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**1. PROJECT DEFINITION**

**1.1 Introduction**

Meta Platforms, Inc., doing business as Meta and formerly named Facebook, Inc., and The Facebook, Inc., is an American multinational technology conglomerate based in Menlo Park, California. The company owns Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp, among other products and services.

## **1.2. Test Objectives**

The test objectives are to ensure that the application functionalities works as expected to ensure product quality, address defect detection and escalation. It will also prioritize defects and drive them to resolution.

The system should allow a user to login with email and password.

## **1.3 Scope of Testing**

The scope includes the following:

* Functional testing
* Black box testing
* Automated testing

## **1.4 Out of Scope**

* Performance testing
* Load and stress testing
* Regression testing and smoke testing
* Testing other apps owned by Meta

**2. TESTING APPROACH**

## **2.1 Test Case Design and Reviews**

* Test cases will be generated according to the scenarios a tester will define
* Tester is responsible for creating and updating Test Cases
* Tests review will be conducted by the RSSB - DF team in-charge for feedback purposes
* Test cases will be documented and stored in Excel sheet
* Each test case will track the following information: Test case ID, Summary, Precondition, Steps, Test Data, Environment, Expected Result, Actual Results, Status

**Project Browser Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OS** | **Browser** | **Browser version** | **Note** |
| Linux | Chrome | Version 109.0.5414.74 | Used for testing demo |
| Linux | Firefox | Latest Version | N/A |
| Linux | Internet Explorer | Current Version | N/A |

**2.2 Test Execution and Environments**

* **QA Environment:** The environment is live or an on-production application.
* NB: It’s not a best practice to test on a live product but I hope it will not cause any damage to the product.

## **2.3 Test Results**

Tester shall use the following status designations for test reporting:

* **Pass:** Actual results are the same as the expected results.
* **Fail:** Actual results differ from expected results
* **Blocked:** The test case could not be executed because of a bug or an undelivered system component
* **NA:** The test case was not executed or was deemed to be invalid. A test case could be deemed invalid if the expected results no longer represent the expected system behavior. In this case, the old test cases would be noted as retired and a new test case with updated expected results will be created.

**2.4 Test Data**

* Test data will be provided (valid and invalid credentials )

## **2.5 Defect Management**

* When finding the defect, tit should be filled in the excel sheet.
* QA should use the values/standards below:
  + **Title**: Component - Summary of the bug
  + **Description:** Details of the bug
  + **Severity:** The impact of an issue to the App
  + **Priority:** This field is reserved for program management/business (This is set by the business owner or the Development Team)
  + **Steps to reproduce:** They should be clear, concise, and include numbered steps
  + **Version:** The version of the application on which the bug was found
  + **Date:** The date on which the bug appeared
  + **Reported:** The person who filled the bug report
  + **Browser Type:** Affected Browser(s)
  + **Environment**: where tests took place
  + **Attachments:** Can be included in the initial entry or can be added after a bug is created
  + **Screenshots:** Including screenshots or an error message can be the key to solving the problem.

### **Definitions of Priority and Severity**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Priority** | **Definition** |
| High | Data loss, missing features, security violations, there is no work-around, cosmetic errors, spelling mistakes, typos, etc. |
| Medium | Functionality is missing, but there is a workaround if high profile users like management will be impacted. |
| Low | The feature is working, but not working exactly as expected. A less than normal amount of users\visibility may be impacted. Minor functional issues (sizing of columns, works on one browser but not on another version) |

Figure 1. Priority

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Severity** | **Definition** |
| No Impact | N\A |
| Low Impact. | There are cosmetic errors, spelling mistakes, typos, etc. Users are seeing minor issues, but are able to continue working. |
| Medium Impact | The feature is missing, but there is a workaround if high profile users like management will be impacted. Minor functional issues (It causes some undesirable behavior, but the system is still functional). |
| High impact | The feature is unusable, and there is no workaround, although other parts of the application may still have some functionality. |
| Critical | Data loss, missing a feature, security violation, there is no work-around |

Figure 2. Severity

## **2.6 Test Schedule**

Below is a list of milestones for which the tester will track actual dates vs. scheduled dates.  
FYI - data recorded in test schedule is only sample (Test cases are not full)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | **Log reason for schedule variance, if applicable** |
| Test Plan | 5th Feb 2023 | 5th Feb 2023 | Estimation of 90% of sample test cases. This will provide developed test cases titles into test cases for UI level |
| Login page test cases | 5th Feb 2023 | 5th Feb 2023 | 90% of all test cases have been written at this point based on the knowledge of the application. The number of test cases will increase during the execution of existing test cases and defects found. |
| Test Execution | 5th Feb 2023 | 5th Feb 2023 | 90% of all test cases should be executed |
| Test Report | 5th Feb 2023 | 5th Feb 2023 | The reporting will done according to the results and be shared to the QA Team. |

# **3. RISK & MITIGATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| RISK | MITIGATION |
| Testing an on-production | Hopefully the there will be no damage |

# **4. DEPENDENCIES & ASSUMPTIONS**

* N/A - in this case

# **5. DOCUMENT SIGN-OFF**

This plan for the quality control approach for the AMI platform has been reviewed by the following project team and stakeholders. The project team, by signing off on this statement of work, understands how QA depends upon the work output from the project team, has clarity with what the team can expect from QA, and concurs with the strategies set forth for performing the following functions:

* Covering the agreed-upon test cases QA identifies for testing
* Tracking & Reporting the execution of test cases
* Reporting & Tracking the discovery of defects

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Role/ Title** | **Names** | **Approval Status** | **Date** |
| Business Management | - | - | - |
| Dev Lead | - | - | - |
| Project Owner | - | - | - |
| QA Tester | Samuel BYIRINGIRO | Approved | 5th February 2023 |

# **6. APPENDIX**

## **6.1 Document Resources**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Document Name** | **Confluence Location/Link** | **Author/Contact** |
| Requirements document | N/A | N/A |
| Test Plan | Link to test case (will be provide) | Samuel BYIRINGIRO |
| Test Scripts | GitLab Link (to be shared) | Samuel BYIRINGIRO |
| Browser\_Matrix & OS | Chrome on Linux | Samuel BYIRINGIRO |

## **6.2 Entrance Criteria Matrix**

**N/A**

**6.3 Stage Entrance Criteria Matrix**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Status Yes/No** | **Author/Contact** |
| The project application is completed, result reviewed and signed-off | ☐Yes ☐ No | QA |
| The test environment has been sanity tested and fully operational with no major unresolved issues | Yes | QA |
| Test data has been identified and set up | Yes | QA |

**6.4 Exit Criteria Matrix**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Status Yes/No** | **Author/Contact** |
| Tester has achieved the level of test coverage outlined in the Test Plan | Yes | Samuel BYIRINGIRO |
| End-to-end testing has successfully completed | Yes | Samuel BYIRINGIRO |
| All known issues have been logged on excel sheet | N/A | Samuel BYIRINGIRO |