

# Verification and Validation Report: Software Engineering

Team 14, Reach  
Aamina Hussain  
David Moroniti  
Anika Peer  
Deep Raj  
Alan Scott

March 4, 2024

# 1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Date 1	1.0	Notes
Date 2	1.1	Notes

## 2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
T	Test

[symbols, abbreviations or acronyms – you can reference the SRS tables if needed —SS]

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Revision History</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Functional Requirements Evaluation</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation</b>	<b>1</b>
4.1	Usability . . . . .	1
4.2	Performance . . . . .	1
4.3	etc. . . . .	1
<b>5</b>	<b>Comparison to Existing Implementation</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Unit Testing</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Changes Due to Testing</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Automated Testing</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Trace to Requirements</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Trace to Modules</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Code Coverage Metrics</b>	<b>2</b>

## List of Tables

## List of Figures

This document ...

### 3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

#### User Data

1. DT-1 Result: **Passed** - New account can successfully be created, and data is stored successfully in the database. Therefore, the tester was able to verify that the data is persistent, so this test was successful.
2. DT-2 Result: **Passed** - Account information can successfully be updated, and the changes are reflected in the database. Therefore, the tester was able to verify that the updates are persistent, so this test was successful.
3. DT-3 Result: **Not run** - reason being that the database application we used will ensure the issue brought up by this test can never happen.

### 4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

#### 4.1 Usability

#### 4.2 Performance

#### 4.3 etc.

### 5 Comparison to Existing Implementation

This section will not be appropriate for every project.

### 6 Unit Testing

### 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**

## **9 Trace to Requirements**

## **10 Trace to Modules**

## **11 Code Coverage Metrics**

## **References**

## Appendix — Reflection

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

1. 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.)