

(19)



Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets



(11)

EP 1 504 347 B1

(12)

EUROPEAN PATENT SPECIFICATION

(45) Date of publication and mention
of the grant of the patent:
20.09.2006 Bulletin 2006/38

(21) Application number: **03727464.4**

(22) Date of filing: **08.05.2003**

(51) Int Cl.:
G06F 11/36^(2006.01)

(86) International application number:
PCT/EP2003/004904

(87) International publication number:
WO 2003/096191 (20.11.2003 Gazette 2003/47)

(54) **AUTOMATED SOFTWARE TESTING SYSTEM AND METHOD**

VERFAHREN UND SYSTEM ZUR AUTOMATISCHEN PRÜFUNG VON SOFTWARE
SYSTEME ET PROCEDE POUR L'ESSAI AUTOMATIQUE DE LOGICIEL

(84) Designated Contracting States:
**AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE DK EE ES FI FR GB GR
HU IE IT LI LU MC NL PT RO SE SI SK TR**

(30) Priority: **11.05.2002 US 379934 P**

(43) Date of publication of application:
09.02.2005 Bulletin 2005/06

(73) Proprietor: **Accenture Global Services GmbH
8200 Schaffhausen (CH)**

(72) Inventors:
• **BARRY, Margaret, Moya
Chicago, IL 60607 (US)**
• **MCEVOY, John, Charles
Algonquin, IL 60102 (US)**

• **STEWART, Matthew, Phillip
Villa Park, IL 60181 (US)**
• **BOWMAN, Christine, Ann
Crown Point, IN 46307 (US)**

(74) Representative: **McLeish, Nicholas Alistair
Maxwell et al
Boult Wade Tennant
Verulam Gardens
70 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8BT (GB)**

(56) References cited:
WO-A-01/93043 WO-A-01/95662
US-A- 5 572 668

EP 1 504 347 B1

Note: Within nine months from the publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent, any person may give notice to the European Patent Office of opposition to the European patent granted. Notice of opposition shall be filed in a written reasoned statement. It shall not be deemed to have been filed until the opposition fee has been paid. (Art. 99(1) European Patent Convention).

Description

[0001] This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/379,934 filed on May 11, 2002.

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

[0002] The present invention relates generally to a system for testing software and particularly to methods and systems for automatically testing software using relational tables.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

[0003] Software development requires extensive repetitive testing both of the first version and of each new version of the software that is produced throughout the development process. With each new version comes a repetitive series of tests to determine if the changes made to create the version have affected the software in an unintended manner. This testing is usually accomplished by a testing organization, which is separate from the software development organization, for example, in a different department.

[0004] In addition, software development is usually accomplished in modules that require complete testing as each new module is added to the software product. Thus, repetitive testing is also required to ensure that each new module, besides adding the functions it was designed to accomplish, will not detrimentally affect the functionality of the integrated software product. Software tests may be organized into test cases, so that different test cases test the functionality of different modules or sets of modules, or of different functionalities of the software.

[0005] Advances in technology have made it possible to record the keystroke input of an operator as the first version of software is tested. Subsequent versions are tested by playing back the previously recorded session. A system of this type is disclosed by Kerr et al. in U.S. Pat. No. 4,696,003, issued Sep. 22, 1987. Another relevant keystroke recording and playback system is the Advanced Test System For Software Test as disclosed in IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, Vol. 30, No. 9, Feb. 9, 1988. Still another recording and playback system is disclosed by Pope, et al. in U.S. Pat. No. 5,335,342, issued Aug. 2, 1994. In this system, a first version of interactive software is executed and all input signals, such as mouse activity and keystrokes, and output screens are recorded. When a new version of the software is created, the recorded input signals may be introduced to the software, and the new output screens compared to the recorded output screens.

[0006] Generally, software testing organizations use some type of record and playback functionality of input and/or output to produce one automated test script per test case. Each test script contains the data, execution logic and expected results for the test case. Within each

script there may be common application functionality and logic.

[0007] Software testing organizations often use commercially available automated testing tools to test software. Record and playback test script generation is the most commonly demonstrated feature of commercially available automated testing tools. Record and playback functionality is one of the most intuitive methods to test software. Merely recording software input and playing it back tends to make the process of test automation appear very straightforward and easy. As the software application under test changes, however, it may also be necessary to change one or more of the test scripts. Maintaining a large number of test scripts that require frequent modification may become time consuming to the point of being overwhelming.

[0008] To help minimize the maintenance of test scripts, testing organizations have begun to use the record and playback functionality in conjunction with parameterized data in an effort to create more robust recorded scripts. Data is said to be "parameterized" when the automated test scripts read the test data values from an external source, such as a file, rather than having the values hard coded into the scripts. For example, pointer movements and selections that navigate through a series of screens may be "hard coded" into a script, while keyboard strokes (text data) may be read from a data structure or a data file. This method allows a variety of data scenarios to be tested by a single test script.

[0009] Nevertheless, even when using parameterized data with recorded scripts, many test cases have to be created to cover all of the target test cases. For example, one test script may be needed for each test case. Therefore, with each of the above methods it may become more difficult to maintain existing automated scripts as more test cases are automated. Maintenance of these scripts may become more complicated both during initial testing and later in regression testing. It would be desirable to provide an automated test system that allowed a single script to be used with many different test cases.

[0010] WO-A-0195662 describes an integrated multiple services switch testing system including a script execution environment for executing a test script.

[0011] WO-A-0193043 describes an automated scripting solution for enterprise testing using a table-driven automated scripting architecture. Synchronized execution of the test script is performed.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

[0012] In accordance with a first aspect of the present invention, there is provided a system for testing application as described in claim 1.

[0013] In a second aspect of the present invention, there is provided a method for testing application as described in claim 11.

[0014] In accordance with a third aspect of the present invention there is provided a computer program for test-

ing an application as described in claim 21.

[0015] Other systems, methods, features and advantages of the invention will be, or will become apparent to one with skill in the art upon examination of the following figures and detailed description. It is intended that all such additional systems, methods, features and advantages be included within this description, be within the scope of the invention, and be protected by the following claims.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

[0016]

FIG. 1 is a system-level data flow diagram of a testing system.

FIG. 2 illustrates a database of relational tables.

FIG. 3 illustrates relational tables of input data.

FIG. 4 illustrates a relational table of test data results.

FIG. 5 illustrates relational tables of flow information for modules.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESENTLY PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

[0017] Referring to Fig. 1, a system-level data flow diagram of a testing system 100 is generally illustrated. The testing system 100 includes a user interface terminal 102, a test application 104, a test application database 106, a controller 108, modules 110, a test configuration database 112, a mapping interface 114, and a test reporting user interface 116. The test configuration database 112 includes a flow data table 122, module input tables 124, and a results data table 126.

[0018] Also shown in Fig. 1 is an application under test 118, which is to be tested by testing system 100. The term "application" is used herein to refer to any combination of hardware and software that accepts one or more electromagnetic (including optical) signals as an input and produces one or more electromagnetic signals as an output. One example of an application is an internet hyper-text transfer protocol (HTTP) client and/or server program running on one or more computer systems. Another example of an application is an embedded control program running on a microprocessor inside a wireless telephone or terminal. A further example of an application is a software program running on a personal computer having a graphical user interface (GUI). The systems and methods for practicing the present invention function equally well with any type of application under test 118, and the illustrative embodiments herein are not intended to limit the claimed invention in any way.

[0019] The modules 110 may each be a software module 120 that is capable of stimulating the application under test 118 by providing input signals to the application. For example, each module 120 may be a C shell script on a UNIX system. Alternatively, each module 120 may be a stand-alone executable program. In a preferred embodiment, each module 120 is a script for use with test

software, for example the test application 104. The test application 104 may be a commercially available package, such as WinRunner test software provided by Mercury Interactive of Sunnyvale, California, SQA Robot supplied by SQA, Inc. of Woburn, Massachusetts, or MS Test, which is supplied by Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Washington, or any other type of package.

[0020] Where the test application 104 is a commercially available package, a controller 108 may be used to provide an interface between the test application 104 and the modules 110. For example, the controller 108 may appear to be one or more test scripts from the perspective of the test application 104, and may appear to be the test application 104 to the modules 110. Where the test application 104 is specifically designed to work with the modules 110 described herein, the controller 108 may be unnecessary. In this case, the functionality attributed to the test application 104 and the controller 108 may all be performed by an integrated testing application.

[0021] The modules 110 may be created by manually entering the code of each module 120 into a text editor or a similar software program. In a preferred embodiment, however, the modules 110 are recorded using the record/playback functionality of the test application 104.

The recording of the modules 110 may be performed by the standard method inherent in the test application 104. Alternatively, the modules 110 may be recorded using the test application 104, and then modified as desired with a text editor or a similar software program capable of editing source code. For example, the modules 110 may be modified in order to parameterize the input data provided to the application under test 118, so that the input data may vary from one test case to the next test case.

[0022] The flow data table 122, the module input tables 124, the results data table 126, and the test application database 106 may each be a relational table. The terms "table", "relational table", and "database" are used interchangeably herein to refer to a data structure capable of relating one set of data elements to one or more other sets of data elements. For example, a relational table may relate a set of names to a set of telephone numbers.

[0023] A relational table containing other tables is referred to herein as a "database" for clarity, but the use of this term is not intended to limit the claimed invention in any way. A database may contain one or more tables that may or may not be related. In a preferred embodiment, relational tables are created and maintained via database software, such as Microsoft Access supplied by Microsoft Corporation, MySQL supplied as open source software at <http://www.mysql.com/> and elsewhere, Sybase supplied by Sybase, Incorporated, Oracle supplied by Oracle Corporation, or some other type of database software.

[0024] The claimed invention, however, is not limited to the use of commercially available database software, and other methods of creating the tables described herein may be used. For example, the tables may be imple-

mented as data structures in the test application 104, the controller 108, and/or the modules 110. The creation of data tables using arrays, linked lists, or other data structures and/or data classes with or without file structures is well known by those skilled in the art of software engineering.

[0025] The flow data table 122, the module input tables 124, the results data table 126 and the test application database 106 may each exist in a separate database, or other data structures. In a preferred embodiment, however, the flow data table 122, the module input tables 124, and the results data table 126 all exist in a test configuration database 112. The test application database 106 may comprise a single table, and exist as a separate database. The test configuration database 112 and the test application database 106 may exist on one or more database servers separate from the other components of the testing system 100. Where one or more database servers are utilized, communications between the test configuration database 112 and the other components of testing system 100 may be carried out via a computer network or some other communications medium.

[0026] In a preferred embodiment, the test configuration database 112 includes one or more data entry forms capable of acting in conjunction with the test reporting user interface 116 as a high-level user interface for the flow data table 122, the module input tables 124, and the results data table 126. Alternatively, the flow data table 122, the module input tables 124, and the results data table 230 may be directly modified by a user via the test reporting user interface 116 or some other user interface, without the use of forms.

[0027] The user interface terminal 102 and the test reporting user interface 116 may each be either a physical terminal, or an interface capable of receiving input and providing visual and/or audio output. In a preferred embodiment the user interface terminal 102 and the test reporting user interface 116 are each a computer terminal having a keyboard, a pointing device, a display, and a graphical user interface. Alternatively, user interface terminal 102 and the test reporting user interface 116 may each be an interface, such as a window, accessed through a remote terminal. The user interface terminal 102 and the test reporting user interface 116 may be either directly connected to the other components of testing system 100, or each may communicate with testing system 100 via a network.

[0028] To summarize the operation of testing system 100, a user creates the modules 110, for example by using the recording functionality of the test application 104. The user then parameterizes each module 120 as desired. The run order of the modules 110 within each test case is then entered into the flow data table 122. The parameters (input values) for each module 120 are entered into the module input tables 124. Once each of the above set-up steps has been completed, not necessarily in the above order, the testing system 100 is prepared to test the application under test 118.

[0029] During testing, the controller 108 reads the flow data table 122, and executes, via the test application 104 to execute, each module 120 in sequence according to the flow data table 122. As each module 120 is being executed by the test application 104, the module 120 reads input values from the module input tables 124. The test application 104 provides these input values to the application under test 118. Also, the test application 104 reads the output values (results) from the application under test 118, and stores the output values in the test application database 106. These "actual results" may be stored as "expected results" where the application under test 118 is a baseline version, or compared to previously stored "expected results" where the application under test 118 is a new or updated version.

[0030] An illustrative flow data table 122 is shown in detail in FIG. 2, illustrative module input tables 124 are shown in detail in FIG. 3, and an illustrative test application database is shown in detail in FIG. 4. Using these detailed exemplary tables, the operation of the testing system 100 will now be explained in greater detail. The form and content of the tables in FIGS. 2-4 will vary greatly depending on the nature of the application under test 118. The following description of the testing system 100, and the tables in FIGS. 2-4 are merely illustrative, and are not intended to limit the claimed invention in any way.

[0031] The process of testing the application under test 118 begins when a user activates the test application 104 by the use of user interface terminal 102. The test application 104 may execute the controller 108, or, if the controller 108 is already running, then the test application 104 may signal the controller 108 to begin one or more test cases. In response, the controller 108 may read data from the flow data table 122 to determine the execution order of the modules 110 within the one or more test cases.

[0032] As shown in FIG. 2, the flow data table 122 relates a test case identifier and a run order value to a module identifier. Each module identifier is associated with one of the modules 110. Each test case identifier is associated with a particular test case. The run order values indicate the flow control for the modules within a test case.

[0033] Consider a flow control example where a first test case is associated with test case identifier "1", a second test case is associated with test case identifier "2", a first module 120 is associated with module identifier "1", a second module 120 is associated with module identifier "2", and so on. As shown in FIG. 2, for the first test case, the run order value of "1" is associated with the second module 120. Therefore, for the first test case, the second module 120 will be executed first. Likewise, for the first test case the run order value of "2" is associated with module identifier "10", so the tenth module 120 will be executed second. In this fashion, the controller 108 reads a module flow order for a test case from the flow data table 122, and executes modules 110 in turn via the test application 104.

[0034] Upon execution, each module 120 may read input values from the module input tables 124 shown generally in FIG. 2, and in detail in FIG. 3. In FIG. 3, four illustrative module input tables 124 are shown. In this illustrative example, the module input tables 124 include a user table 202, an address table 204, a coverage table 206, and an insurer table 208.

[0035] Each module 120 may be provided with a test case identifier by, for example, the controller 108 or the test application 104. Upon execution, a module 120 may read input values based on the provided test case identifier. For example, the first module 120 may simulate a login sequence of the application under test 118. Given a test case identifier of "1", the first module 120 may read the values "ALBERT", "BUNDY" and "SHOES" from the user table 202.

[0036] Based on the column identifiers, the first module 120 may associate the value "ALBERT" with a parameter representing a user's first name, the value "BUNDY" with a parameter representing a user's last name, and the value "SHOES" with a parameter representing a user's password. In this illustrative embodiment, the columns of the module input tables 124 are designated descriptively to improve legibility, but any designations may be used. The first module 120 may then provide, via the test application 104, these values from the user table 202 as inputs into the application under test 118.

[0037] Each module 120 may also cause the application under test 118 to generate one or more output values that may be read by the test application 104. For example, in response to the input values "ALBERT", "BUNDY" and "SHOES", the application under test 118 may generate the output "WELCOME". The test application 104 may relate the generated output values to corresponding test case identifiers and module identifiers in the test application database 106, shown in FIG. 4.

[0038] For a further example, when the tenth module 120 executes with a provided test case identifier "2", it may read the values "110 RUSH ST", "CHICAGO", "IL", and "JONES" from the address table 204. These input values may then be provided as inputs into the application under test 118. In response to the input values "110 RUSH ST", "CHICAGO", "IL", and "JONES", the application under test 118 may generate the output "INVALID ADDRESS". The test application 104 may relate the generated output value "INVALID ADDRESS" to test case identifier "2" and module identifier "10" in the test application database 106.

[0039] Likewise, when the third module 120 executes with a provided test case identifier "1", it may read the value "ALLSTATE" from the insurer table 208, and cause the application under test 118 to generate the result "ALLSTATE". The test application 104 may relate the generated output value "ALLSTATE" to test case identifier "1" and module identifier "3" in the test application database 106. Finally, when the fourth module 120 executes with a provided test case identifier "1", it may read the value "YES" from the coverage table 206, and cause the ap-

plication under test 118 to generate the result "NO". (As will be explained below, the result "NO" is incorrect, and indicates that the application under test 118 is not functioning properly.)

[0040] In a preferred embodiment, the testing system 100 operates in three modes. In a first mode, referred to herein as the "test mode", testing system 100 compares actual results from the application under test 118 against a stored set of expected results. For example, the test mode may be used to debug the application under test 118 during creation of a baseline version of the application under test 118, or during regression testing of an updated version of the application under test 118.

[0041] In the test mode, the mapping interface 114 reads one or more sets of the output values (actual results), test case identifiers and module identifiers from the test application database 106. The mapping interface 114 then relates these output values to previously stored expected output values in the results data table 126. The mapping interface 114 accomplishes this "mapping" by using the test case identifiers and module identifiers as indices into the test application database 106. Once a test case has been at least partially completed, the user may view the test results via the test reporting user interface 116.

[0042] In a second operational mode, referred to herein as the "baseline mode", the mapping interface 114 reads one or more sets of the output values, test case identifiers and module identifiers from the test application database 106 after tests have been run on a baseline (known working version) of the application under test 118. In the baseline mode, the mapping interface 114 stores these output values from the baseline of the application under test 118 as "expected results" in the results data table 126. The mapping interface 114 relates these expected results to test case identifiers and module identifiers. In this manner, expected output values may be automatically generated and stored by simply testing a known-working baseline of the application under test 118.

[0043] In a third operational mode, referred to herein as the "manual mode", the user may manually enter expected results for each test case identifier and module identifier pair. In manual mode, the test reporting user interface 116 may utilize a user interface, such as a database entry form, to facilitate the manual entry or modification of expected results in the results data table 126. Furthermore, the manual mode may also be used to enter information into the flow data table 122, the module input tables 124, and the results data table 126. Again, forms may be used to facilitate the entry of data into the test configuration database 112, or data may be entered directly into the test configuration database 112.

[0044] In the exemplary embodiment described herein, the expected results "WELCOME", "VALID ADDRESS", "ALLSTATE", and "YES" were related in the result table 126 to test case identifier "1" and module identifiers "2", "10", "3", and "4", respectively. The actual

results, however, differ because test case identifier "1" and module identifier "2" actually produced an output of "NO" rather than the expected output of "YES". By using the test reporting user interface 116, the user may either manually compare the expected results and the actual results, or utilize a comparison script to indicate whether a test case executed successfully.

[0045] In the embodiment described above, the run orders of the modules 110 are indicated separately for each test case. In an alternate embodiment, run orders of the modules 110 are categorized into flow types, and each test case is associated with a flow type. An exemplary flow table 122 illustrating this alternate embodiment is shown in FIG. 5. A flow order table 502 relates each test case with a flow type.

[0046] For example, a first test case is associated with a flow type "NORMAL" in flow order table 502. A flow type table 504 associates each flow type with run order values and module identifiers. In this example, each test case associated with the flow type "NORMAL" will execute the modules 110 associated with module identifiers "2", "10", "3", "4", "1", "6", "5", "9", "8", and "7", in that order. In this manner, an additional degree of flexibility may be incorporated into the testing system 100.

[0047] While various embodiments of the invention have been described, it will be apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art that many more embodiments and implementations are possible that are within the scope of this invention. Accordingly, the invention is not to be restricted except in light of the attached claims and their equivalents.

Claims

1. A system for testing an application, the system comprising:

a first relational table (122) operable to relate a plurality of test case identifiers to a plurality of order identifiers and a plurality of module identifiers;

a second relational table (124) operable to relate the plurality of test case identifiers to a plurality of input values;

a module (120) that corresponds to a module identifier of the plurality of module identifiers, wherein the module is operable upon execution to read an input value from the plurality of input values and provide the input value to the application; and

a controller (108) operable to read the first relational table, determine the module identifier based on a test case identifier of the plurality of test case identifiers, and to cause the module to execute, in accordance with the order identifier related to the test case identifier in the first relational table.

2. The system of claim 1, further comprising a test application (104) operable to execute the module.

3. The system of claim 2, wherein the test application includes the controller.

4. The system of claim 1, further comprising a third relational table (126), wherein the controller is further operable to receive an output value from the application, and to relate, in a third relational table, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the output value.

5. The system of claim 4, wherein the controller is further operable to relate, in the third relational table, the test case identifier and the module identifier to an expected output value.

6. The system of claim 5, wherein the controller is further operable to determine whether the expected output value is equal to the output value.

7. The system of claim 1, further comprising a third relational table, wherein the controller is further operable to receive a first output value from the application and a second output value from the application, and to relate, in a third relational table, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the first output value and to the second output value.

8. The system of claim 7, wherein the controller is further operable to determine whether the first output value is equal to the second output value.

9. The system of claim 1, further including a database (112), wherein the database includes the first and second relational tables.

10. The system of claim 1, further comprising a database (112), the database including a third relational table (126), wherein the controller is further operable to receive an output value from the application, and to relate, in the third relational table, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the output value.

11. A method for testing an application, the method comprising the steps of:

relating, in a first data structure (122), a plurality of module identifiers to a plurality of test case identifiers and a plurality of order identifiers;

relating, in a second data structure (124), the plurality of test case identifiers to a plurality of input values;

reading, from the first data structure, a module identifier that corresponds to a test case identifier of the plurality of test case identifiers and an order identifier of the plurality of order identifiers

- that is related to the test case identifier;
 executing a module (120) that corresponds to the module identifier;
 reading, via the module from the second data structure, an input value of the plurality of input values that corresponds to the test case identifier; and
 providing, via the module, the input value to an application.
12. The method of claim 11, further comprising the steps of receiving an output value from the application, and relating, in a third data structure (126), the test case identifier and the module identifier to the output value.
13. The method of claim 12, further comprising the step of relating, in the third data structure, the test case identifier and the module identifier to an expected output value.
14. The method of claim 13, further comprising the step of determining whether the expected output value is equal to the output value.
15. The method of claim 11, further comprising the steps of:
- receiving a first output value from the application;
 relating, in a third data structure (126), the test case identifier and the module identifier to the first output value;
 receiving a second output value from the application; and
 relating, in the third data structure, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the second output value.
16. The method of claim 15, further comprising the step of determining whether the first output value is equal to the second output value.
17. The method of claim 11, wherein the step of relating, in the first data structure, the plurality of module identifiers includes the step of creating a relational table in a database (112).
18. The method of claim 11, wherein the step of relating, in the second data structure, the plurality of test case identifiers includes the step of creating a relational table in a database.
19. The method of claim 11, further comprising the steps of receiving an output value from the application, and relating, in the second data structure, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the output value.
20. The method of claim 11, further comprising the steps of:
- receiving a first output value from the application;
 relating, in the second data structure, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the first output value;
 receiving a second output value from the application; and
 relating, in the second data structure, the test case identifier and the module identifier to the second output value.
21. A computer program for testing an application, the program comprising:
- computer readable program code which, when executed on a computer, performs the method of any of claims 11 to 20.

Patentansprüche

1. System zur Prüfung einer Anwendung, das umfasst:
- eine erste relationale Tabelle (122), die betriebsbereit ist, um eine Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren einer Vielzahl von Befehls-Identifikatoren und einer Vielzahl von Modul-Identifikatoren zuzuordnen;
 eine zweite relationale Tabelle (124), die betriebsbereit ist, um die Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren einer Vielzahl von Eingabewerten zuzuordnen;
 ein Modul (120), das einem Modul-Identifikator aus der Vielzahl von Modul-Identifikatoren entspricht, wobei das Modul nach der Ausführung betriebsbereit ist, um einen Eingabewert aus der Vielzahl von Eingabewerten zu lesen und den Eingabewert für die Anwendung bereitzustellen; und
 ein Steuergerät (108), das betriebsbereit ist, um die erste relationale Tabelle zu lesen, um basierend auf einem Prüffall-Identifikator aus der Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren, den Modul-Identifikator zu bestimmen, und um zu bewirken, dass das Modul gemäß des Befehls-Identifikators in Zusammenhang mit dem Prüffall-Identifikator in der ersten relationalen Tabelle ausgeführt wird.
2. System nach Anspruch 1, das ferner eine Prüfanwendung (104) umfasst, die betriebsbereit ist, um das Modul auszuführen.
3. System nach Anspruch 2, wobei die Prüfanwendung das Steuergerät beinhaltet.

4. System nach Anspruch 1, das ferner eine dritte relationale Tabelle (126) umfasst, wobei das Steuergerät ferner betriebsbereit ist, um einen Ausgabewert von der Anwendung zu empfangen, und um in einer dritten relationalen Tabelle den Prüffall-Identifikator und den Modul-Identifikator dem Ausgabewert zuzuordnen. 5
5. System nach Anspruch 4, wobei das Steuergerät ferner betriebsbereit ist, um in der dritten relationalen Tabelle den Prüffall-Identifikator und den Modul-Identifikator einem erwarteten Ausgabewert zuzuordnen. 10
6. System nach Anspruch 5, wobei das Steuergerät ferner betriebsbereit ist, um zu entscheiden, ob der erwartete Ausgabewert gleich dem Ausgabewert ist. 15
7. System nach Anspruch 1, das ferner eine dritte relationale Tabelle umfasst, wobei das Steuergerät ferner betriebsbereit ist, um einen ersten Ausgabewert und einen zweiten Ausgabewert von der Anwendung zu empfangen, und um in einer dritten relationalen Tabelle den Prüffall-Identifikator und den Modul-Identifikator dem ersten Ausgabewert und dem zweiten Ausgabewert zuzuordnen. 20 25
8. System nach Anspruch 7, wobei das Steuergerät ferner betriebsbereit ist, um zu entscheiden, ob der erste Ausgabewert gleich dem zweiten Ausgabewert ist. 30
9. System nach Anspruch 1, das ferner eine Datenbank (112) beinhaltet, wobei die Datenbank die erste und die zweite relationale Tabelle beinhaltet. 35
10. System nach Anspruch 1, das ferner eine Datenbank (112) umfasst, die eine dritte relationale Tabelle (126) beinhaltet, wobei das Steuergerät ferner betriebsbereit ist, um einen Ausgabewert von der Anwendung zu empfangen, und um in der dritten relationalen Tabelle den Prüffall-Identifikator und den Modul-Identifikator dem Ausgabewert zuzuordnen. 40
11. Verfahren zur Prüfung einer Anwendung, das folgende Schritte umfasst: 45
- Zuordnen einer Vielzahl von Modul-Identifikatoren zu einer Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren und einer Vielzahl von Befehls-Identifikatoren in einer ersten Datenstruktur (122); 50
- Zuordnen der Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren zu einer Vielzahl von Eingabewerten in einer zweiten Datenstruktur (124);
- Lesen eines Modul-Identifikators von der ersten Datenstruktur, der einem Prüffall-Identifikator aus der Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren und einem Befehls-Identifikator aus der Vielzahl von 55
- Befehls-Identifikatoren, der zu dem Prüffall-Identifikator gehört, entspricht;
- Ausführen eines Moduls (120), das dem Modul-Identifikator entspricht;
- Lesen eines Eingabewerts aus der Vielzahl von Eingabewerten, der dem Prüffall-Identifikator entspricht, von der zweiten Datenstruktur mittels des Moduls; und
- Bereitstellen des Eingabewerts für eine Anwendung mittels des Moduls.
12. Verfahren nach Anspruch 11, das ferner die folgenden Schritte umfasst: Empfangen eines Ausgabewerts von der Anwendung und Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu dem Ausgabewert in einer dritten Datenstruktur (126).
13. Verfahren nach Anspruch 12, das ferner den folgenden Schritt umfasst: Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu einem erwarteten Ausgabewert in der dritten Datenstruktur.
14. Verfahren nach Anspruch 13, das ferner den folgenden Schritt umfasst: Entscheiden, ob der erwartete Ausgabewert gleich dem Ausgabewert ist.
15. Verfahren nach Anspruch 11, das ferner die folgenden Schritte umfasst:
- Empfangen eines ersten Ausgabewerts von der Anwendung;
- Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu dem ersten Ausgabewert in einer dritten Datenstruktur (126);
- Empfangen eines zweiten Ausgabewerts von der Anwendung; und
- Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu dem zweiten Ausgabewert in der dritten Datenstruktur.
16. Verfahren nach Anspruch 15, das ferner den folgenden Schritt umfasst: Entscheiden, ob der erste Ausgabewert gleich dem zweiten Ausgabewert ist.
17. Verfahren nach Anspruch 11, wobei der Schritt des Zuordnens der Vielzahl von Modul-Identifikatoren in der ersten Datenstruktur den Schritt des Erzeugens einer relationalen Tabelle in einer Datenbank (112) beinhaltet.
18. Verfahren nach Anspruch 11, wobei der Schritt des Zuordnens der Vielzahl von Prüffall-Identifikatoren in der zweiten Datenstruktur den Schritt des Erzeugens einer relationalen Tabelle in einer Datenbank beinhaltet.
19. Verfahren nach Anspruch 11, das ferner die folgen-

den Schritte umfasst: Empfangen eines Ausgabewerts von der Anwendung und Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu dem Ausgabewert in der zweiten Datenstruktur.

20. Verfahren nach Anspruch 11, das ferner die folgenden Schritte umfasst:

Empfangen eines ersten Ausgabewerts von der Anwendung;
Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu dem ersten Ausgabewert in der zweiten Datenstruktur;
Empfangen eines zweiten Ausgabewerts von der Anwendung; und
Zuordnen des Prüffall-Identifikators und des Modul-Identifikators zu dem zweiten Ausgabewert in der zweiten Datenstruktur.

21. Computerprogramm zur Prüfung einer Anwendung, das umfasst:

einen-computerlesbaren Programmcode, der, sobald er auf einem Computer ausgeführt wird, das Verfahren nach einem der Ansprüche 11 bis 20 durchführt.

Revendications

1. Système destiné à tester une application, le système comprenant :

une première table relationnelle (122) pouvant être mise en oeuvre pour mettre en relation une pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de tests avec une pluralité d'identificateurs d'ordres et une pluralité d'identificateurs de modules, une seconde table relationnelle (124) pouvant être mise en oeuvre pour mettre en relation la pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de tests avec une pluralité de valeurs d'entrée, un module (120) qui correspond à un identificateur de module de la pluralité d'identificateurs de modules, où le module peut être mis en oeuvre lors de l'exécution pour lire une valeur d'entrée parmi la pluralité de valeurs d'entrée et procurer la valeur d'entrée à l'application, et un contrôleur (108) pouvant être mis en oeuvre pour lire la première table relationnelle, déterminer l'identificateur de module sur la base d'un identificateur de cas de test de la pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de test, et pour amener le module à s'exécuter, conformément à l'identificateur d'ordre associé à l'identificateur de cas de test dans la première table relationnelle.

2. Système selon la revendication 1, comprenant en

outre une application de test (104) pouvant être mise en oeuvre pour exécuter le module.

3. Système selon la revendication 2, dans lequel l'application de test comprend le contrôleur.

4. Système selon la revendication 1, comprenant en outre une troisième table relationnelle (126), où le contrôleur peut en outre être mis en oeuvre pour recevoir une valeur de sortie de l'application, et pour mettre en relation, dans une troisième table relationnelle, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la valeur de sortie.

5. Système selon la revendication 4, dans lequel le contrôleur peut en outre être mis en oeuvre pour mettre en relation, dans la troisième table relationnelle, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec une valeur de sortie attendue.

6. Système selon la revendication 5, dans lequel le contrôleur peut en outre être mis en oeuvre pour déterminer si la valeur de sortie attendue est égale à la valeur de sortie.

7. Système selon la revendication 1, comprenant en outre une troisième table relationnelle, dans lequel le contrôleur peut en outre être mis en oeuvre pour recevoir une première valeur de sortie de l'application, et une seconde valeur de sortie de l'application, et pour mettre en relation, dans une troisième table relationnelle, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la première valeur de sortie et la seconde valeur de sortie.

8. Système selon la revendication 7, dans lequel le contrôleur peut en outre être mis en oeuvre pour déterminer si la première valeur de sortie est égale à la seconde valeur de sortie.

9. Système selon la revendication 1, comprenant en outre une base de données (112), dans lequel la base de données comprend les première et seconde tables relationnelles.

10. Système selon la revendication 1, comprenant en outre une base de données (112), la base de données comprenant une troisième table relationnelle (126), où le contrôleur peut en outre être mis en oeuvre pour recevoir une valeur de sortie de l'application, et pour mettre en relation, dans la troisième table relationnelle, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la valeur de sortie.

11. Procédé destiné à tester une application, le procédé comprenant les étapes consistant à :

mettre en relation, dans une première structure

- de données (122), une pluralité d'identificateurs de modules avec une pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de tests et une pluralité d'identificateurs d'ordres,
mettre en relation, dans une seconde structure de données (124), la pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de tests avec une pluralité de valeurs d'entrée,
lire, à partir de la première structure de données, un identificateur de module qui correspond à un identificateur de cas de test de la pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de tests et un identificateur d'ordre de la pluralité d'identificateurs d'ordres qui sont mis en relation avec l'identificateur de cas de test,
exécuter un module (120) qui correspond à l'identificateur de module,
lire, par l'intermédiaire du module à partir de la seconde structure de données, une valeur d'entrée de la pluralité de valeurs d'entrée qui correspond à l'identificateur de cas de test, et procurer, par l'intermédiaire du module, la valeur d'entrée à une application.
12. Procédé selon la revendication 11, comprenant en outre les étapes consistant à recevoir une valeur de sortie de l'application, et mettre en relation, dans une troisième structure de données (126), l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la valeur de sortie.
13. Procédé selon la revendication 12, comprenant en outre l'étape consistant à mettre en relation, dans la troisième structure de données, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec une valeur de sortie attendue.
14. Procédé selon la revendication 13, comprenant en outre l'étape consistant à déterminer si la valeur de sortie attendue est égale à la valeur de sortie.
15. Procédé selon la revendication 11, comprenant en outre les étapes consistant à :
- recevoir une première valeur de sortie de l'application,
mettre en relation, dans une troisième structure de données (126), l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la première valeur de sortie,
recevoir une seconde valeur de sortie de l'application, et
mettre en relation, dans la troisième structure de données, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la seconde valeur de sortie.
16. Procédé selon la revendication 15, comprenant en outre l'étape consistant à déterminer si la première valeur de sortie est égale à la seconde valeur de sortie.
17. Procédé selon la revendication 11, dans lequel l'étape consistant à mettre en relation, dans la première structure de données, la pluralité d'identificateurs de modules comprend l'étape consistant à créer une table relationnelle dans une base de données (112).
18. Procédé selon la revendication 11, dans lequel l'étape consistant à mettre en relation, dans la seconde structure de données, la pluralité d'identificateurs de cas de tests comprend l'étape consistant à créer une table relationnelle dans une base de données.
19. Procédé selon la revendication 11, comprenant en outre les étapes consistant à recevoir une valeur de sortie de l'application, et à mettre en relation, dans la seconde structure de données, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la valeur de sortie.
20. Procédé selon la revendication 11, comprenant en outre les étapes consistant à :
- recevoir une première valeur de sortie de l'application,
mettre en relation, dans la seconde structure de données, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la première valeur de sortie,
recevoir une seconde valeur de sortie de l'application, et
mettre en relation, dans la seconde structure de données, l'identificateur de cas de test et l'identificateur de module avec la seconde valeur de sortie.
21. Programme informatique destiné à tester une application, le programme comprenant :
- un code de programme lisible par un ordinateur qui, lorsqu'il est exécuté sur un ordinateur, exécute le procédé selon l'une quelconque des revendications 11 à 20.




FIG. 1

112





FIG. 2

124




FIG. 3

106

TEST APPLICATION DATABASE		
TEST CASE	MODULE	RESULT
1	2	WELCOME
1	10	VALID ADDRESS
1	3	ALLSTATE
1	4	NO
2	2	WELCOME
2	10	INVALID ADDRESS
2	3	TITAN
2	4	YES

FIG. 4




FIG. 5