EXPERIENCES FROM APPLYING MBT IN AN AGILE SCRUM CONTEXT

AN MBT UC 2011 PRESENTATION

ATHANASIOS KARAPANTELAKIS (athanasios.karapantelakis@ericsson.com)
ALLAN ANDERSSON (allan.andersson@ericsson.com)
JOHAN MALMBERG (johan.malmberg@ericsson.com)
BOGUMILA RUTKOWSKA (bogumila.rutkowska@ericsson.com)

ERICSSON AB, TELLUSBORGSVÄGEN 83-85, 126 25 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

INTRODUCTION TO TEST DOMAIN

- Test Scope: modeling of O&M interfaces (man-machine communication) for a telecommunication system.
  - User point of view when creating models
  - Because of a strict, formalized structure of commands, there is no requirement for wrappers or APIs.
    - Success story with MBT: Generic command and printout handling in test execution harness.
    - Cost efficiency: wrapper class per interface versus wrapper class per command.
- Test methodology: application of MBT for testing a system being developed using SCRUM.

APPROACH (1/3)

- Background and tool selection
  - Conformiq:
    - Provider of an MBT tool suite used to design models and generate test cases out of those models.
    - Model design is UML-based complemented by Java-like code.
    - Black-box testing approach: models describe sequences of incoming and outgoing *messages* to and from the system being modeled.
  - Glue logic
    - Code between the model domain and the test execution platform
    - *Translates* the sequence diagrams produced from the model to executable test cases.
    - Incoming messages to the system are O&M commands, and outgoing messages are command printouts.
      - Based on logic in the model, glue logic creates a set of executable test scripts, through a process within which incoming messages from the model are interpreted as O&M commands, and ougtoing messages are interpreted as command printouts.

APPROACH (2/3)


Model Designer
Design/Modify
Model
Input
MBT tool
Generated sequence diagrams
Glue Logic
Generated executable test scripts
Automated Test Execution Framework


Tester
Issue commands
Receive printouts
O&M interface
Telecommunications System

APPROACH (3/3)

Timeline



EVALUATION

- Duration (approximately two months)
- Time segmentation (man hours)
  - As a percentage of total time
    - Creation and refinement of glue logic (**one time effort**): 53%
    - Creation of models (including verification of models/execution of test cases): 47%



Efficiency: average gain in time of MBT versus manual testing ~14x



Completeness: We managed to cover 78% of the test specification

TECHNICAL CHALLENGES

- Read data from printouts
  - Contracts between the test harness and model-level design.
- Non-deterministic situations
  - Ambiguous command printouts
- Large number of test cases (impacts test execution time)
  - Compacting test suite

MODELING A PROCESS

- Value of modeling the “MBT introduction” process
  - Simulations help correlate measurable parameters to varying values of preset parameters.
  - Facilitates project planning, assignment of resources, estimation of costs.

- Using System Dynamics (SD) mental models as a tool for planning for MBT deployment within a SCRUM project.
  - Define MBT introduction stages
    - Preparation
      - Automated test execution framework
      - MBT training
    - Deployment
  - Define model parameters
    - Measurable parameters
      - Cost of resources, time to deliver, quality
    - Preset parameters
      - Number of engineers allocated, project/training deadlines

MBT TRAINING



MBT TRAINING DYNAMICS



DEVELOPMENT OF TEST EXECUTION AUTOMATION FRAMEWORK



DYNAMICS OF THE FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT PROCESS



CAPTURING THE PERFORMANCE OF MBT WITHIN SCRUM



MBT TEAM EFFICIENCY DYNAMICS



Introduction → Approach → Contributions and results → Technical Challenges → **MBT in SCRUM mental model** → Conclusion

COMBINING MODELS



LESSONS LEARNED

Experiences from evaluation

- Models can focus on the final solution
  - In every sprint, execute only the subset of test cases generated from the model that correspond to implemented functionality.
- Design teams may come up with temporary workarounds, not present in the final version
  - Model workarounds can be introduced and deactivated later
  - Save efforts for redesigning the model later

Experiences from simulation of SD models

- SD models capture the inter-relations of variables that determine project success.
  - Resource allocation, based on engineer experience, that leads to lower costs.
  - Resource allocation, based on engineer experience, that delivers results faster.
    - *But also*: Optimal allocation of engineers that leads to the best compromise of time and costs.

PLANNING AHEAD

Stakeholders

Draft

Formalized Test Specifications

Interpret and design model

MBT

Automated generation

Test Scripts

Automated execution



System Under Test (SUT)

A *third* level of testing process automation

- Complete model creation versus model “stubs”.
- Generated test cases consistency, correctness.
- Reduced testing costs, lead-time.