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**Introduction**

This document is based on the test plan and the test specification and it is specifically dedicated to the OQ for JBA\_v.1.1.0.0. It was set-up as a template by the test analyst, reviewed and approved respectively by the Tester and the QA as they are responsible to review and approve the finalised OQ.

**Purpose**

This document should allow to track and verify the activities of the tester. It is conceived as check list in order to guide and support the tester while performing the automated test. In addition, as the verification of the glue code does not include a classical OQ testing, some steps to allow glue code verification are also included here.

**Feature Files**

* All feature files are ‘Reviewed’, ‘Approved’ and ‘Ready for OQ’.
* The last digital signature for approval of each feature file is valid (last line of the feature file history).[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Correct ‘Sig. Version’ (compared to Test Specifications: Doc\_JBA\_v.1.1.0\_TS\_OQ)

**Glue Code Review (2nd Review)[[2]](#footnote-2)**

* The installed glue code version corresponds to the JBA version (IQ Review)
* The changes in the glue code compared to version 1.0.0 only uses Selenium methods to control the test automation (directly or indirectly by calling another StepDef method)
* Selenium actions which a human tester would not perform in the same way, were not found in the glue code. For example the function *webDriver().navigate().refresh();* should only be found for steps to control or establish the prerequisites or when a tester would also be asked to refresh a page, e.g. after saving.
* The changes in the glue code compared to version 1.0.0 only uses hamcreast matcherassert methods in order to compare the result with the expected results to make a test step passed or failed
* The changes in the glue code compared to version 1.0.0 do not use the rest api to the backend.
* No StepDef method is empty (only to be checked for the changed parts in the glue code).
* If given:
  + Interfaces to peripheral systems are only used for assertions. The JBA function under test must be triggered using the UI by Selenium

**OQ Test App Set-up**

* IQs of the OQ Test App (incl. the glue code) were successfully performed
* Successful integration of the feature file and the glue code into the OQ Test App
* Successful dry run with test ID ...... :
  + All feature files were run
  + All scenarios were performed
  + All steps gave a result (either passed or failed)

**Test Execution**

Test ID: ......

Test Date: .....

Starting Time: .....

Observations: No unexpected observations. The full test set run smoothly.

**Appendix**

* Test Results Folder as zip

**Tester**

I confirm the careful execution of the above-mentioned activities. The automated tests have been carried out correctly and diligently to the best of my knowledge and conscience.

Place, Date Name Signature

**Reviewed**

Place, Date Name Signature

**Approved**

Place, Date Name Signature

1. From the moment on that the feature files are approved as FS initial version, they will be developed and maintained in parallel with the JBA code. In order to go live: the approved TS that is ready for OQ and digitally signed will be committed and pushed with the commit comment “Approved and Ready for OQ”. It will be released together with the glue code and the JBA code with the same release version number. In order to assure, that it has not been changed during that process the tester needs to verify the digital signature. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The glue code and the JBA code are developed and maintained in parallel, meaning they have the same release version and are submitted to the same code reviews process. The foreseen code review by the tester is therefore the second code review. One could also look at it as an approval. Glue Code needs special care, as there are no OQs that could be performed on it. IQ of the glue code is done in parallel and always on the same version as for the JBA IQ. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)