

Project Title: System Verification and Validation Plan for MTOBridge

Team 15, Alpha Software Solutions

Badawy, Adham

Yazdinia, Pedram

Jandric, David

Vakili, Farzad

Vezina, Victor

Chiu, Darren

November 1, 2022

1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
October 30	Darren	Non-Functional System Tests
November 1	Pedram	Functional System Tests
November 1	Victor	Unit Tests Intro
November 1	Victor	Non-Functional System Tests

Contents

1	Revision History	i
2	Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
3	General Information	1
3.1	Summary	1
3.2	Objectives	1
3.3	Relevant Documentation	1
4	Plan	1
4.1	Verification and Validation Team	1
4.2	SRS Verification Plan	2
4.3	Design Verification Plan	2
4.4	Implementation Verification Plan	2
4.5	Automated Testing and Verification Tools	2
4.6	Software Validation Plan	2
5	System Test Description	3
5.1	Tests for Functional Requirements	3
5.1.1	Area of Testing1	3
5.1.2	File Manager	4
5.1.3	Solver Setup	4
5.1.4	Bridge Config	5
5.1.5	Calculation Parameters	6
5.1.6	Result Visualizer	7
5.1.7	Exectution Flow Logging	8
5.2	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements	8
5.2.1	Look and Feel Requirements	8
5.2.2	Usability and Humanity Requirements	9
5.2.3	Performance Requirements	11
5.2.4	Operational and Environmental Requirements	12
5.2.5	Maintainability and Support Requirements	13
5.3	Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements	14
6	Unit Test Description	14
6.1	Unit Testing Scope	14
6.2	Tests for Functional Requirements	14

6.2.1	Module 1	14
6.2.2	Module 2	15
6.3	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements	15
6.3.1	Module ?	16
6.3.2	Module ?	16
6.4	Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules	16
7	Appendix	17
7.1	Symbolic Parameters	17
7.2	Usability Survey Questions?	17

List of Tables

[Remove this section if it isn't needed —SS]

List of Figures

[Remove this section if it isn't needed —SS]

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
T	Test

[symbols, abbreviations or acronyms – you can simply reference the SRS (Author, 2019) tables, if appropriate —SS]

This document ... [provide an introductory blurb and roadmap of the Verification and Validation plan —SS]

3 General Information

3.1 Summary

[Say what software is being tested. Give its name and a brief overview of its general functions. —SS]

3.2 Objectives

[State what is intended to be accomplished. The objective will be around the qualities that are most important for your project. You might have something like: “build confidence in the software correctness,” “demonstrate adequate usability.” etc. You won’t list all of the qualities, just those that are most important. —SS]

3.3 Relevant Documentation

[Reference relevant documentation. This will definitely include your SRS and your other project documents (MG, MIS, etc). You can include these even before they are written, since by the time the project is done, they will be written. —SS]

Author (2019)

4 Plan

[Introduce this section. You can provide a roadmap of the sections to come. —SS]

4.1 Verification and Validation Team

[You, your classmates and the course instructor. Maybe your supervisor. You should do more than list names. You should say what each person’s role is for the project. A table is a good way to summarize this information. —SS]

4.2 SRS Verification Plan

[List any approaches you intend to use for SRS verification. This may just be ad hoc feedback from reviewers, like your classmates, or you may have something more rigorous/systematic in mind.. —SS]

[Remember you have an SRS checklist —SS]

4.3 Design Verification Plan

[Plans for design verification —SS]

[The review will include reviews by your classmates —SS]

[Remember you have MG and MIS checklists —SS]

4.4 Implementation Verification Plan

[You should at least point to the tests listed in this document and the unit testing plan. —SS]

[In this section you would also give any details of any plans for static verification of the implementation. Potential techniques include code walk-throughs, code inspection, static analyzers, etc. —SS]

4.5 Automated Testing and Verification Tools

[What tools are you using for automated testing. Likely a unit testing framework and maybe a profiling tool, like ValGrind. Other possible tools include a static analyzer, make, continuous integration tools, test coverage tools, etc. Explain your plans for summarizing code coverage metrics. Linters are another important class of tools. For the programming language you select, you should look at the available linters. There may also be tools that verify that coding standards have been respected, like flake9 for Python. —SS]

[The details of this section will likely evolve as you get closer to the implementation. —SS]

4.6 Software Validation Plan

[If there is any external data that can be used for validation, you should point to it here. If there are no plans for validation, you should state that here. —SS]

5 System Test Description

5.1 Tests for Functional Requirements

[Subsets of the tests may be in related, so this section is divided into different areas. If there are no identifiable subsets for the tests, this level of document structure can be removed. —SS]

[Include a blurb here to explain why the subsections below cover the requirements. References to the SRS would be good. —SS]

5.1.1 Area of Testing¹

[It would be nice to have a blurb here to explain why the subsections below cover the requirements. References to the SRS would be good. If a section covers tests for input constraints, you should reference the data constraints table in the SRS. —SS]

1. test-id1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State:

Input:

Output: [The expected result for the given inputs —SS]

Test Case Derivation: [Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS]

How test will be performed:

2. test-id2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State:

Input:

Output: [The expected result for the given inputs —SS]

Test Case Derivation: [Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS]

How test will be performed:

5.1.2 File Manager

1. UTFR-2.1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: File location path

Output: New MTOBridge instance initialized with the given data instead of the default

Test Case Derivation: The initial data has to be checked before being plugged into the program

How test will be performed: The test involves instantiating an MTO-Bridge process with the saved data and then running our logic checks to validate the saved input.

2. UTFR-2.2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: File location path

Output: Boolean variable indicating True or False

Test Case Derivation: Require a method to check for the integrity of the saved configurations

How test will be performed: The test is performed by validating the completeness and metadata of the file to make sure the file hasn't been corrupted hence preventing an instance construct call with faulty data.

5.1.3 Solver Setup

1. UTFR-3.1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate the desired solver

Output: Calculation results based on the selected solver

Test Case Derivation: The current logic allows for calculation of the demand at different areas called concerned sections. These can show the forces for both a single section as well as the entire bridge.

How test will be performed: The test involves running a series of pre-determined calculation using both solvers and then comparing with the automatic output selecting one solver at a time.

2. UTFR-3.2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate the desired solver

Output:

Test Case Derivation: Require a method to check for the integrity of the saved configurations

How test will be performed: The test is performed by validating the completeness and metadata of the file to make sure the file hasn't been corrupted hence preventing an instance construct call with faulty data.

5.1.4 Bridge Config

1. UTFR-4.1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate the desired section

Output: Calculation results based on the selected section

Test Case Derivation: The current logic allows for calculation of the demand at different areas called concerned sections. These can show the forces for both a single section as well as the entire bridge.

How test will be performed: Once the section is selected, the test is performed by executing different types of platoon and bridge characteristic to derive actual results. These results are validated and compared to the expected results calculated through the engine only.

2. UTFR-4.2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate the discretization length

Output: Calculation results based on the defined length

Test Case Derivation: In order to use the second solver, the system requires information on the number of equally spaced parts of the bridge.

How test will be performed: Using an array of discretization lengths, we can take advantage of the engine's efficiency to calculate the maximum demand force in different context and compare with our own expected results.

5.1.5 Calculation Parameters

1. UTFR-5.1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate the desired force type

Output: Calculation results based on the selected parameters

Test Case Derivation: The current implementation of the engine allows for calculation across shear, torsion and flexural resistance

How test will be performed: The test entails

2. UTFR-5.2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate the desired moment

Output: Calculation results based on the selected parameters

Test Case Derivation: The current implementation of the engine allows for calculation using positive and negative moment

How test will be performed:

5.1.6 Result Visualizer

1. UTFR-6.1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: calculations based on the concerned section

Output: Animation and visualization highlighting the resulting properties on the specified bridge and load

Test Case Derivation: As one of the main purposes of the program, the visualization will be interactable

How test will be performed:

2. UTFR-6.2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: calculations based on the discretization length

Output: Animation and visualization highlighting the resulting properties on the specified bridge and load

Test Case Derivation: As one of the main purposes of the program, the visualization will be interactable

How test will be performed:

5.1.7 Exectution Flow Logging

1. UTFR-7.1

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate logging flags

Output:

Test Case Derivation:

How test will be performed:

2. UTFR-7.2

Control: Manual versus Automatic

Initial State: None

Input: text input to indicate logging flags

Output:

Test Case Derivation:

How test will be performed:

5.2 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

[The nonfunctional requirements for accuracy will likely just reference the appropriate functional tests from above. The test cases should mention reporting the relative error for these tests. —SS]

[Tests related to usability could include conducting a usability test and survey. —SS]

5.2.1 Look and Feel Requirements

Graphics Informative Value Test

1. NFR1.ST1

Initial State: Bridge UI mockups containing graphic elements will be prepared

Type: Manual, Static

How test will be performed: Civil engineers will be presented with mockups and expected to identify what the graphic elements represent with at least 90% accuracy

5.2.2 Usability and Humanity Requirements

Intuitiveness Test

1. NFR2.ST1

Initial State: Application is opened with no past data

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: User inputs

Output/Results: Bridge analysis within 5 minutes of introduction

How test will be performed: Civil engineer will be asked to provide inputs

Display Resolution Test

1. NFR3.ST1

Initial State: Application is opened

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: Application is running on a computer with 1280x720 display

Output/Results: All buttons and animation window remain visible and accessible

2. NFR3.ST2

Repeat test NFR.ST3 for 1366x768 display

3. NFR3.ST3

Repeat test NFR.ST3 for 1920x1080 display

4. NFR3.ST4

Repeat test NFR.ST3 for 2560x1440 display

5. NFR3.ST5

Repeat test NFR.ST3 for 3840x2160 display

Text Resizing Test

1. NFR4.ST1

Initial State: Application is opened with no past data

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: Font size setting is changed to display as 8pt

Output/Results: All buttons and animation window remain visible and accessible

How test will be performed:

2. NFR4.ST2

Repeat test NFR.ST8 with font size 16pt

3. NFR4.ST3

Repeat test NFR.ST8 with font size 24pt

4. NFR4.ST4

Repeat test NFR.ST8 with font size 32pt

Ease of Installation Test

1. NFR5.ST1

Initial State: Application is not installed

Type: Manual

Input/Condition: Application is downloaded and installed

Output/Results: Application is ready to use within 30 minutes

How test will be performed: By civil engineer

Consistent UI Test

1. NFR6.ST1

Initial State: Visually similar UI elements are grouped into categories by developers

Type: Manual, Static

Input/Condition: Civil engineer asked to associate UI elements with their respective categories

Output/Results: Civil engineer sorts at least 90% of UI elements into their predefined categories

5.2.3 Performance Requirements

UI Speed Test

1. NFR10.ST1

Initial State: Application is opened with no past data

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: Application used to generate a small bridge analysis whose total execution time is at most **X** seconds

Output/Results: Total execution time will not exceed underlying MATLAB script's execution time by 10%

2. NFR10.ST2

Initial State: Application is opened with no past data

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: Application used to generate a large bridge analysis whose total execution time is at least **Y** seconds

Output/Results: Total execution time will not exceed underlying MATLAB script's execution time by 10%

5.2.4 Operational and Environmental Requirements

User Computer Test

1. NFR12.ST1

Initial State: Application is opened on expected users' computer

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: Application used to generate a small bridge analysis

Output/Results: Time needed on user computer will not exceed time needed on developer computers by 10%(?)

How test will be performed: The bridge analysis configuration will be one whose total execution time is at most **X** seconds on developer computers

2. NFR12.ST2

Initial State: Application is opened on expected users' computer

Type: Manual, Dynamic

Input/Condition: Application used to generate a large bridge analysis

Output/Results: Time needed on user computer will not exceed time needed on developer computers by 10%(?)

How test will be performed: The bridge analysis configuration will be one whose total execution time is at least **Y** seconds on developer computers

5.2.5 Maintainability and Support Requirements

Ease of Maintenance Test

1. NFR13.ST1

Type: Automatic, Static

Input/Condition: Measure code file length in lines

Output/Results: At least 75% of files will contain 750 lines of code or less

How test will be performed:

2. NFR13.ST2

Type: Automatic, Static

Input/Condition: Measure method length in lines

Output/Results: At least 75% of methods will contain 75 lines of code or less

How test will be performed:

3. NFR13.ST3

Type: Automatic, Static

Input/Condition: Measure length of code lines

Output/Results: At least 75% of lines will contain **120** characters or less

How test will be performed:

4. NFR13.ST4

Type: Automatic, Static

Input/Condition: Measure nesting depth of methods

Output/Results: At least 75% of methods will have a maximum nesting depth of 5 or less

How test will be performed:

5.3 Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements

[Provide a table that shows which test cases are supporting which requirements. —SS]

6 Unit Test Description

As outlined in our Development Plan, we will be using Qt Test and Google Test to conduct our unit testing. These testing frameworks will allow us to create and run unit tests quickly and easily.

6.1 Unit Testing Scope

[What modules are outside of the scope. If there are modules that are developed by someone else, then you would say here if you aren't planning on verifying them. There may also be modules that are part of your software, but have a lower priority for verification than others. If this is the case, explain your rationale for the ranking of module importance. —SS]

6.2 Tests for Functional Requirements

[Most of the verification will be through automated unit testing. If appropriate specific modules can be verified by a non-testing based technique. That can also be documented in this section. —SS]

6.2.1 Module 1

[Include a blurb here to explain why the subsections below cover the module. References to the MIS would be good. You will want tests from a black box perspective and from a white box perspective. Explain to the reader how the tests were selected. —SS]

1. test-id1

Type: [Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Automatic, Static etc. Most will be automatic —SS]

Initial State:

Input:

Output: [The expected result for the given inputs —SS]

Test Case Derivation: [Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS]

How test will be performed:

2. test-id2

Type: [Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Automatic, Static etc. Most will be automatic —SS]

Initial State:

Input:

Output: [The expected result for the given inputs —SS]

Test Case Derivation: [Justify the expected value given in the Output field —SS]

How test will be performed:

3. ...

6.2.2 Module 2

...

6.3 Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements

[If there is a module that needs to be independently assessed for performance, those test cases can go here. In some projects, planning for nonfunctional tests of units will not be that relevant. —SS]

[These tests may involve collecting performance data from previously mentioned functional tests. —SS]

6.3.1 Module ?

1. test-id1

Type: [Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Automatic, Static etc. Most will be automatic —SS]

Initial State:

Input/Condition:

Output/Result:

How test will be performed:

2. test-id2

Type: Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Static etc.

Initial State:

Input:

Output:

How test will be performed:

6.3.2 Module ?

...

6.4 Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules

[Provide evidence that all of the modules have been considered. —SS]

References

Author Author. System requirements specification. <https://github.com/...>, 2019.

7 Appendix

This is where you can place additional information.

7.1 Symbolic Parameters

The definition of the test cases will call for SYMBOLIC_CONSTANTS. Their values are defined in this section for easy maintenance.

7.2 Usability Survey Questions?

[This is a section that would be appropriate for some projects. —SS]

Appendix — Reflection

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Lifelong Learning. Please answer the following questions:

1. What knowledge and skills will the team collectively need to acquire to successfully complete the verification and validation of your project? Examples of possible knowledge and skills include dynamic testing knowledge, static testing knowledge, specific tool usage etc. You should look to identify at least one item for each team member.
2. For each of the knowledge areas and skills identified in the previous question, what are at least two approaches to acquiring the knowledge or mastering the skill? Of the identified approaches, which will each team member pursue, and why did they make this choice?