# Attendees

Stephan Schulz (Conformiq), Victor Kuliamin (ISPRAS), Alain Vouffo (Fraunhofer), Antal Wu-Chang (Ericsson), Jens Grabowski (University of Göttingen), Anne Kramer (Sepp.Med), Margus Veanus (Microsoft), Andrej Pietschker (Giesecke & Devrient)

# Action Points

* Stephan: Ask Alberto for a 10 day MBT STF extension this year
* Jens: Start of MTS review of MBT STF case study document end of next week
* Jens: Collect “requirements” on test generation output format to minimize “post-processing” of generated test as part of the MTS STF work
* ETSI: Set up GTM MTS review of methodology document for Dec 3rd
* Victor: to draft a first section with Stephan’s support by end of Oct on coverage section in MBT ES (in draft document) that will then be sent around for further comments
* Andrej: provide a short summary of what a test strategy should include to facilitate further discussion

# Summary

## Review of MTS STF Results

* Review of MBT UC 2012 presentation
* **Case study doc status**
  + Close to be finalised, missing some conclusions, some part on the technical work.
  + Models will be made available in an electronic attachment to the ETSI guide.
* **Methodology guideline document status**
  + Methodology depends on the tooling, some difficulty with the tools /process. Not a lot of time left.
  + It is unlikely that the final document will cover ALL aspects of methodology
  + Document should explain how you use requirement, different domain, different ways to deals with requirements.
  + Document should give guidance on how to select criteria to select tests and limit number of tests
  + “Post processing” needs to be reworded – “Adaptation” plus list of requirements on generated output?
* General Conclusion: MBT can be applied in standardized test development.
* STF will need some additional time to finish methodology document, 10 days. ETSI to prepare the request for contingency

## Review of MBT ES Coverage Section Proposal (Contribution by sepp.med)

  - (anne) standard should at least define a common terminology on coverage criteria even if they are not mandatory

  - (Andrej) next to coverage also the selected test strategy plays an important role in test generation. For now test strategy has been excluded from discussion

  - (Victor/stephan) standard should define coverage criteria first in general manner in main section and then again in mappings to specific notations to make it understandable for the reader

  - (jens) coverage of control versus logical expressions & data flow coverage

    - control: system state, system state transition, boundary interior (no of specific loop traversal)?

    - data via mapping of requirements to conditions and data

  - (victor) coverage should not be defined in terms of tests ... but in terms of the model

  - (Andrej) requirement coverage must be standardized although it is hard to define when it is "covered well enough"

  - (Andrej) data is a key issue in testing

  - (stephan/Andrej)  judging good loop coverage for end user is basically impossible

  - (stephan) model coverage alone is not

  - (jens) white box coverage criteria are used for model/specification quality assessment – less test coverage

  - (jens) new coverage section should first introduce coverage, then discuss model coverage (possible) and then requirement coverage & test purpose/requirement sequences/use case coverage

  - (alain) dangerous to formalize too much  what “requirement” means

  - (stephan) relation of model coverage to requirement coverage needs to be clear in the standard, i.e., that it is not necessarily just that one transition or state it is associated with but may be though wider

- (margus) “severity” or priority of tests is also an important factor in working with test generation results