

Verification and Validation Report: SyncMaster

Team 15, SyncMaster

Kyle D'Souza

Mitchell Hynes

Richard Fan

Akshit Gulia

Rafeed Iqbal

March 10, 2025

1 Revision History

| Date | Version | Notes |
|--------|---------|-------|
| Date 1 | 1.0 | Notes |
| Date 2 | 1.1 | Notes |

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

Refer to *Section 4: Naming Conventions and Terminology* of the Software Requirements Specification document [SRS.pdf](#).

Contents

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Revision History | i |
| 2 | Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms | ii |
| 3 | Functional Requirements Evaluation | 1 |
| 4 | Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation | 1 |
| 4.1 | Usability | 1 |
| 4.2 | Performance | 4 |
| 4.3 | Maintainability and Support | 4 |
| 4.4 | etc. | 5 |
| 5 | Comparison to Existing Implementation | 5 |
| 6 | Unit Testing | 5 |
| 6.1 | Database Interaction Module Unit Tests | 5 |
| 6.2 | File Storage Interaction Module Unit Tests | 7 |
| 6.3 | Location Verification Module Unit Tests | 8 |
| 6.4 | User Authentication Module Unit Tests | 8 |
| 6.5 | User Management Module Unit Tests | 9 |
| 6.6 | Logging Module Unit Tests | 10 |
| 7 | Changes Due to Testing | 11 |
| 8 | Automated Testing | 11 |
| 9 | Trace to Requirements | 11 |
| 10 | Trace to Modules | 13 |
| 11 | Code Coverage Metrics | 14 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Usability Test Cases | 4 |
| 2 | Maintainability and Support Test Cases | 4 |
| 3 | Unit Test Cases for Database Interaction Module | 7 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 4 | Unit Test Cases for File Storage Interaction Module | 7 |
| 5 | Unit Test Cases for Location Verification Module | 8 |
| 6 | Unit Test Cases for User Authentication Module | 9 |
| 7 | Unit Test Cases for User Management Module | 10 |
| 8 | Unit Test Cases for Logging Module | 11 |
| 9 | Requirements to Test Case Traceability Matrix | 13 |
| 10 | Module to Test Case Traceability Matrix | 13 |

List of Figures

This document ...

3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

4.1 Usability

Usability testing was conducted on the application prototype to validate humanity, look and feel, operational, and cultural requirements. Two users were given the following scenarios for the usability test, to simulate a typical use of the system:

Phase 1: Testing the contractor portal

You are a contractor hired by the City of Hamilton to perform work at a station. You arrive and scan the QR code at the station to authenticate your presence and explain the work you will perform. We will ask you to perform a variety of tasks to assess their discoverability and usability. We welcome you explaining your thought process as you navigate through the screens.

- You have scanned the QR code. Please follow the initial steps for the health and safety acknowledgements. Did the experience of viewing the acknowledgements screen feel easy and intuitive? Did you encounter any errors? After the acknowledgements, are you able to find the station documents?
- Are you able to find and fill out the instructions for the purpose of your visit?

Phase 2: Testing the admin portal

You are a Facility Manager who has an account with admin permissions. You sign into the application and would like to perform some routine tasks during the day.

- You would like to navigate to the station documents and add a site specific document for station HC057. Please attempt to do so. Were you frustrated trying to find where this was located?

- Please locate the site wide documents which would be displayed for all stations.
- Please locate and view the site visit logs.

2 Users were then directed to fill out the Usability Survey identified in the VnV Plan.

User 1: Man between the ages of 60 - 65, no prior experience with the system. User is comfortable using a smartphone and laptop.

User 2: Woman between ages of 60 - 65, no prior experience with the system. User is comfortable using a smartphone and laptop. Through these actions, the following results were observed:

| Test. ID | User | Result |
|----------|--------|--|
| TC-EU-1 | User 1 | User successfully understood the distinction between the contractor and admin user. User experienced minor confusion what should be entered in the work order field, due to no real work order in scenario. User successfully navigated core features of contractor and admin portal without issue. Test Passed. |
| TC-EU-2 | User 1 | User successfully navigated contractor portal. Minor difficulties understanding distinction of site wide and site and site specific documentation on the admin portal, emphasizing the importance of user documentation in requirement MS-SUP-1. Confusion did not hinder accessing all features of admin portal. Test passed. |

| | | |
|---------|--------|---|
| TC-EU-2 | User 2 | As an admin user, the tester was able to add a site wide document but did not receive a warning before deleting file thus identifying a bug in the system to be patched for rev1. |
| TC-LR-1 | User 1 | As an admin user, the tester was able to add a site wide document but did not receive a warning before deleting file thus identifying a bug in the system to be patched for rev1. |
| TC-LR-1 | User 2 | User successfully discovered the documentation page. Experienced minor confusion that documents are downloaded and not viewed in the application, but successfully opened the document. User gave their confidence a rating of 7. |
| TC-LR-1 | User 1 | |
| TC-LR-2 | User 2 | |
| TC-UP-1 | User 1 | |
| TC-UP-1 | User 2 | |
| TC-UP-2 | User 1 | |
| TC-UP-2 | User 2 | |
| TC-AS-1 | User 1 | |
| TC-AS-2 | User 2 | |
| TC-LF-1 | User 1 | |
| TC-LF-1 | User 2 | |
| TC-LF-2 | User 1 | |
| TC-LF-2 | User 2 | |
| TC-CR-1 | User 1 | |
| TC-CR-1 | User 2 | |
| TC-CR-2 | User 1 | |
| TC-CR-2 | User 2 | |

| | | |
|---------|--------|--|
| TC-OE-1 | User 1 | |
| TC-OE-1 | User 2 | |
| TC-OE-2 | User 1 | |
| TC-OE-2 | User 2 | |

Table 1: Usability Test Cases

4.2 Performance

4.3 Maintainability and Support

| Test. ID | Input | Expected Output | Result |
|----------|-------|---|---|
| TC-MS-4 | - | There is 95% line coverage and 90% branch coverage on our code | Pass, this is being checked in GitHub actions |
| TC-MS-5 | - | All functional requirements have a corresponding unit test | Pass |
| TC-MS-6 | - | Contribution guidelines and maintainer documentation of system approved by the City of Hamilton | Fail, not yet approved |
| TC-MS-7 | - | User manual exists and has been approved by the City of Hamilton | Fail, not yet created |
| TC-MS-8 | - | OAS3 compliant documentation has been provided for all API's | Fail, not yet created |
| TC-MS-9 | - | Internal abstractions (classes and functions) in the system have documentation associated with them | Pass, linter checks this |
| TC-MS-10 | - | Documentation for deployment of the system exists | Fail, not yet created |

Table 2: Maintainability and Support Test Cases

4.4 etc.

5 Comparison to Existing Implementation

This section will not be appropriate for every project.

6 Unit Testing

Note: Unit tests all use [moto](#) to mock AWS services.

6.1 Database Interaction Module Unit Tests

| Test. ID | Description | Result |
|----------|---|--------|
| UT-DB1 | Use the DBTable.put method to create an item, and check that it exists in the database afterwards | Pass |
| UT-DB2 | Use the DBTable.put method with a failing precondition, and check that a ConditionCheckFailed is raised, and the item is not created | Pass |
| UT-DB3 | Use the DBTable.put method with a permission error from AWS, and check that a PermissionException is raised, and the item is not created | Pass |
| UT-DB4 | Use the DBTable.put method with an arbitrary error from AWS, and check that a ExternalServiceException is raised, and the item is not created | Pass |
| UT-DB5 | Use the DBTable.get method to get a pre-existing item | Pass |
| UT-DB6 | Use the DBTable.get method to get an item which does not exist, and check that a ResourceNotFound is raised | Pass |
| UT-DB7 | Use the DBTable.get method with an arbitrary error from AWS, and check that a ExternalServiceException is raised | Pass |
| UT-DB8 | Use the DBTable.delete method on a pre-existing item, and check that the item is no longer in the database | Pass |
| UT-DB9 | Use the DBTable.delete method with a failing precondition, and check that a ConditionCheckFailed is raised, and the item is not deleted | Pass |

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| UT-DB10 | Use the DBTable.delete method with a permission error from AWS, and check that a PermissionException is raised, and the item is not deleted | Pass |
| UT-DB11 | Use the DBTable.delete method with an arbitrary error from AWS, and check that a ExternalServiceException is raised, and the item is not deleted | Pass |
| UT-DB12 | Use the DBTable.update method to update an item adding new attributes, and modifying existing ones, and check that these changes are reflected in the database | Pass |
| UT-DB13 | Use the DBTable.update method to update an item removing some attributes and check that these changes are reflected in the database | Pass |
| UT-DB14 | Use the DBTable.update method with a failing precondition, and check that a ConditionCheckFailed is raised, and the item is not updated | Pass |
| UT-DB15 | Use the DBTable.update method with a permission error from AWS, and check that a PermissionException is raised, and the item is not updated | Pass |
| UT-DB16 | Use the DBTable.update method with an arbitrary error from AWS, and check that a ExternalServiceException is raised, and the item is not updated | Pass |
| UT-DB17 | Use the DBTable.query method, and ensure the returned items all match the query criterion | Pass |
| UT-DB18 | Use the DBTable.query method, under a different GSI, and ensure the returned items all match the query criterion | Pass |
| UT-DB19 | Use the DBTable.query method, with a reversed query direction, and ensure the returned items all match the query criterion | Pass |
| UT-DB20 | Use the DBTable.query method, with using the start_key of an existing db item, to determine where to start the query from, and ensure the returned items all match the query criterion | Pass |
| UT-DB21 | Use the DBTable.query method, using a filter expression alongside a key condition, and ensure the returned items all match the query criterion | Pass |

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| UT-DB22 | Use the DBTable.query method, with an invalid key condition, and ensure that a ConditionValidationError is raised | Pass |
| UT-DB23 | Use the DBTable.query method with an arbitrary error from AWS, and check that a ExternalServiceException is raised | Pass |

Table 3: Unit Test Cases for Database Interaction Module

6.2 File Storage Interaction Module Unit Tests

| Test. ID | Description | Result |
|----------|---|--------|
| UT-FS1 | Use the S3Bucket.create_upload_url method to create an upload url, upload some content to the url, and check that the content exists in the S3 bucket | Pass |
| UT-FS2 | Use the S3Bucket.create_upload_url method with a S3Bucket object that does not have write permissions, and check that a PermissionException gets raised | Pass |
| UT-FS3 | Use the S3Bucket.create_get_url method for a pre-existing file in S3, and check that the file content can be accessed through the url, and check that a PermissionException gets raised | Pass |
| UT-FS4 | Use the S3Bucket.delete method on a pre-existing file in S3, and check that the file no longer exists | Pass |
| UT-FS5 | Use the S3Bucket.delete method on a pre-existing file in S3, with an ETag mismatch, and check that a ResourceNotFound is raised | Pass |
| UT-FS6 | Use the S3Bucket.delete method with a permission error, and check that a PermissionException is raised | Pass |
| UT-FS7 | Use the S3Bucket.delete method with an arbitrary error from AWS, and check that a ExternalServiceException is raised | Pass |

Table 4: Unit Test Cases for File Storage Interaction Module

6.3 Location Verification Module Unit Tests

| Test. ID | Description | Result |
|----------|---|--------|
| UT-LV1 | Use the verify_location method to verify a coordinate within a defined radius, and ensure the return value is True | Pass |
| UT-LV2 | Use the verify_location method to verify a coordinate outside a defined radius, and ensure the return value is False | Pass |
| UT-LV3 | Use the verify_location method to verify a coordinate just on the boundary of a defined radius, and ensure the return value is True | Pass |

Table 5: Unit Test Cases for Location Verification Module

6.4 User Authentication Module Unit Tests

| Test. ID | Description | Result |
|----------|--|--------|
| UT-UA1 | Attempt to authenticate with a pre-existing user, and ensure that a token is successfully generated | Pass |
| UT-UA2 | Attempt to authenticate with an invalid location, and ensure that an UnauthorizedException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UA3 | Attempt to authenticate with an initial one-time password, and ensure that an ForceChangePasswordException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UA4 | Attempt to authenticate with the wrong password, and ensure that an UnauthorizedException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UA5 | Attempt to authenticate with a user that does not exist, and ensure that a ResourceNotFound is raised | Pass |
| UT-UA6 | Attempt to authenticate with an arbitrary error from AWS, and ensure that a ExternalServiceException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UA7 | Attempt to signout a user, with a valid access token, and ensure that the token is successfully invalidated | Pass |

| | | |
|--------|--|------|
| UT-UA8 | Attempt to signout a user, with an invalid access token, and ensure that a <code>BadRequestException</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UA9 | Attempt to signout a user, with an arbitrary error from AWS, and ensure that a <code>ExternalServiceException</code> is raised | Pass |

Table 6: Unit Test Cases for User Authentication Module

6.5 User Management Module Unit Tests

| Test. ID | Description | Result |
|----------|---|--------|
| UT-UM1 | Create an admin, employee, and contractor account, using admin credentials | Pass |
| UT-UM2 | Create a user, using admin credentials, where there is already another user using the same email, and check that a <code>ConflictException</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM3 | Create a user, using employee and contractor credentials, and ensure an <code>UnauthorizedException</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM4 | Create a user, with an arbitrary error occurring from AWS, and check that an <code>ExternalServiceException</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM5 | Get the details of an existing user, using admin and employee credentials | Pass |
| UT-UM6 | Get the details of a user that does not exist, using admin and employee credentials, and ensure a <code>ResourceNotFound</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM7 | Use contractor credentials to get the details of their own user | Pass |
| UT-UM8 | Use contractor credentials to get the details of another user, and ensure an <code>UnauthorizedException</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM9 | Get the details of a user, with an arbitrary error occurring from AWS, and check that an <code>ExternalServiceException</code> is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM10 | Update a user, using admin credentials | Pass |

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| UT-UM11 | Update a user, using admin credentials, where the user to update does not exist, and check that a ResourceNotFound is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM12 | Update a user, using employee and contractor credentials, and ensure an UnauthorizedException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM13 | Update a user, with an arbitrary error occurring from AWS, and check that an ExternalServiceException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM14 | Delete a user, using admin credentials | Pass |
| UT-UM15 | Delete a user, using admin credentials, where the user to delete does not exist, and check that a ResourceNotFound is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM16 | Delete a user, using employee and contractor credentials, and ensure an UnauthorizedException is raised | Pass |
| UT-UM17 | Delete a user, with an arbitrary error occurring from AWS, and check that an ExternalServiceException is raised | Pass |

Table 7: Unit Test Cases for User Management Module

6.6 Logging Module Unit Tests

| Test. ID | Description | Result |
|----------|--|--------|
| UT-LG1 | Create a site visit log, and ensure it gets added to the database | Pass |
| UT-LG2 | Create a site visit log, with the same site id, user id, and entry time as an existing log, and ensure a ResourceConflict is raised | Pass |
| UT-LG3 | Add an exit time to an existing log with no logged exit time, and ensure the change is reflected in the database | Pass |
| UT-LG4 | Add an exit time to an existing log with no logged exit time, but an entry time prior to the exit time we are attempting to add, and ensure a TimeConsistencyException is raised | Pass |

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| UT-LG5 | Add an exit time to an existing log with a logged exit time, and ensure an ExitTimeConflict is raised | Pass |
| UT-LG6 | Add an exit time, where there are no existing logs for the user at the given site, and ensure an ResourceNotFound is raised | Pass |
| UT-LG7 | Get a list of all site visit logs, using admin and employee credentials | Pass |
| UT-LG8 | Get a list of all site visit logs, using contractor credentials, and ensure that an UnauthorizedException is raised | Pass |
| UT-LG9 | Get a list of all site visit logs using filters to only include logs modified between two given dates, and ensure that logs are correctly filtered | Pass |
| UT-LG10 | Get a list of all site visit logs using a database start_key to start the listing from a certain log, and ensure that logs start from the correct location | Pass |

Table 8: Unit Test Cases for Logging Module

7 Changes Due to Testing

[This section should highlight how feedback from the users and from the supervisor (when one exists) shaped the final product. In particular the feedback from the Rev 0 demo to the supervisor (or to potential users) should be highlighted. —SS]

8 Automated Testing

N/A, the only automated testing we have is the unit tests.

9 Trace to Requirements

| Req. ID | Test ID's |
|---------|----------------|
| FR1 | TC-FR1, TC-FR2 |

| | |
|---------|----------------|
| FR3 | TC-FR3, UT-UM3 |
| FR4 | TC-FR4, UT-LG7 |
| FR5 | TC-FR5, UT-UA2 |
| FR6 | TC-FR6 |
| FR7 | TC-FR8 |
| FR8 | TC-FR7 |
| FR9 | TC-FR9 |
| LF-AP1 | TC-LF-1 |
| LF-ST1 | TC-LF-2 |
| UH-EU1 | TC-EU1 |
| UH-EU2 | TC-EU2 |
| UH-LR1 | TC-LR1 |
| UH-LR2 | TC-LR2 |
| UH-UP1 | TC-UP1 |
| UH-UP2 | TC-UP2 |
| UH-AS1 | TC-AS1 |
| PR-SL1 | TC-PR-1 |
| PR-SL3 | TC-PR-2 |
| PR-SC1 | TC-PR-3 |
| PR-SC2 | TC-PR-4 |
| PR-PA1 | TC-PR-5 |
| PR-RFT1 | TC-PR-7 |
| PR-CR2 | TC-PR-10 |
| PR-SE1 | TC-PR-11 |
| OE-PE1 | TC-OE-1 |
| OE-WE1 | TC-OE-2 |
| OE-WE2 | TC-OE-2 |
| OE-REL1 | TC-OE-4 |
| OE-REL2 | TC-OE-4 |
| OE-REL3 | TC-OE-4 |
| OE-REL4 | TC-OE-4 |
| MS-MTN4 | TC-MS-4 |
| MS-MTN5 | TC-MS-5 |
| MS-MTN6 | TC-MS-6 |
| MS-SUP1 | TC-MS-7 |
| MS-SUP2 | TC-MS-8 |

| | |
|---------|----------|
| MS-SUP3 | TC-MS-9 |
| MS-SUP4 | TC-MS-10 |
| MS-ADP1 | TC-LF-2 |
| MS-ADP2 | TC-LF-2 |
| MS-ADP3 | TC-LF-2 |
| SR-AR1 | TC-SS-1 |
| SR-AR2 | TC-SS-1 |
| SR-AR3 | TC-SS-1 |
| SR-AR4 | TC-SS-2 |
| SR-IR1 | TC-SS-2 |
| SR-IR3 | TC-SS-4 |
| SR-PR1 | TC-SS-5 |
| SR-AU1 | TC-SS-6 |
| SR-IMR1 | TC-SS-7 |
| SR-S1 | TC-SS-8 |
| CR-CR1 | TC-CR-1 |

Table 9: Requirements to Test Case Traceability Matrix

10 Trace to Modules

Note: * indicates that any test prefixed with the test case ID, covers the given module

| Module | Test ID's |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| Database Interaction | UT-DB* |
| Logging | UT-LG* |
| File Storage | UT-FS* |
| Location Verification | UT-LV* |
| User Management | UT-UM* |
| User Authentication | UT-AU* |

Table 10: Module to Test Case Traceability Matrix

11 Code Coverage Metrics

The unit testing achieves 95% line coverage and 90% branch coverage. This is checked by our GitHub Actions on every pull request.

Appendix — Reflection

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Reflection.

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?
2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?
3. Which parts of this document stemmed from speaking to your client(s) or a proxy (e.g. your peers)? Which ones were not, and why?
4. 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.)