



POLITECNICO DI MILANO

SOFTWARE ENGINEERING 2 PROJECT

MeteoCal

Acceptance Testing Document

Authors:
Andrea CELLI
Stefano CEREDA

February 7, 2015

Contents

I	Introduction	2
II	RASD	3
1	Weather forecast	3
2	Bad weather alert for the event creator	3
III	Design document	4
3	Date of birth and city	4
4	Closest day with expected weather	4
IV	Automated test	5
V	Manual test	5

Part I

Introduction

The assigned project is <https://code.google.com/p/meteocal-iodicefinardi/>.

In this document we will start describing what, in our opinion, does not match the project assignment and then we will document the various phases of the acceptance testing.

Part II

RASD

1 Weather forecast

In the RASD (page 4 section 1.1 for the first time) it's stated that the user can choose a kind of weather, while the project assignment clearly states that the system has to handle *bad* weather forecast. This is a problem because it's impossible to obtain a behavior that matches the one of the assigned system, suppose a scenario like this:

Event weather	assigned behavior	wanted=sunny	wanted=cloudy
sunny	good	good	bad
cloudy	good	bad	good

This is assuming that cloudy is not a bad weather. The only situation where the two behavior matches is when we consider only sunny to be a good weather, but we think that this is a great limitation, because in most of the cases we don't reschedule our appointments only because the weather is partially cloud. A more reasonable approach is to consider sunny,partially cloud and cloud as good weather and everything else as bad weather.

This approach is reflected in the domain assumptions (page 6 2.2) where it's stated that "A person desires at most one type of weather for an event."

The real problem is how the partially cloud forecast is handled, and that's not clearly stated in any part of the rasd.

2 Bad weather alert for the event creator

The RASD states (page 10 section 3.2.1) that registered users should "Be notified (one day before the event) whenever an outdoor event they accepted an invitation for has an unfavourable weather forecast."

We don't think that this is the assigned behavior. The assignment states that the first type of notification should be sent to all the event's participant, but we think that even the event's creator should be considered a participant.

Part III

Design document

3 Date of birth and city

In the dd (page 7 section 3.1.1-User) it's stated that a user should insert his date of birth and the city where he lives. These attributes are not necessary for any of the requirements in the rasd. Moreover, using the application we noticed that a user can only be older than 10 or without a date of birth (during the registration the date of birth is not mandatory but if present can only be set prior to 10 years ago). We think that this makes no sense.

4 Closest day with expected weather

The dd assumes (page 7 section 3.1.1-WeatherNotification) that a Weather-Notification (the one sent three days in advance to the event organizer) should contain an information about the closest day with the expected weather. We don't think this is a good choice, because from the time when the notification is created to the time when the notification is visualized the forecast could change, making the notification incorrect. We think that the closest good day should be searched when the notification is visualized from the user.

Part IV

Automated test

The unit and integration automated test does not raise any problem. Their code seems correct.

Part V

Manual test

Going though the manual tests proposed in the testing document and trying with some strange inputs we didn't notice any problem.