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# 1.0 Documents

## 1.1 Document Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | <Enter document title> |
| Version: | <Enter version number> |
| Date: | <Enter date> |
| Electronic File Name: | <Enter electronic file name> |
| Electronic File Location: | <Enter electronic file location> |
| Author: | <Enter author> |

### 

### 1.2 Document Authorisation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Document Reviewers | | |
| Name | Role | Type# |
| Manish | Product Owner | <Insert type here> |

***# Mandatory, Information, Author Request, Reviewer***

#### 1.3 Document History

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document History | | | |
| Date | Version | Author | Description |
| 06/07/2021 | 0.1 | Liam, Natasha, Freddy | Test Plan first draft |

# 2.0 INTRODUCTION

## 2.1 PURPOSE:

The purpose of this test plan is to test the functionality of Press Play Video Store developed by the Engineering team in accordance with the requirements given.

### 2.2 OVERVIEW

This test plan will outline the scope, approach and the schedule of all testing activities for the Press Play Video Store. Both functional and non-functional tests will be utilised in this project to ensure that the testing process is thorough. Furthermore, this test plan will identify the features being tested, the type testing being performed, in addition, to the methods used and associated risks. The test methodology/strategy section will look more into how the tests will be performed and associated tools that will be beneficial to the overall progress of the testing process. Defects will be documented, manage and tracked. An overall defect report will be outlined in the test summary report.

#### 2.3 OBJECTIVES

The objective of this test plan is to create a formal document that details the sites compatibility with the user requirements. The plan is to be reviewed.

##### 2.4 SCOPE

The three main features provided by the engineering team include:

* Attractive front-end including animation.
* Three tiers of online users supported including:
  1. Guest – will require no credentials and can see the top 10 videos.
  2. Customer – needs credentials (username and password) and will view when video is to be returned and select video.
  3. Administrator – Add customers, manage titles and manage members of staff.

In order to be able to test these features we need to incorporate the following testing techniques:

* Functional Testing
  + High level requirement
* Non – Functional Testing
  + Performance testing, Load testing, Stress testing, Usability testing
* Cross – Browser & Device testing

Browsers to be tested on:

* Google Chrome
* Safari
* Firefox

Operating Systems to be tested on:

* Windows 10 OS
* Mac OS

###### 2.5 OUT OF SCOPE

The following requirements are deemed out of scope of this test plan for the Test Play Video Store.

* Testing will not be done on the following browsers Microsoft Edge, Opera and Internet Explorer.
* White box testing techniques such as statement coverage and decision coverage will not be conducted in this project.
* Payment related testing will not be conducted.
* Back-end SQL Database will not be tested.

# 3.0 TEST METHODOLOGY / STRATEGY

## 3.1 Approach

The designated strategy adapted by the team will be Kanplan. The foundation for the approach details a hybrid methodology that combines elements from both Scrum and Kanban, eradicating the needs for sprints but still making use of a backlog as well as integrating a Kanban board. As the project won’t be incremental Kanplan will work best within the confines of the project, while still making use of the backlog inherited from the dev team.

Although we decided on a hybrid approach, we will still be adhering to the roles within the Scrum framework and assigning the role of a Scrum Master who will be maintaining and championing the integrity of the project through the three pillars of scrum (Transparency, adaptation and inspection). The team will take part in daily stand-up meetings which are time-boxed to roughly 15 minutes to monitor progress and encourage communication. To ensure equal workload, the team were divided into functional testes and non-functional testers.

### 3.2 Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** | **Responsibility** |
| Tom Abbott | Scrum Master | Ensuring/maintaining the principles of scrum. |
| Manish | Product Owner | Prioritising items on the backlog. |
| -Ryan Shankar  -Freddy Eytle  -Natasha Chabata  -Amani Suleman  -Seb Jennings  -Liam Huetson  -Samuel Morris  -Anas Ellabbakh  -Jintu Baby  -Christopher Lee | Tester/s | Functional and non-functional testing of ‘Press Play Video Store’ |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group 1 – Non Functional** | **Group 2 – Functional** | **Group 3 – Functional** |
| Sam | Freddy | Ryan |
| Amani | Chris | Liam |
| Seb | Natasha | Anas |
| Jintu |  |  |

#### 3.3 Schedule

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Assigned Task** | **Task Completed** |
| 6/7/2021 | Morning Stand-up | Y |
| Delegate responsibilities | Y |
| Begin Test plan | Y |
| 7/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
| Complete Test Plan and have it reviewed |  |
| Create Gherkin syntax for current user stories |  |
| Templates for Test Case, Defect reports ready and available |  |
| Retrospective - 4:30pm |  |
| 8/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
| Update on availability of Software |  |
| Review all documents and confirm that there are completed |  |
| Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 9/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Begin Testing |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 10/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Ensure all documents are up to date |  |
|  | Begin Testing |  |
|  | Begin presentation |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 11/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Ensure all documents are up to date |  |
|  | Continue Testing |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 12/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Ensure all documents are up to date |  |
|  | Complete Testing |  |
|  | Review documents |  |
|  | Presentation Update |  |
|  | Complete defect summary report |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 13/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Review Test Plan ensure exit criteria has been met |  |
|  | Continue to work on presentation |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 14/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Complete and Review Presentation |  |
|  | Begin Presentation rehearsals |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 15/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Run through presentation |  |
|  | Implement any final changes to presentation |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |
| 16/7/2021 | Morning stand-up |  |
|  | Retrospective – 4:30pm |  |

#### 3.4 Test Environment

The press play video store will be the test environment. The tests will be conducted on different operating systems/web browsers.

# 4.0 Entry and Exit Criteria

## 4.1 Entry Criteria

* Following conditions need to be met before test execution.
* All the necessary documentation, design and requirement information should be available that will allow testers to operate the system and judge correct behaviour.
* All the testing tools must have been successfully installed and functioning properly.
* Approved test plan, test scenarios have been reviewed.
* Test environment available
* Dependencies may include Operating system and choice of browser.

### 4.2 Exit Criteria

* Planned tested have been executed.
* All defects found have been properly documented.

# 5.0 Tools

Jmeter

Lighthouse

Git Hub

JIRA

# 6.0 Test Deliverables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Date Submitted** | **Date Approved** |
| Test plan |  |  |
| Backlog |  |  |
| Test Conditions |  |  |
| Test Cases |  |  |
| Test Procedure |  |  |
| Defect Log |  |  |
| Test Summary Report |  |  |

# 7.0 RISKS

Notable risks within this project include:

Time

Version control

Remote working/ Internet issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** | **Severity** |
| Imminent | Critical |
| Highly Likely | High |
| Possible Chance | Medium |
| Minimal Chance | Low |
| Very Unlikely | Cosmetic |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Description** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Severity** | **Likelihood** |
| **Standard Testing Risks** | | | | | |
| 1 | Project documentation is not version controlled via the Change Management process | If Requirements documents are not kept up to date it will not be possible to verify that proposed tests exercise all requirements. Potentially this will lead to a sub-standard application being delivered to the Business | Project Team ensure documentation is version controlled and published to | Low | Minimal Chance |
| 2 | Turnaround time on critical and high defects is not acceptable against delivery timescales | Critical and high defects outstanding will be seen by end user if decision Is made to go live to scheduled date | Agree a turnaround time for critical and high defects with Development prior to execution starting. | Critical | Possible Chance |
| 3 | Test environment is not secluded to  use | Test data changes which will invalidate pre-defined test data, resulting in impact to timescale for test execution | Test environment to be provided for  for the period of test cycle by CCRM environment co-ordinator | High | Possible Chance |
| 4 | Test environment has code/configuration changes implemented without sign off from | Tests run are invalidated. Testing has to start again, impacting test execution timescale. | No environmental changes will take place on test environment without agreement by  and the CCRM environment co-ordinator. | High | Minimal Chance |
| 5 | Test environment downtime | Testing stops, deadlines may not be met | Will record & report downtimes to the Project Manager. Use of different, distinct environments and ensuring that new builds are not loaded directly onto a test environment without change control. Owned and co-ordinated by CCRM Environment Co-ordinator. | Medium | Possible Chance |
| 6 | Misunderstanding of  remit | Coverage of activities | Test Plan agreed and signed off by Project Manager before test build and execution begins. | Medium | Possible Chance |
| 7 | The Project Team doesn’t supply the team with any Risk Analysis priorities for requirements | High priority tests could be executed at the end of the test cycle | will make assumptions on risk and set priorities accordingly | Low | Minimal Chance |
| 8 | ST Exit criteria not met to enter UAT phase | System not proven to be in a position to start UAT. | UAT does not begin until UAT entry criteria has been met | High | Very Unlikely |
| 9 | Performance Testing needs to be performed against a stable and tested system, which is normally done at the end of testing | The current timescales reduce this dramatically. We may even need to begin performance before the final build has been delivered. We may need to repeat Performance testing if high severity defects found (this can add to the time taken) | To carry out performance testing against an environment which has had formal smoke test completed against after cycle 1 of system testing has been completed. | Low | Possible Chance |
| **Project Specific Risks** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Risks will be raised with the Project Manager, who will notify the project stakeholders via the project Risk Log. As all risks are project based and should be part of project standards, testing will not be keeping a separate risk log.