N   **CPE656TL-70**   Created by Corey 20 Oct 2015 03:05   🏷 **PeerReview**

Review Initial Draft For Test Plan

Look at this initial draft of the test plan, and please provide feedback about what is missing / any improvements that you see.

Priority: **Normal**
Type: **Task**
State: **Fixed**
Assignee: **Corey**
Subsystem: **No Subsystem**
Fix versions: **Unscheduled**
Affected versions: **Unknown**
Fixed in build: **Next Build**
Estimation: **?**

Updated by Corey 03 Nov 2015 14:26   📎

Comments (10)	History

Corey — 21 Oct 2015, 02:49

DEFECT: There are not any test cases for boundary conditions or for when failures happen. This is likely to be something that Dr. Kulick would immediately point out, since he's mentioned these things in the testing slides.

I suggest the following Test Cases:

[System Tests]
Bounds Checking for position coordinates
Reporting of an Unknown Track marker ID
Reporting of an Unknown train ID
Cannot Contact Train Controller
Cannot Save Train Information
Cannot Contact Navigation Tracking Rail Car

[Integration Tests]
Bounds Checking for Gyroscope Measurements
Bounds Checking for Accelerometer Measurements
No response from Motion Detection Unit
No response from Train Database
Error Connecting to Train Database
Error Reading or Writing to Train Database
Error Received From Motion Detection Unit

Error from Train Controller

No response from Train Controller

GUI Cannot Locate the Train Navigation Library

Error Received From Train Navigation Library

For Bounds Checking, the following types of checks would be performed:

negative values,

zero,

positive values,

maximum value,

maximum value +1,

minimum value,

minimum value-1

Corey — 21 Oct 2015, 02:50

DEFECT: The standard headers and versioning content, such as a table of contents and revision history need to be added.

Corey — 22 Oct 2015, 15:26

Here is a revised version with standard headers added, a references section added, and the details for error testing included.

Corey — 22 Oct 2015, 15:27

DEFECT: We need to have a traceability matrix from system tests to requirements.

Corey — 23 Oct 2015, 14:22

Rearranged a few sections and included an initial cut of the requirements traceability matrix. I can't think of anything else that he may want to see from this.

Rashad — 26 Oct 2015, 00:38

Is it more appropriate to call the Syntax section Glossary?

As far as testable features section I think we need to test the report of the position and geometry as well as test the display of this data and saving of it, but maybe that all falls under report?

Everything else looks good.

Corey — 26 Oct 2015, 01:44

Yeah we can rename it glossary to be consistent with the other documents. I just kept is Syntax since that's what the original test plan temp late had it as.

As far as your question for testing, yes. I was thinking that that would be covered with the report. I

specifically linked requirements for the display, and navigation library to make sure that our tests cover those things. If we end up doing something differently, then we can split it out into a different test at that point.

Do you think that the content is clear enough to describe that plan?

Corey — 26 Oct 2015, 14:08

Here are the final changes that I have made in preparing for this week's delivery: I added some additional text to the References section. I updated the Table of Contents. I addresssed Rashad 's concerns by renaming the Syntax section the Glossary. I also renamed the 'Test Train Position Estimation' Test Case to the 'Test Reporting of Train Position', since this more accurately describes the intent of the test case. I also confirmed that the requirements traceability matrix includes checking the UI for the reporting of Position. Geometry is like this as well. The Text of that Test Case 'Test Reporting of Track Geometry', already makes that clear.

Rashad — 30 Oct 2015, 02:44

Reviewed

Stephen — 01 Nov 2015, 23:10

Reviewed