System Verification and Validation Plan for Software Engineering

Team #23, Project Proxi
Savinay Chhabra
Amanbeer Singh Minhas
Gourob Podder
Ajay Singh Grewal

October 30, 2025

Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
Date 1	1.0	Notes
Date 2	1.1	Notes

[The intention of the VnV plan is to increase confidence in the software. However, this does not mean listing every verification and validation technique that has ever been devised. The VnV plan should also be a **feasible** plan. Execution of the plan should be possible with the time and team available. If the full plan cannot be completed during the time available, it can either be modified to "fake it", or a better solution is to add a section describing what work has been completed and what work is still planned for the future. —SS]

[The VnV plan is typically started after the requirements stage, but before the design stage. This means that the sections related to unit testing cannot initially be completed. The sections will be filled in after the design stage is complete. the final version of the VnV plan should have all sections filled in. —SS]

Contents

List of Tables

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

List of Figures

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

1 Symbols, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

symbol	description
T	Test

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

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

2 General Information

2.1 Summary

The aim of this document is to layout the verification and validation plan for Project Proxi. Project Proxi is an AI powered voice assistant which allows it's users to use their voice to interface with their computer. The general target demographic for Project Proxi is seniors and individuals with disabilities who wouldn't otherwise be able to use their computers for varying tasks.

2.2 Objectives

The main objective of the Verification and Validation (V&V) plan is to confirm that Project Proxi satisfies it's stated functional and non functional requirements; and fulfuills its primary purpose of enhancing computer accessibility for seniors and individuals with disabilities.

The principal objectives that this VnV plan aims to meet are:

- **Verify Functional Correctness:** Ensure that the features described in the SRS are implemented and behave as expected through Unit, Integration and System Level testing.
- **Validate Usability and Accessibility:** demonstrate that users within the target demographic can effectively operate the system using natural language commands while meeting the relevant accessibility standards like WCAG 2.
- **Assess Performance and reliability:** Confirm the application meets performance, stability and error goals as defined in the SRS document.
- **Hardware Compatibility Testing:** Meet verficiation goals on a variety of consumer hardware devices. Speacialized or adaptive devices will not be included; only commercially available Windows/MacOS Computers.

Out of scope objectives include Extensive long-term field usability studies, comprehensive privacy compliance, and Speacialized Hardware Testing. The project will assume that any external libraries have already been verfied by their respective development team. These exclusions are justified given the project's limited time, budget and academic context. Verification efforts are therefore directed towards objectives that help meet core software requirements.

2.3 Challenge Level and Extras

This project does not include a designated challenge level, as its primary focus is on the development and validation of a functional, accessible, and user-friendly AI-powered desktop assistant. The project scope aligns with the general expectations of the capstone course and emphasizes reliability, usability, and compliance with accessibility standards rather than advanced AI research or complex algorithmic innovation.

This project includes the following approved extras:

- **User Manual:** A user manual that explains how to install, setup, and use the software on a day-to-day basis.
- **Usability Report:** A usability report will be developed that will assess the systems core objectives and requirements. It will summarize the results of testing as specfied in the SRS doc.

2.4 Relevant Documentation

The following documentation is directly relevant to the Verification and Validation activities for Project Proxi:

- **Development Plan** [Chhabra et al. (2025a)]**:** This document defines the overall project workflow, timelines and milestones for the different phases of the project.
- **Problem Statement and Goals** [Chhabra et al. (2025c)]:: This document defines the problems, goals and stakeholders of the project.
- **Software Requirements Specification** [Chhabra et al. (2025d)]**:** Describes the functional and non functional requirements of the project.

- **Hazard Analysis** [Chhabra et al. (2025b)]**:** This document identifies any potenital sources of harm or risk that may be associated with the project. Potential risks like unauthorized access, misuse or data breaches and their mitigation strategies are documented here.
- **Usability Report**[Chhabra et al. (2025e)]**:** Includes results of user evaluation and beta testing during validation stage. It summarizes key findings related to the system meeting it's design and usability goals.
- **User Manual** [Chhabra et al. (2025f)]**:** Provides documentation that explains how to install, setup and use the software. Includes helpful instruction along with walkthroughs and examples to help users with varying techincal proficiency.

3 Plan

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

3.1 Verification and Validation Team

[Your teammates. Maybe your supervisor. You should do more than list names. You should say what each person's role is for the project's verification. A table is a good way to summarize this information. —SS]

3.2 SRS Verification

[List any approaches you intend to use for SRS verification. This may include ad hoc feedback from reviewers, like your classmates (like your primary reviewer), or you may plan for something more rigorous/systematic. —SS]

[If you have a supervisor for the project, you shouldn't just say they will read over the SRS. You should explain your structured approach to the review. Will you have a meeting? What will you present? What questions will you ask? Will you give them instructions for a task-based inspection? Will you use your issue tracker? —SS]

[Maybe create an SRS checklist? —SS]

3.3 Design Verification

[Plans for design verification —SS]

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

[Create a checklists? —SS]

3.4 Verification and Validation Plan Verification

[The verification and validation plan is an artifact that should also be verified. Techniques for this include review and mutation testing. —SS]

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

[Create a checklists? —SS]

3.5 Implementation Verification

[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 walkthroughs, code inspection, static analyzers, etc. —SS]

[The final class presentation in CAS 741 could be used as a code walkthrough. There is also a possibility of using the final presentation (in CAS741) for a partial usability survey. —SS]

3.6 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]

[If you have already done this in the development plan, you can point to that document. —SS]

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

3.7 Software Validation

[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]

[You might want to use review sessions with the stakeholder to check that the requirements document captures the right requirements. Maybe task based inspection? —SS]

[For those capstone teams with an external supervisor, the Rev 0 demo should be used as an opportunity to validate the requirements. You should plan on demonstrating your project to your supervisor shortly after the scheduled Rev 0 demo. The feedback from your supervisor will be very useful for improving your project. —SS]

[For teams without an external supervisor, user testing can serve the same purpose as a Rev 0 demo for the supervisor. —SS]

[This section might reference back to the SRS verification section. —SS]

4 System Tests

[There should be text between all headings, even if it is just a roadmap of the contents of the subsections. —SS]

4.1 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 here. —SS]

4.1.1 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 here. If a section covers tests for input constraints, you should reference the data constraints table in the SRS. —SS]

Title for Test

1. test-id1

   Control: Manual versus Automatic

   Initial State:

   Input:

   Output: [The expected result for the given inputs. Output is not how you are going to return the results of the test. The output is the expected result. —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:

4.1.2 Area of Testing2

...

4.2 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. Not all projects will necessarily have nonfunctional requirements related to accuracy. —SS]

[For some nonfunctional tests, you won't be setting a target threshold for passing the test, but rather describing the experiment you will do to measure the quality for different inputs. For instance, you could measure speed versus the problem size. The output of the test isn't pass/fail, but rather a summary table or graph. —SS]

[Tests related to usability could include conducting a usability test and survey. The survey will be in the Appendix. —SS]

[Static tests, review, inspections, and walkthroughs, will not follow the format for the tests given below. —SS]

[If you introduce static tests in your plan, you need to provide details. How will they be done? In cases like code (or document) walkthroughs, who will be involved? Be specific. —SS]

4.2.1 Area of Testing1

Title for Test

1. test-id1

   Type: Functional, Dynamic, Manual, Static etc.

   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:

4.2.2 Area of Testing2

...

4.3 Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements

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

5 Unit Test Description

[This section should not be filled in until after the MIS (detailed design document) has been completed. —SS]

[Reference your MIS (detailed design document) and explain your overall philosophy for test case selection. —SS]

[To save space and time, it may be an option to provide less detail in this section. For the unit tests you can potentially layout your testing strategy here. That is, you can explain how tests will be selected for each module. For instance, your test building approach could be test cases for each access program, including one test for normal behaviour and as many tests as needed for edge cases. Rather than create the details of the input and output here, you could point to the unit testing code. For this to work, you code needs to be well-documented, with meaningful names for all of the tests. —SS]

5.1 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]

5.2 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]

5.2.1 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. ...

5.2.2 Module 2

...

5.3 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]

5.3.1 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:

5.3.2 Module ?

...

5.4 Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules

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

References

Savinay Chhabra, Gourob Podder, Amanbeer Singh Minhas, and Ajay Singh Grewal. System requirements specification. https://github.com/gkpodder/Capstone/blob/main/docs/DevelopmentPlan/DevelopmentPlan.pdf, 2025a.

Savinay Chhabra, Gourob Podder, Amanbeer Singh Minhas, and Ajay Singh Grewal. System requirements specification. https://github.com/gkpodder/Capstone/blob/main/docs/HazardAnalysis/HazardAnalysis.pdf, 2025b.

Savinay Chhabra, Gourob Podder, Amanbeer Singh Minhas, and Ajay Singh Grewal. System requirements specification. https://github.com/gkpodder/Capstone/blob/main/docs/ProblemStatementAndGoals/ProblemStatement.pdf, 2025c.

Savinay Chhabra, Gourob Podder, Amanbeer Singh Minhas, and Ajay Singh Grewal. System requirements specification. https://github.com/gkpodder/Capstone/blob/main/docs/SRS-Volere/SRS.pdf, 2025d.

Savinay Chhabra, Gourob Podder, Amanbeer Singh Minhas, and Ajay Singh Grewal. System requirements specification. https://github.com/gkpodder/Capstone/tree/main/docs/Extras, 2025e.

Savinay Chhabra, Gourob Podder, Amanbeer Singh Minhas, and Ajay Singh Grewal. System requirements specification. https://github.com/gkpodder/Capstone/tree/main/docs/Extras/UserManual, 2025f.

6 Appendix

This is where you can place additional information.

6.1 Symbolic Parameters

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

6.2 Usability Survey Questions?

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

Appendix — Reflection

[This section is not required for CAS 741 —SS]

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

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?

2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?

3. 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, Valgrind etc. You should look to identify at least one item for each team member.

4. 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?