

# System Verification and Validation Plan for ImgBeamer

Joachim de Fourestier

February 15, 2023

# 1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
2023/02/17 1	1.0	First version
Date 2	1.1	Notes

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Revision History</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>General Information</b>	<b>1</b>
3.1	Summary . . . . .	1
3.2	Objectives . . . . .	1
3.3	Relevant Documentation . . . . .	1
<b>4</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>1</b>
4.1	Verification and Validation Team . . . . .	2
4.2	SRS Verification Plan . . . . .	2
4.3	Design Verification Plan . . . . .	2
4.4	Verification and Validation Plan Verification Plan . . . . .	2
4.5	Implementation Verification Plan . . . . .	2
4.6	Automated Testing and Verification Tools . . . . .	2
4.7	Software Validation Plan . . . . .	3
<b>5</b>	<b>System Test Description</b>	<b>3</b>
5.1	Tests for Functional Requirements . . . . .	3
5.1.1	Area of Testing1 . . . . .	3
5.1.2	Area of Testing2 . . . . .	4
5.2	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements . . . . .	4
5.2.1	Area of Testing1 . . . . .	5
5.2.2	Area of Testing2 . . . . .	5
5.3	Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements . . . . .	5
<b>6</b>	<b>Unit Test Description</b>	<b>5</b>
6.1	Unit Testing Scope . . . . .	6
6.2	Tests for Functional Requirements . . . . .	6
6.2.1	Module 1 . . . . .	6
6.2.2	Module 2 . . . . .	7
6.3	Tests for Nonfunctional Requirements . . . . .	7
6.3.1	Module ? . . . . .	7
6.3.2	Module ? . . . . .	8
6.4	Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules . . . . .	8

<b>7</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>9</b>
7.1	Symbolic Parameters . . . . .	9
7.2	Usability Survey Questions? . . . . .	9

## List of Tables

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

## List of Figures

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

## 2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
SRS	Software Requirements Specification
T	Test
VnV	Verification and Validation

[symbols, abbreviations or acronyms — you can simply reference the SRS  
(de Fourestier, 2023) tables, if appropriate —SS]  
[Remove this section if it isn't needed —SS]

This document lays out the Verification and Validation (VnV) plan of the ImgBeamer (scanning electron microscope image formation) as described by the Software Requirements Specification (SRS) document (de Fourestier, 2023). Testing of the software and its components is conducted to build confidence in its usability, accuracy, and ultimately whether it meets the SRS.

## 3 General Information

### 3.1 Summary

[Say what software is being tested. Give its name and a brief overview of its general functions. —SS]

### 3.2 Objectives

[State what is intended to be accomplished. The objective will be around the qualities that are most important for your project. You might have something like: “build confidence in the software correctness,” “demonstrate adequate usability.” etc. You won’t list all of the qualities, just those that are most important. —SS]

### 3.3 Relevant Documentation

[Reference relevant documentation. This will definitely include your SRS and your other project documents (design documents, like MG, MIS, etc). You can include these even before they are written, since by the time the project is done, they will be written. —SS]

de Fourestier (2023)

## 4 Plan

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

## 4.1 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]

## 4.2 SRS Verification Plan

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

[Maybe create an SRS checklist? —SS]

## 4.3 Design Verification Plan

[Plans for design verification —SS]

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

[Create a checklists? —SS]

## 4.4 Verification and Validation Plan Verification Plan

[The verification and validation plan is an artifact that should also be verified. —SS]

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

[Create a checklists? —SS]

## 4.5 Implementation Verification Plan

[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 walk-throughs, code inspection, static analyzers, etc. —SS]

## 4.6 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]

## 4.7 Software Validation Plan

[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]

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

# 5 System Test Description

## 5.1 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]

### 5.1.1 Area of Testing<sup>1</sup>

[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 —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:

## **5.1.2 Area of Testing2**

...

## **5.2 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]

[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]

### 5.2.1 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:

### 5.2.2 Area of Testing2

...

## 5.3 Traceability Between Test Cases and Requirements

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

## 6 Unit Test Description

[Reference your MIS (detailed design document) and explain your overall philosophy for test case selection. —SS] [This section should not be filled in until after the MIS (detailed design document) has been completed. —SS]

## 6.1 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]

## 6.2 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]

### 6.2.1 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. ...

### 6.2.2 Module 2

...

## 6.3 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]

### 6.3.1 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:

### 6.3.2 Module ?

...

## 6.4 Traceability Between Test Cases and Modules

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

## References

J. de Fourestier. Software requirements specification for imgbeamer: Scanning electron microscope image formation. [https://github.com/joedf/CAS741\\_w23](https://github.com/joedf/CAS741_w23), 2023.

## 7 Appendix

This is where you can place additional information.

### 7.1 Symbolic Parameters

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

### 7.2 Usability Survey Questions?

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

## **Appendix — Reflection**

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

## Appendix — Reflection

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

1. 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 etc. You should look to identify at least one item for each team member.
2. 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?