**1. Effectiveness:**

* How effective were our regression tests in detecting defects from previous releases?

Sebastian: As a (now) nonparticipant of regression testing I will not comment on how it reflects on previous regressions, except that more KT needs to be done as that I can partake in regression testing.   
From my end I think I would improve sharing the tester situation of what issues are active, this can help us find issues earlier and reduce the amount of extra work.  
   
  
David: I’m not sure what bugs we missed from earlier releases, in other words don’t know when the bugs were introduced in the SW.

Adam:

Sharos: Rarely have time to check already existing bugs before choosing test scope and thereby to have more chance to find new bugs.

Ahmed: Ok running existing scope, however there is always room for improvements in terms of effectiveness

Siva: Not sure, but last-minute potential blockers can be found at the earlier stage´(power modding)

Andreas: In the last few regressions we have missed some parts that could have been caught it we follow the planned sessions. I think we need to take the time to do the full drive sessions, at least for 1 day so we can get a good start to the regression.

Speed first few days of regression was good.

Deepthi: As discussed we need to do a longer drive sessions to improve on this

Nitya: Test coverage could be improved with a longer drive session, preparation area was good during RRB1.

Satya: Baseline related issues observed during regression and got fixed later.

Mahesh:  
I have faced Portal issues and QA portal was down (unable to access it).

During the regression test we found that VECU was sending park-brake error, after analyzing the issue from both software and hardware I identified the problem is with VECU software, after that we are able to perform the testing.

* Did the regression suite cover all critical areas of the application?

Sebastian: Building on the point made above, sharing the testing situation will make issues more obvious and it might help the regression period.  
  
David: I think the regression scope is good. It is hard to cover everything with test cases. I believe it is up to the verification engineer to go outside of the testcases and try to cover more ground for the verification, exploratory testing.

Adam:

Sharos: Not of course.

Ahmed: Major critical test covered to my knowledge, can still be improved

Siva: Covered test scope but some areas can be improved (long drive tests and Break scenarios)

Andreas: We are covering the critical areas but the way we are running them we can improve on, to combine and do a bit of “explorational testing” when running the test cases.

Deepthi: Coverage is good in critical areas, may be not all corner cases

Nitya: Covered most of the Scenarios During Regression, not all corner cases.

Satya: SE tool Smoke test testcases need to be improved with latest feature delivery to the market’s.

Mahesh: As I see still few test scenarios need to improve.

**2. Test Coverage:**

* Did we achieve the desired test coverage with our regression tests?

Sebastian: Pass, I guess.  
  
David: Yes, I believe so. It is like design, you can always polish a bit more but in the end you need to draw a line how big the coverage will be. Especially regarding the time it will take if we increase the test scope. Will it be worth it?

Adam:

Sharos: Desired test coverage mostly not the same as existing one.

Ahmed: Not so sure if the desired test coverage was achieved, time constrain can be an issue to do so

Siva: Yes (except long drive test scenarios)

Andreas: Generally yes, but we are lacking a bit on the “normal” usecase from a driver point of view so we are not getting the results from a full drive cycle.

Deepthi: yes, most of it is covered according to me

Nitya: yes (Except corner cases in RB3 and RB4)

Satya:

Mahesh:Yes,Mostly covered

* Were there any gaps in test coverage that resulted in issues slipping through?

Sebastian: Yes, which could have been prevented if better information sharing was done at an earlier point.  
  
David: Longer drives

Adam:

Sharos: Not that I know of, but never 100% of course.

Ahmed: Highly likely, longer drives were not carried out

Siva: Yes, for few parts and good to add power modding scenarios in regression scope

Andreas: We did not follow the full drive sessions planned, so we did not cover the case of “drive -> short rest(lunch) -> drive”, the issue we had a blocker for RB4 were found in this use case.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh:

**3. Defects:**

* Were there any common patterns or themes among the identified defects?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David:

Adam:

Sharos: No pattern but mostly RSWDL and SEM issues.

Ahmed: difficult to tell

Siva:

Andreas: Looking over a span of multiple releases there are not a specific part that sticks out. But in the last 2 releases there have been issues with the data that is sent on CAN from TGW, mostly affecting ISEE but in this release also other CAN data.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh:

4**. Test Data:**

* Were there any issues related to test data that affected the regression testing process?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: PC B1 to get BOS communication took time.

Adam:

Sharos: Not test data but unstable environment and too many credential issues, affect regression negatively.

Ahmed: There was major issues in RSWDL, BOS

Siva: Not related to test data, but might be BO/Support portal issues affected regression

Andreas: In RelD it was more than usual problems in PROD.

Deepthi: Had issues with portal especially in connection with RSWDL

Nitya: RSWDL, got wake up connectivity issue all most for 2 days.

Satya:

Mahesh:

* How well did our test data represent real-world scenarios and edge cases?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David:

Adam:

Sharos:

Ahmed: decent in covering real world scenarios

Siva:

Andreas: I think that we are good at covering the different part of the functionality but need a bit more data from the normal use case over a day. So to continue to build on the drive sessions.

Deepthi: Joint drive session was pretty good

Nitya: Adam supported a lot during the drive session

Satya:

Mahesh:

**5. Execution Time:**

* Did the regression tests complete within the expected time frame?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: Hmm, I think most, if not all, RBs took a little longer.

Adam:

Sharos: Yes and No.

Ahmed: No, took longer time than anticipated

Siva:

Andreas: No, except for the extra smoketest needed on RB4 we were taking longer time than the dealine set for each RB.

Deepthi: With the good collaboration, we could cover most part of the regression

Nitya: yes,( for VTRT Bridge)

Satya:

Mahesh : For smoke test needed a bit more time than the usual time.

* Were there any specific tests or areas that significantly contributed to the overall test execution time?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: BOS communication for PC B1

Adam:

Sharos:

Ahmed:

Siva: RSWDL

Andreas: There were more issues on RSWDL this time around with everything taking a long time from BOS. I also think we are getting stuck in specific test cases and are stuck there for long time, its better to report that specific test case as “test enviroment issue” or similar and move on. (Note that we cannot do this for all cases but for some...)

Deepthi: yes, mainly Remote SW Download. Lots of time wasteed on the consistency check when we lacked the VDA prod access

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh: RSWDL is one the main area,

**6. Collaboration:**

* How well did the collaboration between development and testing teams work during the regression cycle?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: Didn’t have any communication during regression with dev teams.

Adam:

Sharos:Rarely have communication, but when needed was ok.

Ahmed: No collaboration on my side

Siva: Developers are joined for joint test session which reduced feedback time and able to find the root cause in the same session

Andreas: Collaboration was good between the dev team and test team. I think we get good and quick feedback during the regression.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya: Good collaboration during regression

Mahesh: Didn’t have any communication during regression with dev teams.

* Were there any communication gaps or challenges in resolving issues collaboratively?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: No

Adam:

Sharos: Not seen this time.

Ahmed: No

Siva: No, We were able to reproduce SEM-TGW communication issue by performing join tests with EACS

Andreas: This release was good, no real gaps.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh:NO

**7. Environment Stability:**

* Were there any issues related to the stability and consistency of the test environments?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: It felt like a lot of applications were moving slow, maybe not for long time but it added extra time. For example PROTOM, RSWDL, slow internet.

Adam:

Sharos: RSWDL environment.

Ahmed:

Siva: Back office issues

Andreas: RelD had more issues that normal regarding RSWDL in PROD enviroment. Other than that it was OK.

Deepthi: Mainly BOS issues and also missing HW parts in the support bag

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh: I faced Connectivity issues with BOS.

* How can we improve the setup and management of test environments for future regression cycles?

Sebastian: Pass

David: Do all in PROD and let us have VDA PROD edit access.

Adam:

Sharos: Don’t start testing before all environment related ready.

Ahmed:

Siva:

Andreas: I think we should focus on doing everything possible in PROD for the regressions, because if we are having issues with the enviroment it would be the same for the customer. Only use QA where needed (RIGS mostly)

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya: Regression plan does not clear with NAT bridge there is no RB3 story related to NAT Bridge

Mahesh:

**8. Process Improvements:**

* What process improvements can be implemented to streamline the regression testing cycle?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: Joint drive testing where we have a lot of data and then analyze.

Not do one test case at a time, rather do some bulk testing and try to cover several test cases in the same “go”

Adam:

Sharos: Decrease credential issues, check if everything tested ok before us.

Ahmed:

Siva: Joint tests in truck. We were able to finish Rb5/4 (PC24/PCE4/PC23) with in two days.

Andreas: More join tests, continue to improve on the drive sessions and prioritize them.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh:

* Are there any lessons learned that can be applied to future regression cycles?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: Longer drive sessions.

Adam:

Sharos:

Ahmed:

Siva: Joint tests can be planned , Regression checklist can be prepared.

Andreas: Similar to mentioned earlier, some of the issues that we are not catching now we would have if we used a “full” drive session. We might need a bit more time out on road during the regression. Preferably joint testing.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh:

**9. Feedback Loop:**

* How effectively did the team provide feedback on test results and identified issues?

Sebastian: As I am working more in a support role, sharing information about test status could help kick start a positive feedback loop in the group, this needs to be worked on.  
  
David: I think the team provides good feedback when something is found.

Adam:

Sharos: short detail of probl/sol in standup can be done without increasing time too much,

Ahmed:

Siva:

Andreas: I think this works rather well, just remember in regression if we find issues we need to create the PIL/BUG on the same day to not cause delays.

Deepthi:

Nitya:

Satya:

Mahesh:

* Were there any delays in addressing and resolving issues identified during regression testing?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David:

Adam:

Sharos: Not this time.

Ahmed:

Siva: Yes. (BOS, Portal issues)

Andreas:

Deepthi: yes

Nitya:

Satya: FOL portal issues during regression

Mahesh:

**10. Training and Skill Development:**

* Were there any knowledge gaps or skill deficiencies that impacted the regression testing process?

Sebastian: Pass  
  
David: Yes, still learning a lot. Could make the testing faster with more knowledge and skills.

Adam:

Sharos: Not this time.

Ahmed:

Siva: As this is my first regression cycle, I feel lot needs to be learnt from my side specially to debug the issues which we observed during regression and need more hands-on RSWDL.

Andreas: I think we need to spend bit more time reading the loggs and especially taking loggs for when running into issues. Examples being connectivity and RSWDL.

Deepthi: Analyzing the logs and some knowledge to find the root cause

Nitya:

Satya: To simulate the real use cases need to understand the OCP arch.

Mahesh:

* How can we facilitate ongoing training and skill development for the team?

Sebastian: Better and more KT sessions, splitting up work so we do not centralize knowledge inside the group at some individuals.  
  
David: Have shorter KT sessions but more often. Have spontanoues KT sessions for whole team when team member have question of something.

Adam:

Sharos: Share probl/sol somewhere maybe in confluence.

Ahmed:

Siva: More KT sessions

Andreas: I think using the KT sessions that have been done, go back and look at them, we also have some fault tracing trainings.

Deepthi: More KT sessions

Nitya: KT sessions are helpful to understand day to day work, would like to have more

Satya: KT sessions are good learnt a lot with OCP KT sessions excepting more like this

Mahesh: