Detect interface mismatches early

1.6.2 4.2 Test Cases (Examples)

1.6.2.1 4.2.1 Vision → Grasp Planning Test: Detected object pose flows to grasp planner - **Setup:** Launch vision_pipeline and grasp_planner nodes - **Action:** Publish mock RGB-D image with object - **Expected:** Grasp planner receives /vision/object_poses message within 200ms - **Assertion:** “python # launch_testing syntax def test_vision_to_grasp(): vision_node = launch_node('vision_pipeline') grasp_node = launch_node('grasp_planner')

```
pub = Publisher('/camera/color/image_raw', Image)
sub = Subscriber('/grasp/candidates', GraspArray)
```

```
pub.publish(mock_image)
msg = sub.wait_for_message(timeout=1.0)
assert msg is not None
assert len(msg.grasps) > 0
```

4.2.2 Motion Planning → Control

```
**Test:** Trajectory execution action completes
- **Setup:** Launch moveit2 and ros2_control nodes
- **Action:** Send `FollowJointTrajectory` action goal
```

```

- **Expected:** Action succeeds, robot reaches goal within tolerance
- **Assertion:**
```python
client = ActionClient('/joint_trajectory_controller/follow_joint_trajectory', FollowJointTrajectory)
goal = FollowJointTrajectory.Goal(trajectory=test_trajectory)
future = client.send_goal_async(goal)
result = future.result(timeout=10.0)
assert result.error_code == FollowJointTrajectory.Result.SUCCESSFUL

```

### 1.6.3 4.3 Test Environment

**Simulation:** - Use Gazebo for realistic robot/environment simulation - Mock camera publishes synthetic images - Fast iteration, no hardware risk

**Hardware-in-Loop (Optional):** - Real camera, simulated robot (or vice versa) - Validate sensor drivers, communication latency

---

## 1.7 5. System Testing

### 1.7.1 5.1 Objectives

- Validate end-to-end workflows (idle → scan → detect → pick → place → home)
- Test in realistic scenarios (cluttered workspace, varying lighting)
- Verify all requirements met

### 1.7.2 5.2 Test Scenarios

**1.7.2.1 5.2.1 Nominal Pick-Place (Sunny Day) Scenario:** Single object, ideal conditions

1. **Pre-conditions:** - Robot at home position - 1 red cube (50×50×50mm) on table at (x=0.5, y=0.2, z=0.05) - Camera operational, lighting uniform (2000 lumen) 2. **Steps:** - Press “Start” button - System scans workspace (camera captures image) - Vision detects cube (bounding box, pose) - Grasp planner computes top-down grasp - Motion planner generates pick trajectory - Robot executes pick (gripper closes, force=20N) - Motion planner generates place trajectory - Robot executes place at target (x=0.3, y=-0.2, z=0.05) - Robot returns home 3. **Expected Results:** - Cycle time: <10 seconds - Object successfully placed at target - Placement error: <5mm - No collisions detected

**1.7.2.2 5.2.2 Multi-Object Sequential Picking Scenario:** 5 objects, pick all sequentially

1. **Pre-conditions:** 5 colored cubes randomly placed on table 2. **Steps:** For each object: scan → detect → pick → place 3. **Expected Results:** - All 5 objects picked and placed - Total cycle time: <60 seconds - Success rate: 100% (0 failures)

**1.7.2.3 5.2.3 Error Recovery (Grasp Failure) Scenario:** Intentional grasp failure, test

retry logic 1. **Pre-conditions:** - Slippery object (low friction) - Grasp force reduced to 50% (to induce failure) 2. **Steps:** - Robot attempts pick - F/T sensor detects drop (force spike → 0N) - System logs error: “Grasp failed” - System retries with increased force (100%) - Second attempt succeeds 3. **Expected Results:** - Failure detected within 500ms - Retry succeeds - Event logged with timestamp

**1.7.2.4 5.2.4 Occlusion Handling Scenario:** Partially occluded object 1. **Pre-conditions:** Object A partially hidden behind object B 2. **Steps:** - Scan workspace - Vision detects visible objects (A partially visible, B fully visible) - System picks B first (higher confidence) - Re-scan after picking B - Now A fully visible, system picks A 3. **Expected Results:** - Both objects eventually picked - No collisions with occluding objects

---

## 1.8 6. Performance Testing

### 1.8.1 6.1 Objectives

- Measure and validate performance metrics
- Identify bottlenecks
- Ensure real-time constraints met

### 1.8.2 6.2 Test Cases

**1.8.2.1 6.2.1 Cycle Time Test Objective:** Measure average cycle time - **Setup:** 100 pick-place cycles (single object) - **Metrics:** - Mean cycle time - P50, P95, P99 percentiles - Standard deviation - **Pass Criteria:** Mean <2.5 sec, P95 <3.0 sec

#### Test Procedure:

```
cycle_times = []
for i in range(100):
 start = time.time()
 execute_pick_place()
 end = time.time()
 cycle_times.append(end - start)

mean_time = np.mean(cycle_times)
p95_time = np.percentile(cycle_times, 95)
assert mean_time < 2.5, f"Mean cycle time {mean_time}s exceeds 2.5s"
assert p95_time < 3.0, f"P95 cycle time {p95_time}s exceeds 3.0s"
```

**1.8.2.2 6.2.2 Vision Latency Test Objective:** Measure vision pipeline latency - **Setup:** 1000 images processed - **Metrics:** - Detection latency (image → bounding boxes) - Pose estimation latency (image → 6DoF pose) - **Pass Criteria:** Detection <50ms, Pose <100ms

**1.8.2.3 6.2.3 Control Loop Jitter Test Objective:** Measure real-time control loop stability - **Setup:** 1 hour continuous operation, log loop timings - **Metrics:** - Mean loop time (should be 1ms for 1kHz) - Jitter (std dev) - Max jitter - **Pass Criteria:** Mean=1ms ±0.1ms, Max jitter <2ms

**Tool:** cyclicttest (Linux RT benchmark)

```
sudo cyclicttest -p 90 -t 1 -n -a 1 -D 3600 -m -q
```

**1.8.2.4 6.2.4 Throughput Test Objective:** Max picks per hour (continuous operation) - **Setup:** 1-hour run, unlimited objects (refill bin as needed) - **Metrics:** Total picks in 1 hour - **Pass Criteria:** 1800 picks/hour (30 picks/min)

### 1.8.3 6.3 Load Testing (API)

**Objective:** Test REST API under concurrent load - **Tool:** Locust (Python load testing framework) - **Scenario:** 100 concurrent users, each calling /start API - **Pass Criteria:** 95% requests complete <100ms, 0% errors

---

## 1.9 7. Safety Testing

### 1.9.1 7.1 Objectives

- Verify compliance with ISO 10218 (robot safety), ISO/TS 15066 (collaborative robots)
- Validate E-stop functionality
- Test collision detection, force limiting

### 1.9.2 7.2 Test Cases

**1.9.2.1 7.2.1 Emergency Stop (E-Stop) Test Test:** E-stop response time - **Setup:** Robot in motion (50% of max speed) - **Action:** Press E-stop button - **Measurement:** Time from button press to motor stop (oscilloscope) - **Pass Criteria:** <100ms

**Test:** E-stop recovery - **Setup:** E-stop triggered, robot halted - **Action:** Release E-stop, press “Reset”, select “Return Home” - **Expected:** Robot returns to home position safely - **Pass Criteria:** No unintended motion, user acknowledges before resuming

**1.9.2.2 7.2.2 Collision Detection Test Test:** Detect unexpected contact - **Setup:** Robot moving toward pick position - **Action:** Place foam block in path (simulated collision) - **Expected:** F/T sensor detects force spike (>150N), robot stops - **Pass Criteria:** Stop within 100ms, no damage to robot/object

**1.9.2.3 7.2.3 Force Limiting Test (ISO/TS 15066) Test:** Verify force limits in collaborative mode - **Setup:** Robot approaches human (mannequin with force sensor) - **Action:** Robot contacts mannequin during motion - **Measurement:** Peak contact force (N) - **Pass Criteria:** Force <150N (ISO/TS 15066 limit for transient contact)

**1.9.2.4 7.2.4 Safety Zone Test Test:** Human enters safety zone, robot slows/stops - **Setup:** Robot operating at 100% speed, camera detects humans - **Action:** Human enters outer zone (slow zone) - **Expected:** Robot slows to 50% speed - **Action:** Human enters inner zone (stop zone) - **Expected:** Robot stops completely - **Pass Criteria:** Speed reduction smooth, stop <100ms

### 1.9.3 7.3 Safety Certification

**Process:** 1. Conduct all safety tests 2. Document results in safety report 3. Submit to TÜV/UL for certification audit 4. Obtain CE marking (EU) or UL listing (US)

---



## 1.10 8. Acceptance Testing

### 1.10.1 8.1 Objectives

- Validate system meets customer requirements
- Obtain customer sign-off for deployment
- Basis for contract completion

### 1.10.2 8.2 Acceptance Criteria

Criterion	Target	Measurement Method	Pass/Fail
Cycle Time	2 sec/object	100-pick test, average	TBD
Throughput	28,000 picks/day	8-hour run, extrapolate to 24h	TBD
Grasp Success Rate	99%	1000-pick test, count failures	TBD
Placement Accuracy	±0.1mm	CMM measurement (10 placements)	TBD
Uptime	99.5%	1-week continuous run, track downtime	TBD
Safety Compliance	ISO 10218, ISO/TS 15066	Certification audit	TBD

### 1.10.3 8.3 User Acceptance Test (UAT) Procedure

#### 1. Preparation (Week 1):

- Install system at customer site
- Calibrate camera-robot transform
- Load customer objects (train detection model if needed)

#### 2. Training (Week 1):

- Train operators (2 days)
- Train maintenance staff (1 day)

#### 3. UAT Execution (Week 2):

- Customer runs system for 40 hours (1 week)
- Customer observes performance, logs issues
- Project team fixes critical bugs (on-site support)

#### 4. UAT Sign-Off (End of Week 2):

- Customer reviews acceptance criteria table
- If all “Pass”, customer signs acceptance document
- If any “Fail”, create punch list, remediate, retest

### 1.10.4 8.4 Acceptance Test Report Template

```
Acceptance Test Report
```

```
Test Summary
```

```
- **Date:** [YYYY-MM-DD]
- **Location:** [Customer Site]
- **Testers:** [Names]
```

```

Results
| Criterion | Target | Actual | Pass/Fail | Notes |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Cycle Time | 2 sec | 1.8 sec | Pass | Average of 100 picks |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

Issues Found
| Issue ID | Severity | Description | Status |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| UAT-001 | High | Camera loses connection after 4 hours | Fixed |
| UAT-002 | Low | Dashboard slow to load (5 sec) | Open |

Conclusion
[Pass / Fail / Conditional Pass]

Signatures
- Customer Representative: _____ Date: _____
- Project Manager: _____ Date: _____

```

## 1.11 9. Regression Testing

### 1.11.1 9.1 Objectives

- Ensure new changes don't break existing functionality
- Run after every significant code change or bug fix

### 1.11.2 9.2 Regression Suite

**Composition:** - All unit tests (full suite) - Critical integration tests (vision → planning → control)  
 - 1 end-to-end system test (smoke test: single pick-place)

**Execution:** - Automated (CI/CD pipeline) - Run on every merge to **main** branch - Takes ~30 minutes (parallelized)

**Pass Criteria:** - 100% of unit tests pass - All critical integration tests pass - Smoke test completes successfully

## 1.12 10. Test Environment & Tools

### 1.12.1 10.1 Test Environments

Environment	Purpose	Hardware	Software
Dev	Unit, integration tests	Developer laptop	Ubuntu 22.04, ROS2, Gazebo
CI/CD	Automated regression	GitHub Actions runners	Docker containers

Environment	Purpose	Hardware	Software
Sim	System tests (simulation)	x86 server (16 cores, 32GB RAM)	Gazebo, RViz2
Lab	System tests (real hardware)	Full robot cell (UR5e, camera, NUC)	Production-identical setup
Customer	Acceptance tests	Customer site	Customer environment

### 1.12.2 10.2 Test Tools

Tool	Purpose	Language	License
pytest	Unit tests (Python)	Python	MIT
gtest	Unit tests (C++)	C++	BSD
coverage.py	Code coverage (Python)	Python	Apache 2.0
gcov/lcov	Code coverage (C++)	C++	GPL
launch_testing	ROS2 integration tests	Python	Apache 2.0
JMeter	API load testing	Java	Apache 2.0
Locust	API load testing	Python	MIT
cyclictest	Real-time jitter testing	C	GPL
Gazebo	Robot simulation	C++	Apache 2.0
RViz2	Visualization, debugging	C++	BSD

## 1.13 11. Test Data Management

### 1.13.1 11.1 Test Data Sets

Dataset	Description	Size	Location
Synthetic Images	Rendered cubes, boxes (Blender)	1000 images	/test_data/synthetic/
Real Images	Lab-captured RGB-D	500 images	/test_data/real/
Edge Cases	Occlusions, poor lighting	100 images	/test_data/edge_cases/
Point Clouds	Pre-captured scenes	200 PCD files	/test_data/point_clouds/

### 1.13.2 11.2 Test Data Versioning

- **Tool:** DVC (Data Version Control)
- **Storage:** AWS S3 bucket (or local NAS)
- **Versioning:** Tag datasets with git commit hash

Example:

```
dvc add test_data/
git add test_data.dvc .gitignore
git commit -m "Add test dataset v1.0"
```

```
git tag test-data-v1.0
dvc push
```

---

## 1.14 12. Defect Management

### 1.14.1 12.1 Defect Lifecycle

[Found] → [Logged] → [Triaged] → [Assigned] → [Fixed] → [Verified] → [Closed]

### 1.14.2 12.2 Defect Severity Levels

Severity	Definition	SLA	Example
Critical	System unusable, safety risk	Fix within 24h	E-stop not working
High	Major feature broken	Fix within 1 week	Object detection fails
Medium	Minor feature broken	Fix within 2 weeks	Dashboard slow to load
Low	Cosmetic, minor annoyance	Fix in next release	Typo in UI

### 1.14.3 12.3 Defect Tracking Tool

**Tool:** Jira / GitHub Issues **Fields:** - **ID:** BUG-XXX - **Summary:** Short description - **Severity:** Critical / High / Medium / Low - **Priority:** P0 (urgent) to P3 (low) - **Assignee:** Developer responsible - **Status:** Open / In Progress / Resolved / Closed - **Found in Version:** v1.0 - **Fixed in Version:** v1.1

---

## 1.15 13. Test Metrics & Reporting

### 1.15.1 13.1 Key Metrics

Metric	Target	Current	Trend
Code Coverage	>80%	TBD	TBD
Test Pass Rate	100% (all must pass)	TBD	TBD
Defect Density	<1 bug per 1000 LOC	TBD	TBD
Mean Time to Detect (MTTD)	<1 day (find bugs fast)	TBD	TBD
Mean Time to Resolve (MTTR)	<5 days (fix bugs fast)	TBD	TBD

### 1.15.2 13.2 Test Reports

**Weekly Test Summary:** - Tests executed: 1250 - Tests passed: 1248 (99.8%) - Tests failed: 2 (0.2%) - Integration test: vision → grasp (timeout) - System test: multi-object (1 out of 5 objects missed) - New bugs found: 3 (2 High, 1 Low) - Bugs fixed this week: 5

**Release Test Report:** - All acceptance criteria met: - Critical bugs: 0 - High bugs: 1 (known issue, workaround documented) - **Recommendation:** Approve for release

---

### 1.16 14. Test Schedule

Phase	Duration	Start	End	Deliverables
Unit Tests	Ongoing (every commit)	Week 7	Week 22	Test code, coverage reports
Integration Tests	2 weeks	Week 17	Week 18	Integration test suite
System Tests (Sim)	2 weeks	Week 19	Week 20	Test results, bug reports
System Tests (Hardware)	2 weeks	Week 21	Week 22	Hardware test report
Performance Tests	1 week	Week 22	Week 22	Performance benchmarks
Safety Tests	1 week	Week 22	Week 22	Safety certification docs
Acceptance Tests	2 weeks	Week 25	Week 26	UAT report, sign-off

---

### 1.17 15. Roles & Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
QA Lead	Define test strategy, review test plans, approve releases
Test Engineer	Write test cases, execute tests, log bugs
Developer	Write unit tests (code coverage), fix bugs
Automation Engineer	Build CI/CD pipelines, automate regression tests
Safety Auditor	Conduct safety tests, obtain certifications
Customer Representative	Define acceptance criteria, execute UAT, sign-off

---

### 1.18 16. Risks & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
Insufficient test coverage (<80%)	Bugs slip to production	Enforce coverage gates in CI/CD, prioritize critical paths
Real hardware unavailable for testing	Delays, reliance on simulation	Procure hardware early, use hardware-in-loop (HIL) setup
Test data not representative	False confidence	Collaborate with customer, use real production objects
Acceptance tests fail at customer site	Project delay, reputation damage	Pre-acceptance testing in lab with customer objects, buffer time
Safety certification rejected	Cannot deploy	Engage safety consultants early, pre-audit with TÜV

## 1.19 17. Appendices

### 1.19.1 Appendix A: Test Case Templates

#### Unit Test Template (pytest):

```
def test_object_detection():
 """
 Test that object detector correctly identifies a single cube.
 """
 # Arrange
 detector = ObjectDetector(model_path="yolov8.onnx")
 image = load_test_image("single_cube.jpg")

 # Act
 detections = detector.detect(image)

 # Assert
 assert len(detections) == 1
 assert detections[0].class_name == "cube"
 assert detections[0].confidence > 0.9
```

#### Integration Test Template (ROS2 launch\_testing):

```
import launch_testing.actions
import pytest

def generate_test_description():
 return launch.LaunchDescription([
 launch.actions.Node(package='vision_pipeline', executable='detector'),
 launch_testing.actions.ReadyToTest()
])

def test_vision_publishes_detections(launch_service, proc_info, proc_output):
 sub = Subscriber('/vision/detections', Detection2DArray)
```

```
msg = sub.wait_for_message(timeout=5.0)
assert msg is not None
```

### 1.19.2 Appendix B: Test Data Samples

- `test_data/synthetic/cube_001.jpg`: Red cube, centered, well-lit
- `test_data/edge_cases/occluded.jpg`: Partially occluded object
- `test_data/point_clouds/bin_pile.pcd`: 20 objects in random pile

### 1.19.3 Appendix C: References

- [ISO 10218-1:2011 \(Robot Safety\)](#)
- [ISO/TS 15066:2016 \(Collaborative Robots\)](#)
- [ROS2 Testing Guide](#)

---

**Document Status:** Complete **Last Updated:** 2025-10-18 **Next Review:** After Development Phase (Week 22) **Approvals:** Pending QA Lead, Tech Lead Sign-Off