TPAC 2024

WebDriver and Test Automation, take 3

@rakuco, @JuhaVainio



WebDriver and Test Automation?

Test hardware-dependent APIs...

- Are the right sensor readings being reported?
- Is Device Motion data processed correctly?
- Can a certain posture be passed to the Device Posture API?
- How does the Compute Pressure API react to this CPU pressure reading?

... without actual hardware

- No hardware = more predictable, easier to integrate in CI workflows
- Tests should behave identically across browsers

Testing approaches

MojoJS

- o Replaces part of the API implementation with JS-based mocks
- o ✓ Easy to prototype web tests during API implementation phase
- Reduces test coverage of actual implementation
- Chromium-specific, not interoperable (see WPT's rfcs#172)

WebDriver

- Endpoints to control part of API behavior defined in the spec
- o Tests in WPT use endpoints via testdriver.js wrappers
- o ✓ Tests exercise larger parts of the implementation
- o <a>Interoperable approach
- o X Higher implementation cost
 - Spec, WPT, WebDriver, API implementation
 - Existing tests need to be rearchitected

Take 3?

- 2018: TPAC in Lyon, France
 - "14:00 WebDriver Extension API for Generic Sensor (preview) (PR, explainer, slides) - @rakuco & @Honry to lead"
 - The <u>spec PR</u> did land, but it was not implemented or used in WPT
- 2023: TPAC in Seville, Spain
 - WebDriver for Sensors, take 2
 - Update on changes to Generic Sensors spec and Chromium+WPT work
- 2024: Third time's the charm 🥕



- Generic Sensor changes have landed
- Scope expanded to other specs
- Lessons learned

WPT and DAS specs: TPAC 2023 vs TPAC 2024

2023

- Specs under heavy development lacked web tests
 Device Posture
- Other specs had tests in WPT but depended on MojoJS
 - Generic Sensors (WebDriver conversion in progress)
 - o Device Orientation and Motion
 - o Compute Pressure

2024

- Specs and web tests written/converted
 - o Device Posture
 - o Generic Sensors
 - o Device Orientation and Motion
 - o Compute Pressure (last patch under review)

General spec approach

- Main goal is to modify non-automated workflow as little as possible
 - o Store data (readings, override information etc) in top-level traversable
 - o Add "Update data/reading/override" WebDriver endpoint
 - Option 1: Trigger spec-specific "data has arrived steps"
 - Option 2: Store new fake data that will be used by existing "process data" steps later
 When processing data:
 - Check top-level traversable for fake data source and fake data, try to use them before trying real data/HW
- Hooking into top-level traversable allows using the same data for all navigables under it
 - o Also mimics real HW flow: all frames get the same readings
 - o **Note**: this concerns data *entering processing*, not data *reported to script*

Learnings and challenges

- WebDriver changes requires (re)thinking parts of the spec
 - o For DAS, it often means more precise specification of "data delivery/retrieval". Rewrites can be big.
 - Need to decide between set/clear override endpoints (e.g. <u>Device Posture</u>) and add/remove override + update readings (e.g. <u>Compute Pressure</u>). The former is simpler, the latter is required to simulate different conditions for the data source.
- testdriver.js limitations make writing some tests harder
 - o Functions can only be called from top-level browsing context: bad for workers and cross-origin iframes (see Compute Pressure hacks for workers here)
- Top-level navigables do not play well with shared workers
- Future work: take WebDriver BiDi into consideration
 - Even if BiDi capabilities are not required, tools like Puppeteer <u>can use BiDi</u> <u>endpoints instead of e.g. CDP</u>

Thank you

Alexis Menard, Arnaud Mandy, Juha Vainio, Kenneth Christiansen, Reilly Grant, Wanming Lin and so many others!