${\bf section}\ Module Manager Test\ {\bf parents}\ Module Manager$

This specification defines several unit tests for the Module Manager.

We start by defining some members of the given sets, so that we can use meaningful names within our examples.

```
networkReaderClass == 10
pvReaderClass == 11
pvAssetFactory == 12
pvAllocationReader == 13
pvCharacteristicsReader == 14
networkAssetFactory == 15
pvMinorParameterReader == 16
pvExactAllocationReader == 17
pvAssetSpecificReader == 18
pvAssetCommonReader == 19
extAssetFactory == 20
extAgentFactory == 21
extDataProvider == 22
dataIdNetworkData == 30
dataIdBillingData == 31
dataIdPvAssetDataAllocMinor == 32
dataIdPvAssetDataAllocExact == 33
dataIdPvSystems == 34
dataIdPvCharacteristics == 35
dataIdPvExactAllocation == 36
path TownsvilleNetwork == 40
path Townsville Billing Data == 41
pathMinorParameterCsv == 42
pathExactPvAllocationCsv == 43
path Townsville PvInstalls Csv == 44
pathCommonPvCsv == 45
contributorPvAsset == 50
contributorPvAssetReader == 51
```

First we define an example factory (for PhotoVoltaic Solar Panels), with a compulsory property called pvCharacteristics that takes any data provider that subclasses pvCharacteristicsReader (these data providers provide a list of typical PV systems), and an optional getter-setter called exactAllocation that takes a data provider of type pvExactAllocationReader (this is used when precise information is available about which houses have PV systems, and the details of those systems).

```
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline exactAllocation \\\hline SetterGetter\\\hline\\ name = dataIdPvExactAllocation\\ argType = pvExactAllocationReader\\ value = nullClass\\ optional = YES\\ \end{array}
```

```
PvAssetFactory \_
AssetFactory
className = pvAssetFactory
consumes = \{\}
prior = \{\}
methods = pvCharacteristics \cup exactAllocation
```

We also prove that these two getter-setters and the factory are correctly and unambiguously defined (we have not defined any contradictory properties, or left any properties unspecified), as follows:

```
 \begin{array}{l} \textbf{theorem} \ \ pvCharacteristicsIsValid} \\ \vdash ? \# \ pvCharacteristics = 1 \end{array}
```

```
theorem exactAllocationIsValid \vdash? # exactAllocation = 1
```

```
 \begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{theorem} & PvAssetReaderFactoryIsValid \\ & \vdash? \# PvAssetFactory = 1 \end{tabular}
```

However, when we ask ZLive to prove these conjectures, the first two fail, because we specified a Java class name rather than a Java type for 'argType'.

This is a minor error that is picked up by the Z typechecker when we use separate given types for each kind of value, or is picked up by the above conjectures when we just use integers for animation purposes. Reflecting on these failures led us to revise our model so that the *value* and *argType* are now both Java class names, representing the actual and expected types of parameter, respectively.

Next we define an example plugin module.

```
theorem EgModulePvAssetIsValid \vdash? # EgModulePvAsset = 1
```

Now we test each of the four cases of the SatisfySetterMethod.

1. When there are no matching data providers and the setter is compulsory:

```
testNoMatch SatisfySetterMethod m \in pvCharacteristics dataProviders? = \{\} outputid = \{\}
```

Animating this test in ZLive gives the following (unique) result – note that the output value! is set to dataProviderError (8):

```
\begin{array}{l} 1: \langle m == \langle name == 35, argType == 14, value == 9, optional == 0 \rangle, \\ m' == \langle name == 35, argType == 14, value == 8, optional == 0 \rangle, \\ dataProviders? == \{\}, outputid == \{\}, matching! == \{\}, value! == 8 \rangle. \end{array}
```

2. When there are no matching data providers and the setter is optional:

ZLive gives:

```
1: \langle m == \langle name == 36, argType == 17, value == 9, optional == 1 \rangle, m' == \langle name == 36, argType == 17, value == 9, optional == 1 \rangle, dataProviders? == \{\}, outputid == \{\}, matching! == \{\}, value! == 9 \rangle
```

This leaves the m.value field unchanged (nullClass) and returns nullClass in value! as well, which indicates that no error has occurred.

3. When there are several matching data providers, ZLive reports a unique solution, with the *value!* output set to *dataProviderError* (8):

ZLive gives:

```
1: \langle m == \langle name == 35, argType == 14, value == 9, optional == 0 \rangle, m' == \langle name == 35, argType == 14, value == 8, optional == 0 \rangle, dataProviders? == \{14, 17\}, outputid == \{(14, 35), (17, 35)\}, matching! == \{14, 17\}, value! == 8 \rangle
```

4. Finally, we test the sweet path, where there is exactly one match.

```
\begin{tabular}{ll} \hline testUniqMatch $\_$ \\ \hline SatisfySetterMethod \\ \hline \hline $m \in pvCharacteristics$ \\ dataProviders? = \{pvCharacteristicsReader, pvExactAllocationReader\}$ \\ outputid = \{pvCharacteristicsReader \mapsto dataIdPvCharacteristics, \\ pvExactAllocationReader \mapsto dataIdPvExactAllocation\}$ \\ \hline \end{tabular}
```

In this case, ZLive updates m'.value to the unique matching data provider class (pvCharacteristicsReader), and also returns that class in value!.

ZLive returns:

```
1: \langle m == \langle name == 35, argType == 14, value == 9, optional == 0 \rangle, m' == \langle name == 35, argType == 14, value == 14, optional == 0 \rangle, dataProviders? == \{14, 17\}, outputid == \{(14, 35), (17, 36)\}, matching! == \{14\}, value! == 14 \rangle
```

This testing approach uses the set-oriented nature of Z to check that each of the four test cases is correctly defined, with no inconsistent values, no missing/unspecified values, and returns a unique solution (a singleton set) that contains the expected results. This gives us strong confidence that the specified operation is correct, and that it has the four behaviours that we desire.

The next step is to test the lifted operation SatisfyFactoryInputs that sets all the properties of a whole factory. To do this, we need an example instance of a ModuleManager that contains some Module objects.

```
Example Pv Module $$ Module $$ Module $$ contributor = contributor Pv Asset $$ classes = Pv Asset Factory $$ Example Module Manager $$ Module Manager $$ modules = Example Pv Module $$
```

As usual, we check that these examples are uniquely defined.

```
theorem ExamplePvModuleIsValid \vdash? # ExamplePvModule = 1
```

theorem ExampleModuleManagerIsValid \vdash ? # ExampleModuleManager = 1

 $test Satisfy Factory Inputs 1 \\ ___$

```
Satisfy Factory Inputs \\ Example Module Manager \\ \hline factory? \in PvAsset Factory \\ data Providers? = \{pvCharacteristicsReader, pvExactAllocationReader\} \\ outputid = \{pvCharacteristicsReader \mapsto data IdPvCharacteristics, \\ pvExactAllocationReader \mapsto data IdPvExactAllocation\} \\ \hline \end{cases}
```