Test Completion Report for Guru99 banking

# 1. Document Controls

## 1.1. Document Revision History

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Date** | **Author** | **Modification** | **Notes** |
| 1.0 | 21.03.2024 | Pricopie Adrian |  | Initial Version |
| 1.1 | 25.03.2024 | Pricopie Adrian | Add the systems that are going to be used |  |
| 1.2 | 31.03.2024 | Pricopie Adrian | Update number of test cases passed |  |
| 1.3 | 1.04.2024 | Pricopie Adrian | Update the number of closed defects | Final Version |

## 1.2. Distribution List

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Role |
| Andrew Madisson | QA Team Lead |
| Pricopie Adrian | QA Analyst |
| Michael Slater | QA Analyst |
| Antoine Benguella | Technical Analyst |
| Rany Chaveron | Business Analyst |
| Cristiana Styles | Software Development Lead |
| Mary Stuart | Software Engineer |
| Adrien Postowski | Project Manager |
| Cole Garfield | Product Owner |

# 2. Introduction

## 2.1. Project Description

The Guru99 Bank Online Banking System project is designed to revolutionize the banking experience for customers by providing a seamless and secure net banking facility. The primary goal is to enhance the overall customer experience, streamline the process of banking transactions, and alleviate the workload on front desk employees.

## 2.2. Objective

The objective of this test report is to show the status of the testing and quality targets at the completion of the project and to provide stakeholders with risk assessment data, which supports the decision to proceed with the release of the tested version of the script on the Go Live date of April 29th 2024.

# 3. Test Scope

## 3.1. Tests in scope (a.i. tests that were executed during the testing process)

The following table reflects the BR/TR traceability, and it contains only the requirement name (a.i. no BR description/FR technical details will be provided)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Requirement Document**  **BRD** | | **Functional Specification Document (Technical Requirements Document)**  **FRD** | |
| Business Requirement ID | Business Requirement Name | Functional Requirement Id | Functional Requirement Name |
| BR1 | New customer module | FR1 | Adding new customer with valid data |
|  |  | FR2 | Disallow future birth date |
|  |  | FR3 | Pin code length check |
|  |  | FR4 | Customer name validation |
|  |  | FR6 | Mandatory field check |
|  |  | FR7 | Numeric characters in city and state |
|  |  | FR8 | Special characters in customer name |
|  |  | FR9 | Special characters in Pin |
|  |  | FR10 | Invalid email address check |
|  |  | FR11 | Existing email prevetion |
|  |  | FR12 | First character restrictions |
|  |  | FR13 | Special characters in telephone number |
|  |  | FR14 | Email ID uniqueness check |
| BR2 | Edit customer module | FR15 | Error message for special characters in customer id |
|  |  | FR16 | Deletedd user check in customer ID |
|  |  | FR17 | Reset button functionality |
|  |  | FR18 | “No changes Made”Pop-up |
|  |  | FR19 | Password field functionality |
|  |  | FR20 | Manager editing customer data from edit customer section |
| BR3 | Delete customer module | FR21 | Customer deletion by manager |
|  |  | FR22 | Error message for special characters in customer id |
|  |  | FR23 | Clicking “reset”button resets values in “delete customer”form |
|  |  | FR24 | Error message for empty customer id |

## 3.2. Tests not in scope:

Non-functional testing like stress, performance is beyond the scope of this project.

Automation testing is beyond scope.

No QA support for mobile applications developed. Only web applications will be tested.

## 3.3 Additional Functionalities or Features Tested

There were no additional functions that were tested that were not originally in the plan to be tested.

# 4. Test Results

## 4.1 Test Execution Details

The following sprints were included in the product development process:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sprint Id** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | **Status** |
| S1 | 2024-01-01 | 2024-01-07 | COMPLETED |
| S2 | 2024-01-08 | 2024-01-15 | COMPLETED |
| S3 | 2024-01-16 | 2024-01-23 | COMPLETED |
| S4 | 2024-01-24 | 2024-01-31 | COMPLETED |
| S5 | 2024-02-01 | 2024-02-08 | COMPLETED |
| S6 | 2024-02-09 | 2024-02-16 | COMPLETED |
| S7 | 2024-02-17 | 2024-02-24 | COMPLETED |

## 4.2 Any variance to original test Plan

The first testing cycle was delayed by three days because the UAT environment setup was not ready. However, the timelines were adapted throughout the process and the project finished on time.

# 5. Quality of Software

## 5.1. Test Coverage and results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Test Cycles** | **Total Number of Test Cases** | **# of Test Cases Executed** | **# of Test Cases Passed** | **# of Test Cases Still Failed** |
| S1 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 10 |
| S2 | 30 | 30 | 22 | 8 |
| S3 | 30 | 30 | 26 | 4 |
| S4 | 30 | 30 | 26 | 4 |
| S5 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 3 |
| S6 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 3 |
| S7 | 30 | 30 | 28 | 2 |
| **Total # TCs** | 210 | 210 | 176 | 34 |

**Performance Test Results** **NA – No Performance testing was performed**

## 5.2 Defect Metrics – by Defect Type (throughout the project)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Defect in Phase** | **Severe** | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** | **Lowest** | **Total** |
| S1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | **1** | 10 |
| S2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | **1** | 1 | 8 |
| S3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| S4 | **1** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **4** |
| S5 | **0** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **3** |
| S6 | **0** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **3** |
| S7 | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **2** |

## 5.3. Exit Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Met/Not Met** |
| All planned test cases have been executed in Execution Tool | Met |
| All defects found have been recorded in the Defect Management Tool | Met |
| All Severity High defects have been resolved | Met |
| Test Summary Report (this document) issued to stakeholders | Met |
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# 6. Knowledge Maintenance

## 6.1. Best Practices Adopted & New Improvements Implemented

1. QA Team performed Peer review of Test Cases for each Sprint which helps in better test coverage.
2. QA team involved Development team to provide review comments on test cases.
3. QA team member is attending daily development scrum calls for seeking clarifications & inputs.
4. Communication improved by mitigating conflicts in the team.