**CS4227**

**Systems Architecture and Design**

Automated Testing Framework

*James Reidy*, 14147009

*Aoife Watson*, 14159295

*Jiasen Tian*, 16060245

*George Rickard*, 14118637

**2. Table of Contents**

3. Requirements ...................................................................................................................... 3

Scenario Outline .......................................................................................................

Discussion on architectural use cases ..........................................................................

Discussion on tactics to support architectural use cases ..........................................

4. Discussion on Interceptor Architectural Pattern and Design Patterns .........................

5. System Architecture ........................................................................................................

6. Diagrams ........................................................................................................

Architectural Diagram ...........................................................................................

Structural Diagram ........................................................................................................

Runtime Diagram ........................................................................................................

7. Demonstration of quality attributes ........................................................................

8. Added Value ...................................................................................................................

9. Testing ...............................................................................................................................

10. Problems encountered and their solutions ...........................................................................

11. Evaluation and critique ........................................................................................................

12. References ............................................................................................................................

**3. Requirements**

**Scenario Outline**

**Use Case Descriptions**


|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case** | **Select Option** |
| *Success Scenario* | *System Response* |
| 1. User selects desired action | 1. System returns appropriate window |
| *Extension* |  |
| 1. Click “Exit” button | 1. System exits application |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case** | **Parse Page** |
| *Success Scenario* | *System Response* |
| 1. Enter webpage URL 2. Enter a name for the parsed file 3. Select XML or JSON format 4. Click “Parse” button | 1. System checks validity of URL 2. System parses page into desired format 3. System returns message indicating successful parse |
| *Extension* |  |
|  | 1. System returns message indicating unsuccessful parse |
| 1. Click “Main Menu” button | 1. System presents main menu |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case** | **Create Test** |
| *Success Scenario* | *System Response* |
| 1. Select page elements to test 2. Enter inputs/actions to take on each element 3. Select XML or JSON format 4. Click “Save Test” button | 1. System checks if path exists 2. System saves tests 3. Test name and path are written to text file |
| *Extension* |  |
|  | 1. System returns error message indicating that a test with that name already exists |
| 1. Click “Main Menu” button | 1. System presents main menu |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case** | **Run Test** |
| *Success Scenario* | *System Response* |
| 1. Select desired test to run 2. Click “Run” button | 1. System runs tests and logs results |
| *Extension* |  |
| 1. Click “Main Menu” button | 1. System presents main menu |

**Use Case Diagram**

****

**Discussion on Architectural Use Cases**

1. Parsing a web page

Users must be able to parse a web page of their choosing. The parsed webpage elements can be saved in either XML or JSON format.

2. Creating a Test

All elements from the parsed web pages are displayed in a table. Users can pick elements from this table to add to a test, or insert their own. All tests must have a unique name and tests with duplicate names will not be saved.

3. Running a test

All saved tests appear in a list. The user picks one and clicks the run test button.

4. Log messages saving to the log file

Running a test returns a success or fail string. The logger takes this string and saved it to the log.txt, along with the date, and the test name. For tests containing multiple elements, a success or fail note is included for each element.

**Discussion on Tactics to Support Architectural Use Cases**

**Portability**

We supported portability through our choice of programming language java. Java is a highly portable language, as it can run on practically any platform. Additionally, all of our team members are proficient in java so this also contributed to our decision to use java.

**Extensibility**

Our extensive use of design pattern creates lots of opportunities for extensions in our application. One such opportunity is creating JSON tests. When parsing a webpage, the element can be saved in XML or JSON. At the moment, tests are automatically created in XML format. However, to create tests in JSON, an additional class – a JSON parser equivalent to our XML parser class – is necessary, along with an option create the test in JSON or XML on the create test menu.

**Performance**

We support performance through our use of a QueryBuilder. The QueryBuilder was used to extract information from a text file. Statements are easy to prepare using the QueryBuilder. Statements can be prepared in advance, with execution occurring at a later stage. This improved performance as we were not executing any unnecessary file manipulation.


**4. Discussion of Interceptor Architectural Pattern and Design Patterns**

**3 pages max! discuss context and consequences and their support in scenario**


**Interceptor**

**Interceptor design pattern**

In our project, we use Interceptor design pattern to implement logger operation in our project, there are three different interceptors - DateInterceptor (Automatic create log time), DatabaseTestingLineInterceptor (Check validity of Testing line) and TestingStatementInterceptor (Check validity of Testing result), these interceptors will be added in dispatcher as specific out-of-band services and they will use context object (action) to control the concrete framework.



InterceptorDispatcher, which allows applications to register and remove concrete interceptor. InterceptorDispatcher use priority call back strategy - each interceptor have its own priority number. The dispatcher always invoke the interceptor firstly who has the max priority number.



**Strategy – write more about strategy than other 5**

**Command Design Pattern**

The command design pattern was implemented in two classes in our project. In the first instance, the command design pattern was used in conjunction with the factory design pattern to create the UI controller classes. This supports extensibility as adding another controller class to the factory method requires only one line of code in the *createControllers* method.

The command pattern was also used to encapsulate test commands. Each type of element requires a different testing mechanism. We put in place the command pattern to create a handler for each type of test. This also extends extensibility as adding a new element handler to this scenario requires the addition of one line of code.


**Factory Design Pattern**

We used the Factory Method Design pattern to create the UI controllers in our application. We did this to capture controller creation in one class. This was used with the command pattern as previously discussed. This has the additional benefit of ensuring the controllers are only created once, they are instantiated when they are added to a data structure as per the command design pattern and called from there.


**Memento design pattern**

Memento design pattern can capture and externalise an object’s internal state so that the object can be restored to this state later without any violating encapsulation. In our project, the memento design pattern was used in undo operation in select XML/Json elements which be chosen as a test case of running test. This operation allow the user to ‘back out’ and recover form error operations.There are three important parts of memento design pattern in our project - DataOriginator (The ‘thing’ that ‘changes’), Caretaker (The ‘thing’ that changes the originator) and memento(The state of the originator before the change)

In DataOriginator, the restore method will get the previous state of Originator.




In Memento, it can store the state of selection operation.




In Caretaker, there are two important methods: undoOperation() and setOriginatorValue().

undoOperation will get a previous state from stack and restore it which will make originator return to previous state.




In setOriginatorValue(), the caretaker will create new memento to store the current state and push it into stack.



**Builder**

Our implementation of the Builder was used in the QueryBuilder system in our application. QueryBuilder constructs simple “Queries” to be performed on CSV files in an SQL-like fashion.




SelectOperation in the example shown takes in the columns to be selected, TableTestCases acts as a wrapper for the path to the text file containing the data, and WhereClause narrows the data down as the user desires. The SQL equivalent to the example shown would be “SELECT name FROM TestCases WHERE name = n”.

**Visitor**

As well as incorporating the Builder design pattern, the concrete Query it constructs utilizes the Visitor design patter to perform an action depending on the DataOperation being performed. Shown below is the visitor being passed into the dataOperation.



Once the visitor is passed in it performs the necessary action based on its type; select, delete, insert or update.



**Singleton**

**5. Discussion of System Architecture**

Our system is structured using an Model-View-Controller architectural pattern. In our application, as we are using JavaFX for the user interface (UI), the FXML files take the place of any view java files that would typically exist.

We have two types of controllers in our application – UI controllers and model controllers. The UI controllers only interact with the FXML files, and delegate out any other responsibility to the model controllers. We have one model controller in our application as we have only one model class. The UI controllers and model controller are kept completely separate, with minimal dependencies. Only *TestSelectionController* and *CreateTestController* have a dependency on the model controller, as they need to delegate actions to it.

The model class in our application simulates an entity class from a database. It encapsulates the data in the TEST\_CASES.txt file. In this class, the QueryBuilder is used extensively to select, update and insert data to and from the text file. The model class is situated in the models package in our business logic layer (bll).


We also have a data access (dal) layer to our application. This packages contains the implementation of the QueryBuilder, and its related operations.


We have included a properties text file with our application. This file contains values for various external variables in our application. The advantage of using a properties file is that the values of these variables can be altered with necessitating recompilation.


**6. Structural, Runtime and Architectural Diagrams**


**Structural Diagram : Class Diagram**


Package diagram for package src





























**Runtime Diagram : Sequence Diagram**

Scenario is parsing a webpage into XML



**Architecture Diagram**



**7. Demonstration of Quality Attributes**

**8. Documentation of Added Value**


**Interceptor Priority**


**Selenium**

**Properties**

**QueryBuilder**


As discussed earlier in this report, QueryBuilder is an attempt to model CSV files as if they were tables in an SQL database by allowing the user to perform select, update, insert and delete operations on it and passing in where clauses when needed. Its creation was motivated from a project done last semester that also made use of CSV files. Information was pulled from a single class and team members created members to pull very specific information, which became messy, convoluted and posed a security concern. Thus, attempting to model an industry standard in its most basic form felt like a fitting solution to this problem. Below is the format of the text file required and a SelectOperation being performed on this file.





**JavaFX and Scene Builder**

JavaFX is Oracle’s latest set of tools for developing GUIs. We used it in our project for two reasons; ease of use thanks to Scene Builder, and to gain experience with newer technologies instead of working with old, soon-to-be deprecated JPanels. It allows for drag and drop capabilities of different widgets and editing different parameters all from the same window. This information is then stored on an FXML file. Shown below is Scene Builder in action on CreateTestView.fxml. Along the left-hand side are available widgets, while the right-hand side contains information about the selected widget, such as ID and handler.



Controllers use the @FXML annotation for objects to create the link between the controller and the view. The first line of code shown below is the FXML for the “Main Menu” button on the upper left-hand corner of the window above. The next line is the corresponding controller calling that instance of that button.



**Git**


Git was our version control system of choice for this project. While there are many platforms that utilize git i.e. BitBucket, GitLab, we went with GitHub since it what we were most familiar with. Using version control allowed us to seamlessly make changes to code without having to worry too much about breaking or accidentally removing work by other team members.

**9. Evidence of Testing**

For this project, we implemented a Test Primer which runs 2 Test Suits. First one is DatabaseOperationTest: JUnit testing for TestAddData, Second one is InterceptorDispatcherTest: JUnit testing for TestInvoke and TestLoggerResultForm. There tests would tell us whether our database access method(text file operation) were working as we intend and whether dispatcher will work as we designed.


For DatabaseOperationTest: Testing of AddData, addData is a txt file operation method, which will get a new String type of testing result and write it into text file. In this JUnit test, test will pass once the new line is successfully added in and found as the last line.






For InterceptorDispatcherTest: TestInvoke and TestLoggerResultForm, both of these methods are JUnit testing for Dispatcher.

For TestInvoke, it is a method which can check whether dispatcher will callback interceptors by priority strategy. As our project designed, each interceptor has its own priority, and the dispatcher will always invoke the interceptor who has the most large priority number currently. In this method, there different interceptors will be registered in dispatch in random ordering.




And it will check the callback ordering of three interceptors and theirs own priority.




This JUnit testing will pass if the callback ordering is correct.

In this case, the correct result order is: 1.DateInterceptor 2. DatabaseInterceptor 3.StatementInterceptor.




For TestLoggerResultForm, this method is designed to check whether dispatcher will return a right result form which will be written in log.txt. The JUnit testing will pass once the created form is “Date” + “Testing line” + “Testing Result”.





The test result as picture shows below. All 3 tests passed.




**10. Discussion of Problems Encountered**

**Provide evidence of how all this was resolved**

**.gitignore**

Early on in implementation we experienced issues with Git. Code was failing to compile due to configuration issues within the IDE we were using, IntelliJ. The root of these issues was the misconfiguration of gitignore, which contains a list of files and/or file types to be ignore by Git. These include configuration files specific to each machine. Displayed below is an early repository with workspace.xml included in Git.



The issue was resolved by creating a new repository for the project with a .gitignore file that had been created specifically for IntelliJ.

**File Paths**

**Selenium Dependency**

**Dividing work – lots of waiting on people to finish bits before others could be completed.**

**11. Evaluation of Support for Non-Functional Requirements**

**“should be done using scenarios” whatever that means?**

**12. References**

**Give reference for any images shown or tools used (including jdom etc.)**

**13. Contributions**

**Few screenshots from github should do this**