

# FAQAS Framework

## SUITP

### Software Unit and Integration Test Plan

O. Cornejo, F. Pastore

Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust

University of Luxembourg

ITT-1-9873-ESA-FAQAS-SUITP

Issue 1, Rev. 1

March 30, 2021

---

# Revisions

Issue Number	Date	Authors	Description
ITT-1-9873-ESA- FAQAS-SUITP Issue 1 Rev. 1	March 31th, 2021	Oscar Cornejo, Fabrizio Pastore	Initial release.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Scope and content</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Applicable and reference documents . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Software overview</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Software Unit Testing and Software Integration Testing</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Organization . . . . .	11
4.2	Resource Summary . . . . .	11
4.3	Responsibilities . . . . .	11
4.4	Tool, techniques and methods . . . . .	12
4.5	Personnel and Personnel Training Requirements . . . . .	12
4.6	Risks and Contingencies . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>MASS - Software Unit Testing and Integration Testing Approach</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1	Unit/Integration Testing Strategy . . . . .	13
5.2	Tasks and Items under Test . . . . .	13
5.3	Feature to be tested . . . . .	13
5.4	Feature not to be tested . . . . .	13
5.5	Test Pass - Fail Criteria . . . . .	14
5.6	Manually and Automatically Generated Code . . . . .	14
<b>6</b>	<b>MASS - Software Unit and Integration Test Case Design</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1	General . . . . .	15

---

6.2	MASS - Test Design - SRCMutation - Operators . . . . .	15
6.2.1	Test design identifier . . . . .	15
6.2.2	Features to be tested . . . . .	15
6.2.3	Approach refinements . . . . .	16
<b>7</b>	<b>MASS - Software Unit and Integration Test Case Specification</b>	<b>19</b>
7.1	General . . . . .	19
7.2	Organization of the Test Cases . . . . .	21
<b>8</b>	<b>Software Unit and Integration Test Procedures</b>	<b>23</b>
8.1	General . . . . .	23

# Chapter 1

## Scope and content

This document is the combined Software Unit and Integration Test Plan of the software delivered by the ESA activity ITT-1-9873-ESA (i.e., the *FAQAS framework*). Its purpose is to describe the unit and integration tests to be done for the FAQAS-framework. The FAQAS framework consists of the following software: a toolset implementing code-driven mutation analysis (MASS), a toolset implementing code-driven test generation, a toolset implementing data-driven mutation analysis, a toolset implementing data-driven test generation.

This document follows a structure derived from tailoring of the structure proposed in ECSS-E-ST-40C Annex K. Tailoring has been adopted to clearly describe differences in the procedures adopted for the different components of the FAQAS-framework. More precisely, our tailoring adheres to the following directives:

- Sections *K.1 - Introduction*, *K.2 - Applicable and reference documents*, *K.3 - Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms*, which are generic, are reported following the structure suggested in ECSS-E-ST-40C.
- Sections *K.4 - Software overview*, *K.5 - Software unit testing and software integration testing*, and *K.6 - Control procedures for software unit testing / integration testing* are reported following the structure suggested in ECSS-E-ST-40C. They describe the procedures followed concern all the components of the FAQAS-framework.
- Sections *K.7 - Software unit testing and integration testing approach*, *K.8 - Software unit test / integration test design*, and *K.9 - Software unit and integration test case specification* appear multiple times, one for each tested component of the FAQAS-framework<sup>1</sup>.

### 1.1 Applicable and reference documents

- D1 - Mutation testing survey
- D2 - Study of mutation testing applicability to space software
- SSS - Software Systems Specifications
- SUM - Software User Manual
- SVS - Software Validation Specifications

---

<sup>1</sup>Issue 1 contains only MASS



## Chapter 2

# Terms, definitions and abbreviated terms

- FAQAS: activity ITT-1-9873-ESA
- FAQAS-framework: software system to be released at the end of WP4 of FAQAS
- D2: Deliverable D2 of FAQAS, *Study of mutation testing applicability to space software*
- KLEE: Third party test generation tool, details are provided in D2.
- SUT: Software under test, i.e, the software that should be mutated by means of mutation testing.
- WP: Work package





## Chapter 3

# Software overview

This document concerns the testing of the following components

- code-driven mutation analysis toolset (MASS)
- code-driven test generation toolset
- data-driven mutation analysis toolset
- data-driven test generation toolset



## Chapter 4

# Software Unit Testing and Software Integration Testing

### 4.1 Organization

Unit tests are prepared by SnT in the form of Bash shell scripts.

Since units are self-contained (i.e., they do not interact with other units but simply store results in files processed by other units), we avoid testing the integration of pairs of unit. Instead, we test the system as a whole, based on tutorial examples described in SUM. The system testing procedure is reported in the SVS - software validation specification.

Testing is conducted by SnT personnel.

If any software problems occur during testing a development issue shall be raised in GitLab Issue Tracker for the FAQAS-framework, which shall be amended by SnT personnel.

### 4.2 Resource Summary

Unit tests and integration tests make use of the FAQAS-framework. Tests will be performed in one hardware platform, a x86-64 desktop PC. Unit test execution time should not exceed one day for all target platforms combined.

### 4.3 Responsibilities

Unit tests tests are prepared by the SnT personnel.

The test cases are executed by an SnT specialist who has the responsibility of reporting any failure.

## **4.4 Tool, techniques and methods**

Unit tests are specified in Bash files. Each unit test contains a launcher script that configures the environment for the correct execution of FAQAS-framework, and a source code example for its mutation. The launcher script will invoke a dedicated operator Bash script, that generates the corresponding mutants and assesses its results.

## **4.5 Personnel and Personnel Training Requirements**

Unit testing is performed by a single person using a launcher script from the source folder of the SUT. Additional training is not needed.

## **4.6 Risks and Contingencies**

The unit testing campaign is conducted in parallel with the development of the SUT and thus is not associated to any specific risk.

## Chapter 5

# MASS - Software Unit Testing and Integration Testing Approach

### 5.1 Unit/Integration Testing Strategy

Integration testing is out of scope because of the motivations discussed in Section 4.1.

Unit testing aims to verify that the functional requirements of MASS units are correctly implemented; test inputs are identified through the category-partition method.

### 5.2 Tasks and Items under Test

Testing concerns the source code mutation component (hereafter, *SRCMutation*) of MASS. *SRCMutation* is the component with the most complicate implementation logic and thus require detailed unit testing. All the other components either filter or join data, their implementation is simpler than *SRCMutation* and thus their test automation is performed through system tests (described in SVS).

### 5.3 Feature to be tested

Testing concerns verifying the correct implementation of the mutation operators implemented by *SRCMutation*.

### 5.4 Feature not to be tested

Testing does not concern the verification of the capability of *SRCMutation* to parse source files valid according to C/C++ language grammar. Since *SRCMutation* is implemented on top of CLANG, we assume parsing capabilities are inherited from CLANG.

## 5.5 Test Pass - Fail Criteria

Unit testing pass if all the following are true:

- Every test case is executed
- All test cases pass
- Exceptions and unexpected messages do not appear on screen and logs.

## 5.6 Manually and Automatically Generated Code

The FAQAS-framework does not contain any automatically generated code.

## Chapter 6

# MASS - Software Unit and Integration Test Case Design

### 6.1 General

The MASS unit test suite concerns the source code mutation component (SRCMutation). It address its functional requirements. A single test design has been identified, it is based on the category partition method and reported in the following sections.

### 6.2 MASS - Test Design - SRCMutation - Operators

#### 6.2.1 Test design identifier

The test design identifier is *MASS-TD-SRCMutation-1*

With this test design we aim to ensure that each mutation operator for the FAQAS is implemented according to its requirements.

#### 6.2.2 Features to be tested

Table 6.1 shows the specifications for the mutation operators implemented by SRCMutation.

The set of SRCMutation mutation operators is composed of the following: Absolute Value Insertion (ABS), Arithmetic Operator Replacement (AOR), Integer Constraint Replacement (ICR), Logical Connector Replacement (LCR), Relational Operator Replacement (ROR), Unary Operator Insertion (UOI), Statement Deletion Operator (SDL), and Literal Value Replacement (LVR). It also include OODL mutation operators: delete Arithmetic (AOD), Bitwise (BOD), Logical (LOD), Relational (ROD), and Shift (SOD) operators.

Each mutation operator, when applied to a statement, generates one or more mutated statements. Each mutation operator works by altering the value of a *term* in a statement, which could be either an operator (*op*), a value (*v*), or a literal (*l*). More precisely, each mutation operator replaces a term with a number of replacement terms, which are identified based on the rules in the description

Table 6.1: Implemented set of mutation operators.

	Operator	Description*
Sufficient Set	ABS	$\{(v, -v)\}$
	AOR	$\{(op_1, op_2) \mid op_1, op_2 \in \{+, -, *, /, \%\} \wedge op_1 \neq op_2\}$ $\{(op_1, op_2) \mid op_1, op_2 \in \{+=, -=, *=, /=, \%= \} \wedge op_1 \neq op_2\}$
	ICR	$\{(i, x) \mid x \in \{1, -1, 0, i + 1, i - 1, -i\}\}$
	LCR	$\{(op_1, op_2) \mid op_1, op_2 \in \{\&\&,   \} \wedge op_1 \neq op_2\}$ $\{(op_1, op_2) \mid op_1, op_2 \in \{\&=,  =, \&= \} \wedge op_1 \neq op_2\}$ $\{(op_1, op_2) \mid op_1, op_2 \in \{\&,  , \&\&\} \wedge op_1 \neq op_2\}$
	ROR	$\{(op_1, op_2) \mid op_1, op_2 \in \{>, >=, <, <=, ==, !=\}\}$ $\{(e, !(e)) \mid e \in \{if(e), while(e)\}\}$
	SDL	$\{(s, remove(s))\}$
	UOI	$\{(v, -v), (v, v-), (v, ++v), (v, v++)\}$
OODL	AOD	$\{((t_1 op t_2), t_1), ((t_1 op t_2), t_2) \mid op \in \{+, -, *, /, \%\}\}$
	LOD	$\{((t_1 op t_2), t_1), ((t_1 op t_2), t_2) \mid op \in \{\&\&,   \}\}$
	ROD	$\{((t_1 op t_2), t_1), ((t_1 op t_2), t_2) \mid op \in \{>, >=, <, <=, ==, !=\}\}$
	BOD	$\{((t_1 op t_2), t_1), ((t_1 op t_2), t_2) \mid op \in \{\&,  , \wedge\}\}$
	SOD	$\{((t_1 op t_2), t_1), ((t_1 op t_2), t_2) \mid op \in \{\gg, \ll\}\}$
Other	LVR	$\{(l_1, l_2) \mid (l_1, l_2) \in \{(0, -1), (l_1, -l_1), (l_1, 0), (true, false), (false, true)\}\}$

\*Each pair in parenthesis shows how a program element is modified by the mutation operator on the left; we follow standard syntax [?]. Program elements are literals (*l*), integer literals (*i*), boolean expressions (*e*), operators (*op*), statements (*s*), variables (*v*), and terms (*t<sub>i</sub>*, which might be either variables or literals).

column of Table 6.1. For each term to mutate, SRCMutation shall generate one mutant including each replacement term. If a statement includes more than one term to mutate, the mutation operator generates a set of mutants for each term to mutate. Table 6.2, shows, for every mutation operator the terms it mutates and the replacement terms (separated by comma). Replacement terms shall be used when defining test assertions (i.e., we shall verify that the term to mutate has been replaced any of the available replacements, one for each generated mutant).

### 6.2.3 Approach refinements

Based on Table 6.2 we can derive the categories to be used for the category-partition method. They are *Operator* (i.e., the operator to be applied, which could be a specific *one* or *many* operators at once) and *Term to replace* (which depend on the operator and might be either *one* or *many* for each statement).

We provide the identified categories and values in tabular form, in Table 6.3. Because of the presence of many constraints between the categories *Operator* and *Term to replace*, to simplify the reading, in Table 6.3, instead of listing dependencies between *Operator* and *Term to replace*, we simply provide all the feasible combinations. In Table 6.3, the keyword *many* may indicates that either (a) more than one term should be replaced in a same statement (if the keyword *many* appears under *Term to replace*) or (b) more than one operator shall be applied in a same statement (if the keyword *many* appears under *Operator*). In Table 6.3, column *Constraints* reports other standard category-partition constraints (in this case, all the value classes shall be tested once). Finally, we also provide corresponding test identifiers, which match the name of the test script file. Test cases are identified using the name of the operator acronym and the input type to be processed, for example the test case `ror_lt.sh` represents the ROR operator for the “less than” input.



Table 6.2: Terms to mutate and replacements per mutation operator.

Operator	Term to mutate	Replacements
ABS	$v$	$-v$
AOR	$+$	$-, *, /, \%$
AOR	$-$	$+, *, /, \%$
AOR	$*$	$+, -, /, \%$
AOR	$/$	$+, -, *, \%$
AOR	$\%$	$+, -, *, /$
AOR	$+=$	$-=, *=, /=, \%=$
AOR	$-=$	$+=, *=, /=, \%=$
AOR	$*=$	$+=, -=, /=, \%=$
AOR	$/=$	$+=, -=, *=, \%=$
AOR	$\%=$	$+=, -=, *=, /=$
ICR	$i$	$1, -1, 0, i + 1, i - 1, -i$
LCR	$\&\&$	$  $
LCR	$  $	$\&\&$
LCR	$\&$	$ , \wedge$
LCR	$ $	$\&, \wedge$
LCR	$\wedge$	$\&,  $
LCR	$\&=$	$ =, \wedge=$
LCR	$ =$	$\&=, \wedge=$
LCR	$\wedge=$	$\&=,  =$
ROR	$>$	$>=, <, <=, ==, !=$
ROR	$>=$	$>, <, <=, ==, !=$
ROR	$<$	$>, >=, <=, ==, !=$
ROR	$<=$	$>, >=, <, ==, !=$
ROR	$==$	$>, >=, <, <=, !=$
ROR	$!=$	$>, >=, <, <=, ==$
ROR	<code>if( e )</code>	<code>if(!e)</code>
ROR	<code>while( e )</code>	<code>while(!e)</code>
SDL	$s$	<code>remove(s)</code>
UOI	$v$	$-v, v-, ++v, v++$
AOD	$a + b$	$a, b$
AOD	$a - b$	$a, b$
AOD	$a * b$	$a, b$
AOD	$a / b$	$a, b$
AOD	$a \% b$	$a, b$
LOD	$a \&\& b$	$a, b$
LOD	$a    b$	$a, b$
ROD	$>$	$a, b$
ROD	$>=$	$a, b$
ROD	$<$	$a, b$
ROD	$<=$	$a, b$
ROD	$==$	$a, b$
ROD	$!=$	$a, b$
BOD	$\&$	$a, b$
BOD	$ $	$a, b$
BOD	$\wedge$	$a, b$
SOD	$>>$	$a, b$
SOD	$<<$	$a, b$
LVR	$0$	$-1$
LVR	$l$	$-l, 0$
LVR	<code>true</code>	<code>false</code>
LVR	<code>false</code>	<code>true</code>

Table 6.3: Organization matrix of unit test cases for source code mutation operators component.

Operator	Term to replace	Constraints	Test Case
ABS	<i>v</i>	[single]	abs_val.sh
ABS	<i>many</i>	[single]	
AOR	+	[single]	aor_plus.sh
AOR	-	[single]	aor_minus.sh
AOR	*	[single]	aor_mult.sh
AOR	/	[single]	aor_div.sh
AOR	%	[single]	aor_mod.sh
AOR	+ =	[single]	aor_plus_assign.sh
AOR	- =	[single]	aor_minus_assign.sh
AOR	* =	[single]	aor_mult_assign.sh
AOR	/ =	[single]	aor_div_assign.sh
AOR	% =	[single]	aor_mod_assign.sh
AOR	<i>many</i>	[single]	
ICR	<i>i</i>	[single]	icr_val.sh
ICR	<i>many</i>	[single]	
LCR	&&	[single]	lcr_logic_or.sh
LCR		[single]	lcr_logic_and.sh
LCR	&	[single]	lcr_and.sh
LCR		[single]	lcr_or.sh
LCR	^	[single]	lcr_xor.sh
LCR	& =	[single]	lcr_and_assign.sh
LCR	=	[single]	lcr_or_assign.sh
LCR	^ =	[single]	lcr_xor_assign.sh
LCR	<i>many</i>	[single]	
ROR	>	[single]	ror_gt.sh
ROR	>=	[single]	ror_ge.sh
ROR	<	[single]	ror_lt.sh
ROR	<=	[single]	ror_le.sh
ROR	==	[single]	ror_eq.sh
ROR	!=	[single]	ror_neq.sh
ROR	if( e )	[single]	ror_if.sh
ROR	while( e )	[single]	ror_while.sh
ROR	<i>many</i>	[single]	
SDL	<i>s</i>	[single]	sdl.sh
SDL	<i>many</i>	[single]	
UOI	<i>v</i>	[single]	uoi.sh
UOI	<i>many</i>	[single]	
AOD	<i>a + b</i>	[single]	aod_plus.sh
AOD	<i>a - b</i>	[single]	aod_minus.sh
AOD	<i>a * b</i>	[single]	aod_mult.sh
AOD	<i>a/b</i>	[single]	aod_div.sh
AOD	<i>a%b</i>	[single]	aod_mod.sh
AOD	<i>many</i>	[single]	
LOD	<i>a&amp;&amp; b</i>	[single]	lod_logic_and.sh
LOD	<i>a   b</i>	[single]	lod_logic_or.sh
LOD	<i>many</i>	[single]	
ROD	>	[single]	rod_gt.sh
ROD	>=	[single]	rod_ge.sh
ROD	<	[single]	rod_lt.sh
ROD	<=	[single]	rod_le.sh
ROD	==	[single]	rod_eq.sh
ROD	!=	[single]	rod_neq.sh
ROD	<i>many</i>	[single]	
BOD	&	[single]	bod_and.sh
BOD		[single]	bod_or.sh
BOD	^	[single]	bod_xor.sh
BOD	<i>many</i>	[single]	
SOD	>>	[single]	sod_sl.sh
SOD	<<	[single]	sod_sr.sh
SOD	<i>many</i>	[single]	
LVR	0	[single]	lvr_zero.sh
LVR	<i>l</i>	[single]	lvr_literal.sh
LVR	true	[single]	lvr_true.sh
LVR	false	[single]	lvr_false.sh
LVR	<i>many</i>	[single]	

## Chapter 7

# MASS - Software Unit and Integration Test Case Specification

### 7.1 General

Table 7.1 provides the list of unit test cases derived based on the procedure described in Chapter 7. Column *Term to replace* indicates the operator appearing in the line to be mutated. When a test case is supposed to mutate many terms, we report all of them. Column *Replacements* provides, for each operator, the expected replacements. Note that *SRCMutation* shall generate one distinct mutant for each element of the replacement column.

**TODO:** Add missing test cases

Table 7.1: Unit test cases for SRCMutation.

Operator	Input	Replacements	Test Case
ABS	$v$	$-v$	abs_val.sh
AOR	$+$	$\{-, *, /, \%\}$	aor_plus.sh
AOR	$-$	$\{+, *, /, \%\}$	aor_minus.sh
AOR	$*$	$\{+, -, /, \%\}$	aor_mult.sh
AOR	$/$	$\{+, -, *, \%\}$	aor_div.sh
AOR	$\%$	$\{+, -, *, /\}$	aor_mod.sh
AOR	$+=$	$\{- =, * =, / =, \% =\}$	aor_plus_assign.sh
AOR	$- =$	$\{+ =, * =, / =, \% =\}$	aor_minus_assign.sh
AOR	$* =$	$\{+ =, - =, / =, \% =\}$	aor_mult_assign.sh
AOR	$/ =$	$\{+ =, - =, * =, \% =\}$	aor_div_assign.sh
AOR	$\% =$	$\{+ =, - =, * =, / =\}$	aor_mod_assign.sh
ICR	$i$	$\{1, -1, 0, i + 1, i - 1, -i\}$	icr_val.sh
LCR	$\&\&$	$\ $	lcr_logic_or.sh
LCR	$\ $	$\&\&$	lcr_logic_and.sh
LCR	$\&$	$\{!, \wedge\}$	lcr_and.sh
LCR	$ $	$\{\&, \wedge\}$	lcr_or.sh
LCR	$\wedge$	$\{\&,  \}$	lcr_xor.sh
LCR	$\& =$	$\{! =, \wedge =\}$	lcr_and_assign.sh
LCR	$  =$	$\{\& =, \wedge =\}$	lcr_or_assign.sh
LCR	$\wedge =$	$\{\& =,   =\}$	lcr_xor_assign.sh
ROR	$>$	$\{> =, <, < =, ==, ! =\}$	ror_gt.sh
ROR	$> =$	$\{>, <, < =, ==, ! =\}$	ror_ge.sh
ROR	$<$	$\{>, > =, < =, ==, ! =\}$	ror_lt.sh
ROR	$< =$	$\{>, > =, <, ==, ! =\}$	ror_le.sh
ROR	$==$	$\{>, > =, <, < =, ! =\}$	ror_eq.sh
ROR	$!=$	$\{>, > =, <, < =, ==\}$	ror_neq.sh
ROR	$\text{if}(e)$	$\text{if}(!e)$	ror_if.sh
ROR	$\text{while}(e)$	$\text{while}(!e)$	ror_while.sh
SDL	$s$	$\text{remove}(s)$	sdl.sh
UOI	$v$	$\{-v, v-, ++v, v++\}$	uoi.sh
AOD	$a + b$	$\{a, b\}$	aod_plus.sh
AOD	$a - b$	$\{a, b\}$	aod_minus.sh
AOD	$a * b$	$\{a, b\}$	aod_mult.sh
AOD	$a / b$	$\{a, b\}$	aod_div.sh
AOD	$a \% b$	$\{a, b\}$	aod_mod.sh
LOD	$a \&\& b$	$\{a, b\}$	lod_logic_and.sh
LOD	$a \  b$	$\{a, b\}$	lod_logic_or.sh
ROD	$>$	$\{a, b\}$	rod_gt.sh
ROD	$> =$	$\{a, b\}$	rod_ge.sh
ROD	$<$	$\{a, b\}$	rod_lt.sh
ROD	$< =$	$\{a, b\}$	rod_le.sh
ROD	$==$	$\{a, b\}$	rod_eq.sh
ROD	$!=$	$\{a, b\}$	rod_neq.sh
BOD	$\&$	$\{a, b\}$	bod_and.sh
BOD	$ $	$\{a, b\}$	bod_or.sh
BOD	$\wedge$	$\{a, b\}$	bod_xor.sh
SOD	$>>$	$\{a, b\}$	sod_sl.sh
SOD	$<<$	$\{a, b\}$	sod_sr.sh
LVR	$0$	$-1$	lvr_zero.sh
LVR	$l$	$\{-l, 0\}$	lvr_literal.sh
LVR	$\text{true}$	$\text{false}$	lvr_true.sh
LVR	$\text{false}$	$\text{true}$	lvr_false.sh

## 7.2 Organization of the Test Cases

```
1 double function() {  
2   int a = 4, b = 5;  
3   return a / b;  
4 }
```

Listing 7.1: C function example.

```
1 $MUTATOR --compilation "$FILE -o test" --operators ABS  
2  
3 EXPECTED="double function() {\ndouble a = 3;\nreturn -(a);\n}"  
4  
5 tst='diff test.mut.3.1_1_8.ABS.function.c <(echo -e $EXPECTED) | wc -l'  
6  
7 if [ $tst -eq 0 ];then  
8   echo -e "TEST abs_val PASSED"  
9 else  
10  echo -e "TEST abs_val FAILED"  
11 fi
```

Listing 7.2: ABS test case example.

Listings 7.1 and 7.2 introduce an example of source code and test case for the mutation operator ABS, respectively. As shown in Listing 7.2, each test case (i) invokes the mutator component selecting the corresponding operator acronym (Line 1), (ii) defines the expected output for operator (Line 3), (iii) checks if there are differences between the actual output of the component and the expected output (Line 5), (iv) print out the test result (Lines 7-11).

All test cases are independent from each other; therefore there is no need for executing test cases in a specific order. Note that a mutation operator might produce one or more mutants for a single input, all outputs shall be as expected.



## Chapter 8

# MASS - Software Unit and Integration Test Procedures

### 8.1 General

A single procedure has been identified to perform unit testing of MASS, it is described in the following.

### 8.2 MASS Test Procedure

#### 8.2.1 Test procedure Identifier

#### 8.2.2 Purpose

This procedure aims to execute all the test cases reported in Table 7.1.

#### 8.2.3 Procedure steps

##### 8.2.3.1 log

describe any special methods or format for logging the results of test execution, the incidents observed, and any other event pertinent to this test;

##### 8.2.3.2 set up

: describe the sequence of actions to set up the procedure execution;

#### **8.2.3.3 start**

: describe the actions to begin the procedure execution; proceed: describe the actions during the procedure execution;

#### **8.2.3.4 test result acquisition**

: describe how the test measurements is made;

#### **8.2.3.5 shut down**

: describe the action to suspend testing when interruption is forced by unscheduled events;

#### **8.2.3.6 restart**

: identify any procedural restart points and describe the actions to restart the procedure at each of these points;

#### **8.2.3.7 wrap up**

: describe the actions to terminate testing.