Testing on the IBM i



Introduction to Wim Jongman



ROPE

Wim Jongman, CTO of Remain Software

Dutchy from Haarlem 4 kids, one wife Nerd

REMAIN SOFTWARE

Remain Software specializes in delivering innovative and reliable solutions for application lifecycle management (ALM), change management, workflow, and DevOps. With 30 years of experience, we offer tools designed to streamline software development processes across various platforms, including IBM i, Windows, and Unix/Linux.

REMAIN SOFTWARE

TD/OMS, our flagship product, is a scalable and user-friendly ALM solution that supports software changes, development, deployment, and modernization projects. TD/OMS enables development teams to collaborate effectively and manage software components throughout different stages of development.

Happy DevOps teams use Remain Software

- IUnit Open Source Unit Testing
- TD/OMS Full Stack DevOps for IBM i
- Gravity Ticketing and Workflow System
- OpenAPI Studio REST Design and Generation
- OCTO DevOps for IBM i Modernization
- XREF Enterprise Source Cross Reference
- MiWorkplace Lightweight RDi Replacement
- X-Analysis Comprehensive Object Analytics
- ReplicTest Full Testing Software for IBM i



REMAIN SOFTWARE

- https://remainsoftware.com
- https://miworkplace.com
- https://github.com/remainsoftware
- https://github.com/i-unit/iunit

Testing in the Software Development Life Cycle



| | E EM. PROD | | |
|--|---------------|--|--|
| | Method | Peer Review | |
| | Objective | Ensure code quality, adherence to standards, and early detection of potential issues. | |
| | Scope | Code-level review by peers focusing on logic, readability, test coverage, and adherence to coding standards. | |
| | Tools | TD/OMS, Rdi, GitHub, GitLab, etc | |
| IBM. | Example | Reviewing a pull request for adherence to coding guidelines and ensuring edge | |
| REMAINSOFTVARE Embrace Change. Remain In Control. | | Cases are addressed. | |

| | PROD | |
|--|-----------|---|
| | Method | Unit Testing |
| | Objective | Verify that individual functions or components behave as expected. |
| | Scope | Smallest testable units, often automated. |
| | Tools | iUnit, iRPGUnit, Jest, JUnit, NUnit, etc |
| | Example | Ensuring a function calculating discounts works for all edge cases. |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTWARE Embrace Change. Remain In Control. | | |

| F | E IEM. PROD | |
|--|----------------|---|
| | Method | Integration Testing |
| | Objective | Ensure that different components/modules interact correctly. |
| | Scope | Multiple units combined, focusing on data flow and API integration. |
| | Tools | ReplicTest, iUnit with Curl, TestContainers, or custom integration tests. |
| | Example | Testing a frontend form with a backend API to validate end-to-end data processing. |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTVARE Embrace Change. Remain In Control. | | |

| | E IEM. PROD | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | Method | System Testing | |
| <u> </u> | Objective | Validate the entire system's behavior against requirements. | |
| | Scope | The whole application or system in a controlled environment. | |
| | Tools | ReplicTest, Selenium, Cypress, or manual testing. | - |
| | Example | Simulating user workflows like login, checkout, or user management. | |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTVARE | | | |

| | E IBM. PROD | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | Method | Regression Testing | |
| | Objective | Confirm that new changes haven't broken existing functionality. | |
| | Scope | Previously developed and tested features. | |
| | Tools | ReplicTest, iUnit, Automated regression test suites. | + |
| | Example | Running tests for all major workflows after adding a new feature. | |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTVARE | | | |

| E Contraction of the second se | TEM. PROD | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|
| | Method | Performance Testing | |
| | Objective | Assess speed, responsiveness, and stability under expected and stress conditions. | |
| | Scope | Application as a whole or specific bottlenecks. | |
| | Tools | JMeter, Gatling, or LoadRunner. | |
| · IBM. | Example | Checking response times under 1,000 concurrent users. | |
| REMAINSOFTWARE Embrace Change. Remain In Control. | | | |

| | E EN PROD | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|--|---|
| | Method | User Acceptance Testing | |
| | Objective | Validate that the feature meets business needs and is ready for end users. | |
| | Scope | New features and bug fixes | |
| | Tools | None typically (manual testing with stakeholders). | |
| | Example | Allowing a sample group to use the new feature and provide feedback. | |
| READY REMAINSOFTWARE | | REV REV REV REV REV REV REV REV | 6 |

| P | IBM. PROD | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | Method | Security Testing | |
| | Objective | Ensure the application is resistant to security threats. | |
| | Scope | Vulnerabilities, penetration testing, and compliance with security standards. | |
| | Tools | OWASP ZAP, Burp Suite, or manual ethical hacking. | X |
| IBM. | Example | Testing for SQL injection vulnerabilities in input fields. | |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTWARE | | | |

| P | IBM. ROD | |
|--|-------------|---|
| | Method | Usability Testing |
| - | Objective | Assess the feature's user experience and ease of use. |
| | Scope | Real-world scenarios with users. |
| | Tools | Observation and user testing tools. |
| IBM. | Example | Observing users navigating a new dashboard for confusion or inefficiency. |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTWARE Embrace Change. Remain In Control. | | |

| | E IBM. PROD | | |
|----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 4 | Method | Beta Testing | |
| - | Objective | Gather feedback from a broader user base in a near-production environment. | |
| | Scope | Feature released to selected users (internal or external) under real-world conditions. | |
| | Tools | Feature toggles and analytics tools. | |
| | Example | Releasing a new messaging feature to 5% of users. | |
| REMAINSOFTWARE | | EV EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX | |

| | V IBM. PROD | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---|
| | Method | Smoke Testing |
| | Objective | Quickly verify that the basic functionality works after deployment. |
| 5 | Scope | High-level, covering critical workflows. |
| | Tools | Manual or automated test scripts. |
| | Example | Checking that the login page loads and accepts credentials. |
| READY READY REMAINSOFTWAR | | |

| | E IBM. PROD | |
|--|----------------|--|
| | Method | Exploratory Testing |
| | Objective | Discover unexpected issues by exploring the system creatively. |
| 7 | Scope | Entire application, focusing on areas prone to errors. |
| | Tools | None typically (manual testing). |
| | Example | Manually testing edge cases or unusual workflows. |
| REMAINSOFTWARE Embrace Change. Remain In Control. | | |

| | E IBM. PROD | |
|----------------|----------------|---|
| | Method | Deployment Testing |
| | Objective | Confirm that the deployment didn't introduce issues in production. |
| 5 | Scope | Pre Production environment. |
| | Tools | TD/OMS |
| | Example | Verifying the live application and rolling back if critical errors occur. |
| REMAINSOFTWARE | | |

| P | IEM. | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|---|
| | Method | A/B Testing | |
| | Objective | Compare two versions of a feature to determine effectiveness. | - |
| | Scope | Limited rollout with monitoring tools. | |
| | Tools | None | |
| | Example | Testing two UI designs to see which performs better with users. | |
| REMAINSOFTWARE | | Reverse of the second s | |

| Method | Objective | Scope | Tools | Example |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Peer Review | Ensure code quality, adherence to standards, and early detection of potential issues. | Code-level review by peers focusing on logic, readability, test coverage, and adherence to coding standards. | GitHub, GitLab, Bitbucket | Reviewing a pull request for adherence to coding guidelines and ensuring edge cases are addressed. |
| Unit Testing | Verify that individual functions or components behave as expected. | Smallest testable units, often automated. | Jest, JUnit, NUnit, etc. | Ensuring a function calculating discounts works for all edge cases. |
| Integration Testing | Ensure that different components/modules interact correctly. | Multiple units combined, focusing on data flow and API integration. | Postman, TestContainers, or custom integration tests. | Testing a frontend form with a backend API to validate end-to-end data processing. |
| System Testing | Validate the entire system's behavior against requirements. | The whole application or system in a controlled environment. | Selenium, Cypress, or manual testing. | Simulating user workflows like login, checkout, or user management. |
| Regression Testing | Confirm that new changes haven't broken existing functionality. | Previously developed and tested features. | Automated regression test suites. | Running tests for all major workflows after adding a new feature. |
| Performance Testing | Assess speed, responsiveness, and stability under expected and stress conditions. | Application as a whole or specific bottlenecks. | JMeter, Gatling, or LoadRunner. | Checking response times under 1,000 concurrent users. |
| User Acceptance Testing (UAT) | Validate that the feature meets business needs and is ready for end users. | Real-world scenarios with business stakeholders or selected users. | None typically (manual testing with stakeholders). | Allowing a sample group to use the new feature and provide feedback. |
| Security Testing | Ensure the application is resistant to security threats. | Vulnerabilities, penetration testing, and compliance with security standards. | OWASP ZAP, Burp Suite, or manual ethical hacking. | Testing for SQL injection vulnerabilities in input fields. |
| Usability Testing | Assess the feature's user experience and ease of use. | Real-world scenarios with user personas. | Observation and user testing tools. | Observing users navigating a new dashboard for confusion or inefficiency. |
| Beta Testing | Gather feedback from a broader user base in a near-production environment. | Feature released to selected users (internal or external) under real-world conditions. | Feature toggles and analytics tools. | Releasing a new messaging feature to 5% of users. |
| Smoke Testing | Quickly verify that the basic functionality works after deployment. | High-level, covering critical workflows. | Manual or automated test scripts. | Checking that the login page loads and accepts credentials. |
| Exploratory Testing | Discover unexpected issues by exploring | Entire application, focusing on areas | None typically (manual testing) | Manually testing edge cases or unusual |

How many bugs reach production without testing?

Defect Density:

Industry averages suggest a defect density ranging from 1 to 5 bugs per KLOC.

KLOC = 1000 (1K) Lines Of Code.

Defect Detection Efficiency (DDE): Different testing methods have varying effectiveness in identifying defects. The DDE represents the percentage of total defects detected during a specific testing phase. While exact percentages can vary based on numerous factors, general industry observations provide the following approximate DDE values:

<u>Wikipedia</u>

- **1. Peer Review**: ~60%
- **2.** Unit Testing: ~30%
- **3. Integration Testing**: ~35%
- **4.** System Testing: ~40%
- 5. User Acceptance Testing (UAT): ~15%
- **6.** Beta Testing: ~10%





What are you testing?

The broken pipeline



The broken <u>PROGRAMMER</u> pipeline







REMAINSOFTWARE



What **<u>data</u>** are you testing with?

T=*f*(P,C,D)

Where:

- T: Test Result
- P: Changed Program
- C: Test Case
- D: Input Data provided during the test



Failures can be attributed to:

- 1. Change in the Program Logic (Regression): $T = f(P_{\Delta}, C, D)$
 - P_{Δ} represents a change in the program logic or version.
 - A regression in the program may result in a failure.
- 2. Change in the Data (New or Invalid Inputs): $T=f(P,C,D_{\Delta})$
 - D_{Δ} indicates that the input data has changed.
 - New or unexpected input data could lead to incorrect results.
- 3. Change or Error in the Test Case Logic: $T = f(P, C_{\Delta}, D)$
 - C_{Δ} reflects a change or error in the test case definition or expected outcome.
 - If the test case is incorrect, it might falsely indicate a failure.

- If your PROGRAM changes AND your DATA changes:
- Where is the issue?

Bottom line:

• Don't change your test data

Unit Testing



```
pgm parm(&num1 &operator &num2 &result)
```

```
dcl &num1 *dec (15 5)
dcl &operator *char (1)
dcl &num2 *dec (15 5)
dcl &result *dec (15 5)
if (&operator *eq '+') then(do)
   chgvar &result (&num1 + &num2)
   return
enddo
if (&operator *eq 'x') then(do)
   chgvar &result (&num1 + &num2)
   return
enddo
```

endpgm



Unit Testing rules

```
pgm
```

```
dcl &num1 *dec (15 5)
dcl &operator *char (1)
dcl &num2 *dec (15 5)
dcl &result *dec (15 5)
chgvar &num1 (5)
chgvar &num2 (10)
call calculator parm(&num1 '+' &num2 &result)
if (&result *ne 15) then(do)
SNDPGMMSG MSGID(CPF9898) +
MSGF(QCPFMSG) +
MSGTYPE(*ESCAPE) +
MSGDTA('Calc addition: Expected 15
but got ' *cat %char(&result))
enddo
```

endpgm

```
pgm
```

```
dcl &num1 *dec (15 5)
dcl &operator *char (1)
dcl &num2 *dec (15 5)
dcl &result *dec (15 5)
chgvar &num1 (5)
chgvar &num2 (10)
call calculator parm(&num1 'x' &num2 &result)
if (&result *ne 50) then(do)
SNDPGMMSG MSGID(CPF9898) +
MSGF(QCPFMSG) +
MSGTYPE(*ESCAPE) +
MSGDTA('Calc mulitply: Expected 50
but got ' *cat %char(&result))
enddo
```

endpgm

Unit Testing

Where do your business rules live?



Unit Testing

- Code according to MVC principles
 - Split Business Rules from UI
- Use Service Programs
- Code with modernization in mind



Peer Review

Integration Test





JEST, Junit, Etc..

Open Source Tools

| Tool | Use Case | Key Features |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Selenium | Web application testing | Cross-browser support, multi-language compatibility, record- and-playback with Selenium IDE. |
| JUnit | Unit testing (Java) | Annotations for test cases, integration with CI/CD tools, and detailed test reporting. |
| TestNG | Unit and integration testing | Parallel test execution, flexible test configurations, and data- driven testing capabilities. |
| Cypress | End-to-end web testing | Real-time reloads, time-travel debugging, and built-in test runner with assertions. |
| Appium | Mobile app testing | Cross-platform support (iOS, Android), testing for native, hybrid, and mobile web apps. |
| Postman | API testing | API design, testing, and documentation; automated testing with collections; mock server setup. |
| JMeter | Performance and load testing | Testing of web applications, databases, REST APIs; graphical interface for test plan creation. |
| Robot Framework | Acceptance testing | Keyword-driven testing, human-readable test cases, extensible with custom libraries. |
| Playwright | End-to-end web testing | Supports modern web browsers, parallel and cross-browser testing, auto-wait mechanism. |
| iUnit | Unit testing on IBM i systems | Lightweight framework for IBM i, supports CLLE programs, integrates with change management systems. |

| Commerc | ial T | ools |
|---------|-------|-------|
| | | ••••• |

| Tool | Description | Key Features | Website |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| ReplicTest | Automated end-to-end testing tool for IBM i applications, including 5250 green screens. | 5250 I/O encapsulation, web services support, automated database management, and code coverage analysis. | Polverini & Partners |
| TestBench | Comprehensive testing solution for IBM i applications. | Test data management, batch process testing, database testing, data masking, and rollback capabilities. | Original Software |
| X-Datatest | Data and test management solution for IBM i applications. | Test data anonymization, compliance with GDPR/HIPAA, code coverage reports, and development workflow integration. | Fresche Solutions |
| IBM Performance Tools for i | A suite of performance monitoring and analysis tools for IBM i systems. | Performance data collection, system health monitoring, and detailed reporting through IBM Navigator for i. | IBM Docs |