

AllSeen Alliance
Certification and Compliance Work Group (under TSC) Minutes
June 4, 2014
5:00pm PST
via WebEx

Presentation slides at:

https://wiki.allseenalliance.org/compliance/overview#meeting_minutes_and_presentations

Participants: Brett Preston (LF), David McBride (QCE), Joe Speed (LF), Jun Zhang (Haier), Takeshi Matsushita (Sharp), Telis Kaleas (QCE), Tolly Smith (Silicon Image)

Joe reviewed the Antitrust Compliance Notice and the Bylaws

Joe presented goals for the day's discussion, which included:

- a) Review Haier's updates to the test case specs
- b) Your Feedback on Homework
- c) Status of extending "homework" ask to all members
- b) Review validation tool output

Review Haier's updates to the test case specs

Joe handed off to Jun to speak about Haier's updates to the test case specs.

Jun talked through edits that were made:

Under Onboarding

3.8 Onboarding-v1-08: GetScanInfo() returns results or FeatureNotAvailable error
- Expected results added

Under Configuration

3.1 System app appld equals DeviceID

- Test deleted

3.9 Config-v1-09: UpdateConfigurations() method with an unspecified language

- Test added

3.18 Config-v1-18: ResetConfigurations() method with an unspecified language

- Test added

Under Control Panel

3.2 ControlPanel-v1-02: Verify all Container bus objects

- Step 6 added

- Expected results added

3.3 ControlPanel-v1-03: Verify all Property bus objects

- Step 6 added
- Expected results added
- 3.4 ControlPanel-v1-04: Verify all LabelProperty bus objects
- Step 6 added
- Expected results added
- 3.5 ControlPanel-v1-05: Verify all Action bus objects
- Steps 6 & 7 added
- Expected results added
- 3.6 ControlPanel-v1-06: Verify all Dialog bus objects
- Step 6 added
- Expected results added
- 3.7 ControlPanel-v1-07:
- Steps 6-12 added
- Expected results added
- 3.8 ControlPanel-v1-08:
- Steps 6-12 added
- Expected results added

Under Notification

- 2.1 Requirements -- 2nd device added
- 3.3 Notification-Consumer-v1-0403: Invalid language field -- expected results added
- 3.5 Notification-Consumer-v1-05: Attributes -- New test added
- 3.53.6 Notification-Consumer-v1-06: Custom attributes -- Name change added
- 3.7 Notification-Consumer-v1-07: TTL -- New test added
- 4.1 Notification-v1-01: Sending of notifications -- expected results added
- 5.1 Notification-Dismiss-v1-01: dismiss signal -- New test added

Joe asked question to those on call around some of the use cases that require 2 devices, does the group feel that is a reasonable requirement or does it put too much of a burden for example in Phase 2 when you would have to provide 2 of every product.

Telis noted that for the 2 devices, it concerns him that it's not as much interface testing, but becomes interoperability testing. We are testing the interface definitions. He asked Jun if when 2 devices are referenced, would it be from same product, or could it be different product?

Jun noted it could be either (2nd product could be a Golden Unit)

Tolly asked if it would be possible to use 1 device?

Joe suggested that it should either be one device or be rewritten to make it explicit that we're not requiring a 2nd one of the same device

David McBride provided input that a manufacturer or developer that is doing development and tests around devices they are putting into market will likely have piles of them around, so it doesn't seem like it's a huge burden to require more than one. If the tests can be easily written and still valid using one device great, but doesn't seem like a huge burden to use 2 devices where it makes sense.

It was decided to accept as is, and we can revisit whether it can be done with 1 device at a future time, since these won't apply until Phase 2

Review validation tool output

Telis introduced Vinay to talk through the output log (logcat from Nexus 7), showing one test case that was run (About)

ValidationInstrumentationTestRunnerHelper dumps out the parameters
Next you will see TestRunner which shows which Test Case it is executing
Each Test will have a setUp
At the end of setUp, you will see test setUp done
After finished, will list if it has passed

Joe raised the question around when Jun adds a test case, which results in the renumbering, is everything going to need to be renumbered in the code, or should he add his test case to the end of the number sequence.

It was noticed that for some of Jun's, he changed the numbers

It was left for future discussion whether we have the test cases in what makes logical sense, or do we add to the end of the numbers, so that we don't have to go in and change the source code of the tool for existing cases.

It was confirmed that as of now, the only results available would be full log files, which would require AllSeen staff to parse the results and check that every test case w/in each test run passed successfully

Your Feedback on Homework

Joe asked group if anyone was able to do the self validation homework.
Nobody was able to execute yet.

Status of extending "homework" ask to all members

Joe noted that before we send homework to all members, the Android app self-validation test needs to be built.

Test results and feedback will be sent to allseen-cc@lists.allseenalliance.org

“Ask” will be used for technical support

(<https://ask.allseenalliance.org/questions/>)

- Tag as Validation

Joe asked if anyone was able to try the Self-Validation Test

> Jun noted that they are trying to do the test, but are currently having problems building the validation tool, and have submitted a help request to “Ask” (labeled “Test Problem, Android Maven packaging error”)

> Joe noted Ryan/Linux Foundation was also unable to build the self-validation test tool

Open issues to discuss further on a later call:

1. 1 DUT or 2 DUT

2. where Haier has added a new section, do we move it to the end of that section (suggested approach) or go in and modify the test tool code to renumber the cases (not suggested)

3. cryptic log file, requires AllSeen staff to parse the results and check that every test case w/in each test run passed successfully. would be better if bottom of log file included message similar to ===== PASSED 8 of 8 TESTS =====

4) Neither Ryan nor Haier have been able to successfully build the self-validation test tool using the provided instructions in the user guide.

Joe closed the call