

Object Recognition and Path Smoothing Robot, Phase 6 Test Plan

University of Washington Tacoma, School of Engineering and Technology

Authors:

Ammon Dodson ammon0@uw.edu

Alex Marlow alexmarlow117@gmail.com

Jake McKenzie jake314@uw.edu

Distribution: Matthew Tolentino

Document state: draft

Modified: February 24, 2019

Contents

1	Revision History	3
2	Introduction	3
2.1	Purpose	3
2.2	Project Overview	4
2.3	Audience	4
3	Test Items	4
3.1	Hardware Test Items	4
3.1.1	Hardware Test Items Table	7
3.2	Software Test Items	7
3.2.1	Software Test Items Table	8
3.3	System Test Items	8
3.3.1	System Test Items Table	12
4	Approach	13
4.1	Special Tools	13
4.2	Training Required	13
4.2.1	Non-Experts	13
4.2.2	Experts	14
4.3	Metrics	14
4.3.1	Metrics Methodology	14
4.3.2	Measuring Safety	15
4.3.3	Criticality	15
4.3.4	Regression Testing	16
5	Fail Criteria & Testing Deliverables	17
5.1	Defect Detection Percentage	17
6	Roles	17
7	Schedule	18
7.1	Delay Handling	18
7.2	Dates	18
8	Testing Risks and Mitigation	19
9	Approvals	19

1 Revision History

- v0.1: In this version of the testplan we defined the scope of the problem with the introduction, test items and approach.
- v0.2: In this version of the testplan we defined the test items, schedule and approach.
- v0.3: In this version of the testplan we updated the hardware, software, and system test items with tables and test descriptions. A criticality criterion was added to distinguish a hierarchy of tests. Four key modes were added in the hardware test items section. Software test item levels were established. A figure was created to show the research test environment. Research testing criteria was established. The entire special tools section was created with training required. An experts and non-experts section was established. Software testing methodology was established.
- v0.4: A section on measuring safety was established. A defect detection percentage was established. Roles were given out.
- v0.5: The entire schedule section was overhauled split into delay handling and dates trimming much of the fluff to make it more readable for the user. A regression testing section was added with three criteria explored and established for introduction of regression tests.
- v0.6: The testing deliverables and failure criteria section was fleshed out. Defect detection percentage was moved to this section and a caveat was added to the defined procedure as it is becoming clear that this may not be used by the end of it.

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose

This test plan describes the testing approach and overall framework that will drive the testing of the ORPS-Robot version 0.3 – The Object Recognition and Path Smoothing robot. The document introduces:

Test Strategy: These are the rules the test will be based on including the givens of the project (e.g.: start / end dates, objectives, assumptions); description of the process to set up a valid test (e.g.: entry / exit criteria, creation of test cases, specific tasks to perform and scheduling)

Execution Strategy: describes how the test will be performed and process to identify and report problems, and to fix and implement fixes.

Test Management: process to handle the logistics of the test and all the events that come up during execution (e.g.: communications, escalation procedures and risk mitigation)

2.2 Project Overview

The ORPS-Robot will be a platform for validating the research of Michael McCourt and a scheme for exploring object recognition via OpenCV with Robot Operating System, which is a powerful framework for writing robot software. There will be a demonstration of Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM). Together this will demonstrate a “finder robot” with applications in search and rescue and threat detection. Additionally there will be beacon triangulation and/or GPS to fuse additional location information into the SLAM or finder functionality.

2.3 Audience

Collaborative robotics software development for research in control systems for path smoothing. Collaboration in academic research is usually thought to mean equal partnership between two academic faculty members who are pursuing mutually interesting and beneficial research. In our case we are creating a platform which will serve Dr. McCourt’s research where deep understanding of the control system in place is not required on our part and a deep understanding of the robot are not required on the part of Dr. McCourt.

Creating truly, robust, general-purpose robot software is hard. As undergraduates using the robot operating system framework allows us to encompass solving robotics problems in real-world variations in complex tasks and environments that no single individual, laboratory, or institution could hope to create completely on their own from scratch. The audience for this device is us, as it serves our education.

Applications in path smoothing and object recognition used in ORPS-Robot project are heavily used in semi-autonomous and autonomous vehicles. The knowledge gained in applying these skills in the ROS ecosystem should serve us to gaining a greater knowledge of the systems and practices of both control systems and object recognition.

3 Test Items

3.1 Hardware Test Items

Hardware testing is the exercising of a piece of hardware. Which often times involves the ability to take measurements along the way with a generated record of the whole process. Testing must be cataloged and recorded. While this is mostly a software project hardware testing for the ORPS-Robot, should and will be split into four key modes:

- M1. Electrical Testing: This is one type of test, unlike software testing, that poses a verifiable risk of physical danger to the test and system under test. Even a system that is not powered can have potentially have deadly electrical charges stored in capacitors and batteries. For the purposes of ORPS-Robot most electrical tests will be in the form of connectivity testing and the testing of the battery on the robot itself.

- M2. Environmental Testing: This is the testing of the device with things as they are, not how we would like them to be. This is to see how a system responds to various types of insults, justifiable hurdles and taxing conditions. For this project we will be testing how the ORPS-robot responds to various stimuli including windows, people, interferences over the Wi-Fi, LiDAR and ultrasonic signals and other stimuli yet to be discovered. The system must be tested and verified to deal with such stimuli.
- M3. Mechanical Testing: Anything that can bend, click, flex, is in any way subject to opposing forces, latch, open and close, plug and unplug, press and depress, rotate, or switch and toggle, might eventually fail and will be subject to strains and wear. For this project the main mechanical component that must be dealt with are the DYNAMIXEL actuator system and wheels and LiDAR.
- M4. Integrated Software: Poor maintenance of the BIOS and firmware on a system can ripple through to affect both hardware and software, causing reliability issues for the system under test. Good software principles, for this reason, make good hardware and for this reason this goes in the hardware testing. For the ORPS-robot our BIOS and firmware make up a huge aspect of the project itself. Much of that is up to us to control and tune, not some third party. For this reason, it is identified that this is a major key area of the project. This will also include the most fundamental of hardware tests: subsystem sanity tests, which are no more than tests that run whenever a system reboots or power ups. These must be employed on the ORPS-Robot to ensure a first line of defense in isolating hardware issues.

The ideas for these modes were borrowed heavily from Managing the Testing Process by Rex Black 3rd Edition, Appendix A: Hardware Testing Fundamentals.

- H1. 360° LiDAR for SLAM & Navigation
- H2. Raspberry Pi 3 Model B
- H3. 32-bit ARM Cortex-M7 OpenCR
- H4. DYNAMIXEL actuator system and wheels
- H5. Li-Po Battery 11.1V 1,800mAh
- H6. Xbox 360 Controller
- H7. Marvelmind Sensors
- H8. Laptop

Connectivity on the Raspberry Pi 3 Model B and *32-bit ARM Cortex-M7 OpenCR* must be completed regularly. The Li-Po Battery 11.1V 1,800mAh will need to have its voltage checked to regularly. To assist in this process only batteries that match our desired voltage and amperage will be used, as they will have some sort of marking (coloured tape) to distinguish from other batteries that may exist in the lab. The DYNAMIXEL actuator system and wheels will need some sort of test. We do not know what that looks like at

this time but that falls into the category of mechanical testing. The integrated software will be the test most frequently ran, as this is a test ran whenever the device is booted up. If problems arise, that puts a halt on the entire project so dealing with such issues should have a methodological approach to stamping them out.

3.1.1 Hardware Test Items Table

Hardware Test Number	Mode	Components Involved	Pass Criteria	Fail Criteria	Overview	Criticality
HT1	M1	H2	Read 5V on the board	Read 0V on the board	Connectivity testing on the Raspberry Pi 3	S1
HT2	M1	H3	Read 11.1V on the board	Read 0V on the board	Connectivity testing on the OpenCR	S1
HT3	M1	H5	Read 11.1V on the Battery and check that it is our battery	Read 0V on the battery	Testing voltage of the battery connected to the OpenCR	S3
HT4	M3	H4	The actuator system moves as expected with no blockages or undesired movements	The actuator system has blockages or undesired movements	Testing the correctness of the DYNAMIXEL actuator system and wheels	S1
HT5	M4	H2	The ORPS-Robot boots up as expected without any issues	The ORPS-Robot does not boot up as expected	Whenever we turn on the device the BIOS will run sanity tests.	S1

3.2 Software Test Items

At this point in the process we do not know what the overall architecture of the software will look like but we can have a general plan of attack for writing software tests using `rostopic`. According to Paul Ammann's Introduction to Software Testing, there are five levels of software testing:

L0. Level 0: There is no difference between testing and debugging.

L1. Level 1: The purpose of testing is to show correctness.

L2. Level 2: The purpose of testing is to show that software does not work.

L3. Level 3: The purpose of testing is not to prove anything specific, but to reduce the risk of using the software.

L4. Level 4: Testing is a mental discipline that helps all IT professionals develop higher-quality software.

For our purposes levels 0 through 2 will be used heavily in this process while level 3 and 4 will only be used when needed. To accomplish the task in level 0 we will be making heavy use of first GDB (C debugger) and PDB (Python debugger) along with Valgrind. Levels 1 and 2 will be tackled, hopefully, by making heavy use of `rostopic` which is an extension of `roslaunch` that enables `roslaunch` files to be used as text fixtures. Due to complex behaviors involved in this project we need to write tests and move on from functionality. When we introduce new functionality to the to ORPS-robot it will need to pass the old tests we wrote for it. if everything is functioning properly there should be no need to re-write our old tests. This will likely only be done with software strict aspects of the project as hardware is subject to

change as the implementation changes over time. These tests, at least of the framing of this writing, will be to test the linking of different scripts and files written in the overall project. Some sort of test of tests should be employed for any software. This can go on forever, so to limit the number of tests of tests for only specified mission critical software tests.

3.2.1 Software Test Items Table

3.3 System Test Items

For the 360° LiDAR for SLAM & Navigation we will need to consult three separate resources for testing the LiDAR. The first will be a github wiki page entitled “How to use rplidar” which is just a walk-through of how to get rplidar ros package working. While this just gives a short introduction to rplidar, a more up to date tutorial on quickly getting rplidar up and running can be found on Service Engineering Research Area website under “From unboxing RPLIDAR to running in ROS in 10 minutes flat”. The first goal with LiDAR appears to be establishing the range of the device as this what determines the quality of the information used in navigation. Given more time there will also involve be static and dynamic tests based on scanning calibration, speed of the LiDAR, vehicle speed, laser position feedback. Further testing will involve the use of a tutorial on husarion.com entitled

The initial test whenever running the ORPS-Robot will always be to call *roscore*. This is a collection of nodes and programs that are a pre-requisite of any ROS-based platform. Think init in Linux. This is a secondary service that is always run whenever we launch ROS. When this finishes it should say “started core service”

There should be some sort of test between the network of the base station and the ORPS-Robot. We do not currently have much knowledge of networking but that test will be tackled when we get there. There should be some sort of basic test of movement instructions in some sort of unit test framework. There should also be a unit test for the Marvelmind sensors. A unit test must be written to check to see whether the location information of the ORPS-Robot is reaching the base station.


A major component of the software section will be software under test for the graphical user interface which will involve knowing the domain and range of our graphical user interface. The domain (set of legal inputs) including possible clicks, keyboard events, controller events and the range (set of possible application states). The domain for this system, that is to say the size of all possible graphical user interface inputs is quite huge. Identifying what a set of good graphical user interface test inputs. To accomplish this it will be some combination of just using the application, injecting some sort of stream of “fake” graphical user interface events and most importantly reproducing graphical user interface inputs that crashed a previous version of the software by injecting similar or the same inputs back into the program.

“SLAM navigation”. According to the Bachelor’s Thesis of Felix Feik from Technical University of Munich, the most difficult factor in indoor mapping using LiDAR is that the laser sensor always has the position or your map building and pose estimation will fail. The

Software Test Number	Components Involved	Level	Pass Criteria	Fail Criteria	Overview	Criticality
SWT1	H2,H8	L1	No errors come up when we run rostest	Any error comes up when we run rostest	rostest allows us to write small unit tests for our scripts that deal in ROS	S2
SWT2	H8	L0-L2	We can step through our program with GDB	GDB gives back an error	Running GDB allows us to track down bugs for our programs written in C	S2
SWT3	H8	L0-L2	We can step through our program with PDB	Read 0V on the battery	Running PDB allows us to track down bugs for our programs written in Python	S2
SWT4	H8	L0-L2	Valgrind tells us our program has no current memory issues	Valgrind tells us our program has memory issues	Valgrind is a powerful tool used for memory debugging, memory leak detection and profiling	S2
SWT5	H8	L0-L2	There are no problems in linking small programs together	There are problems in linking small programs together	Testing the linkages between programs makes sure our smaller programs are talking to each other and playing nice	S2
SWT6	H8	L0-L2	Resulted in no errors sent back.	Resulted in errors sent back.	Writing tests can often times be more challenging than writing programs so we must check these tests when we can	S1

LiDAR needs a consistent, relative motion to map a building correctly. Glass doors and other visible objects will not be accounted for by the LiDAR as the signal will not penetrate glass. Long story short, to use SLAM properly we will need to test take into account the limitations of the device and leverage the libraries provided by robot operating system to do so. As for testing our controller that will make heavy use of the joy package in ROS which is a library for generic Linux joysticks.

Figure 1: The research testing environment for the ORPS-Robot



The final test for Dr. McCourt will involve both the Marvelmind Beacons and LiDAR working in conjunction with the ORPS-Robot. We will define three criteria to get to this point. Those criteria will be defined below. This test will involve the ability to setup the Marvelmind sensors into a room in a rectangular fashion, with a mobile beacon on the ORPS-Robot. These sensors will be talking to each other. We will feed some desired path to the user to follow while the Marvelmind sensors measure the actual path that the robot is taking. That error between what the user is doing and what the Marvelmind sensors are feeding back is what we care about. This is also where we will be testing the LiDAR. The LiDAR will be mapping out the room giving back additional location data for error correction. There are many systems talking to each other in this system, as can be seen in the figure above. A unit test must be written for McCourt's input-output transformations to ensure that the

transforms were implemented correctly in the software and output the correct values. A lot of care must be paid in the calculations here and *Press's Numerical Recipes in C* should be consulted early and often to ensure accuracy.

- RC1. Research Entry Criteria - This is where we establish that the appropriate documentation, design, and requirements information is available to begin testing the final system and judge correct behavior. This doesn't have to be at the very end, but it must be at a stage where we can test multiple systems interacting at once.
- RC2. Research Continuation Criteria - this defines those conditions and situations that must prevail in the final research testing process to allow testing to continue smoothly and robustly, that serves meeting our final goal. This is also where the main stage where keeping the bug backlog and having unit tests that just work without much fiddling. At this stage we want to be fighting with how to use the tool, not just getting the tool to work to begin with.
- RC3. Research Exit Criteria - This is the criteria we must meet to determine when the project has completed the main stage of testing of Dr. McCourt's research interests. This means that no changes need to be made to this completed part, except to address system test defects introduced by later stages of the project. No crash, halt, panic, unexpected process termination, or other stoppages in completing this part. The research portion must be self-encapsulated from other portions of the project as much as possible. We must be able to reach demo day, having completed this portion of the project, and for it to just work on command.

3.3.1 System Test Items Table

System Test Number	Components Involved	Research Criteria	Pass Criteria	Fail Criteria	Overview	Criticality
SYST1	H2,H8		rplidar returns back no errors	rplidar returns back errors	rplidar is a package for testing the LiDAR	S1
SYST2	H2,H8		The LiDAR can sufficiently scan a room and map it	The LiDAR cannot sufficiently scan a room and map it	Testing of the LiDAR system to see whether it can map room	S2
SYST3	H2,H8		The LiDAR can return back the speed	The LiDAR cannot return back the speed	Tests must be run on the LiDAR system to measure if it can return back the speed	S2
SYST4	H2,H8		roscore ran without any erros	roscore returned back errors	roscore is the init function for ros and acts as a sanity check	S1
SYST5	H2,H8		The base-station can sufficiently send packets to the ORPS-Robot and are received	The base-station cannot sufficiently send packets to the ORPS-Robot and are received	The base station must be able to talk to the ORPS-Robot over the network	S2
SYST6	H2,H7		The ORPS-Robot can sufficiently send packets to the base-station and are received	The ORPS-Robot cannot sufficiently send packets to the base-station and are received.	The ORPS-Robot must be able to talk to the base station over the network	S2
SYST7	H2,H8		The ORPS-Robot can execute correct movement instructions	The ORPS-Robot cannot execute correct movement instructions	Some testing must be done to show that the ORPS-Robot can move as instructed	S3
SYST8	H7,H8		The unit test passes	The unit test fails	Simple sanity unit test of the Marvelmind sensors	S2
SYST9	H8		The GUI passes user testing	The GUI does not pass user testing	User testing must be done on the GUI	S3
SYST10	H8		The GUI passes injection testing	The GUI does not pass injection testing	An injection of fake user inputs will be sent into the GUI	S3
SYST11	H8		The GUI passes tests of inputs similar to user testing	The GUI fails tests of inputs similar to user testing	Bugs found in user testing are simulated with injection testing	S3
SYST12	H2,H8	RC1	The input-output transforms return the correct results	The input-output transforms return the incorrect results	The input-output transforms of Dr. McCourt's research are tested	S3

This table will be split into different tables on further revisions. I reached the size limit for latex and I will split this up later. The hardware testing modes column need to be added to some of the future tables. Also a column for software levels. - Jake.

4 Approach

4.1 Special Tools

Most special tools in this project will be software based. These tools will mostly be used for debugging, bug tracking, reproducibility, source control and catching memory leaks. These tools will include:

1. GDB - For the portions of the project written in C the GNU Debugger will be used in tracking down bugs. Generally speaking print statements will not be used. For instance, catching problems with linkages of programs we write will be caught most likely by use of the debugger.
2. PDB - For the portions of the project written in Python the Python Debugger will be used in tracking down bugs. Generally speaking print statements will not be used. For instance, inside of the GUI, which will mostly be written in Python, the PDB may be run to find issues in the domain of possible inputs.
3. Git - For bug tracking, reproducibility and source control Git will be employed. Two of our group members have been using Git regularly. We will need to make sure all the team members are up to speed with the philosophy of minor branches, that merge into the main branch and making sure that we all aren't too far from the main branch.
4. Valgrind - A tool used for memory debugging, memory leak detection and profiling. For example Valgrind can tell us if at some point in our program we've done conditional jumps based on uninitialized values with bad reads of memory. When used in conjunction with GDB this gives us the tools to test our programs in ways that are not possible without it.

4.2 Training Required

As mentioned in Special Tools we will need to make sure all users are up to speed with using Git and making sure that all teammates buy-in to using debuggers regularly. This is where level 4 comes from the five levels of software testing.

To distinguish in training needed we will ask two sections and split into these key areas:

Non-Expert: Do you plan to only use the ORPS-Robot for path recognition testing?

Experts: Do you plan on furthering research in the ORPS-Robot?

4.2.1 Non-Experts

Non-experts need to be given some prompt on how to control the robot via the controller or keyboard and how to read the commands from the GUI. Some of this training will be buried

inside of the UI itself and using good design principles. Good design is in itself an act of communication. Care will be paid into having a deep understanding of the type of user that uses our device. Clever and sophisticated GUI solutions will be superseded by GUI solutions that are simple and solving *the correct problem*.

4.2.2 Experts

Experts will need some prior knowledge in how to run each subsystem, as follows:

1. Having some knowledge of ROS commands. We will include a setup ritual for setting the project up to where we leave it at.
2. Having some knowledge of the Linux Ubuntu command line for running programs. We will include some examples of this process to help the future users along.
3. Having knowledge of setting up the Raspberry Pi and OpenCR to connect each component together, also connecting the LiDAR to the robot. This will involve some sort of setup ritual that we will include.
4. Having the ability to follow a setup ritual we create for the Marvelmind sensors.

For experts some self-learning will be required as we cannot possibly include all cases that need to be covered but some baseline of the setup ritual process will be passed onto the next group for further research purposes.

4.3 Metrics

4.3.1 Metrics Methodology

Our tests will be derived from the requirements and specifications of our project and will follow the following methodological approach:

- T1. Acceptance Testing: Assess system (software & hardware) interaction with respect to user needs. For example, making sure the controller is responsive or camera is functioning adequately.
- T2. System Testing: Assesses system interaction to architecture design and overall behavior. For example a series of rostests that test the linking of each submodule we write for the overall project.
- T3. Integration Testing: The continuous conjoining of different software artifacts to serve the overall project development. For example, a test that ensures two individual modules are linked properly.
- T4. Unit Testing: Assesses system interaction with respect to implementation of specific subsystems. For example, a test that ensures the controller is functioning properly standalone through the joy package.

While these levels are emphasized in terms of when they are applied, it is more important to distinguish the types of faults listed above. They are all a continuous part of the design and build process. At the end of the day there is an entire spectrum of testing, and much of it is hard to distinguish from development itself. Most tests look like unit tests and are quite simple. Other tests are more subtle, complex and critical. For such tests we need to use the tools laid out in this document to check our implementation. In the testing process the standard behavioral model should be employed, where execution of a program or task is represented by a behavior. A behavior is sequence of states while a state is an assignment of values of variables. Our program should be tested and modeled by a set of behaviors we define, representing possible executions.

4.3.2 Measuring Safety

Safety when testing can be specified using two things:

- The set of possible initial states.
- A next-state relation, describing all possible successor states of any state.

The above is a mindset that integrates the testing process into the development process.

Failures can rarely be forecasted. But what we can do is establish a hierarchy of criticality to ensure that we are keeping up with the most important test and using other tests as needed. Ordering what we need to do by priority is important as the scope of the project grows. The reason for the priority emphasis is that it is by far the most efficient way of working, in terms of creating reliable products and reducing the overall cost of the project. For instance using the wrong battery on the ORPS-Robot would likely ruin at least the Raspberry Pi or OpenCR, along with other mission critical components. This is not only a likely outcome if special care is not paid but we have seen it happen with prior groups in previous projects in this program. For this reason a heavy emphasis will be paid on this scheme.

4.3.3 Criticality

- S1. Secondary Service - These involve services that are only checked when a component fails. Use see in many applications test conditions can take longer to create than others. This is the sort of service that happens ala cart and may be indistinguishable from the actual build and design process in spots. These are components that we should likely assume work until they don't.
- S2. Critical or Primary Service - Most component tests, both software and hardware, fall under this category. Some but not all integration test that fall under interaction of components (system test items) will likely fall under this category. These are services that if they fail, will not mean the end of the project, but are extremely critical components and should be worried about early and often.




Figure 2: The *Criticality* hierarchy for the ORPS-Robot

- S3. Mission Critical Service - Most acceptance tests will fall under this category, this means systems test items critical to Dr. McCourt's research and of our object recognition portion. A lot of integration testing will follow under this category. These are services that if they fail, then the project has serious issues that need to be resolved.

4.3.4 Regression Testing

In this section we will discuss three criteria for regression testing on the ORPS-Robot platform. That is answering three key questions:

1. What kind of tests should be in a regression test for this project?
2. When to run regression tests?
3. What to do when a regression test fails?

Research criteria testing should part of the regression testing, as those are tests, that must not introduce bugs once implemented as those are the most critical tests for the project. GUI testing and unit tests must be part of the regression testing. The logic for including these in regression testing is as follows: these are the tests of the most critical sections of the project as such follows the criticality hierarchy. It can be assumed that most secondary and critical or primary services can be assumed to be working once tested and shown to be working. The mission critical services for this project tend to be the most forward facing, as they serve the point of interaction between the user either in form of the research interests or the graphical user interface. Including every test imaginable in the regression testing is undesirable and only these tests will be done on regular intervals.

As for when the regression tests will be done whenever a new functionality is introduced to the project. Since we will be doing issue tracking for defect detection this will make sense to do so, and should create a tight enough loop of creation, integration then testing. If a regression test fails it will be up to the developer implementing the change to either get in contact with the developer who's section of the project is broken to know to fix it or to fix it themselves. This will be up to the developer who discovers the fix to decide. Regression testing should be **modification-revealing**, **precise**, **efficient** and **general**. Techniques

like data flow were not used in selecting tests for regression testing because it is neither **safe** or **precise**. Critical thinking was used in the selection process.

5 Fail Criteria & Testing Deliverables

The main deliverable for this project is a platform to aid in research. By the end of this project there must exist an artifact to aid and abet network control systems research. To accomplish this goal we must build a platform that allows a user to control a robot and collect the data of the user using the robot. Testing is an area where a lot can go wrong and Murphy's Law is in full effect: if something can go wrong, it will. We will accomplish testing our deliverables by following this checklist:

1. Is the deliverable working as originally designed?
2. Are the identified operational requirements being met?

The decision of whether we've failed to meet the research criteria as defined in the above regression testing section will be a pass or fail decision decided by our client. This fail criteria, while crude, avoids the IEEE 826 format that requires failure criteria being centered around defects as it is becoming exceedingly clear that identifying and cataloging defects is exceedingly intractable. This criteria was clearly defined for projects for large teams with the resources to do so. Instead a more tractable and punitive failure criteria will be adopted. If it becomes clear the defects are a part of this project in the future and that we can catalog them effectively then a defect detection percentage will be used to measure success in dealing with them.

5.1 Defect Detection Percentage

This metric will be using is the *defect detection percentage* on testing the research portion of this project. We will define this metric as follows:

$$DDE = \frac{\text{Bugs Prior to Research Testing}}{\text{Bugs Prior to Research Testing} + \text{Bugs during Research Testing}}$$

Bugs are required to be unique for the relationship in this equation to hold, but if they are the DDE should give us some sort of metric on how well we captured and tackled bugs prior to release. This assumes for the sake of argument that all bugs are *ceteris paribus* (all things held equal). This is not the case. All bugs are not created equal, neither are all metrics, but they do allow us some sort of evaluation on our quality of work.

6 Roles

Roles will be split up according to their need. Since this is not much of a hardware project, the role of hardware test items will fall under the purview of Alex. For the software and

system test items, those will be split among all three members. All three members will need to be familiar with the tools listed in the special tools section. All three group members in the ORPS-Robot group will be writing code, which means debugging code. Jake will focus on the Marvelmind sensors testing for trilateration, Ammon will focus on testing the path smoothing, and Alex will focus on testing the GUI. These roles are subject to change with time but this is the current understanding of who's roles are what. There should be overlap with each role and it should be no one person's role to do all of one thing if the work grows in complexity. Alex's job will be keeping track of the schedule, Jake's job will be keeping track of bugs in some sort of process, and Ammon's job will be to manage the git repository to make sure all branches are integrating smoothly.

7 Schedule

7.1 Delay Handling

In the testing of the different components of the final system there are always possibilities for unpredictable delays in the schedule, caused by either the testing or by the design. To stop these delays from having an effect on the overall project completion time there are a couple safeguards in place to ensure the project remains on schedule.

The first safeguard in place is the breaks in between quarters. In the estimation for completing specific tasks, the breaks between quarters was not included as optional time. This allows for two, 2 – 3 weeks of time, which are completely clear of other curricular activities, to catch up on the schedule or to get ahead.

If the breaks in between quarters are not enough time to handle the delays the first task besides stretch goals which will be allowed to be shortened or removed, is the testing of the radar sensor. The completion of the Marvelmind positional sensors is necessary for the testing of input-output transform, so the robot's primary purpose will still be able to function without a completely tested radar system. The image recognition is not necessary for this project and therefore will be cut if time does not allow it.

7.2 Dates

Testing controller functionality: Dec-8th to Jan-7th

Testing moving robot with controller: Jan-7th to Jan-21st

Testing Marvel Mind position sensors: Feb-7th to Feb-14th

Testing moving the robot to positions using the sensors: Feb-21st to Feb-28th

Testing Testing the input-output transformation: March-21st to March-28th

Testing algorithm implemented in the system: April-7th to April-14th

Testing Lidar room mapping functionality: April-21st to April-28th

Testing Intel RealSense camera: May-1st to May-7th

Testing Image and object recognition: May-14th to May-21st

8 Testing Risks and Mitigation

9 Approvals