

Critique-Software Testing documentation(SRS_DOC_2)

- Objectives of the Testing Doc is ill-defined and not explicitly mentioned. For example: Specifying that how the test results will be evaluated is not said, no plan on how to mitigate the risk, also, have not mentioned a plan to organise the activities and timescales.
- Acceptance testing and criteria for production are entirely missed in the doc. (mentioned it only once under broad overview but doesn't write anything about it) It is mentioned that the Testing team should quit but where to terminate the process and at what exact position is not mentioned in the doc.
- It just focuses on comprehensive features of the product and misses minute details like installation/uninstallation of on-device testing, Launching of application testing, exiting / forcefully stopping the web app testing,
- There is no testing of many test cases: one of the prevalent ones is that two users can not login simultaneously into the system.
- Post Condition of secondary storage testing is incorrect: It should not mention that recording is not found; it will just be that it would take more time now to load the videos from the secondary storage; it's not like it's lost or corrupted or not available at all.
- Database Testing is missed. Storing the user's password along with his/her username is a massive problem, but the test document throws no light on it.
- Google Account alternative to login is also missed.
- Item Pass/Fail Criteria is not mentioned clearly.
- Automated Testing is given in the Test Strategy but is nowhere explained. It seems that the person forgot or ran out of time while making the assignment.
- Security Testing involves minute structural testing of the database and how any algorithm should encrypt the table's passwords. But, the test doc throws no light on it.
- The document is a very high-level one; It gives some basic/crude testing of the software's significant features. It misses a lot of technical details regarding various things like Installation Testing, Compatibility testing, Interruption Testing.
- The criteria based on which the doc defines the risk is unknown or subjective. The document is not well displayed. There is no separate section for Test Deliverables, how to mitigate risk and contingencies.
- A lot of functional and non-functional features has not been tested at all in the document. There were a lot of functional features in SRS, but it has not been covered here.
- The document ends abruptly.