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# Purpose

The User Acceptance Testing (UAT) plan gives an overview of steps that YM Project Manager (PM) and Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology (SAGES) Project Manager will take to ensure that the Learning Management System (LMS) will deliver the capability that SAGES needs to meet their e-Learning business objectives. The outcome of UAT enables both parties to determine whether the final product satisfies the acceptance criteria or not. Thereby the client and YM will be able to make the decision to push the code to Production Environment or implement corrective action to resolve any defect.

## 1.1 Objectives of the Test Plan

The objective of this UAT Plan is to communicate to all stakeholders the detailed plan for developing UAT tests and the outline plan for running them. The goals are highlighted as follows:

* Highlights YM Education’s approach to formal testing of the LMS taking into consideration user experience, requirements specifications, and SAGES’s business rules.
* Define the scope of what will be tested.
* Estimate resource requirements – QA Testers, UAT Environment, UAT Timeline.
* Organise the activities and timescales.
* Define UAT deliverables.
* Specify how the testing results will be evaluated.
* Estimate the risks to testing plan and how to mitigate them.
* Present the entry and exit criteria to stakeholders.

## 1.2 Objectives of UAT

* Checking that the functionality that is delivered works in business scenarios.
* Checking that all functionality required for business scenarios has been delivered.
* Checking that the delivered functionality works to specification.
* Ensures that defects are reported and fixed as soon as possible.

## 

## 1.3 References

The following project documents are related to this test plan:

* SAGES Project Plan
* SAGES UAT Test Cases
* SAGES LMS Statement of Work (SOW)
  + LMS Content Specifications
  + Configuration and Branding
  + SAGES Approved Mock-Ups
  + Integration Use Cases
  + Main Navigation ‘Credits’ Tab Use Case

# 2. Test Items

## 2.1 Features and functionalities of the Learning Management System

|  |
| --- |
| Item to Test |
| Branding and Configuration:   * UI / UX * Dashboard Page * Administration Pages * Overall User Workflow |
| Integration & Data Exchange:   * SSO from netFORUM (via Auth0) to LMS * Shopping cart integration with netFORUM * User Enrollment and Completion “Status” updates from LMS to netFORUM * Grades/CEU push LMS to netFORUM * Credly Integration * YMCareers Integration * WebEx Event Center Integration |
| Content Setup:   * Course setup * Course Migration |
| Standard Modules   * Himalaya Test Engine – no customization * Survey Creation Tool – no customizations * LMS “Business Intelligence” Reporting Tool – no customizations |
| Customizations:   * “Credits” tab in main navigation linking to netFORUM CME records. * Integration/SSO User Parameters:   + ABIM# and DOB passing from netFORUM to LMS * Subdomain for production site: |

## 

## 2.2 Features Not to Be Tested

The following features will NOT be tested at this time, for the following reasons:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item NOT Being Tested | Business Scenarios NOT Being Tested | Reason |
| User Historical Completion Data | User sees previous completions of program items from the legacy system | Final load of active enrolment information to take place closer to production release. |

# UAT Approach

UAT Process Map



The UAT Process is in six steps as follows:

## 3.1 UAT Plan

a) UAT Scope

* End-to-end testing of the SAGES LMS Site will be conducted by YM QA team and SAGES UAT team.
* See Section 2.1 [“Test Items](#_2._Test_Items)” for more details

b) Create UAT Timescale

**UAT Timescale**

| **Action Item** | **Start Date** | **End Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| YM Internal UAT |  |  |
| YM Feature/Functionalities Adjustments |  |  |
| YM Conducts Training with SAGES |  |  |
| YM sends UAT Plan to SAGES |  |  |
| SAGES reviews UAT Plan, sends comment to YM |  |  |
| YM updates UAT Plan and sends it back to SAGES for approval |  |  |
| SAGES sends approved UAT Plan |  |  |
| SAGES Conducts UAT |  |  |
| UAT Incidence Report Meeting |  |  |
| YM Makes Changes to Product based on UAT Feedback |  |  |
| SAGES Reviews UAT Incident Issues and Approves Staging |  |  |

c) UAT Resources

* YM Project Team and QA Team
* SAGES PM Team, Content Project Owners, and IT

d) Identified UAT Risks

* UAT Major Defects will delay timeline for Portal Go Live
* End User Historical Completion Data not being tested at this time
* Program questions still need to be uploaded into the LMS

Before SAGES can proceeds to UAT, YM and SAGES will agree that the following criteria have been met:

* Testing plan has been approved by SAGES.
* YM & SAGES QA resources available in terms of People, Process and UAT environment.
* All the acceptance criteria and test cases have been developed and signed off by key stakeholders before the testing runs start.

e) Define Exit Criteria with key stakeholders.

* YM will confirm that the main functionalities are available according to the approved User Story and Acceptance Criteria.
* Defects that are classified as Severity 1 or 2 are important faults that must be cleared before YM can proceed to production.
* Defects categorized under Severity 3, and 4 should ideally be fixed if there are quick workarounds. YM Product team will decide the effect they will have if the system was to be pushed into production.
* YM PM will update UAT Test Case Tracker Log, and Action Items Log.
* The Test Summary Report will be signed by the client to mark the end of UAT.

## 3.2 Test Cases Development

Analyse Requirements: YM QA team has reviewed the key project activities and the Requirements specification agreed to in the Statement of Work (SOW).

**Develop Scenarios:** YM has developed use cases related to the integration and custom navigation “Credits” tab.

**Derive Acceptance Criteria:** YM has created Acceptance Criteria, within the use cases shared earlier. SAGES should use these to guide their testing and ensure the LMS meets their technical and business requirements.

**Create Test Cases** - Test Cases are the set of specific inputs and expected results which enable one or more Acceptance Criteria to be proved. YM has developed Test Cases based on the Requirements specification discussions agreed to in the Statement of Work (SOW).

## 3.3 Actual Testing Preparation

* **Prepare UAT environment to run the tests** - Making sure that YM QA team and SAGES QA team are aware of their responsibilities. A firm UAT process will be known by SAGES and YM. YM PM will confirm that the UAT environment will be available and for use throughout the UAT period.
* **Creating three key documents:**
  + [**Entry Criteria**](http://www.coleyconsulting.co.uk/testing-entry-criteria.htm) - What must be done before testing starts.
  + **UAT Test Cases:** Develop UAT test cases in alignment with SAGES requirement specifications document.
  + **Test Procedure** – Walk QA team through the instructions about how to run the tests on the test system.

## 3.4 Run Tests

The QA team runs the tests and records the results as follows:

* Running the tests involves using the input and expected results from the Test Cases and Acceptance Criteria to run them.
* Recording the results involves recording in the Test Case Tracker Log the activities that were completed, and the events that happened when the test was run. Any that have actual results that differ from the expected results have the information recorded. The issue severity is also decided at this point.

## 3.5 Review Test Results

YM PM will check how many UAT Issues have been reported, and their severity levels. The test results will then be checked to see what effect they have on:

* Features and Functionality
* Approved Requirements Specifications
* Business Rules or System Impact

This analysis enables a decision to be made about whether system passes these tests and to make recommendations about its use. The results of all this activity are then recorded in a **Test Case Document.**

## 3.6 Change Management

YM PM will coordinate an impact analysis session with the client to understand the effect any change will have on the system, project schedule, and cost. Corrective action will follow approved Change Control process.

# 4. Item Pass/Fail Decision Making Process

4.1 Evaluation Process:

Review UAT Incident Reporting Log for updates on issues that were found during UAT.

Exit Criteria for the following:

* Main functionality available.
* Important faults cleared.
* Other faults recorded.
* Documentation updated.
* Test Summary Report produced

## 4.2 Estimate Business Scenario and Impact

Analyse the incident, the effect it will have, the frequency of the impact on the business, and workaround that could be taken if the item was released with this open incident.

## 4.3 Make Acceptance or Rejection Decision

It is useful for both parties to understand that the objective of UAT is to make sure that the developed system is fit for purpose. This means it will satisfy the business objectives as described in the Requirements Specification Document. SAGES and YM will decide on corrective action based on the severity level of a defect.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Severity Level** | **Description** | **Accept** | **Suspend** |
| **1** | Critical Business Impact: Problems in certain areas | **If there is a workaround to reduce impact on the business** | **If there is no workaround** |
| **2** | Significant Business Impact: Key features with no workaround | **If there is a workaround to reduce impact on the business** | **If there is no workaround** |
| **3** | Some Business Impact: Important features not available but there is some workaround, but not a high risk | **If fix can be deferred to a future date** |  |
| **4** | Minimum Business Impact - visual, fields in the wrong place, left or right-hand placement, misspelt word, font size, color of the screen | **If fix can be deferred to a future date** |  |

# 5. Test Deliverables

Here is a list of what is produced during the testing process:

* UAT Plan - document that highlights the key activities in the UAT process.
* Test Designs - The UAT Acceptance Criteria.
* Test Cases - The values input and results expected from tests conducted.
* UAT Incident Report Logs – UAT Issue Tracker in TeamWork PM that will be visible to YM and SAGES for real-time updates.
* Test Summary Report - Summary of testing that will be signed by SAGES.

# 6. Roles and Responsibilities

YM Evaluation Team:

* YM Product Manager – Stephen German
* YM Business Analyst – Chris Hills
* YM PM – Jeff DeSimone
* YM QA Team
* Assigned Developer(s)

SAGES UAT Team

# 7. Risks and Contingencies

* UAT Major Defects will delay timeline for Portal Go Live
* End User Historical Completion Data not being tested at this time
* Program questions still need to be uploaded into the LMS
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# 9. Appendices

LMS Implementation UAT Test Cases

*Click Here*