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• Testing is a design requirement
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• Conclusions
The Test Space is Infinite

- There are hundreds of systems on warships
- All systems must interoperate seamlessly
- The environment is harsh and boundless
- Human factors (faults) must be prevented
- Participants rely on simultaneous correct execution
- Lives are at stake
- Testing is sparse relative to the entire space
Critical Faults

• There will be faults left behind
• Some faults are more severe than others
  • Risk
  • Difficulty of detection
  • Probability of occurrence
  • Severity
Critical Faults

• Finding critical faults may require cheating
  • Statistically invisible = impossible to detect by black box testing
• Clear box testing can do better
  • Use constraint solvers to synthesize test inputs for majority of cases
Systems Are Never Finished

• There are always faults to be fixed
• There are always upgrades desired
• Added features create more demand signal
Automation Can Improve Testing

• Faster development time
• Stable and consistent quality systems
• Lower costs
• Allow fast regression testing
• Changes in approach are required
Hardware Testing

• Easier than software testing
  • Uniform state representation
  • Known expected outputs
  • Effective error models
Software Testing

• More complex failure patterns
• Complete test sets not algorithmically computable in the general case
# Testability levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>syntactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>observable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>measurable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>decidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unbounded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agile vs. Waterfall Automated Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agile</th>
<th>Waterfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows for fluid requirements shifts and changes</td>
<td>Does not accommodate changes in requirements easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically requires smaller teams of dedicated developers focused on</td>
<td>Typically is based on larger teams working more at the system level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaller applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires that work be time boxed into Sprints with a working product</td>
<td>Does not have to provide any working components until delivery at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrable at the end of each time box</td>
<td>end of the development cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing is a Design Requirement

• Programs Approach Testing differently
• Common Instrumentation of SW could allow formalization of Automated Testing
• Using similar Technical Reference Frameworks allows common tools to be utilized
• DoN is considering sponsoring standards for testing
Experience with Automated Testing

• Rapid Integration and Test Environment (RITE)
  • SPAWAR initiative
  • Fundamental change to DoD integration activities
  • Graduated set of tests
• Focused testing accomplished in three phases is a fundamental aspect
• Continuous integration process
RITE Continuous Integration Process
Conclusions

- Automated testing has an important role in achieving affordability
- Depends on valid and sufficiently defined requirements
- Complementary quality assurance processes are needed