

Verification and Validation Report: CVT Simulator

Team #17, Baja Dynamics

Grace McKenna

Travis Wing

Cameron Dunn

Kai Arseneau

March 9, 2025

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

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

List of Tables

List of Figures

1	Home Page	3
----------	----------------------------	----------

This document ...

3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

4.1 Usability

4.2 Performance

4.3 etc.

5 Comparison to Existing Implementation

Not applicable for this project.

6 Unit Testing

6.1 Back End Unit Testing

The back end was fully covered by unit tests except for a several files which were not suited for unit testing as they were mainly constants or did not provide functionality that could be tested.

The test structure that was created was to essentially mirror how the code-base is organized. There is a test folder which houses all the tests, then inside that there is a simulations and utils folder which contain mirrored test files of the actual files under src/simulations or src/utils.

The tests were written using the built in unittest module in python. The tests were run using the command `coverage run -m unittest discover -s test/simulations -s test/utils`. This command runs all the tests in those two folders using the coverage library.

A coverage report was generated using the command `coverage report -m`.

This command generates a report that shows the percentage of code that

was covered by the tests. The report also shows which lines were not covered by the tests. This can be seen in section 11 of this document.

6.2 Front End Unit Testing

Cam fill this in please

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

The backend test run has been added to the CI/CD of the project. Now whenever there is a commit it must pass all the tests in order to be verified. If there is an error it will fail and state which tests failed. This is a good way to ensure that the code is always working as expected.

As well the coverage report is also generated in the CI/CD run so you can see how much of the code is being covered by tests at that moment.

The configuration for the CI/CD can be seen here: <https://github.com/gr812b/CVT-Simulator/blob/develop/.github/workflows/ci.yaml>

9 Trace to Requirements

10 Trace to Modules

11 Code Coverage Metrics

11.1 Back End Code Coverage

```
PS C:\Users\travi\CVT-Simulator> coverage report
```

Name	Stmts	Miss	Cover
src\constants\car_specs.py	24	0	100%
src\utils\argument_parser.py	32	0	100%
src\utils\conversions.py	13	0	100%
src\utils\simulation_result.py	31	13	58%
src\utils\system_state.py	13	0	100%
src\utils\theoretical_models.py	64	2	97%
test\utils\test_argument_parser.py	19	1	95%
test\utils\test_conversions.py	30	1	97%
test\utils\test_simulation_result.py	37	1	97%
test\utils\test_system_state.py	26	1	96%
test\utils\test_theoretical_models.py	35	1	97%
TOTAL	324	20	94%

Figure 1: Home Page

References

Appendix — Reflection

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

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. Which parts of this document stemmed from speaking to your client(s) or a proxy (e.g. your peers)? Which ones were not, and why?
4. 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.)