

Certified Tester

Foundation Level Syllabus

Version 2018 V3.1

International Software Testing Qualifications Board



Copyright Notice

This document may be copied in its entirety, or extracts made, if the source is acknowledged.

Copyright Notice © International Software Testing Qualifications Board (hereinafter called ISTQB®)
ISTQB® is a registered trademark of the International Software Testing Qualifications Board.

Copyright © 2019 the authors for the update 2018 V3.1 Klaus Olsen (chair), Meile Posthuma and Stephanie Ulrich.

Copyright © 2018 the authors for the update 2018 Klaus Olsen (chair), Tauhida Parveen (vice chair), Rex Black (project manager), Debra Friedenberg, Matthias Hamburg, Judy McKay, Meile Posthuma, Hans Schaefer, Radoslaw Smilgin, Mike Smith, Steve Toms, Stephanie Ulrich, Marie Walsh, and Eshraka Zakaria.

Copyright © 2011 the authors for the update 2011 Thomas Müller (chair), Debra Friedenberg, and the ISTQB® WG Foundation Level.

Copyright © 2010 the authors for the update 2010 Thomas Müller (chair), Armin Beer, Martin Klonk, and Rahul Verma.

Copyright © 2007 the authors for the update 2007 Thomas Müller (chair), Dorothy Graham, Debra Friedenberg and Erik van Veenendaal.

Copyright © 2005, the authors Thomas Müller (chair), Rex Black, Sigrid Eldh, Dorothy Graham, Klaus Olsen, Maaret Pyhäjärvi, Geoff Thompson, and Erik van Veenendaal.

All rights reserved.

The authors hereby transfer the copyright to the International Software Testing Qualifications Board (ISTQB®). The authors (as current copyright holders) and ISTQB® (as the future copyright holder) have agreed to the following conditions of use:

Any individual or training company may use this syllabus as the basis for a training course if the authors and the ISTQB® are acknowledged as the source and copyright owners of the syllabus and provided that any advertisement of such a training course may mention the syllabus only after official accreditation of the training materials has been received from an ISTQB® recognized Member Board.

Any individual or group of individuals may use this syllabus as the basis for articles, books, or other derivative writings if the authors and the ISTQB® are acknowledged as the source and copyright owners of the syllabus.

Any ISTQB-recognized Member Board may translate this syllabus and license the syllabus (or its translation) to other parties.

Revision History

Version	Date	Remarks
ISTQB® 2018 V3.1	11-November-2019	Certified Tester Foundation Level Syllabus Maintenance Release with minor updates – see Release Notes
ISTQB® 2018	27-April-2018	Candidate general release version
ISTQB® 2011	1-Apr-2011	Certified Tester Foundation Level Syllabus Maintenance Release – see Release Notes
ISTQB® 2010	30-Mar-2010	Certified Tester Foundation Level Syllabus Maintenance Release – see Release Notes
ISTQB® 2007	01-May-2007	Certified Tester Foundation Level Syllabus Maintenance Release
ISTQB® 2005	01-July-2005	Certified Tester Foundation Level Syllabus
ASQF V2.2	July-2003	ASQF Syllabus Foundation Level Version 2.2 “Lehrplan Grundlagen des Software-testens”
ISEB V2.0	25-Feb-1999	ISEB Software Testing Foundation Syllabus V2.0

Table of Contents

Copyright Notice	2
Revision History	4
Table of Contents	5
Acknowledgements	8
0 Introduction	10
0.1 Purpose of this Syllabus	10
0.2 The Certified Tester Foundation Level in Software Testing	10
0.3 Examinable Learning Objectives and Cognitive Levels of Knowledge	11
0.4 The Foundation Level Certificate Exam	11
0.5 Accreditation	11
0.6 Level of Detail	12
0.7 How this Syllabus is Organized	12
1 Fundamentals of Testing	13
1.1 What is Testing?	14
1.1.1 Typical Objectives of Testing	14
1.1.2 Testing and Debugging	15
1.2 Why is Testing Necessary?	15
1.2.1 Testing's Contributions to Success	15
1.2.2 Quality Assurance and Testing	16
1.2.3 Errors, Defects, and Failures	16
1.2.4 Defects, Root Causes and Effects	17
1.3 Seven Testing Principles	17
1.4 Test Process	18
1.4.1 Test Process in Context	18
1.4.2 Test Activities and Tasks	19
1.4.3 Test Work Products	23
1.4.4 Traceability between the Test Basis and Test Work Products	25
1.5 The Psychology of Testing	26
1.5.1 Human Psychology and Testing	26
1.5.2 Tester's and Developer's Mindsets	26
2 Testing Throughout the Software Development Lifecycle	28
2.1 Software Development Lifecycle Models	29
2.1.1 Software Development and Software Testing	29
2.1.2 Software Development Lifecycle Models in Context	30
2.2 Test Levels	31
2.2.1 Component Testing	32
2.2.2 Integration Testing	33
2.2.3 System Testing	35
2.2.4 Acceptance Testing	37
2.3 Test Types	40
2.3.1 Functional Testing	40
2.3.2 Non-functional Testing	41
2.3.3 White-box Testing	41
2.3.4 Change-related Testing	42
2.3.5 Test Types and Test Levels	42
2.4 Maintenance Testing	43
2.4.1 Triggers for Maintenance	44

2.4.2	Impact Analysis for Maintenance	44
3	Static Testing.....	46
3.1	Static Testing Basics	47
3.1.1	Work Products that Can Be Examined by Static Testing	47
3.1.2	Benefits of Static Testing.....	47
3.1.3	Differences between Static and Dynamic Testing	48
3.2	Review Process	49
3.2.1	Work Product Review Process.....	49
3.2.2	Roles and responsibilities in a formal review	50
3.2.3	Review Types.....	51
3.2.4	Applying Review Techniques	53
3.2.5	Success Factors for Reviews	54
4	Test Techniques.....	56
4.1	Categories of Test Techniques.....	57
4.1.1	Categories of Test Techniques and Their Characteristics	57
4.2	Black-box Test Techniques	58
4.2.1	Equivalence Partitioning	58
4.2.2	Boundary Value Analysis	59
4.2.3	Decision Table Testing.....	59
4.2.4	State Transition Testing	60
4.2.5	Use Case Testing.....	60
4.3	White-box Test Techniques	61
4.3.1	Statement Testing and Coverage.....	61
4.3.2	Decision Testing and Coverage	61
4.3.3	The Value of Statement and Decision Testing	61
4.4	Experience-based Test Techniques	62
4.4.1	Error Guessing	62
4.4.2	Exploratory Testing	62
4.4.3	Checklist-based Testing	62
5	Test Management	63
5.1	Test Organization	64
5.1.1	Independent Testing.....	64
5.1.2	Tasks of a Test Manager and Tester	65
5.2	Test Planning and Estimation	67
5.2.1	Purpose and Content of a Test Plan	67
5.2.2	Test Strategy and Test Approach.....	67
5.2.3	Entry Criteria and Exit Criteria (Definition of Ready and Definition of Done)	68
5.2.4	Test Execution Schedule.....	69
5.2.5	Factors Influencing the Test Effort	69
5.2.6	Test Estimation Techniques	70
5.3	Test Monitoring and Control	71
5.3.1	Metrics Used in Testing.....	71
5.3.2	Purposes, Contents, and Audiences for Test Reports	72
5.4	Configuration Management	73
5.5	Risks and Testing	73
5.5.1	Definition of Risk	73
5.5.2	Product and Project Risks	73
5.5.3	Risk-based Testing and Product Quality	75
5.6	Defect Management	76
6	Tool Support for Testing.....	78
6.1	Test Tool Considerations.....	79

6.1.1	Test Tool Classification	79
6.1.2	Benefits and Risks of Test Automation	80
6.1.3	Special Considerations for Test Execution and Test Management Tools	81
6.2	Effective Use of Tools	82
6.2.1	Main Principles for Tool Selection	82
6.2.2	Pilot Projects for Introducing a Tool into an Organization	83
6.2.3	Success Factors for Tools	83
7	References	84
	Standards	84
	ISTQB® documents	84
	Books and Articles	85
	Other Resources (not directly referenced in this Syllabus)	85
8	Appendix A – Syllabus Background	86
	History of this Document	86
	Objectives of the Foundation Certificate Qualification	86
	Objectives of the International Qualification	86
	Entry Requirements for this Qualification	87
	Background and History of the Foundation Certificate in Software Testing	87
9	Appendix B – Learning Objectives/Cognitive Level of Knowledge	88
	Level 1: Remember (K1)	88
	Level 2: Understand (K2)	88
	Level 3: Apply (K3)	88
10	Appendix C – Release Notes	89
11	Index	90

Acknowledgements

This document was formally released by the General Assembly of the ISTQB® (11 November 2019).

It was produced by a team from the International Software Testing Qualifications Board: Klaus Olsen (chair), Meile Posthuma and Stephanie Ulrich.

The team thanks the Member Boards for their review comments related to the Foundation Syllabus 2018.

The Foundation Syllabus 2018 was produced by a team from the International Software Testing Qualifications Board: Klaus Olsen (chair), Tauhida Parveen (vice chair), Rex Black (project manager), Debra Friedenber, Judy McKay, Meile Posthuma, Hans Schaefer, Radoslaw Smilgin, Mike Smith, Steve Toms, Stephanie Ulrich, Marie Walsh, and Eshraka Zakaria.

The team thanks Rex Black and Dorothy Graham for their technical editing, and the review team, the cross-review team, and the Member Boards for their suggestions and input.

The following persons participated in the reviewing, commenting and balloting of this syllabus: Tom Adams, Tobias Ahlgren, Xu Aiguo, Chris Van Bael, Katalin Balla, Graham Bath, Gualtiero Bazzana, Arne Becher, Veronica Belcher, Lars Hilmar Bjørstrup, Ralf Bongard, Armin Born, Robert Bornelind, Mette Bruhn-Pedersen, Geza Bujdosó, Earl Burba, Filipe Carlos, Young Jae Choi, Greg Collina, Alessandro Collino, Cui Zhe, Taz Daughtrey, Matthias Daigl, Wim Decoutere, Frans Dijkman, Klaudia Dussa-Zieger, Yonit Elbaz, Ofer Feldman, Mark Fewster, Florian Fieber, David Frei, Debra Friedenber, Conrad Fujimoto, Pooja Gautam, Thorsten Geiselhart, Chen Geng, Christian Alexander Graf, Dorothy Graham, Michel Grandjean, Richard Green, Attila Gyuri, Jon Hagar, Kobi Halperin, Matthias Hamburg, Zsolt Hargitai, Satoshi Hasegawa, Berit Hatten, Wang Hongwei, Tamás Horváth, Leanne Howard, Chinthaka Indikadahena, J. Jayapradeep, Kari Kakkonen, Gábor Kapros, Beata Karpinska, Karl Kemminger, Kwanho Kim, Seonjoon Kim, Cecilia Kjellman, Johan Klintin, Corne Kruger, Gerard Kruijff, Peter Kunit, Hyeyong Kwon, Bruno Legeard, Thomas Letzkus, Alon Linetzki, Balder Lingegård, Tilo Linz, Hongbiao Liu, Claire Lohr, Ine Lutterman, Marek Majernik, Rik Marselis, Romanos Matthaïos, Judy McKay, Fergus McLachlan, Dénes Medzihradzsky, Stefan Merkel, Armin Metzger, Don Mills, Gary Mogyoródi, Ninna Morin, Ingvar Nordström, Adam Novak, Avi Ofer, Magnus C Ohlsson, Joel Oliviera, Monika Stocklein Olsen, Kenji Onishi, Francisca Cano Ortiz, Gitte Ottosen, Tuula Pääkkönen, Ana Paiva, Tal Pe'er, Helmut Pichler, Michaël Pilaeten, Horst Pohlmann, Andrew Pollner, Meile Posthuma, Vitalijs Puiso, Salvatore Reale, Stuart Reid, Ralf Reissing, Shark Ren, Miroslav Renda, Randy Rice, Adam Roman, Jan Sabak, Hans Schaefer, Ina Schieferdecker, Franz Schiller, Jianxiong Shen, Klaus Skafte, Mike Smith, Cristina Sobrero, Marco Sogliani, Murian Song, Emilio Soresi, Helder Sousa, Michael Sowers, Michael Stahl, Lucjan Stapp, Li Suyuan, Toby Thompson, Steve Toms, Sagi Traybel, Sabine Uhde, Stephanie Ulrich, Philippos Vakalakis, Erik van Veenendaal, Marianne Vesterdal, Ernst von Düring, Salinda Wickramasinghe, Marie Walsh, Søren Wassard, Hans Weiberg, Paul Weymouth, Hyungjin Yoon, John Young, Surong Yuan, Ester Zabar, and Karolina Zmitrowicz.

International Software Testing Qualifications Board Working Group Foundation Level (Edition 2018): Klaus Olsen (chair), Tauhida Parveen (vice chair), Rex Black (project manager), Dani Almog, Debra Friedenber, Rashed Karim, Johan Klintin, Vipul Kocher, Corne Kruger, Sunny Kwon, Judy McKay, Thomas Müller, Igal Levi, Ebbe Munk, Kenji Onishi, Meile Posthuma, Eric Riou du Cosquer, Hans Schaefer, Radoslaw Smilgin, Mike Smith, Steve Toms, Stephanie Ulrich, Marie Walsh, Eshraka Zakaria, and Stevan Zivanovic. The core team thanks the review team and all Member Boards for their suggestions.

International Software Testing Qualifications Board Working Group Foundation Level (Edition 2011): Thomas Müller (chair), Debra Friedenber. The core team thanks the review team (Dan Almog, Armin

Beer, Rex Black, Julie Gardiner, Judy McKay, Tuula Pääkkönen, Eric Riou du Cosquier Hans Schaefer, Stephanie Ulrich, Erik van Veenendaal), and all Member Boards for their suggestions.

International Software Testing Qualifications Board Working Group Foundation Level (Edition 2010): Thomas Müller (chair), Rahul Verma, Martin Klonk and Armin Beer. The core team thanks the review team (Rex Black, Mette Bruhn-Pederson, Debra Friedenberg, Klaus Olsen, Judy McKay, Tuula Pääkkönen, Meile Posthuma, Hans Schaefer, Stephanie Ulrich, Pete Williams, Erik van Veenendaal), and all Member Boards for their suggestions.

International Software Testing Qualifications Board Working Group Foundation Level (Edition 2007): Thomas Müller (chair), Dorothy Graham, Debra Friedenberg, and Erik van Veenendaal. The core team thanks the review team (Hans Schaefer, Stephanie Ulrich, Meile Posthuma, Anders Pettersson, and Wonil Kwon) and all the Member Boards for their suggestions.

International Software Testing Qualifications Board Working Group Foundation Level (Edition 2005): Thomas Müller (chair), Rex Black, Sigrid Eldh, Dorothy Graham, Klaus Olsen, Maaret Pyhäjärvi, Geoff Thompson and Erik van Veenendaal. The core team thanks the review team and all Member Boards for their suggestions.

0 Introduction

0.1 Purpose of this Syllabus

This syllabus forms the basis for the International Software Testing Qualification at the Foundation Level. The ISTQB® provides this syllabus as follows:

1. To member boards, to translate into their local language and to accredit training providers. Member boards may adapt the syllabus to their particular language needs and add references to adapt to their local publications.
2. To certification bodies, to derive examination questions in their local language adapted to the learning objectives for this syllabus.
3. To training providers, to produce courseware and determine appropriate teaching methods.
4. To certification candidates, to prepare for the certification exam (either as part of a training course or independently).
5. To the international software and systems engineering community, to advance the profession of software and systems testing, and as a basis for books and articles.

The ISTQB® may allow other entities to use this syllabus for other purposes, provided they seek and obtain prior written permission from the ISTQB®.

0.2 The Certified Tester Foundation Level in Software Testing

The Foundation Level qualification is aimed at anyone involved in software testing. This includes people in roles such as testers, test analysts, test engineers, test consultants, test managers, user acceptance testers, and software developers. This Foundation Level qualification is also appropriate for anyone who wants a basic understanding of software testing, such as product owners, project managers, quality managers, software development managers, business analysts, IT directors and management consultants. Holders of the Foundation Certificate will be able to go on to higher-level software testing certifications.

The ISTQB® Foundation Level Overview 2018 is a separate document which is still valid for this Foundation Syllabus 2018 V3.1 and includes the following information:

- Business outcomes for the syllabus
- Matrix showing traceability between business outcomes and learning objectives
- Summary of this syllabus

0.3 Examinable Learning Objectives and Cognitive Levels of Knowledge

Learning objectives support the business outcomes and are used to create the Certified Tester Foundation Level exams.

In general, all contents of this syllabus are examinable at a K1 level, except for the Introduction and Appendices. That is, the candidate may be asked to recognize, remember, or recall a keyword or concept mentioned in any of the six chapters. The knowledge levels of the specific learning objectives are shown at the beginning of each chapter, and classified as follows:

- K1: remember
- K2: understand
- K3: apply

Further details and examples of learning objectives are given in Appendix B.

The definitions of all terms listed as keywords just below chapter headings shall be remembered (K1), even if not explicitly mentioned in the learning objectives.

0.4 The Foundation Level Certificate Exam

The Foundation Level Certificate exam will be based on this syllabus. Answers to exam questions may require the use of material based on more than one section of this syllabus. All sections of the syllabus are examinable, except for the Introduction and Appendices. Standards, books, and other ISTQB® syllabi are included as references, but their content is not examinable, beyond what is summarized in this syllabus itself from such standards, books, and other ISTQB® syllabi.

The format of the exam is multiple choice. There are 40 questions. To pass the exam, at least 65% of the questions (i.e., 26 questions) must be answered correctly.

Exams may be taken as part of an accredited training course or taken independently (e.g., at an exam center or in a public exam). Completion of an accredited training course is not a pre-requisite for the exam.

0.5 Accreditation

An ISTQB® Member Board may accredit training providers whose course material follows this syllabus. Training providers should obtain accreditation guidelines from the Member Board or body that performs the accreditation. An accredited course is recognized as conforming to this syllabus, and is allowed to have an ISTQB® exam as part of the course.

0.6 Level of Detail

The level of detail in this syllabus allows internationally consistent courses and exams. In order to achieve this goal, the syllabus consists of:

- General instructional objectives describing the intention of the Foundation Level
- A list of terms that students must be able to recall
- Learning objectives for each knowledge area, describing the cognitive learning outcome to be achieved
- A description of the key concepts, including references to sources such as accepted literature and standards

The syllabus content is not a description of the entire knowledge area of software testing; it reflects the level of detail to be covered in Foundation Level training courses. It focuses on test concepts and techniques that can apply to all software projects, including Agile projects. This syllabus does not contain any specific learning objectives related to any particular software development lifecycle or method, but it does discuss how these concepts apply in Agile projects, other types of iterative and incremental lifecycles, and in sequential lifecycles.

0.7 How this Syllabus is Organized

There are six chapters with examinable content. The top-level heading for each chapter specifies the time for the chapter; timing is not provided below chapter level. For accredited training courses, the syllabus requires a minimum of 16.75 hours of instruction, distributed across the six chapters as follows:

- Chapter 1: 175 minutes Fundamentals of Testing
- Chapter 2: 100 minutes Testing Throughout the Software Development Lifecycle
- Chapter 3: 135 minutes Static Testing
- Chapter 4: 330 minutes Test Techniques
- Chapter 5: 225 minutes Test Management
- Chapter 6: 40 minutes Tool Support for Testing

1 Fundamentals of Testing

175 minutes

Keywords

coverage, debugging, defect, error, failure, quality, quality assurance, root cause, test analysis, test basis, test case, test completion, test condition, test control, test data, test design, test execution, test implementation, test monitoring, test object, test objective, test oracle, test planning, test procedure, test process, test suite, testing, testware, traceability, validation, verification

Learning Objectives for Fundamentals of Testing:

1.1 What is Testing?

FL-1.1.1 (K1) Identify typical objectives of testing

FL-1.1.2 (K2) Differentiate testing from debugging

1.2 Why is Testing Necessary?

FL-1.2.1 (K2) Give examples of why testing is necessary

FL-1.2.2 (K2) Describe the relationship between testing and quality assurance and give examples of how testing contributes to higher quality

FL-1.2.3 (K2) Distinguish between error, defect, and failure

FL-1.2.4 (K2) Distinguish between the root cause of a defect and its effects

1.3 Seven Testing Principles

FL-1.3.1 (K2) Explain the seven testing principles

1.4 Test Process

FL-1.4.1 (K2) Explain the impact of context on the test process

FL-1.4.2 (K2) Describe the test activities and respective tasks within the test process

FL-1.4.3 (K2) Differentiate the work products that support the test process

FL-1.4.4 (K2) Explain the value of maintaining traceability between the test basis and test work products

1.5 The Psychology of Testing

FL-1.5.1 (K1) Identify the psychological factors that influence the success of testing

FL-1.5.2 (K2) Explain the difference between the mindset required for test activities and the mindset required for development activities

1.1 What is Testing?

Software systems are an integral part of life, from business applications (e.g., banking) to consumer products (e.g., cars). Most people have had an experience with software that did not work as expected. Software that does not work correctly can lead to many problems, including loss of money, time, or business reputation, and even injury or death. Software testing is a way to assess the quality of the software and to **reduce the risk** of software failure in operation.

A common misperception of testing is that it only consists of running tests, i.e., executing the software and checking the results. As described in section 1.4, software testing is a process which includes many different activities; test execution (including checking of results) is only one of these activities. The test process also includes activities such as test planning, analyzing, designing, and implementing tests, reporting test progress and results, and evaluating the quality of a test object.

Some testing does involve the execution of the component or system being tested; such testing is called dynamic testing. Other testing does not involve the execution of the component or system being tested; such testing is called static testing. So, testing also includes reviewing work products such as requirements, user stories, and source code.

Another common misperception of testing is that it focuses entirely on verification of requirements, user stories, or other specifications. While testing does involve checking whether the system meets specified requirements, it also involves validation, which is checking whether the system will meet user and other stakeholder needs in its operational environment(s).

Test activities are organized and carried out differently in different lifecycles (see section 2.1).

1.1.1 Typical Objectives of Testing

For any given project, the objectives of testing may include:

- To prevent defects by evaluate work products such as requirements, user stories, design, and code
- To verify whether all specified requirements have been fulfilled
- To check whether the test object is complete and validate if it works as the users and other stakeholders expect
- To build confidence in the level of quality of the test object
- To find defects and failures thus reduce the level of risk of inadequate software quality
- To provide sufficient information to stakeholders to allow them to make informed decisions, especially regarding the level of quality of the test object
- To comply with contractual, legal, or regulatory requirements or standards, and/or to verify the test object's compliance with such requirements or standards

The objectives of testing can vary, depending upon the context of the component or system being tested, the test level, and the software development lifecycle model. These differences may include, for example:

- During component testing, one objective may be to find as many failures as possible so that the underlying defects are identified and fixed early. Another objective may be to increase code coverage of the component tests.

- During acceptance testing, one objective may be to confirm that the system works as expected and satisfies requirements. Another objective of this testing may be to give information to stakeholders about the risk of releasing the system at a given time.

1.1.2 Testing and Debugging

Testing and debugging are different. Executing tests can show failures that are caused by defects in the software. Debugging is the development activity that finds, analyzes, and fixes such defects. Subsequent confirmation testing checks whether the fixes resolved the defects. In some cases, testers are responsible for the initial test and the final confirmation test, while developers do the debugging, associated component and component integration testing (continuous integration). However, in Agile development and in some other software development lifecycles, testers may be involved in debugging and component testing.

ISO standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-1) has further information about software testing concepts.

1.2 Why is Testing Necessary?

Rigorous testing of components and systems, and their associated documentation, can help reduce the risk of failures occurring during operation. When defects are detected, and subsequently fixed, this contributes to the quality of the components or systems. In addition, software testing may also be required to meet contractual or legal requirements or industry-specific standards.

1.2.1 Testing's Contributions to Success

Throughout the history of computing, it is quite common for software and systems to be delivered into operation and, due to the presence of defects, to subsequently cause failures or otherwise not meet the stakeholders' needs. However, using appropriate test techniques can reduce the frequency of such problematic deliveries, when those techniques are applied with the appropriate level of test expertise, in the appropriate test levels, and at the appropriate points in the software development lifecycle. Examples include:

- Having testers involved in requirements reviews or user story refinement could detect defects in these work products. The identification and removal of requirements defects reduces the risk of incorrect or untestable features being developed.
- Having testers work closely with system designers while the system is being designed can increase each party's understanding of the design and how to test it. This increased understanding can reduce the risk of fundamental design defects and enable tests to be identified at an early stage.
- Having testers work closely with developers while the code is under development can increase each party's understanding of the code and how to test it. This increased understanding can reduce the risk of defects within the code and the tests.
- Having testers verify and validate the software prior to release can detect failures that might otherwise have been missed, and support the process of removing the defects that caused the failures (i.e., debugging). This increases the likelihood that the software meets stakeholder needs and satisfies requirements.

In addition to these examples, the achievement of defined test objectives (see section 1.1.1) contributes to overall software development and maintenance success.

1.2.2 Quality Assurance and Testing

While people often use the phrase *quality assurance* (or just QA) to refer to testing, quality assurance and testing are not the same, but they are related. A larger concept, quality management, ties them together. Quality management includes all activities that direct and control an organization with regard to quality. Among other activities, quality management includes both quality assurance and quality control. Quality assurance is typically focused on adherence to proper processes, in order to provide confidence that the appropriate levels of quality will be achieved. When processes are carried out properly, the work products created by those processes are generally of higher quality, which contributes to defect prevention. In addition, the use of root cause analysis to detect and remove the causes of defects, along with the proper application of the findings of retrospective meetings to improve processes, are important for effective quality assurance.

Quality control involves various activities, including test activities, that support the achievement of appropriate levels of quality. Test activities are part of the overall software development or maintenance process. Since quality assurance is concerned with the proper execution of the entire process, quality assurance supports proper testing. As described in sections 1.1.1 and 1.2.1, testing contributes to the achievement of quality in a variety of ways.

1.2.3 Errors, Defects, and Failures

A person can make an error (mistake), which can lead to the introduction of a defect (fault or bug) in the software code or in some other related work product. An error that leads to the introduction of a defect in one work product can trigger an error that leads to the introduction of a defect in a related work product. For example, a requirements elicitation error can lead to a requirements defect, which then results in a programming error that leads to a defect in the code.

If a defect in the code is executed, this may cause a failure, but not necessarily in all circumstances. For example, some defects require very specific inputs or preconditions to trigger a failure, which may occur rarely or never.

Errors may occur for many reasons, such as:

- Time pressure
- Human fallibility
- Inexperienced or insufficiently skilled project participants
- Miscommunication between project participants, including miscommunication about requirements and design
- Complexity of the code, design, architecture, the underlying problem to be solved, and/or the technologies used
- Misunderstandings about intra-system and inter-system interfaces, especially when such intra-system and inter-system interactions are large in number
- New, unfamiliar technologies

In addition to failures caused due to defects in the code, failures can also be caused by environmental conditions. For example, radiation, electromagnetic fields, and pollution can cause defects in firmware or influence the execution of software by changing hardware conditions.

Not all unexpected test results are failures. False positives may occur due to errors in the way tests were executed, or due to defects in the test data, the test environment, or other testware, or for other reasons. The inverse situation can also occur, where similar errors or defects lead to false negatives. False negatives are tests that do not detect defects that they should have detected; false positives are reported as defects, but aren't actually defects.

1.2.4 Defects, Root Causes and Effects

The root causes of defects are the earliest actions or conditions that contributed to creating the defects. Defects can be analyzed to identify their root causes, so as to reduce the occurrence of similar defects in the future. By focusing on the most significant root causes, root cause analysis can lead to process improvements that prevent a significant number of future defects from being introduced.

For example, suppose incorrect interest payments, due to a single line of incorrect code, result in customer complaints. The defective code was written for a user story which was ambiguous, due to the product owner's misunderstanding of how to calculate interest. If a large percentage of defects exist in interest calculations, and these defects have their root cause in similar misunderstandings, the product owners could be trained in the topic of interest calculations to reduce such defects in the future.

In this example, the customer complaints are effects. The incorrect interest payments are failures. The improper calculation in the code is a defect, and it resulted from the original defect, the ambiguity in the user story. The root cause of the original defect was a lack of knowledge on the part of the product owner, which resulted in the product owner making an error while writing the user story. The process of root cause analysis is discussed in ISTQB-CTEL-TM and ISTQB-CTEL-ITP.

1.3 Seven Testing Principles

A number of testing principles have been suggested over the past 50 years and offer general guidelines common for all testing.

1. Testing shows the presence of defects, not their absence

Testing can show that defects are present, but cannot prove that there are no defects. Testing reduces the probability of undiscovered defects remaining in the software but, even if no defects are found, testing is not a proof of correctness.

2. Exhaustive testing is impossible

Testing everything (all combinations of inputs and preconditions) is not feasible except for trivial cases. Rather than attempting to test exhaustively, risk analysis, test techniques, and priorities should be used to focus test efforts.

3. Early testing saves time and money

To find defects early, both static and dynamic test activities should be started as early as possible in the software development lifecycle. Early testing is sometimes referred to as *shift left*. Testing early in the software development lifecycle helps reduce or eliminate costly changes (see section 3.1).

4. Defects cluster together

A small number of modules usually contains most of the defects discovered during pre-release testing, or is responsible for most of the operational failures. Predicted defect clusters, and the actual observed defect clusters in test or operation, are an important input into a risk analysis used to focus the test effort (as mentioned in principle 2).

5. Beware of the pesticide paradox

If the same tests are repeated over and over again, eventually these tests no longer find any new defects. To detect new defects, existing tests and test data may need changing, and new tests may need to be written. (Tests are no longer effective at finding defects, just as pesticides are no longer effective at killing insects after a while.) In some cases, such as automated regression testing, the pesticide paradox has a beneficial outcome, which is the relatively low number of regression defects.

6. Testing is context dependent

Testing is done differently in different contexts. For example, safety-critical industrial control software is tested differently from an e-commerce mobile app. As another example, testing in an Agile project is done differently than testing in a sequential software development lifecycle project (see section 2.1).

7. Absence-of-errors is a fallacy

Some organizations expect that testers can run all possible tests and find all possible defects, but principles 2 and 1, respectively, tell us that this is impossible. Further, it is a fallacy (i.e., a mistaken belief) to expect that just finding and fixing a large number of defects will ensure the success of a system. For example, thoroughly testing all specified requirements and fixing all defects found could still produce a system that is difficult to use, that does not fulfill the users' needs and expectations, or that is inferior compared to other competing systems.

See Myers 2011, Kaner 2002, Weinberg 2008, and Beizer 1990 for examples of these and other testing principles.

1.4 Test Process

There is no one universal software test process, but there are common sets of test activities without which testing will be less likely to achieve its established objectives. These sets of test activities are a test process. The proper, specific software test process in any given situation depends on many factors. Which test activities are involved in this test process, how these activities are implemented, and when these activities occur may be discussed in an organization's test strategy.

1.4.1 Test Process in Context

Contextual factors that influence the test process for an organization, include, but are not limited to:

- Software development lifecycle model and project methodologies being used
- Test levels and test types being considered
- Product and project risks
- Business domain
- Operational constraints, including but not limited to:
 - Budgets and resources
 - Timescales
 - Complexity
 - Contractual and regulatory requirements
- Organizational policies and practices
- Required internal and external standards

The following sections describe general aspects of organizational test processes in terms of the following:

- Test activities and tasks
- Test work products
- Traceability between the test basis and test work products

It is very useful if the test basis (for any level or type of testing that is being considered) has measurable coverage criteria defined. The coverage criteria can act effectively as key performance indicators (KPIs) to drive the activities that demonstrate achievement of software test objectives (see section 1.1.1).

For example, for a mobile application, the test basis may include a list of requirements and a list of supported mobile devices. Each requirement is an element of the test basis. Each supported device is also an element of the test basis. The coverage criteria may require at least one test case for each element of the test basis. Once executed, the results of these tests tell stakeholders whether specified requirements are fulfilled and whether failures were observed on supported devices.

ISO standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-2) has further information about test processes.

1.4.2 Test Activities and Tasks

A test process consists of the following main groups of activities:

- Test planning
- Test monitoring and control
- Test analysis
- Test design
- Test implementation
- Test execution
- Test completion

Each main group of activities is composed of constituent activities, which will be described in the subsections below. Each constituent activity consists of multiple individual tasks, which would vary from one project or release to another.

Further, although many of these main activity groups may appear logically sequential, they are often implemented iteratively. For example, Agile development involves small iterations of software design, build, and test that happen on a continuous basis, supported by on-going planning. So test activities are also happening on an iterative, continuous basis within this software development approach. Even in sequential software development, the stepped logical sequence of main groups of activities will involve overlap, combination, concurrency, or omission, so tailoring these main groups of activities within the context of the system and the project is usually required.

Test planning

Test planning involves activities that define the objectives of testing and the approach for meeting test objectives within constraints imposed by the context (e.g., specifying suitable test techniques and tasks, and formulating a test schedule for meeting a deadline). Test plans may be revisited based on feedback from monitoring and control activities. Test planning is further explained in section 5.2.

Test monitoring and control

Test monitoring involves the on-going comparison of actual progress against planned progress using any test monitoring metrics defined in the test plan. Test control involves taking actions necessary to meet the objectives of the test plan (which may be updated over time). Test monitoring and control are supported by the evaluation of exit criteria, which are referred to as the definition of done in some software development lifecycle models (see ISTQB-CTFL-AT). For example, the evaluation of exit criteria for test execution as part of a given test level may include:

- Checking test results and logs against specified coverage criteria
- Assessing the level of component or system quality based on test results and logs
- Determining if more tests are needed (e.g., if tests originally intended to achieve a certain level of product risk coverage failed to do so, requiring additional tests to be written and executed)

Test progress against the plan is communicated to stakeholders in test progress reports, including deviations from the plan and information to support any decision to stop testing.

Test monitoring and control are further explained in section 5.3.

Test analysis

During test analysis, the test basis is analyzed to identify testable features and define associated test conditions. In other words, test analysis determines “what to test” in terms of measurable coverage criteria.

Test analysis includes the following major activities:

- Analyzing the test basis appropriate to the test level being considered, for example:
 - Requirement specifications, such as business requirements, functional requirements, system requirements, user stories, epics, use cases, or similar work products that specify desired functional and non-functional component or system behavior
 - Design and implementation information, such as system or software architecture diagrams or documents, design specifications, call flow graphs, modelling diagrams (e.g., UML or entity-relationship diagrams), interface specifications, or similar work products that specify component or system structure
 - The implementation of the component or system itself, including code, database metadata and queries, and interfaces
 - Risk analysis reports, which may consider functional, non-functional, and structural aspects of the component or system
- Evaluating the test basis and test items to identify defects of various types, such as:
 - Ambiguities
 - Omissions
 - Inconsistencies
 - Inaccuracies
 - Contradictions
 - Superfluous statements

- Identifying features and sets of features to be tested
- Defining and prioritizing test conditions for each feature based on analysis of the test basis, and considering functional, non-functional, and structural characteristics, other business and technical factors, and levels of risks
- Capturing bi-directional traceability between each element of the test basis and the associated test conditions (see sections 1.4.3 and 1.4.4)

The application of black-box, white-box, and experience-based test techniques can be useful in the process of test analysis (see chapter 4) to reduce the likelihood of omitting important test conditions and to define more precise and accurate test conditions.

In some cases, test analysis produces test conditions which are to be used as test objectives in test charters. Test charters are typical work products in some types of experience-based testing (see section 4.4.2). When these test objectives are traceable to the test basis, coverage achieved during such experience-based testing can be measured.

The identification of defects during test analysis is an important potential benefit, especially where no other review process is being used and/or the test process is closely connected with the review process. Such test analysis activities not only verify whether the requirements are consistent, properly expressed, and complete, but also validate whether the requirements properly capture customer, user, and other stakeholder needs. For example, techniques such as behavior driven development (BDD) and acceptance test driven development (ATDD), which involve generating test conditions and test cases from user stories and acceptance criteria prior to coding. These techniques also verify, validate, and detect defects in the user stories and acceptance criteria (see ISTQB-CTFL-AT).

Test design

During test design, the test conditions are elaborated into high-level test cases, sets of high-level test cases, and other testware. So, test analysis answers the question “what to test?” while test design answers the question “how to test?”

Test design includes the following major activities:

- Designing and prioritizing test cases and sets of test cases
- Identifying necessary test data to support test conditions and test cases
- Designing the test environment and identifying any required infrastructure and tools
- Capturing bi-directional traceability between the test basis, test conditions, and test cases (see section 1.4.4)

The elaboration of test conditions into test cases and sets of test cases during test design often involves using test techniques (see chapter 4).

As with test analysis, test design may also result in the identification of similar types of defects in the test basis. Also, as with test analysis, the identification of defects during test design is an important potential benefit.

Test implementation

During test implementation, the testware necessary for test execution is created and/or completed, including sequencing the test cases into test procedures. So, test design answers the question “how to test?” while test implementation answers the question “do we now have everything in place to run the tests?”

Test implementation includes the following major activities:

- Developing and prioritizing test procedures, and, potentially, creating automated test scripts
- Creating test suites from the test procedures and (if any) automated test scripts
- Arranging the test suites within a test execution schedule in a way that results in efficient test execution (see section 5.2.4)
- Building the test environment (including, potentially, test harnesses, service virtualization, simulators, and other infrastructure items) and verifying that everything needed has been set up correctly
- Preparing test data and ensuring it is properly loaded in the test environment
- Verifying and updating bi-directional traceability between the test basis, test conditions, test cases, test procedures, and test suites (see section 1.4.4)

Test design and test implementation tasks are often combined.

In exploratory testing and other types of experience-based testing, test design and implementation may occur, and may be documented, as part of test execution. Exploratory testing may be based on test charters (produced as part of test analysis), and exploratory tests are executed immediately as they are designed and implemented (see section 4.4.2).

Test execution

During test execution, test suites are run in accordance with the test execution schedule.

Test execution includes the following major activities:

- Recording the IDs and versions of the test item(s) or test object, test tool(s), and testware
- Executing tests either manually or by using test execution tools
- Comparing actual results with expected results
- Analyzing anomalies to establish their likely causes (e.g., failures may occur due to defects in the code, but false positives also may occur (see section 1.2.3)
- Reporting defects based on the failures observed (see section 5.6)
- Logging the outcome of test execution (e.g., pass, fail, blocked)
- Repeating test activities either as a result of action taken for an anomaly, or as part of the planned testing (e.g., execution of a corrected test, confirmation testing, and/or regression testing)
- Verifying and updating bi-directional traceability between the test basis, test conditions, test cases, test procedures, and test results.

Test completion

Test completion activities collect data from completed test activities to consolidate experience, testware, and any other relevant information. Test completion activities occur at project milestones such as when a software system is released, a test project is completed (or cancelled), an Agile project iteration is finished, a test level is completed, or a maintenance release has been completed.

Test completion includes the following major activities:

- Checking whether all defect reports are closed, entering change requests or product backlog items for any defects that remain unresolved at the end of test execution
- Creating a test summary report to be communicated to stakeholders
- Finalizing and archiving the test environment, the test data, the test infrastructure, and other testware for later reuse
- Handing over the testware to the maintenance teams, other project teams, and/or other stakeholders who could benefit from its use
- Analyzing lessons learned from the completed test activities to determine changes needed for future iterations, releases, and projects
- Using the information gathered to improve test process maturity

1.4.3 Test Work Products

Test work products are created as part of the test process. Just as there is significant variation in the way that organizations implement the test process, there is also significant variation in the types of work products created during that process, in the ways those work products are organized and managed, and in the names used for those work products. This syllabus adheres to the test process outlined above, and the work products described in this syllabus and in the ISTQB® Glossary. ISO standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-3) may also serve as a guideline for test work products.

Many of the test work products described in this section can be captured and managed using test management tools and defect management tools (see chapter 6).

Test planning work products

Test planning work products typically include one or more test plans. The test plan includes information about the test basis, to which the other test work products will be related via traceability information (see below and section 1.4.4), as well as exit criteria (or definition of done) which will be used during test monitoring and control. Test plans are described in section 5.2.

Test monitoring and control work products

Test monitoring and control work products typically include various types of test reports, including test progress reports produced on an ongoing and/or a regular basis, and test summary reports produced at various completion milestones. All test reports should provide audience-relevant details about the test progress as of the date of the report, including summarizing the test execution results once those become available.

Test monitoring and control work products should also address project management concerns, such as task completion, resource allocation and usage, and effort.

Test monitoring and control, and the work products created during these activities, are further explained in section 5.3 of this syllabus.

Test analysis work products

Test analysis work products include defined and prioritized test conditions, each of which is ideally bi-directionally traceable to the specific element(s) of the test basis it covers. For exploratory testing, test analysis may involve the creation of test charters. Test analysis may also result in the discovery and reporting of defects in the test basis.

Test design work products

Test design results in test cases and sets of test cases to exercise the test conditions defined in test analysis. It is often a good practice to design high-level test cases, without concrete values for input data and expected results. Such high-level test cases are reusable across multiple test cycles with different concrete data, while still adequately documenting the scope of the test case. Ideally, each test case is bi-directionally traceable to the test condition(s) it covers.

Test design also results in:

- the design and/or identification of the necessary test data
- the design of the test environment
- the identification of infrastructure and tools

Though the extent to which these results are documented varies significantly.

Test implementation work products

Test implementation work products include:

- Test procedures and the sequencing of those test procedures
- Test suites
- A test execution schedule

Ideally, once test implementation is complete, achievement of coverage criteria established in the test plan can be demonstrated via bi-directional traceability between test procedures and specific elements of the test basis, through the test cases and test conditions.

In some cases, test implementation involves creating work products using or used by tools, such as service virtualization and automated test scripts.

Test implementation also may result in the creation and verification of test data and the test environment. The completeness of the documentation of the data and/or environment verification results may vary significantly.

The test data serve to assign concrete values to the inputs and expected results of test cases. Such concrete values, together with explicit directions about the use of the concrete values, turn high-level test cases into executable low-level test cases. The same high-level test case may use different test data when executed on different releases of the test object. The concrete expected results which are associated with concrete test data are identified by using a test oracle.

In exploratory testing, some test design and implementation work products may be created during test execution, though the extent to which exploratory tests (and their traceability to specific elements of the test basis) are documented may vary significantly.

Test conditions defined in test analysis may be further refined in test implementation.

Test execution work products

Test execution work products include:

- Documentation of the status of individual test cases or test procedures (e.g., ready to run, pass, fail, blocked, deliberately skipped, etc.)
- Defect reports (see section 5.6)
- Documentation about which test item(s), test object(s), test tools, and testware were involved in the testing

Ideally, once test execution is complete, the status of each element of the test basis can be determined and reported via bi-directional traceability with the associated the test procedure(s). For example, we can say which requirements have passed all planned tests, which requirements have failed tests and/or have defects associated with them, and which requirements have planned tests still waiting to be run. This enables verification that the coverage criteria have been met, and enables the reporting of test results in terms that are understandable to stakeholders.

Test completion work products

Test completion work products include test summary reports, action items for improvement of subsequent projects or iterations, change requests or product backlog items, and finalized testware.

1.4.4 Traceability between the Test Basis and Test Work Products

As mentioned in section 1.4.3, test work products and the names of those work products vary significantly. Regardless of these variations, in order to implement effective test monitoring and control, it is important to establish and maintain traceability throughout the test process between each element of the test basis and the various test work products associated with that element, as described above. In addition to the evaluation of test coverage, good traceability supports:

- Analyzing the impact of changes
- Making testing auditable
- Meeting IT governance criteria
- Improving the understandability of test progress reports and test summary reports to include the status of elements of the test basis (e.g., requirements that passed their tests, requirements that failed their tests, and requirements that have pending tests)
- Relating the technical aspects of testing to stakeholders in terms that they can understand
- Providing information to assess product quality, process capability, and project progress against business goals

Some test management tools provide test work product models that match part or all of the test work products outlined in this section. Some organizations build their own management systems to organize the work products and provide the information traceability they require.

1.5 The Psychology of Testing

Software development, including software testing, involves human beings. Therefore, human psychology has important effects on software testing.

1.5.1 Human Psychology and Testing

Identifying defects during a static test such as a requirement review or user story refinement session, or identifying failures during dynamic test execution, may be perceived as criticism of the product and of its author. An element of human psychology called confirmation bias can make it difficult to accept information that disagrees with currently held beliefs. For example, since developers expect their code to be correct, they have a confirmation bias that makes it difficult to accept that the code is incorrect. In addition to confirmation bias, other cognitive biases may make it difficult for people to understand or accept information produced by testing. Further, it is a common human trait to blame the bearer of bad news, and information produced by testing often contains bad news.

As a result of these psychological factors, some people may perceive testing as a destructive activity, even though it contributes greatly to project progress and product quality (see sections 1.1 and 1.2). To try to reduce these perceptions, information about defects and failures should be communicated in a constructive way. This way, tensions between the testers and the analysts, product owners, designers, and developers can be reduced. This applies during both static and dynamic testing.

Testers and test managers need to have good interpersonal skills to be able to communicate effectively about defects, failures, test results, test progress, and risks, and to build positive relationships with colleagues. Ways to communicate well include the following examples:

- Start with collaboration rather than battles. Remind everyone of the common goal of better quality systems.
- Emphasize the benefits of testing. For example, for the authors, defect information can help them improve their work products and their skills. For the organization, defects found and fixed during testing will save time and money and reduce overall risk to product quality.
- Communicate test results and other findings in a neutral, fact-focused way without criticizing the person who created the defective item. Write objective and factual defect reports and review findings.
- Try to understand how the other person feels and the reasons they may react negatively to the information.
- Confirm that the other person has understood what has been said and vice versa.

Typical test objectives were discussed earlier (see section 1.1). Clearly defining the right set of test objectives has important psychological implications. Most people tend to align their plans and behaviors with the objectives set by the team, management, and other stakeholders. It is also important that testers adhere to these objectives with minimal personal bias.

1.5.2 Tester's and Developer's Mindsets

Developers and testers often think differently. The primary objective of development is to design and build a product. As discussed earlier, the objectives of testing include verifying and validating the product, finding defects prior to release, and so forth. These are different sets of objectives which require different mindsets. Bringing these mindsets together helps to achieve a higher level of product quality.

A mindset reflects an individual's assumptions and preferred methods for decision making and problem-solving. A tester's mindset should include curiosity, professional pessimism, a critical eye, attention to detail, and a motivation for good and positive communications and relationships. A tester's mindset tends to grow and mature as the tester gains experience.

A developer's mindset may include some of the elements of a tester's mindset, but successful developers are often more interested in designing and building solutions than in contemplating what might be wrong with those solutions. In addition, confirmation bias makes it difficult to become aware of errors committed by themselves.

With the right mindset, developers are able to test their own code. Different software development lifecycle models often have different ways of organizing the testers and test activities. Having some of the test activities done by independent testers increases defect detection effectiveness, which is particularly important for large, complex, or safety-critical systems. Independent testers bring a perspective which is different than that of the work product authors (i.e., business analysts, product owners, designers, and developers), since they have different cognitive biases from the authors.

2 Testing Throughout the Software Development Lifecycle

100 minutes

Keywords

acceptance testing, alpha testing, beta testing, change-related testing, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS), component integration testing, component testing, confirmation testing, contractual acceptance testing, functional testing, impact analysis, integration testing, maintenance testing, non-functional testing, operational acceptance testing, regression testing, regulatory acceptance testing, sequential development model, system integration testing, system testing, test basis, test case, test environment, test level, test object, test objective, test type, user acceptance testing, white-box testing

Learning Objectives for Testing Throughout the Software Development Lifecycle

2.1 Software Development Lifecycle Models

- FL-2.1.1 (K2) Explain the relationships between software development activities and test activities in the software development lifecycle
- FL-2.1.2 (K1) Identify reasons why software development lifecycle models must be adapted to the context of project and product characteristics

2.2 Test Levels

- FL-2.2.1 (K2) Compare the different test levels from the perspective of objectives, test basis, test objects, typical defects and failures, and approaches and responsibilities

2.3 Test Types

- FL-2.3.1 (K2) Compare functional, non-functional, and white-box testing
- FL-2.3.2 (K1) Recognize that functional, non-functional, and white-box tests occur at any test level
- FL-2.3.3 (K2) Compare the purposes of confirmation testing and regression testing

2.4 Maintenance Testing

- FL-2.4.1 (K2) Summarize triggers for maintenance testing
- FL-2.4.2 (K2) Describe the role of impact analysis in maintenance testing

2.1 Software Development Lifecycle Models

A software development lifecycle model describes the types of activity performed at each stage in a software development project, and how the activities relate to one another logically and chronologically. There are a number of different software development lifecycle models, each of which requires different approaches to testing.

2.1.1 Software Development and Software Testing

It is an important part of a tester's role to be familiar with the common software development lifecycle models so that appropriate test activities can take place.

In any software development lifecycle model, there are several characteristics of good testing:

- For every development activity, there is a corresponding test activity
- Each test level has test objectives specific to that level
- Test analysis and design for a given test level begin during the corresponding development activity
- Testers participate in discussions to define and refine requirements and design, and are involved in reviewing work products (e.g., requirements, design, user stories, etc.) as soon as drafts are available

No matter which software development lifecycle model is chosen, test activities should start in the early stages of the lifecycle, adhering to the testing principle of early testing.

This syllabus categorizes common software development lifecycle models as follows:

- Sequential development models
- Iterative and incremental development models

A sequential development model describes the software development process as a linear, sequential flow of activities. This means that any phase in the development process should begin when the previous phase is complete. In theory, there is no overlap of phases, but in practice, it is beneficial to have early feedback from the following phase.

In the Waterfall model, the development activities (e.g., requirements analysis, design, coding, testing) are completed one after another. In this model, test activities only occur after all other development activities have been completed.

Unlike the Waterfall model, the V-model integrates the test process throughout the development process, implementing the principle of early testing. Further, the V-model includes test levels associated with each corresponding development phase, which further supports early testing (see section 2.2 for a discussion of test levels). In this model, the execution of tests associated with each test level proceeds sequentially, but in some cases overlapping occurs.

Sequential development models deliver software that contains the complete set of features, but typically require months or years for delivery to stakeholders and users.

Incremental development involves establishing requirements, designing, building, and testing a system in pieces, which means that the software's features grow incrementally. The size of these feature increments varies, with some methods having larger pieces and some smaller pieces. The feature increments can be as small as a single change to a user interface screen or new query option.

Iterative development occurs when groups of features are specified, designed, built, and tested together in a series of cycles, often of a fixed duration. Iterations may involve changes to features developed in earlier iterations, along with changes in project scope. Each iteration delivers working software which is a growing subset of the overall set of features until the final software is delivered or development is stopped.

Examples include:

- Rational Unified Process: Each iteration tends to be relatively long (e.g., two to three months), and the feature increments are correspondingly large, such as two or three groups of related features
- Scrum: Each iteration tends to be relatively short (e.g., hours, days, or a few weeks), and the feature increments are correspondingly small, such as a few enhancements and/or two or three new features
- Kanban: Implemented with or without fixed-length iterations, which can deliver either a single enhancement or feature upon completion, or can group features together to release at once
- Spiral: Involves creating experimental increments, some of which may be heavily re-worked or even abandoned in subsequent development work

Components or systems developed using these methods often involve overlapping and iterating test levels throughout development. Ideally, each feature is tested at several test levels as it moves towards delivery. In some cases, teams use continuous delivery or continuous deployment, both of which involve significant automation of multiple test levels as part of their delivery pipelines. Many development efforts using these methods also include the concept of self-organizing teams, which can change the way testing work is organized as well as the relationship between testers and developers.

These methods form a growing system, which may be released to end-users on a feature-by-feature basis, on an iteration-by-iteration basis, or in a more traditional major-release fashion. Regardless of whether the software increments are released to end-users, regression testing is increasingly important as the system grows.

In contrast to sequential models, iterative and incremental models may deliver usable software in weeks or even days, but may only deliver the complete set of requirements product over a period of months or even years.

For more information on software testing in the context of Agile development. (see ISTQB-CTFL-AT, Black 2017, Crispin 2008, and Gregory 2015).

2.1.2 Software Development Lifecycle Models in Context

Software development lifecycle models must be selected and adapted to the context of project and product characteristics. An appropriate software development lifecycle model should be selected and adapted based on the project goal, the type of product being developed, business priorities (e.g., time-to-market), and identified product and project risks. For example, the development and testing of a minor internal administrative system should differ from the development and testing of a safety-critical system such as an automobile's brake control system. As another example, in some cases organizational and cultural issues may inhibit communication between team members, which can impede iterative development.

Depending on the context of the project, it may be necessary to combine or reorganize test levels and/or test activities. For example, for the integration of a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software product into a larger system, the purchaser may perform interoperability testing at the system integration test level

(e.g., integration to the infrastructure and other systems) and at the acceptance test level (functional and non-functional, along with user acceptance testing and operational acceptance testing). See section 2.2 for a discussion of test levels and section 2.3 for a discussion of test types.

In addition, software development lifecycle models themselves may be combined. For example, a V-model may be used for the development and testing of the backend systems and their integrations, while an Agile development model may be used to develop and test the front-end user interface (UI) and functionality. Prototyping may be used early in a project, with an incremental development model adopted once the experimental phase is complete.

Internet of Things (IoT) systems, which consist of many different objects, such as devices, products, and services, typically apply separate software development lifecycle models for each object. This presents a particular challenge for the development of Internet of Things system versions. Additionally the software development lifecycle of such objects places stronger emphasis on the later phases of the software development lifecycle after they have been introduced to operational use (e.g., operate, update, and decommission phases).

Reasons why software development models must be adapted to the context of project and product characteristics can be:

- Difference in product risks of systems (complex or simple project)
- Many business units can be part of a project or program (combination of sequential and agile development)
- Short time to deliver a product to the market (merge of test levels and/or integration of test types in test levels)

2.2 Test Levels

Test levels are groups of test activities that are organized and managed together. Each test level is an instance of the test process, consisting of the activities described in section 1.4, performed in relation to software at a given level of development, from individual units or components to complete systems or, where applicable, systems of systems. Test levels are related to other activities within the software development lifecycle. The test levels used in this syllabus are:

- Component testing
- Integration testing
- System testing
- Acceptance testing

Test levels are characterized by the following attributes:

- Specific objectives
- Test basis, referenced to derive test cases
- Test object (i.e., what is being tested)
- Typical defects and failures
- Specific approaches and responsibilities

For every test level, a suitable test environment is required. In acceptance testing, for example, a production-like test environment is ideal, while in component testing the developers typically use their own development environment.

2.2.1 Component Testing

Objectives of component testing

Component testing (also known as unit or module testing) focuses on components that are separately testable. Objectives of component testing include:

- Reducing risk
- Verifying whether the functional and non-functional behaviors of the component are as designed and specified
- Building confidence in the component's quality
- Finding defects in the component
- Preventing defects from escaping to higher test levels

In some cases, especially in incremental and iterative development models (e.g., Agile) where code changes are ongoing, automated component regression tests play a key role in building confidence that changes have not broken existing components.

Component testing is often done in isolation from the rest of the system, depending on the software development lifecycle model and the system, which may require mock objects, service virtualization, harnesses, stubs, and drivers. Component testing may cover functionality (e.g., correctness of calculations), non-functional characteristics (e.g., searching for memory leaks), and structural properties (e.g., decision testing).

Test basis

Examples of work products that can be used as a test basis for component testing include:

- Detailed design
- Code
- Data model
- Component specifications

Test objects

Typical test objects for component testing include:

- Components, units or modules
- Code and data structures
- Classes
- Database modules

Typical defects and failures

Examples of typical defects and failures for component testing include:

- Incorrect functionality (e.g., not as described in design specifications)
- Data flow problems
- Incorrect code and logic

Defects are typically fixed as soon as they are found, often with no formal defect management. However, when developers do report defects, this provides important information for root cause analysis and process improvement.

Specific approaches and responsibilities

Component testing is usually performed by the developer who wrote the code, but it at least requires access to the code being tested. Developers may alternate component development with finding and fixing defects. Developers will often write and execute tests after having written the code for a component. However, in Agile development especially, writing automated component test cases may precede writing application code.

For example, consider test driven development (TDD). Test driven development is highly iterative and is based on cycles of developing automated test cases, then building and integrating small pieces of code, then executing the component tests, correcting any issues, and re-factoring the code. This process continues until the component has been completely built and all component tests are passing. Test driven development is an example of a test-first approach. While test driven development originated in eXtreme Programming (XP), it has spread to other forms of Agile and also to sequential lifecycles (see ISTQB-CTFL-AT).

2.2.2 Integration Testing

Objectives of integration testing

Integration testing focuses on interactions between components or systems. Objectives of integration testing include:

- Reducing risk
- Verifying whether the functional and non-functional behaviors of the interfaces are as designed and specified
- Building confidence in the quality of the interfaces
- Finding defects (which may be in the interfaces themselves or within the components or systems)
- Preventing defects from escaping to higher test levels

As with component testing, in some cases automated integration regression tests provide confidence that changes have not broken existing interfaces, components, or systems.

There are two different levels of integration testing described in this syllabus, which may be carried out on test objects of varying size as follows:

- Component integration testing focuses on the interactions and interfaces between integrated components. Component integration testing is performed after component testing, and is generally automated. In iterative and incremental development, component integration tests are usually part of the continuous integration process.
- System integration testing focuses on the interactions and interfaces between systems, packages, and microservices. System integration testing can also cover interactions with, and interfaces provided by, external organizations (e.g., web services). In this case, the developing organization does not control the external interfaces, which can create various challenges for testing (e.g., ensuring that test-blocking defects in the external organization's code are resolved, arranging for test environments, etc.). System integration testing may be done after system testing or in parallel with ongoing system test activities (in both sequential development and iterative and incremental development).

Test basis

Examples of work products that can be used as a test basis for integration testing include:

- Software and system design
- Sequence diagrams
- Interface and communication protocol specifications
- Use cases
- Architecture at component or system level
- Workflows
- External interface definitions

Test objects

Typical test objects for integration testing include:

- Subsystems
- Databases
- Infrastructure
- Interfaces
- APIs
- Microservices

Typical defects and failures

Examples of typical defects and failures for component integration testing include:

- Incorrect data, missing data, or incorrect data encoding
- Incorrect sequencing or timing of interface calls
- Interface mismatch
- Failures in communication between components
- Unhandled or improperly handled communication failures between components
- Incorrect assumptions about the meaning, units, or boundaries of the data being passed between components

Examples of typical defects and failures for system integration testing include:

- Inconsistent message structures between systems
- Incorrect data, missing data, or incorrect data encoding
- Interface mismatch
- Failures in communication between systems
- Unhandled or improperly handled communication failures between systems

- Incorrect assumptions about the meaning, units, or boundaries of the data being passed between systems
- Failure to comply with mandatory security regulations

Specific approaches and responsibilities

Component integration tests and system integration tests should concentrate on the integration itself. For example, if integrating module A with module B, tests should focus on the communication between the modules, not the functionality of the individual modules, as that should have been covered during component testing. If integrating system X with system Y, tests should focus on the communication between the systems, not the functionality of the individual systems, as that should have been covered during system testing. Functional, non-functional, and structural test types are applicable.

Component integration testing is often the responsibility of developers. System integration testing is generally the responsibility of testers. Ideally, testers performing system integration testing should understand the system architecture, and should have influenced integration planning.

If integration tests and the integration strategy are planned before components or systems are built, those components or systems can be built in the order required for most efficient testing. Systematic integration strategies may be based on the system architecture (e.g., top-down and bottom-up), functional tasks, transaction processing sequences, or some other aspect of the system or components. In order to simplify defect isolation and detect defects early, integration should normally be incremental (i.e., a small number of additional components or systems at a time) rather than “big bang” (i.e., integrating all components or systems in one single step). A risk analysis of the most complex interfaces can help to focus the integration testing.

The greater the scope of integration, the more difficult it becomes to isolate defects to a specific component or system, which may lead to increased risk and additional time for troubleshooting. This is one reason that continuous integration, where software is integrated on a component-by-component basis (i.e., functional integration), has become common practice. Such continuous integration often includes automated regression testing, ideally at multiple test levels.

2.2.3 System Testing

Objectives of system testing

System testing focuses on the behavior and capabilities of a whole system or product, often considering the end-to-end tasks the system can perform and the non-functional behaviors it exhibits while performing those tasks. Objectives of system testing include:

- Reducing risk
- Verifying whether the functional and non-functional behaviors of the system are as designed and specified
- Validating that the system is complete and will work as expected
- Building confidence in the quality of the system as a whole
- Finding defects
- Preventing defects from escaping to higher test levels or production

For certain systems, verifying data quality may also be an objective. As with component testing and integration testing, in some cases automated system regression tests provide confidence that changes have not broken existing features or end-to-end capabilities. System testing often produces information that is used by stakeholders to make release decisions. System testing may also satisfy legal or regulatory requirements or standards.

The test environment should ideally correspond to the final target or production environment.

Test basis

Examples of work products that can be used as a test basis for system testing include:

- System and software requirement specifications (functional and non-functional)
- Risk analysis reports
- Use cases
- Epics and user stories
- Models of system behavior
- State diagrams
- System and user manuals

Test objects

Typical test objects for system testing include:

- Applications
- Hardware/software systems
- Operating systems
- System under test (SUT)
- System configuration and configuration data

Typical defects and failures

Examples of typical defects and failures for system testing include:

- Incorrect calculations
- Incorrect or unexpected system functional or non-functional behavior
- Incorrect control and/or data flows within the system
- Failure to properly and completely carry out end-to-end functional tasks
- Failure of the system to work properly in the system environment(s)
- Failure of the system to work as described in system and user manuals

Specific approaches and responsibilities

System testing should focus on the overall, end-to-end behavior of the system as a whole, both functional and non-functional. System testing should use the most appropriate techniques (see chapter 4) for the aspect(s) of the system to be tested. For example, a decision table may be created to verify whether functional behavior is as described in business rules.

System testing is typically carried out by independent testers who rely heavily on specifications. Defects in specifications (e.g., missing user stories, incorrectly stated business requirements, etc.) can lead to a lack of understanding of, or disagreements about, expected system behavior. Such situations can cause false positives and false negatives, which waste time and reduce defect detection effectiveness, respectively. Early involvement of testers in user story refinement or static testing activities, such as reviews, helps to reduce the incidence of such situations.

2.2.4 Acceptance Testing

Objectives of acceptance testing

Acceptance testing, like system testing, typically focuses on the behavior and capabilities of a whole system or product. Objectives of acceptance testing include:

- Establishing confidence in the quality of the system as a whole
- Validating that the system is complete and will work as expected
- Verifying that functional and non-functional behaviors of the system are as specified

Acceptance testing may produce information to assess the system's readiness for deployment and use by the customer (end-user). Defects may be found during acceptance testing, but finding defects is often not an objective, and finding a significant number of defects during acceptance testing may in some cases be considered a major project risk. Acceptance testing may also satisfy legal or regulatory requirements or standards.

Common forms of acceptance testing include the following:

- User acceptance testing
- Operational acceptance testing
- Contractual and regulatory acceptance testing
- Alpha and beta testing.

Each is described in the following four subsections.

User acceptance testing (UAT)

User acceptance testing of the system is typically focused on validating the fitness for use of the system by intended users in a real or simulated operational environment. The main objective is building confidence that the users can use the system to meet their needs, fulfill requirements, and perform business processes with minimum difficulty, cost, and risk.

Operational acceptance testing (OAT)

The acceptance testing of the system by operations or systems administration staff is usually performed in a (simulated) production environment. The tests focus on operational aspects, and may include:

- Testing of backup and restore
- Installing, uninstalling and upgrading
- Disaster recovery
- User management
- Maintenance tasks

- Data load and migration tasks
- Checks for security vulnerabilities
- Performance testing

The main objective of operational acceptance testing is building confidence that the operators or system administrators can keep the system working properly for the users in the operational environment, even under exceptional or difficult conditions.

Contractual and regulatory acceptance testing

Contractual acceptance testing is performed against a contract's acceptance criteria for producing custom-developed software. Acceptance criteria should be defined when the parties agree to the contract. Contractual acceptance testing is often performed by users or by independent testers.

Regulatory acceptance testing is performed against any regulations that must be adhered to, such as government, legal, or safety regulations. Regulatory acceptance testing is often performed by users or by independent testers, sometimes with the results being witnessed or audited by regulatory agencies.

The main objective of contractual and regulatory acceptance testing is building confidence that contractual or regulatory compliance has been achieved.

Alpha and beta testing

Alpha and beta testing are typically used by developers of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software who want to get feedback from potential or existing users, customers, and/or operators before the software product is put on the market. Alpha testing is performed at the developing organization's site, not by the development team, but by potential or existing customers, and/or operators or an independent test team. Beta testing is performed by potential or existing customers, and/or operators at their own locations. Beta testing may come after alpha testing, or may occur without any preceding alpha testing having occurred.

One objective of alpha and beta testing is building confidence among potential or existing customers, and/or operators that they can use the system under normal, everyday conditions, and in the operational environment(s) to achieve their objectives with minimum difficulty, cost, and risk. Another objective may be the detection of defects related to the conditions and environment(s) in which the system will be used, especially when those conditions and environment(s) are difficult to replicate by the development team.

Test basis

Examples of work products that can be used as a test basis for any form of acceptance testing include:

- Business processes
- User or business requirements
- Regulations, legal contracts and standards
- Use cases and/or user stories
- System requirements
- System or user documentation
- Installation procedures
- Risk analysis reports

In addition, as a test basis for deriving test cases for operational acceptance testing, one or more of the following work products can be used:

- Backup and restore procedures
- Disaster recovery procedures
- Non-functional requirements
- Operations documentation
- Deployment and installation instructions
- Performance targets
- Database packages
- Security standards or regulations

Typical test objects

Typical test objects for any form of acceptance testing include:

- System under test
- System configuration and configuration data
- Business processes for a fully integrated system
- Recovery systems and hot sites (for business continuity and disaster recovery testing)
- Operational and maintenance processes
- Forms
- Reports
- Existing and converted production data

Typical defects and failures

Examples of typical defects for any form of acceptance testing include:

- System workflows do not meet business or user requirements
- Business rules are not implemented correctly
- System does not satisfy contractual or regulatory requirements
- Non-functional failures such as security vulnerabilities, inadequate performance efficiency under high loads, or improper operation on a supported platform

Specific approaches and responsibilities

Acceptance testing is often the responsibility of the customers, business users, product owners, or operators of a system, and other stakeholders may be involved as well.

Acceptance testing is often thought of as the last test level in a sequential development lifecycle, but it may also occur at other times, for example:

- Acceptance testing of a COTS software product may occur when it is installed or integrated
- Acceptance testing of a new functional enhancement may occur before system testing

In iterative development, project teams can employ various forms of acceptance testing during and at the end of each iteration, such as those focused on verifying a new feature against its acceptance criteria and those focused on validating that a new feature satisfies the users' needs. In addition, alpha tests and beta tests may occur, either at the end of each iteration, after the completion of each iteration, or after a series of iterations. User acceptance tests, operational acceptance tests, regulatory acceptance tests, and contractual acceptance tests also may occur, either at the close of each iteration, after the completion of each iteration, or after a series of iterations.

2.3 Test Types

A test type is a group of test activities aimed at testing specific characteristics of a software system, or a part of a system, based on specific test objectives. Such objectives may include:

- Evaluating functional quality characteristics, such as completeness, correctness, and appropriateness
- Evaluating non-functional quality characteristics, such as reliability, performance efficiency, security, compatibility, and usability
- Evaluating whether the structure or architecture of the component or system is correct, complete, and as specified
- Evaluating the effects of changes, such as confirming that defects have been fixed (confirmation testing) and looking for unintended changes in behavior resulting from software or environment changes (regression testing)

2.3.1 Functional Testing

Functional testing of a system involves tests that evaluate functions that the system should perform. Functional requirements may be described in work products such as business requirements specifications, epics, user stories, use cases, or functional specifications, or they may be undocumented. The functions are “what” the system should do.

Functional tests should be performed at all test levels (e.g., tests for components may be based on a component specification), though the focus is different at each level (see section 2.2).

Functional testing considers the behavior of the software, so black-box techniques may be used to derive test conditions and test cases for the functionality of the component or system (see section 4.2).

The thoroughness of functional testing can be measured through functional coverage. Functional coverage is the extent to which some functionality has been exercised by tests, and is expressed as a percentage of the type(s) of element being covered. For example, using traceability between tests and functional requirements, the percentage of these requirements which are addressed by testing can be calculated, potentially identifying coverage gaps.

Functional test design and execution may involve special skills or knowledge, such as knowledge of the particular business problem the software solves (e.g., geological modelling software for the oil and gas industries).

2.3.2 Non-functional Testing

Non-functional testing of a system evaluates characteristics of systems and software such as usability, performance efficiency or security. Refer to ISO standard (ISO/IEC 25010) for a classification of software product quality characteristics. Non-functional testing is the testing of “how well” the system behaves.

Contrary to common misperceptions, non-functional testing can and often should be performed at all test levels, and done as early as possible. The late discovery of non-functional defects can be extremely dangerous to the success of a project.

Black-box techniques (see section 4.2) may be used to derive test conditions and test cases for non-functional testing. For example, boundary value analysis can be used to define the stress conditions for performance tests.

The thoroughness of non-functional testing can be measured through non-functional coverage. Non-functional coverage is the extent to which some type of non-functional element has been exercised by tests, and is expressed as a percentage of the type(s) of element being covered. For example, using traceability between tests and supported devices for a mobile application, the percentage of devices which are addressed by compatibility testing can be calculated, potentially identifying coverage gaps.

Non-functional test design and execution may involve special skills or knowledge, such as knowledge of the inherent weaknesses of a design or technology (e.g., security vulnerabilities associated with particular programming languages) or the particular user base (e.g., the personas of users of healthcare facility management systems).

Refer to ISTQB-CTAL-TA, ISTQB-CTAL-TTA, ISTQB-CTAL-SEC, and other ISTQB® specialist modules for more details regarding the testing of non-functional quality characteristics.

2.3.3 White-box Testing

White-box testing derives tests based on the system’s internal structure or implementation. Internal structure may include code, architecture, work flows, and/or data flows within the system (see section 4.3).

The thoroughness of white-box testing can be measured through structural coverage. Structural coverage is the extent to which some type of structural element has been exercised by tests, and is expressed as a percentage of the type of element being covered.

At the component testing level, code coverage is based on the percentage of component code that has been tested, and may be measured in terms of different aspects of code (coverage items) such as the percentage of executable statements tested in the component, or the percentage of decision outcomes tested. These types of coverage are collectively called code coverage. At the component integration testing level, white-box testing may be based on the architecture of the system, such as interfaces between components, and structural coverage may be measured in terms of the percentage of interfaces exercised by tests.

White-box test design and execution may involve special skills or knowledge, such as the way the code is built, how data is stored (e.g., to evaluate possible database queries), and how to use coverage tools and to correctly interpret their results.

2.3.4 Change-related Testing

When changes are made to a system, either to correct a defect or because of new or changing functionality, testing should be done to confirm that the changes have corrected the defect or implemented the functionality correctly, and have not caused any unforeseen adverse consequences.

- **Confirmation testing:** After a defect is fixed, the software may be tested with all test cases that failed due to the defect, which should be re-executed on the new software version. The software may also be tested with new tests to cover changes needed to fix the defect. At the very least, the steps to reproduce the failure(s) caused by the defect must be re-executed on the new software version. The purpose of a confirmation test is to confirm whether the original defect has been successfully fixed.
- **Regression testing:** It is possible that a change made in one part of the code, whether a fix or another type of change, may accidentally affect the behavior of other parts of the code, whether within the same component, in other components of the same system, or even in other systems. Changes may include changes to the environment, such as a new version of an operating system or database management system. Such unintended side-effects are called regressions. Regression testing involves running tests to detect such unintended side-effects.

Confirmation testing and regression testing are performed at all test levels.

Especially in iterative and incremental development lifecycles (e.g., Agile), new features, changes to existing features, and code refactoring result in frequent changes to the code, which also requires change-related testing. Due to the evolving nature of the system, confirmation and regression testing are very important. This is particularly relevant for Internet of Things systems where individual objects (e.g., devices) are frequently updated or replaced.

Regression test suites are run many times and generally evolve slowly, so regression testing is a strong candidate for automation. Automation of these tests should start early in the project (see chapter 6).

2.3.5 Test Types and Test Levels

It is possible to perform any of the test types mentioned above at any test level. To illustrate, examples of functional, non-functional, white-box, and change-related tests will be given across all test levels, for a banking application, starting with functional tests:

- For component testing, tests are designed based on how a component should calculate compound interest.
- For component integration testing, tests are designed based on how account information captured at the user interface is passed to the business logic.
- For system testing, tests are designed based on how account holders can apply for a line of credit on their checking accounts.
- For system integration testing, tests are designed based on how the system uses an external microservice to check an account holder's credit score.
- For acceptance testing, tests are designed based on how the banker handles approving or declining a credit application.

The following are examples of non-functional tests:

- For component testing, performance tests are designed to evaluate the number of CPU cycles required to perform a complex total interest calculation.

- For component integration testing, security tests are designed for buffer overflow vulnerabilities due to data passed from the user interface to the business logic.
- For system testing, portability tests are designed to check whether the presentation layer works on all supported browsers and mobile devices.
- For system integration testing, reliability tests are designed to evaluate system robustness if the credit score microservice fails to respond.
- For acceptance testing, usability tests are designed to evaluate the accessibility of the banker's credit processing interface for people with disabilities.

The following are examples of white-box tests:

- For component testing, tests are designed to achieve complete statement and decision coverage (see section 4.3) for all components that perform financial calculations.
- For component integration testing, tests are designed to exercise how each screen in the browser interface passes data to the next screen and to the business logic.
- For system testing, tests are designed to cover sequences of web pages that can occur during a credit line application.
- For system integration testing, tests are designed to exercise all possible inquiry types sent to the credit score microservice.
- For acceptance testing, tests are designed to cover all supported financial data file structures and value ranges for bank-to-bank transfers.

Finally, the following are examples for change-related tests:

- For component testing, automated regression tests are built for each component and included within the continuous integration framework.
- For component integration testing, tests are designed to confirm fixes to interface-related defects as the fixes are checked into the code repository.
- For system testing, all tests for a given workflow are re-executed if any screen on that workflow changes.
- For system integration testing, tests of the application interacting with the credit scoring microservice are re-executed daily as part of continuous deployment of that microservice.
- For acceptance testing, all previously-failed tests are re-executed after a defect found in acceptance testing is fixed.

While this section provides examples of every test type across every level, it is not necessary, for all software, to have every test type represented across every level. However, it is important to run applicable test types at each level, especially the earliest level where the test type occurs.

2.4 Maintenance Testing

Once deployed to production environments, software and systems need to be maintained. Changes of various sorts are almost inevitable in delivered software and systems, either to fix defects discovered in operational use, to add new functionality, or to delete or alter already-delivered functionality. Maintenance is also needed to preserve or improve non-functional quality characteristics of the component or system

over its lifetime, especially performance efficiency, compatibility, reliability, security, , and portability.

When any changes are made as part of maintenance, maintenance testing should be performed, both to evaluate the success with which the changes were made and to check for possible side-effects (e.g., regressions) in parts of the system that remain unchanged (which is usually most of the system). Maintenance can involve planned releases and unplanned releases (hot fixes).

A maintenance release may require maintenance testing at multiple test levels, using various test types, based on its scope. The scope of maintenance testing depends on:

- The degree of risk of the change, for example, the degree to which the changed area of software communicates with other components or systems
- The size of the existing system
- The size of the change

2.4.1 Triggers for Maintenance

There are several reasons why software maintenance, and thus maintenance testing, takes place, both for planned and unplanned changes.

We can classify the triggers for maintenance as follows:

- Modification, such as planned enhancements (e.g., release-based), corrective and emergency changes, changes of the operational environment (such as planned operating system or database upgrades), upgrades of COTS software, and patches for defects and vulnerabilities
- Migration, such as from one platform to another, which can require operational tests of the new environment as well as of the changed software, or tests of data conversion when data from another application will be migrated into the system being maintained
 - Retirement, such as when an application reaches the end of its life. When an application or system is retired, this can require testing of data migration or archiving if long data-retention periods are required.
 - Testing restore/retrieve procedures after archiving for long retention periods may also be needed.
 - regression testing may be needed to ensure that any functionality that remains in service still works.

For Internet of Things systems, maintenance testing may be triggered by the introduction of completely new or modified things, such as hardware devices and software services, into the overall system. The maintenance testing for such systems places particular emphasis on integration testing at different levels (e.g., network level, application level) and on security aspects, in particular those relating to personal data.

2.4.2 Impact Analysis for Maintenance

Impact analysis evaluates the changes that were made for a maintenance release to identify the intended consequences as well as expected and possible side effects of a change, and to identify the areas in the system that will be affected by the change. Impact analysis can also help to identify the impact of a change on existing tests. The side effects and affected areas in the system need to be tested for regressions, possibly after updating any existing tests affected by the change.

Impact analysis may be done before a change is made, to help decide if the change should be made, based on the potential consequences in other areas of the system.

Impact analysis can be difficult if:

- Specifications (e.g., business requirements, user stories, architecture) are out of date or missing
- Test cases are not documented or are out of date
- Bi-directional traceability between tests and the test basis has not been maintained
- Tool support is weak or non-existent
- The people involved do not have domain and/or system knowledge
- Insufficient attention has been paid to the software's maintainability during development

3 Static Testing

135 minutes

Keywords

ad hoc review, checklist-based review, dynamic testing, formal review, informal review, inspection, perspective-based reading, review, role-based review, scenario-based review, static analysis, static testing, technical review, walkthrough

Learning Objectives for Static Testing

3.1 Static Testing Basics

- FL-3.1.1 (K1) Recognize types of software work product that can be examined by the different static testing techniques
- FL-3.1.2 (K2) Use examples to describe the value of static testing
- FL-3.1.3 (K2) Explain the difference between static and dynamic techniques, considering objectives, types of defects to be identified, and the role of these techniques within the software lifecycle

3.2 Review Process

- FL-3.2.1 (K2) Summarize the activities of the work product review process
- FL-3.2.2 (K1) Recognize the different roles and responsibilities in a formal review
- FL-3.2.3 (K2) Explain the differences between different review types: informal review, walkthrough, technical review, and inspection
- FL-3.2.4 (K3) Apply a review technique to a work product to find defects
- FL-3.2.5 (K2) Explain the factors that contribute to a successful review

3.1 Static Testing Basics

In contrast to dynamic testing, which requires the execution of the software being tested, static testing relies on the manual examination of work products (i.e., reviews) or tool-driven evaluation of the code or other work products (i.e., static analysis). Both types of static testing assess the code or other work product being tested without actually executing the code or work product being tested.

Static analysis is important for safety-critical computer systems (e.g., aviation, medical, or nuclear software), but static analysis has also become important and common in other settings. For example, static analysis is an important part of security testing. Static analysis is also often incorporated into automated software build and distribution tools, for example in Agile development, continuous delivery, and continuous deployment.

3.1.1 Work Products that Can Be Examined by Static Testing

Almost any work product can be examined using static testing (reviews and/or static analysis), for example:

- Specifications, including business requirements, functional requirements, and security requirements
- Epics, user stories, and acceptance criteria
- Architecture and design specifications
- Code
- Testware, including test plans, test cases, test procedures, and automated test scripts
- User guides
- Web pages
- Contracts, project plans, schedules, and budget planning
- Configuration set up and infrastructure set up
- Models, such as activity diagrams, which may be used for Model-Based testing (see ISTQB-CTFL-MBT and Kramer 2016)

Reviews can be applied to any work product that the participants know how to read and understand. Static analysis can be applied efficiently to any work product with a formal structure (typically code or models) for which an appropriate static analysis tool exists. Static analysis can even be applied with tools that evaluate work products written in natural language such as requirements (e.g., checking for spelling, grammar, and readability).

3.1.2 Benefits of Static Testing

Static testing techniques provide a variety of benefits. When applied early in the software development lifecycle, static testing enables the early detection of defects before dynamic testing is performed (e.g., in requirements or design specifications reviews, backlog refinement, etc.). Defects found early are often much cheaper to remove than defects found later in the lifecycle, especially compared to defects found after the software is deployed and in active use. Using static testing techniques to find defects and then fixing those defects promptly is almost always much cheaper for the organization than using dynamic testing to find defects in the test object and then fixing them, especially when considering the additional costs associated with updating other work products and performing confirmation and regression testing.

Additional benefits of static testing may include:

- Detecting and correcting defects more efficiently, and prior to dynamic test execution
- Identifying defects which are not easily found by dynamic testing
- Preventing defects in design or coding by uncovering inconsistencies, ambiguities, contradictions, omissions, inaccuracies, and redundancies in requirements
- Increasing development productivity (e.g., due to improved design, more maintainable code)
- Reducing development cost and time
- Reducing testing cost and time
- Reducing total cost of quality over the software's lifetime, due to fewer failures later in the lifecycle or after delivery into operation
- Improving communication between team members in the course of participating in reviews

3.1.3 Differences between Static and Dynamic Testing

Static testing and dynamic testing can have the same objectives (see section 1.1.1), such as providing an assessment of the quality of the work products and identifying defects as early as possible. Static and dynamic testing complement each other by finding different types of defects.

One main distinction is that static testing finds defects in work products directly rather than identifying failures caused by defects when the software is run. A defect can reside in a work product for a very long time without causing a failure. The path where the defect lies may be rarely exercised or hard to reach, so it will not be easy to construct and execute a dynamic test that encounters it. Static testing may be able to find the defect with much less effort.

Another distinction is that static testing can be used to improve the consistency and internal quality of work products, while dynamic testing typically focuses on externally visible behaviors.

Compared with dynamic testing, typical defects that are easier and cheaper to find and fix through static testing include:

- Requirement defects (e.g., inconsistencies, ambiguities, contradictions, omissions, inaccuracies, and redundancies)
- Design defects (e.g., inefficient algorithms or database structures, high coupling, low cohesion)
- Coding defects (e.g., variables with undefined values, variables that are declared but never used, unreachable code, duplicate code)
- Deviations from standards (e.g., lack of adherence to coding standards)
- Incorrect interface specifications (e.g., different units of measurement used by the calling system than by the called system)
- Security vulnerabilities (e.g., susceptibility to buffer overflows)
- Gaps or inaccuracies in test basis traceability or coverage (e.g., missing tests for an acceptance criterion)

Moreover, most types of maintainability defects can only be found by static testing (e.g., improper modularization, poor reusability of components, code that is difficult to analyze and modify without introducing new defects).

3.2 Review Process

Reviews vary from informal to formal. Informal reviews are characterized by not following a defined process and not having formal documented output. Formal reviews are characterized by team participation, documented results of the review, and documented procedures for conducting the review. The formality of a review process is related to factors such as the software development lifecycle model, the maturity of the development process, the complexity of the work product to be reviewed, any legal or regulatory requirements, and/or the need for an audit trail.

The focus of a review depends on the agreed objectives of the review (e.g., finding defects, gaining understanding, educating participants such as testers and new team members, or discussing and deciding by consensus).

ISO standard (ISO/IEC 20246) contains more in-depth descriptions of the review process for work products, including roles and review techniques.

3.2.1 Work Product Review Process

The review process comprises the following main activities:

Planning

- Defining the scope, which includes the purpose of the review, what documents or parts of documents to review, and the quality characteristics to be evaluated
- Estimating effort and timeframe
- Identifying review characteristics such as the review type with roles, activities, and checklists
- Selecting the people to participate in the review and allocating roles
- Defining the entry and exit criteria for more formal review types (e.g., inspections)
- Checking that entry criteria are met (for more formal review types)

Initiate review

- Distributing the work product (physically or by electronic means) and other material, such as issue log forms, checklists, and related work products
- Explaining the scope, objectives, process, roles, and work products to the participants
- Answering any questions that participants may have about the review

Individual review (i.e., individual preparation)

- Reviewing all or part of the work product
- Noting potential defects, recommendations, and questions

Issue communication and analysis

- Communicating identified potential defects (e.g., in a review meeting)
- Analyzing potential defects, assigning ownership and status to them
- Evaluating and documenting quality characteristics
- Evaluating the review findings against the exit criteria to make a review decision (reject; major changes needed; accept, possibly with minor changes)

Fixing and reporting

- Creating defect reports for those findings that require changes to a work product
- Fixing defects found (typically done by the author) in the work product reviewed
- Communicating defects to the appropriate person or team (when found in a work product related to the work product reviewed)
- Recording updated status of defects (in formal reviews), potentially including the agreement of the comment originator
- Gathering metrics (for more formal review types)
- Checking that exit criteria are met (for more formal review types)
- Accepting the work product when the exit criteria are reached

The results of a work product review vary, depending on the review type and formality, as described in section 3.2.3.

3.2.2 Roles and responsibilities in a formal review

A typical formal review will include the roles below:

Author

- Creates the work product under review
- Fixes defects in the work product under review (if necessary)

Management

- Is responsible for review planning
- Decides on the execution of reviews
- Assigns staff, budget, and time
- Monitors ongoing cost-effectiveness
- Executes control decisions in the event of inadequate outcomes

Facilitator (often called moderator)

- Ensures effective running of review meetings (when held)
- Mediates, if necessary, between the various points of view
- Is often the person upon whom the success of the review depends

Review leader

- Takes overall responsibility for the review
- Decides who will be involved and organizes when and where it will take place

Reviewers

- May be subject matter experts, persons working on the project, stakeholders with an interest in the work product, and/or individuals with specific technical or business backgrounds
- Identify potential defects in the work product under review
- May represent different perspectives (e.g., tester, developer, user, operator, business analyst, usability expert, etc.)

Scribe (or recorder)

- Collates potential defects found during the individual review activity
- Records new potential defects, open points, and decisions from the review meeting (when held)

In some review types, one person may play more than one role, and the actions associated with each role may also vary based on review type. In addition, with the advent of tools to support the review process, especially the logging of defects, open points, and decisions, there is often no need for a scribe.

Further, more detailed roles are possible, as described in ISO standard (ISO/IEC 20246).

3.2.3 Review Types

Although reviews can be used for various purposes, one of the main objectives is to uncover defects. All review types can aid in defect detection, and the selected review type should be based on the needs of the project, available resources, product type and risks, business domain, and company culture, among other selection criteria.

A single work product may be the subject of more than one type of review. If more than one type of review is used, the order may vary. For example, an informal review may be carried out before a technical review, to ensure the work product is ready for a technical review.

The types of reviews described below can be done as peer reviews, i.e., done by colleagues qualified to do the same work.

The types of defects found in a review vary, depending especially on the work product being reviewed. (See section 3.1.3 for examples of defects that can be found by reviews in different work products, and Gilb 1993 for information on formal inspections). Reviews can be classified according to various attributes. The following lists the four most common types of reviews and their associated attributes.

Informal review (e.g., buddy check, pairing, pair review)

- Main purpose: detecting potential defects
- Possible additional purposes: generating new ideas or solutions, quickly solving minor problems
- Not based on a formal (documented) process
- May not involve a review meeting
- May be performed by a colleague of the author (buddy check) or by more people
- Results may be documented
- Varies in usefulness depending on the reviewers
- Use of checklists is optional
- Very commonly used in Agile development

Walkthrough

- Main purposes: find defects, improve the software product, consider alternative implementations, evaluate conformance to standards and specifications
- Possible additional purposes: exchanging ideas about techniques or style variations, training of participants, achieving consensus
- Individual preparation before the review meeting is optional
- Review meeting is typically led by the author of the work product
- Scribe is mandatory
- Use of checklists is optional
- May take the form of scenarios, dry runs, or simulations
- Potential defect logs and review reports are produced
- May vary in practice from quite informal to very formal

Technical review

- Main purposes: gaining consensus, detecting potential defects
- Possible further purposes: evaluating quality and building confidence in the work product, generating new ideas, motivating and enabling authors to improve future work products, considering alternative implementations
- Reviewers should be technical peers of the author, and technical experts in the same or other disciplines
- Individual preparation before the review meeting is required
- Review meeting is optional, ideally led by a trained facilitator (typically not the author)
- Scribe is mandatory, ideally not the author
- Use of checklists is optional
- Potential defect logs and review reports are produced

Inspection

- Main purposes: detecting potential defects, evaluating quality and building confidence in the work product, preventing future similar defects through author learning and root cause analysis
- Possible further purposes: motivating and enabling authors to improve future work products and the software development process, achieving consensus
- Follows a defined process with formal documented outputs, based on rules and checklists
- Uses clearly defined roles, such as those specified in section 3.2.2 which are mandatory, and may include a dedicated reader (who reads the work product aloud often paraphrase, i.e. describes it in own words, during the review meeting)
- Individual preparation before the review meeting is required
- Reviewers are either peers of the author or experts in other disciplines that are relevant to the work product

- Specified entry and exit criteria are used
- Scribe is mandatory
- Review meeting is led by a trained facilitator (not the author)
- Author cannot act as the review leader, reader, or scribe
- Potential defect logs and review report are produced
- Metrics are collected and used to improve the entire software development process, including the inspection process

3.2.4 Applying Review Techniques

There are a number of review techniques that can be applied during the individual review (i.e., individual preparation) activity to uncover defects. These techniques can be used across the review types described above. The effectiveness of the techniques may differ depending on the type of review used. Examples of different individual review techniques for various review types are listed below.

Ad hoc

In an ad hoc review, reviewers are provided with little or no guidance on how this task should be performed. Reviewers often read the work product sequentially, identifying and documenting issues as they encounter them. Ad hoc reviewing is a commonly used technique needing little preparation. This technique is highly dependent on reviewer skills and may lead to many duplicate issues being reported by different reviewers.

Checklist-based

A checklist-based review is a systematic technique, whereby the reviewers detect issues based on checklists that are distributed at review initiation (e.g., by the facilitator). A review checklist consists of a set of questions based on potential defects, which may be derived from experience. Checklists should be specific to the type of work product under review and should be maintained regularly to cover issue types missed in previous reviews. The main advantage of the checklist-based technique is a systematic coverage of typical defect types. Care should be taken not to simply follow the checklist in individual reviewing, but also to look for defects outside the checklist.

Scenarios and dry runs

In a scenario-based review, reviewers are provided with structured guidelines on how to read through the work product. A scenario-based review supports reviewers in performing “dry runs” on the work product based on expected usage of the work product (if the work product is documented in a suitable format such as use cases). These scenarios provide reviewers with better guidelines on how to identify specific defect types than simple checklist entries. As with checklist-based reviews, in order not to miss other defect types (e.g., missing features), reviewers should not be constrained to the documented scenarios.

Perspective-based

In perspective-based reading, similar to a role-based review, reviewers take on different stakeholder viewpoints in individual reviewing. Typical stakeholder viewpoints include end user, marketing, designer, tester, or operations. Using different stakeholder viewpoints leads to more depth in individual reviewing with less duplication of issues across reviewers.

In addition, perspective-based reading also requires the reviewers to attempt to use the work product under review to generate the product they would derive from it. For example, a tester would attempt to generate draft acceptance tests if performing a perspective-based reading on a requirements

specification to see if all the necessary information was included. Further, in perspective-based reading, checklists are expected to be used.

Empirical studies have shown perspective-based reading to be the most effective general technique for reviewing requirements and technical work products. A key success factor is including and weighing different stakeholder viewpoints appropriately, based on risks. See Shul 2000 for details on perspective-based reading, and Sauer 2000 for the effectiveness of different review techniques.

Role-based

A role-based review is a technique in which the reviewers evaluate the work product from the perspective of individual stakeholder roles. Typical roles include specific end user types (experienced, inexperienced, senior, child, etc.), and specific roles in the organization (user administrator, system administrator, performance tester, etc.). The same principles apply as in perspective-based reading because the roles are similar.

3.2.5 Success Factors for Reviews

In order to have a successful review, the appropriate type of review and the techniques used must be considered. In addition, there are a number of other factors that will affect the outcome of the review.

Organizational success factors for reviews include:

- Each review has clear objectives, defined during review planning, and used as measurable exit criteria
- Review types are applied which are suitable to achieve the objectives and are appropriate to the type and level of software work products and participants
- Any review techniques used, such as checklist-based or role-based reviewing, are suitable for effective defect identification in the work product to be reviewed
- Any checklists used address the main risks and are up to date
- Large documents are written and reviewed in small chunks, so that quality control is exercised by providing authors early and frequent feedback on defects
- Participants have adequate time to prepare
- Reviews are scheduled with adequate notice
- Management supports the review process (e.g., by incorporating adequate time for review activities in project schedules)
- Reviews are integrated in the company's quality and/or test policies.

People-related success factors for reviews include:

- The right people are involved to meet the review objectives, for example, people with different skill sets or perspectives, who may use the document as a work input
- Testers are seen as valued reviewers who contribute to the review and learn about the work product, which enables them to prepare more effective tests, and to prepare those tests earlier
- Participants dedicate adequate time and attention to detail
- Reviews are conducted on small chunks, so that reviewers do not lose concentration during individual review and/or the review meeting (when held)
- Defects found are acknowledged, appreciated, and handled objectively
- The meeting is well-managed, so that participants consider it a valuable use of their time
- The review is conducted in an atmosphere of trust; the outcome will not be used for the evaluation of the participants
- Participants avoid body language and behaviors that might indicate boredom, exasperation, or hostility to other participants
- Adequate training is provided, especially for more formal review types such as inspections
- A culture of learning and process improvement is promoted

(See Gilb 1993, Wiegers 2002, and van Veenendaal 2004 for more on successful reviews.)

4 Test Techniques

330 minutes

Keywords

black-box test technique, boundary value analysis, checklist-based testing, coverage, decision coverage, decision table testing, error guessing, equivalence partitioning, experience-based test technique, exploratory testing, state transition testing, statement coverage, test technique, use case testing, white-box test technique

Learning Objectives for Test Techniques

4.1 Categories of Test Techniques

FL-4.1.1 (K2) Explain the characteristics, commonalities, and differences between black-box test techniques, white-box test techniques, and experience-based test techniques

4.2 Black-box Test Techniques

FL-4.2.1 (K3) Apply equivalence partitioning to derive test cases from given requirements

FL-4.2.2 (K3) Apply boundary value analysis to derive test cases from given requirements

FL-4.2.3 (K3) Apply decision table testing to derive test cases from given requirements

FL-4.2.4 (K3) Apply state transition testing to derive test cases from given requirements

FL-4.2.5 (K2) Explain how to derive test cases from a use case

4.3 White-box Test Techniques

FL-4.3.1 (K2) Explain statement coverage

FL-4.3.2 (K2) Explain decision coverage

FL-4.3.3 (K2) Explain the value of statement and decision coverage

4.4 Experience-based Test Techniques

FL-4.4.1 (K2) Explain error guessing

FL-4.4.2 (K2) Explain exploratory testing

FL-4.4.3 (K2) Explain checklist-based testing

4.1 Categories of Test Techniques

The purpose of a test technique, including those discussed in this section, is to help in identifying test conditions, test cases, and test data.

The choice of which test techniques to use depends on a number of factors, including:

- Component or system complexity
- Regulatory standards
- Customer or contractual requirements
- Risk levels and types
- Available documentation
- Tester knowledge and skills
- Available tools
- Time and budget
- Software development lifecycle model
- The types of defects expected in the component or system

Some techniques are more applicable to certain situations and test levels; others are applicable to all test levels. When creating test cases, testers generally use a combination of test techniques to achieve the best results from the test effort.

The use of test techniques in the test analysis, test design, and test implementation activities can range from very informal (little to no documentation) to very formal. The appropriate level of formality depends on the context of testing, including the maturity of test and development processes, time constraints, safety or regulatory requirements, the knowledge and skills of the people involved, and the software development lifecycle model being followed.

4.1.1 Categories of Test Techniques and Their Characteristics

In this syllabus, test techniques are classified as black-box, white-box, or experience-based.

Black-box test techniques (also called behavioral or behavior-based techniques) are based on an analysis of the appropriate test basis (e.g., formal requirements documents, specifications, use cases, user stories, or business processes). These techniques are applicable to both functional and non-functional testing. Black-box test techniques concentrate on the inputs and outputs of the test object without reference to its internal structure.

White-box test techniques (also called structural or structure-based techniques) are based on an analysis of the architecture, detailed design, internal structure, or the code of the test object. Unlike black-box test techniques, white-box test techniques concentrate on the structure and processing within the test object.

Experience-based test techniques leverage the experience of developers, testers and users to design, implement, and execute tests. These techniques are often combined with black-box and white-box test techniques.

Common characteristics of black-box test techniques include the following:

- Test conditions, test cases, and test data are derived from a test basis that may include software requirements, specifications, use cases, and user stories

- Test cases may be used to detect gaps between the requirements and the implementation of the requirements, as well as deviations from the requirements
- Coverage is measured based on the items tested in the test basis and the technique applied to the test basis

Common characteristics of white-box test techniques include::

- Test conditions, test cases, and test data are derived from a test basis that may include code, software architecture, detailed design, or any other source of information regarding the structure of the software
- Coverage is measured based on the items tested within a selected structure (e.g., the code or interfaces) and the technique applied to the test basis

Common characteristics of experience-based test techniques include::

- Test conditions, test cases, and test data are derived from a test basis that may include knowledge and experience of testers, developers, users and other stakeholders

This knowledge and experience includes expected use of the software, its environment, likely defects, and the distribution of those defects

The international standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-4) contains descriptions of test techniques and their corresponding coverage measures (see Craig 2002 and Copeland 2004 for more on techniques).

4.2 Black-box Test Techniques

4.2.1 Equivalence Partitioning

Equivalence partitioning divides data into partitions (also known as equivalence classes) in such a way that all the members of a given partition are expected to be processed in the same way (see Kaner 2013 and Jorgensen 2014). There are equivalence partitions for both valid and invalid values.

- Valid values are values that should be accepted by the component or system. An equivalence partition containing valid values is called a “valid equivalence partition.”
- Invalid values are values that should be rejected by the component or system. An equivalence partition containing invalid values is called an “invalid equivalence partition.”
- Partitions can be identified for any data element related to the test object, including inputs, outputs, internal values, time-related values (e.g., before or after an event) and for interface parameters (e.g., integrated components being tested during integration testing).
- Any partition may be divided into sub partitions if required.
- Each value must belong to one and only one equivalence partition.
- When invalid equivalence partitions are used in test cases, they should be tested individually, i.e., not combined with other invalid equivalence partitions, to ensure that failures are not masked. Failures can be masked when several failures occur at the same time but only one is visible, causing the other failures to be undetected.

To achieve 100% coverage with this technique, test cases must cover all identified partitions (including invalid partitions) by using a minimum of one value from each partition. Coverage is measured as the number of equivalence partitions tested by at least one value, divided by the total number of identified

equivalence partitions, normally expressed as a percentage. Equivalence partitioning is applicable at all test levels.

4.2.2 Boundary Value Analysis

Boundary value analysis (BVA) is an extension of equivalence partitioning, but can only be used when the partition is ordered, consisting of numeric or sequential data. The minimum and maximum values (or first and last values) of a partition are its boundary values (see Beizer 1990).

For example, suppose an input field accepts a single integer value as an input, using a keypad to limit inputs so that non-integer inputs are impossible. The valid range is from 1 to 5, inclusive. So, there are three equivalence partitions: invalid (too low); valid; invalid (too high). For the valid equivalence partition, the boundary values are 1 and 5. For the invalid (too high) partition, the boundary value is 6. For the invalid (too low) partition, there is only one boundary value, 0, because this is a partition with only one member.

In the example above, we identify two boundary values per boundary. The boundary between invalid (too low) and valid gives the test values 0 and 1. The boundary between valid and invalid (too high) gives the test values 5 and 6. Some variations of this technique identify three boundary values per boundary: the values before, at, and just over the boundary. In the previous example, using three-point boundary values, the lower boundary test values are 0, 1, and 2, and the upper boundary test values are 4, 5, and 6 (see Jorgensen 2014).

Behavior at the boundaries of equivalence partitions is more likely to be incorrect than behavior within the partitions. It is important to remember that both specified and implemented boundaries may be displaced to positions above or below their intended positions, may be omitted altogether, or may be supplemented with unwanted additional boundaries. Boundary value analysis and testing will reveal almost all such defects by forcing the software to show behaviors from a partition other than the one to which the boundary value should belong.

Boundary value analysis can be applied at all test levels. This technique is generally used to test requirements that call for a range of numbers (including dates and times). Boundary coverage for a partition is measured as the number of boundary values tested, divided by the total number of identified boundary test values, normally expressed as a percentage.

4.2.3 Decision Table Testing

Decision tables are a good way to record complex business rules that a system must implement. When creating decision tables, the tester identifies conditions (often inputs) and the resulting actions (often outputs) of the system. These form the rows of the table, usually with the conditions at the top and the actions at the bottom. Each column corresponds to a decision rule that defines a unique combination of conditions which results in the execution of the actions associated with that rule. The values of the conditions and actions are usually shown as Boolean values (true or false) or discrete values (e.g., red, green, blue), but can also be numbers or ranges of numbers. These different types of conditions and actions might be found together in the same table.

The common notation in decision tables is as follows:

For conditions:

- Y means the condition is true (may also be shown as T or 1)
- N means the condition is false (may also be shown as F or 0)
- — means the value of the condition doesn't matter (may also be shown as N/A)

For actions:

- X means the action should occur (may also be shown as Y or T or 1)
- Blank means the action should not occur (may also be shown as – or N or F or 0)

A full decision table has enough columns (test cases) to cover every combination of conditions. By deleting columns that do not affect the outcome, the number of test cases can decrease considerably. For example by removing impossible combinations of conditions. For more information on how to collapse decision tables. (see ISTQB-CTAL-AT).

The common minimum coverage standard for decision table testing is to have at least one test case per decision rule in the table. This typically involves covering all combinations of conditions. Coverage is measured as the number of decision rules tested by at least one test case, divided by the total number of decision rules, normally expressed as a percentage.

The strength of decision table testing is that it helps to identify all the important combinations of conditions, some of which might otherwise be overlooked. It also helps in finding any gaps in the requirements. It may be applied to all situations in which the behavior of the software depends on a combination of conditions, at any test level.

4.2.4 State Transition Testing

Components or systems may respond differently to an event depending on current conditions or previous history (e.g., the events that have occurred since the system was initialized). The previous history can be summarized using the concept of states. A state transition diagram shows the possible software states, as well as how the software enters, exits, and transitions between states. A transition is initiated by an event (e.g., user input of a value into a field). The event results in a transition. The same event can result in two or more different transitions from the same state. The state change may result in the software taking an action (e.g., outputting a calculation or error message).

A state transition table shows all valid transitions and potentially invalid transitions between states, as well as the events, and resulting actions for valid transitions. State transition diagrams normally show only the valid transitions and exclude the invalid transitions.

Tests can be designed to cover a typical sequence of states, to exercise all states, to exercise every transition, to exercise specific sequences of transitions, or to test invalid transitions.

State transition testing is used for menu-based applications and is widely used within the embedded software industry. The technique is also suitable for modeling a business scenario having specific states or for testing screen navigation. The concept of a state is abstract – it may represent a few lines of code or an entire business process.

Coverage is commonly measured as the number of identified states or transitions tested, divided by the total number of identified states or transitions in the test object, normally expressed as a percentage. For more information on coverage criteria for state transition testing, (see ISTQB-CTAL-AT).

4.2.5 Use Case Testing

Tests can be derived from use cases, which are a specific way of designing interactions with software items. They incorporate requirements for the software functions. Use cases are associated with actors (human users, external hardware, or other components or systems) and subjects (the component or system to which the use case is applied).

Each use case specifies some behavior that a subject can perform in collaboration with one or more actors (UML 2.5.1 2017). A use case can be described by interactions and activities, as well as preconditions, postconditions and natural language where appropriate. Interactions between the actors and the subject may result in changes to the state of the subject. Interactions may be represented graphically by work flows, activity diagrams, or business process models.

A use case can include possible variations of its basic behavior, including exceptional behavior and error handling (system response and recovery from programming, application and communication errors, e.g., resulting in an error message). Tests are designed to exercise the defined behaviors (basic, exceptional or alternative, and error handling). Coverage can be measured by the number of use case behaviors tested divided by the total number of use case behaviors, normally expressed as a percentage.

For more information on coverage criteria for use case testing. (see the ISTQB-CTAL-AT).

4.3 White-box Test Techniques

White-box testing is based on the internal structure of the test object. White-box test techniques can be used at all test levels, but the two code-related techniques discussed in this section are most commonly used at the component test level. There are more advanced techniques that are used in some safety-critical, mission-critical, or high integrity environments to achieve more thorough coverage, but those are not discussed here. For more information on such techniques, see the ISTQB-CTAL-TTA.

4.3.1 Statement Testing and Coverage

Statement testing exercises the potential executable statements in the code. Coverage is measured as the number of statements executed by the tests divided by the total number of executable statements in the test object, normally expressed as a percentage.

4.3.2 Decision Testing and Coverage

Decision testing exercises the decisions in the code and tests the code that is executed based on the decision outcomes. To do this, the test cases follow the control flows that occur from a decision point (e.g., for an IF statement, one for the true outcome and one for the false outcome; for a CASE statement, test cases would be required for all the possible outcomes, including the default outcome).

Coverage is measured as the number of decision outcomes executed by the tests divided by the total number of decision outcomes in the test object, normally expressed as a percentage.

4.3.3 The Value of Statement and Decision Testing

When 100% statement coverage is achieved, it ensures that all executable statements in the code have been tested at least once, but it does not ensure that all decision logic has been tested. Of the two white-box techniques discussed in this syllabus, statement testing may provide less coverage than decision testing.

When 100% decision coverage is achieved, it executes all decision outcomes, which includes testing the true outcome and also the false outcome, even when there is no explicit false statement (e.g., in the case of an IF statement without an else in the code). Statement coverage helps to find defects in code that was not exercised by other tests. Decision coverage helps to find defects in code where other tests have not taken both true and false outcomes.

Achieving 100% decision coverage guarantees 100% statement coverage (but not vice versa).

4.4 Experience-based Test Techniques

When applying experience-based test techniques, the test cases are derived from the tester's skill and intuition, and their experience with similar applications and technologies. These techniques can be helpful in identifying tests that were not easily identified by other more systematic techniques. Depending on the tester's approach and experience, these techniques may achieve widely varying degrees of coverage and effectiveness. Coverage can be difficult to assess and may not be measurable with these techniques.

Commonly used experience-based techniques are discussed in the following sections.

4.4.1 Error Guessing

Error guessing is a technique used to anticipate the occurrence of errors, defects, and failures, based on the tester's knowledge, including:

- How the application has worked in the past
- What kind of errors tend to be made
- Failures that have occurred in other applications

A methodical approach to the error guessing technique is to create a list of possible errors, defects, and failures, and design tests that will expose those failures and the defects that caused them. These error, defect, failure lists can be built based on experience, defect and failure data, or from common knowledge about why software fails.

4.4.2 Exploratory Testing

In exploratory testing, informal (not pre-defined) tests are designed, executed, logged, and evaluated dynamically during test execution. The test results are used to learn more about the component or system, and to create tests for the areas that may need more testing.

Exploratory testing is sometimes conducted using session-based testing to structure the activity. In session-based testing, exploratory testing is conducted within a defined time-box, and the tester uses a test charter containing test objectives to guide the testing. The tester may use test session sheets to document the steps followed and the discoveries made.

Exploratory testing is most useful when there are few or inadequate specifications or significant time pressure on testing. Exploratory testing is also useful to complement other more formal testing techniques.

Exploratory testing is strongly associated with reactive test strategies (see section 5.2.2). Exploratory testing can incorporate the use of other black-box, white-box, and experience-based techniques.

4.4.3 Checklist-based Testing

In checklist-based testing, testers design, implement, and execute tests to cover test conditions found in a checklist. As part of analysis, testers create a new checklist or expand an existing checklist, but testers may also use an existing checklist without modification. Such checklists can be built based on experience, knowledge about what is important for the user, or an understanding of why and how software fails.

Checklists can be created to support various test types, including functional and non-functional testing. In the absence of detailed test cases, checklist-based testing can provide guidelines and a degree of consistency. As these are high-level lists, some variability in the actual testing is likely to occur, resulting in potentially greater coverage but less repeatability.

5 Test Management

225 minutes

Keywords

configuration management, defect management, defect report, entry criteria, exit criteria, product risk, project risk, risk, risk level, risk-based testing, test approach, test control, test estimation, test manager, test monitoring, test plan, test planning, test progress report, test strategy, test summary report, tester

Learning Objectives for Test Management

5.1 Test Organization

- FL-5.1.1 (K2) Explain the benefits and drawbacks of independent testing
- FL-5.1.2 (K1) Identify the tasks of a test manager and tester

5.2 Test Planning and Estimation

- FL-5.2.1 (K2) Summarize the purpose and content of a test plan
- FL-5.2.2 (K2) Differentiate between various test strategies
- FL-5.2.3 (K2) Give examples of potential entry and exit criteria
- FL-5.2.4 (K3) Apply knowledge of prioritization, and technical and logical dependencies, to schedule test execution for a given set of test cases
- FL-5.2.5 (K1) Identify factors that influence the effort related to testing
- FL-5.2.6 (K2) Explain the difference between two estimation techniques: the metrics-based technique and the expert-based technique

5.3 Test Monitoring and Control

- FL-5.3.1 (K1) Recall metrics used for testing
- FL-5.3.2 (K2) Summarize the purposes, contents, and audiences for test reports

5.4 Configuration Management

- FL-5.4.1 (K2) Summarize how configuration management supports testing

5.5 Risks and Testing

- FL-5.5.1 (K1) Define risk level by using likelihood and impact
- FL-5.5.2 (K2) Distinguish between project and product risks
- FL-5.5.3 (K2) Describe, by using examples, how product risk analysis may influence the thoroughness and scope of testing

5.6 Defect Management

- FL-5.6.1 (K3) Write a defect report, covering a defect found during testing

5.1 Test Organization

5.1.1 Independent Testing

Testing tasks may be done by people in a specific testing role, or by people in another role (e.g., customers). A certain degree of independence often makes the tester more effective at finding defects due to differences between the author's and the tester's cognitive biases (see section 1.5). Independence is not, however, a replacement for familiarity, and developers can efficiently find many defects in their own code.

Degrees of independence in testing include the following (from low level of independence to high level):

- No independent testers; the only form of testing available is developers testing their own code
- Independent developers or testers within the development teams or the project team; this could be developers testing their colleagues' products
- Independent test team or group within the organization, reporting to project management or executive management
- Independent testers from the business organization or user community, or with specializations in specific test types such as usability, security, performance, regulatory/compliance, or portability
- Independent testers external to the organization, either working on-site (in-house) or off-site (outsourcing)

For most types of projects, it is usually best to have multiple test levels, with some of these levels handled by independent testers. Developers should participate in testing, especially at the lower levels, so as to exercise control over the quality of their own work.

The way in which independence of testing is implemented varies depending on the software development lifecycle model. For example, in Agile development, testers may be part of a development team. In some organizations using Agile methods, these testers may be considered part of a larger independent test team as well. In addition, in such organizations, product owners may perform acceptance testing to validate user stories at the end of each iteration.

Potential benefits of test independence include:

- Independent testers are likely to recognize different kinds of failures compared to developers because of their different backgrounds, technical perspectives, and biases
- An independent tester can verify, challenge, or disprove assumptions made by stakeholders during specification and implementation of the system
- Independent testers of a vendor can report in an upright and objective manner about the system under test without (political) pressure of the company that hired them

Potential drawbacks of test independence include:

- Isolation from the development team, may lead to a lack of collaboration, delays in providing feedback to the development team, or an adversarial relationship with the development team
- Developers may lose a sense of responsibility for quality
- Independent testers may be seen as a bottleneck
- Independent testers may lack some important information (e.g., about the test object)

Many organizations are able to successfully achieve the benefits of test independence while avoiding the drawbacks.

5.1.2 Tasks of a Test Manager and Tester

In this syllabus, two test roles are covered, test managers and testers. The activities and tasks performed by these two roles depend on the project and product context, the skills of the people in the roles, and the organization.

The test manager is tasked with overall responsibility for the test process and successful leadership of the test activities. The test management role might be performed by a professional test manager, or by a project manager, a development manager, or a quality assurance manager. In larger projects or organizations, several test teams may report to a test manager, test coach, or test coordinator, each team being headed by a test leader or lead tester.

Typical test manager tasks may include:

- Develop or review a test policy and test strategy for the organization
- Plan the test activities by considering the context, and understanding the test objectives and risks. This may include selecting test approaches, estimating test time, effort and cost, acquiring resources, defining test levels and test cycles, and planning defect management
- Write and update the test plan(s)
- Coordinate the test plan(s) with project managers, product owners, and others
- Share testing perspectives with other project activities, such as integration planning
- Initiate the analysis, design, implementation, and execution of tests, monitor test progress and results, and check the status of exit criteria (or definition of done) and facilitate test completion activities
- Prepare and deliver test progress reports and test summary reports based on the information gathered
- Adapt planning based on test results and progress (sometimes documented in test progress reports, and/or in test summary reports for other testing already completed on the project) and take any actions necessary for test control
- Support setting up the defect management system and adequate configuration management of testware
- Introduce suitable metrics for measuring test progress and evaluating the quality of the testing and the product
- Support the selection and implementation of tools to support the test process, including recommending the budget for tool selection (and possibly purchase and/or support), allocating time and effort for pilot projects, and providing continuing support in the use of the tool(s)
- Decide about the implementation of test environment(s)
- Promote and advocate the testers, the test team, and the test profession within the organization
- Develop the skills and careers of testers (e.g., through training plans, performance evaluations, coaching, etc.)

The way in which the test manager role is carried out varies depending on the software development lifecycle. For example, in Agile development, some of the tasks mentioned above are handled by the

Agile team, especially those tasks concerned with the day-to-day testing done within the team, often by a tester working within the team. Some of the tasks that span multiple teams or the entire organization, or that have to do with personnel management, may be done by test managers outside of the development team, who are sometimes called test coaches. See Black 2009 for more on managing the test process.

Typical tester tasks may include:

- Review and contribute to test plans
- Analyze, review, and assess requirements, user stories and acceptance criteria, specifications, and models for testability (i.e., the test basis)
- Identify and document test conditions, and capture traceability between test cases, test conditions, and the test basis
- Design, set up, and verify test environment(s), often coordinating with system administration and network management
- Design and implement test cases and test procedures
- Prepare and acquire test data
- Create the detailed test execution schedule
- Execute tests, evaluate the results, and document deviations from expected results
- Use appropriate tools to facilitate the test process
- Automate tests as needed (may be supported by a developer or a test automation expert)
- Evaluate non-functional characteristics such as performance efficiency, reliability, usability, security, compatibility, and portability
- Review tests developed by others

People who work on test analysis, test design, specific test types, or test automation may be specialists in these roles. Depending on the risks related to the product and the project, and the software development lifecycle model selected, different people may take over the role of tester at different test levels. For example, at the component testing level and the component integration testing level, the role of a tester is often done by developers. At the acceptance test level, the role of a tester is often done by business analysts, subject matter experts, and users. At the system test level and the system integration test level, the role of a tester is often done by an independent test team. At the operational acceptance test level, the role of a tester is often done by operations and/or systems administration staff.

5.2 Test Planning and Estimation

5.2.1 Purpose and Content of a Test Plan

A test plan outlines test activities for development and maintenance projects. Planning is influenced by the test policy and test strategy of the organization, the development lifecycles and methods being used (see section 2.1), the scope of testing, objectives, risks, constraints, criticality, testability, and the availability of resources.

As the project and test planning progress, more information becomes available and more detail can be included in the test plan. Test planning is a continuous activity and is performed throughout the product's lifecycle. (Note that the product's lifecycle may extend beyond a project's scope to include the maintenance phase.) Feedback from test activities should be used to recognize changing risks so that planning can be adjusted. Planning may be documented in a master test plan and in separate test plans for test levels, such as system testing and acceptance testing, or for separate test types, such as usability testing and performance testing. Test planning activities may include the following and some of these may be documented in a test plan:

- Determining the scope, objectives, and risks of testing
- Defining the overall approach of testing
- Integrating and coordinating the test activities into the software lifecycle activities
- Making decisions about what to test, the people and other resources required to perform the various test activities, and how test activities will be carried out
- Scheduling of test analysis, design, implementation, execution, and evaluation activities, either on particular dates (e.g., in sequential development) or in the context of each iteration (e.g., in iterative development)
- Selecting metrics for test monitoring and control
- Budgeting for the test activities
- Determining the level of detail and structure for test documentation (e.g., by providing templates or example documents)

The content of test plans vary, and can extend beyond the topics identified above. A sample test plan structure and a sample test plan can be found in ISO standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-3).

5.2.2 Test Strategy and Test Approach

A test strategy provides a generalized description of the test process, usually at the product or organizational level. Common types of test strategies include:

- **Analytical:** This type of test strategy is based on an analysis of some factor (e.g., requirement or risk). Risk-based testing is an example of an analytical approach, where tests are designed and prioritized based on the level of risk.
- **Model-Based:** In this type of test strategy, tests are designed based on some model of some required aspect of the product, such as a function, a business process, an internal structure, or a non-functional characteristic (e.g., reliability). Examples of such models include business process models, state models, and reliability growth models.

- **Methodical:** This type of test strategy relies on making systematic use of some predefined set of tests or test conditions, such as a taxonomy of common or likely types of failures, a list of important quality characteristics, or company-wide look-and-feel standards for mobile apps or web pages.
- **Process-compliant** (or standard-compliant): This type of test strategy involves analyzing, designing, and implementing tests based on external rules and standards, such as those specified by industry-specific standards, by process documentation, by the rigorous identification and use of the test basis, or by any process or standard imposed on or by the organization.
- **Directed** (or consultative): This type of test strategy is driven primarily by the advice, guidance, or instructions of stakeholders, business domain experts, or technology experts, who may be outside the test team or outside the organization itself.
- **Regression-averse:** This type of test strategy is motivated by a desire to avoid regression of existing capabilities. This test strategy includes reuse of existing testware (especially test cases and test data), extensive automation of regression tests, and standard test suites.
- **Reactive:** In this type of test strategy, testing is reactive to the component or system being tested, and the events occurring during test execution, rather than being pre-planned (as the preceding strategies are). Tests are designed and implemented, and may immediately be executed in response to knowledge gained from prior test results. Exploratory testing is a common technique employed in reactive strategies.

An appropriate test strategy is often created by combining several of these types of test strategies. For example, risk-based testing (an analytical strategy) can be combined with exploratory testing (a reactive strategy); they complement each other and may achieve more effective testing when used together.

While the test strategy provides a generalized description of the test process, the test approach tailors the test strategy for a particular project or release. The test approach is the starting point for selecting the test techniques, test levels, and test types, and for defining the entry criteria and exit criteria (or definition of ready and definition of done, respectively). The tailoring of the strategy is based on decisions made in relation to the complexity and goals of the project, the type of product being developed, and product risk analysis. The selected approach depends on the context and may consider factors such as risks, safety, available resources and skills, technology, the nature of the system (e.g., custom-built versus COTS), test objectives, and regulations.

5.2.3 Entry Criteria and Exit Criteria (Definition of Ready and Definition of Done)

In order to exercise effective control over the quality of the software, and of the testing, it is advisable to have criteria which define when a given test activity should start and when the activity is complete. Entry criteria (more typically called definition of ready in Agile development) define the preconditions for undertaking a given test activity. If entry criteria are not met, it is likely that the activity will prove more difficult, more time-consuming, more costly, and more risky. Exit criteria (more typically called definition of done in Agile development) define what conditions must be achieved in order to declare a test level or a set of tests completed. Entry and exit criteria should be defined for each test level and test type, and will differ based on the test objectives.

Typical entry criteria include:

- Availability of testable requirements, user stories, and/or models (e.g., when following a model-based testing strategy)
- Availability of test items that have met the exit criteria for any prior test levels

- Availability of test environment
- Availability of necessary test tools
- Availability of test data and other necessary resources

Typical exit criteria include:

- Planned tests have been executed
- A defined level of coverage (e.g., of requirements, user stories, acceptance criteria, risks, code) has been achieved
- The number of unresolved defects is within an agreed limit
- The number of estimated remaining defects is sufficiently low
- The evaluated levels of reliability, performance efficiency, usability, security, and other relevant quality characteristics are sufficient

Even without exit criteria being satisfied, it is also common for test activities to be curtailed due to the budget being expended, the scheduled time being completed, and/or pressure to bring the product to market. It can be acceptable to end testing under such circumstances, if the project stakeholders and business owners have reviewed and accepted the risk to go live without further testing.

5.2.4 Test Execution Schedule

Once the various test cases and test procedures are produced (with some test procedures potentially automated) and assembled into test suites, the test suites can be arranged in a test execution schedule that defines the order in which they are to be run. The test execution schedule should take into account such factors as prioritization, dependencies, confirmation tests, regression tests, and the most efficient sequence for executing the tests.

Ideally, test cases would be ordered to run based on their priority levels, usually by executing the test cases with the highest priority first. However, this practice may not work if the test cases have dependencies or the features being tested have dependencies. If a test case with a higher priority is dependent on a test case with a lower priority, the lower priority test case must be executed first. Similarly, if there are dependencies across test cases, they must be ordered appropriately regardless of their relative priorities. Confirmation and regression tests must be prioritized as well, based on the importance of rapid feedback on changes, but here again dependencies may apply.

In some cases, various sequences of tests are possible, with differing levels of efficiency associated with those sequences. In such cases, trade-offs between efficiency of test execution versus adherence to prioritization must be made.

5.2.5 Factors Influencing the Test Effort

Test effort estimation involves predicting the amount of test-related work that will be needed in order to meet the objectives of the testing for a particular project, release, or iteration. Factors influencing the test effort may include characteristics of the product, characteristics of the development process, characteristics of the people, and the test results, as shown below.

Product characteristics

- The risks associated with the product
- The quality of the test basis

- The size of the product
- The complexity of the product domain
- The requirements for quality characteristics (e.g., security, reliability)
- The required level of detail for test documentation
- Requirements for legal and regulatory compliance

Development process characteristics

- The stability and maturity of the organization
- The development model in use
- The test approach
- The tools used
- The test process
- Time pressure

People characteristics

- The skills and experience of the people involved, especially with similar projects and products (e.g., domain knowledge)
- Team cohesion and leadership

Test results

- The number and severity of defects found
- The amount of rework required

5.2.6 Test Estimation Techniques

There are a number of estimation techniques used to determine the effort required for adequate testing. Two of the most commonly used techniques are:

- The metrics-based technique: estimating the test effort based on metrics of former similar projects, or based on typical values
- The expert-based technique: estimating the test effort based on the experience of the owners of the testing tasks or by experts

For example, in Agile development, burndown charts are examples of the metrics-based approach as effort remaining is being captured and reported, and is then used to feed into the team's velocity to determine the amount of work the team can do in the next iteration; whereas planning poker is an example of the expert-based approach, as team members are estimating the effort to deliver a feature based on their experience (ISTQB-CTFL-AT).

Within sequential projects, defect removal models are examples of the metrics-based approach, where volumes of defects and time to remove them are captured and reported, which then provides a basis for estimating future projects of a similar nature; whereas the Wideband Delphi estimation technique is an example of the expert-based approach in which a group of experts provides estimates based on their experience (ISTQB-CTAL-TM).

5.3 Test Monitoring and Control

The purpose of test monitoring is to gather information and provide feedback and visibility about test activities. Information to be monitored may be collected manually or automatically and should be used to assess test progress and to measure whether the test exit criteria, or the testing tasks associated with an Agile project's definition of done, are satisfied, such as meeting the targets for coverage of product risks, requirements, or acceptance criteria.

Test control describes any guiding or corrective actions taken as a result of information and metrics gathered and (possibly) reported. Actions may cover any test activity and may affect any other software lifecycle activity.

Examples of test control actions include:

- Re-prioritizing tests when an identified risk occurs (e.g., software delivered late)
- Changing the test schedule due to availability or unavailability of a test environment or other resources
- Re-evaluating whether a test item meets an entry or exit criterion due to rework

5.3.1 Metrics Used in Testing

Metrics can be collected during and at the end of test activities in order to assess:

- Progress against the planned schedule and budget
- Current quality of the test object
- Adequacy of the test approach
- Effectiveness of the test activities with respect to the objectives

Common test metrics include:

- Percentage of planned work done in test case preparation (or percentage of planned test cases implemented)
- Percentage of planned work done in test environment preparation
- Test case execution (e.g., number of test cases run/not run, test cases passed/failed, and/or test conditions passed/failed)
- Defect information (e.g., defect density, defects found and fixed, failure rate, and confirmation test results)
- Test coverage of requirements, user stories, acceptance criteria, risks, or code
- Task completion, resource allocation and usage, and effort
- Cost of testing, including the cost compared to the benefit of finding the next defect or the cost compared to the benefit of running the next test

5.3.2 Purposes, Contents, and Audiences for Test Reports

The purpose of test reporting is to summarize and communicate test activity information, both during and at the end of a test activity (e.g., a test level). The test report prepared during a test activity may be referred to as a test progress report, while a test report prepared at the end of a test activity may be referred to as a test summary report.

During test monitoring and control, the test manager regularly issues test progress reports for stakeholders. In addition to content common to test progress reports and test summary reports, typical test progress reports may also include:

- The status of the test activities and progress against the test plan
- Factors impeding progress
- Testing planned for the next reporting period
- The quality of the test object

When exit criteria are reached, the test manager issues the test summary report. This report provides a summary of the testing performed, based on the latest test progress report and any other relevant information.

Typical test summary reports may include:

- Summary of testing performed
- Information on what occurred during a test period
- Deviations from plan, including deviations in schedule, duration, or effort of test activities
- Status of testing and product quality with respect to the exit criteria or definition of done
- Factors that have blocked or continue to block progress
- Metrics of defects, test cases, test coverage, activity progress, and resource consumption. (e.g., as described in 5.3.1)
- Residual risks (see section 5.5)
- Reusable test work products produced

The contents of a test report will vary depending on the project, the organizational requirements, and the software development lifecycle. For example, a complex project with many stakeholders or a regulated project may require more detailed and rigorous reporting than a quick software update. As another example, in Agile development, test progress reporting may be incorporated into task boards, defect summaries, and burndown charts, which may be discussed during a daily stand-up meeting (see ISTQB-CTFL-AT).

In addition to tailoring test reports based on the context of the project, test reports should be tailored based on the report's audience. The type and amount of information that should be included for a technical audience or a test team may be different from what would be included in an executive summary report. In the first case, detailed information on defect types and trends may be important. In the latter case, a high-level report (e.g., a status summary of defects by priority, budget, schedule, and test conditions passed/failed/not tested) may be more appropriate.

ISO standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-3) refers to two types of test reports, test progress reports and test completion reports (called test summary reports in this syllabus), and contains structures and examples for each type.

5.4 Configuration Management

The purpose of configuration management is to establish and maintain the integrity of the component or system, the testware, and their relationships to one another through the project and product lifecycle.

To properly support testing, configuration management may involve ensuring the following:

- All test items are uniquely identified, version controlled, tracked for changes, and related to each other
- All items of testware are uniquely identified, version controlled, tracked for changes, related to each other and related to versions of the test item(s) so that traceability can be maintained throughout the test process
- All identified documents and software items are referenced unambiguously in test documentation

During test planning, configuration management procedures and infrastructure (tools) should be identified and implemented.

5.5 Risks and Testing

5.5.1 Definition of Risk

Risk involves the possibility of an event in the future which has negative consequences. The level of risk is determined by the likelihood of the event and the impact (the harm) from that event.

5.5.2 Product and Project Risks

Product risk involves the possibility that a work product (e.g., a specification, component, system, or test) may fail to satisfy the legitimate needs of its users and/or stakeholders. When the product risks are associated with specific quality characteristics of a product (e.g., functional suitability, reliability, performance efficiency, usability, security, compatibility, maintainability, and portability), product risks are also called quality risks. Examples of product risks include:

- Software might not perform its intended functions according to the specification
- Software might not perform its intended functions according to user, customer, and/or stakeholder needs
- A system architecture may not adequately support some non-functional requirement(s)
- A particular computation may be performed incorrectly in some circumstances
- A loop control structure may be coded incorrectly
- Response-times may be inadequate for a high-performance transaction processing system
- User experience (UX) feedback might not meet product expectations

Project risk involves situations that, should they occur, may have a negative effect on a project's ability to achieve its objectives. Examples of project risks include:

- Project issues:
 - Delays may occur in delivery, task completion, or satisfaction of exit criteria or definition of done
 - Inaccurate estimates, reallocation of funds to higher priority projects, or general cost-cutting across the organization may result in inadequate funding
 - Late changes may result in substantial re-work
- Organizational issues:
 - Skills, training, and staff may not be sufficient
 - Personnel issues may cause conflict and problems
 - Users, business staff, or subject matter experts may not be available due to conflicting business priorities
- Political issues:
 - Testers may not communicate their needs and/or the test results adequately
 - Developers and/or testers may fail to follow up on information found in testing and reviews (e.g., not improving development and testing practices)
 - There may be an improper attitude toward, or expectations of, testing (e.g., not appreciating the value of finding defects during testing)
- Technical issues:
 - Requirements may not be defined well enough
 - The requirements may not be met, given existing constraints
 - The test environment may not be ready on time
 - Data conversion, migration planning, and their tool support may be late
 - Weaknesses in the development process may impact the consistency or quality of project work products such as design, code, configuration, test data, and test cases
 - Poor defect management and similar problems may result in accumulated defects and other technical debt
- Supplier issues:
 - A third party may fail to deliver a necessary product or service, or go bankrupt
 - Contractual issues may cause problems to the project

Project risks may affect both development activities and test activities. In some cases, project managers are responsible for handling all project risks, but it is not unusual for test managers to have responsibility for test-related project risks.

5.5.3 Risk-based Testing and Product Quality

Risk is used to focus the effort required during testing. It is used to decide where and when to start testing and to identify areas that need more attention. Testing is used to reduce the probability of an adverse event occurring, or to reduce the impact of an adverse event. Testing is used as a risk mitigation activity, to provide information about identified risks, as well as providing information on residual (unresolved) risks.

A risk-based approach to testing provides proactive opportunities to reduce the levels of product risk. It involves product risk analysis, which includes the identification of product risks and the assessment of each risk's likelihood and impact. The resulting product risk information is used to guide test planning, the specification, preparation and execution of test cases, and test monitoring and control. Analyzing product risks early contributes to the success of a project.

In a risk-based approach, the results of product risk analysis are used to:

- Determine the test techniques to be employed
- Determine the particular levels and types of testing to be performed (e.g., security testing, accessibility testing)
- Determine the extent of testing to be carried out
- Prioritize testing in an attempt to find the critical defects as early as possible
- Determine whether any activities in addition to testing could be employed to reduce risk (e.g., providing training to inexperienced designers)

Risk-based testing draws on the collective knowledge and insight of the project stakeholders to carry out product risk analysis. To ensure that the likelihood of a product failure is minimized, risk management activities provide a disciplined approach to:

- Analyze (and re-evaluate on a regular basis) what can go wrong (risks)
- Determine which risks are important to deal with
- Implement actions to mitigate those risks
- Make contingency plans to deal with the risks should they become actual events

In addition, testing may identify new risks, help to determine what risks should be mitigated, and lower uncertainty about risks.

5.6 Defect Management

Since one of the objectives of testing is to find defects, defects found during testing should be logged. The way in which defects are logged may vary, depending on the context of the component or system being tested, the test level, and the software development lifecycle model. Any defects identified should be investigated and should be tracked from discovery and classification to their resolution (e.g., correction of the defects and successful confirmation testing of the solution, deferral to a subsequent release, acceptance as a permanent product limitation, etc.). In order to manage all defects to resolution, an organization should establish a defect management process which includes a workflow and rules for classification. This process must be agreed with all those participating in defect management, including architects, designers, developers, testers, and product owners. In some organizations, defect logging and tracking may be very informal.

During the defect management process, some of the reports may turn out to describe false positives, not actual failures due to defects. For example, a test may fail when a network connection is broken or times out. This behavior does not result from a defect in the test object, but is an anomaly that needs to be investigated. Testers should attempt to minimize the number of false positives reported as defects.

Defects may be reported during coding, static analysis, reviews, or during dynamic testing, or use of a software product. Defects may be reported for issues in code or working systems, or in any type of documentation including requirements, user stories and acceptance criteria, development documents, test documents, user manuals, or installation guides. In order to have an effective and efficient defect management process, organizations may define standards for the attributes, classification, and workflow of defects.

Typical defect reports have the following objectives:

- Provide developers and other parties with information about any adverse event that occurred, to enable them to identify specific effects, to isolate the problem with a minimal reproducing test, and to correct the potential defect(s), as needed or to otherwise resolve the problem
- Provide test managers a means of tracking the quality of the work product and the impact on the testing (e.g., if a lot of defects are reported, the testers will have spent a lot of time reporting them instead of running tests, and there will be more confirmation testing needed)
- Provide ideas for development and test process improvement

A defect report filed during dynamic testing typically includes:

- An identifier
- A title and a short summary of the defect being reported
- Date of the defect report, issuing organization, and author
- Identification of the test item (configuration item being tested) and environment
- The development lifecycle phase(s) in which the defect was observed
- A description of the defect to enable reproduction and resolution, including logs, database dumps, screenshots, or recordings (if found during test execution)
- Expected and actual results
- Scope or degree of impact (severity) of the defect on the interests of stakeholder(s)
- Urgency/priority to fix

- State of the defect report (e.g., open, deferred, duplicate, waiting to be fixed, awaiting confirmation testing, re-opened, closed)
- Conclusions, recommendations and approvals
- Global issues, such as other areas that may be affected by a change resulting from the defect
- Change history, such as the sequence of actions taken by project team members with respect to the defect to isolate, repair, and confirm it as fixed
- References, including the test case that revealed the problem

Some of these details may be automatically included and/or managed when using defect management tools, e.g., automatic assignment of an identifier, assignment and update of the defect report state during the workflow, etc. Defects found during static testing, particularly reviews, will normally be documented in a different way, e.g., in review meeting notes.

An example of the contents of a defect report can be found in ISO standard (ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-3) (which refers to defect reports as incident reports).

6 Tool Support for Testing

40 minutes

Keywords

data-driven testing, keyword-driven testing, test automation, test execution tool, test management tool

Learning Objectives for Test Tools

6.1 Test tool considerations

- FL-6.1.1 (K2) Classify test tools according to their purpose and the test activities they support
- FL-6.1.2 (K1) Identify benefits and risks of test automation
- FL-6.1.3 (K1) Remember special considerations for test execution and test management tools

6.2 Effective use of tools

- FL-6.2.1 (K1) Identify the main principles for selecting a tool
- FL-6.2.2 (K1) Recall the objectives for using pilot projects to introduce tools
- FL-6.2.3 (K1) Identify the success factors for evaluation, implementation, deployment, and on-going support of test tools in an organization

6.1 Test Tool Considerations

Test tools can be used to support one or more testing activities. Such tools include:

- Tools that are directly used in testing, such as test execution tools and test data preparation tools
- Tools that help to manage requirements, test cases, test procedures, automated test scripts, test results, test data, and defects, and for reporting and monitoring test execution
- Tools that are used for analysis and evaluation
- Any tool that assists in testing (a spreadsheet is also a test tool in this meaning)

6.1.1 Test Tool Classification

Test tools can have one or more of the following purposes depending on the context:

- Improve the efficiency of test activities by automating repetitive tasks or tasks that require significant resources when done manually (e.g., test execution, regression testing)
- Improve the efficiency of test activities by supporting manual test activities throughout the test process (see section 1.4)
- Improve the quality of test activities by allowing for more consistent testing and a higher level of defect reproducibility
- Automate activities that cannot be executed manually (e.g., large scale performance testing)
- Increase reliability of testing (e.g., by automating large data comparisons or simulating behavior)

Tools can be classified based on several criteria such as purpose, pricing, licensing model (e.g., commercial or open source), and technology used. Tools are classified in this syllabus according to the test activities that they support.

Some tools clearly support only or mainly one activity; others may support more than one activity, but are classified under the activity with which they are most closely associated. Tools from a single provider, especially those that have been designed to work together, may be provided as an integrated suite.

Some types of test tools can be intrusive, which means that they may affect the actual outcome of the test. For example, the actual response times for an application may be different due to the extra instructions that are executed by a performance testing tool, or the amount of code coverage achieved may be distorted due to the use of a coverage tool. The consequence of using intrusive tools is called the probe effect.

Some tools offer support that is typically more appropriate for developers (e.g., tools that are used during component and integration testing). Such tools are marked with “(D)” in the sections below.

Tool support for management of testing and testware

Management tools may apply to any test activities over the entire software development lifecycle.

Examples of tools that support management of testing and testware include:

- Test management tools and application lifecycle management tools (ALM)
- Requirements management tools (e.g., traceability to test objects)
- Defect management tools

- Configuration management tools
- Continuous integration tools (D)

Tool support for static testing

Static testing tools are associated with the activities and benefits described in chapter 3. Examples of such tool include:

- Static analysis tools (D)

Tool support for test design and implementation

Test design tools aid in the creation of maintainable work products in test design and implementation, including test cases, test procedures and test data. Examples of such tools include:

- Model-Based testing tools
- Test data preparation tools

In some cases, tools that support test design and implementation may also support test execution and logging, or provide their outputs directly to other tools that support test execution and logging.

Tool support for test execution and logging

Many tools exist to support and enhance test execution and logging activities. Examples of these tools include:

- Test execution tools (e.g., to run regression tests)
- Coverage tools (e.g., requirements coverage, code coverage (D))
- Test harnesses (D)

Tool support for performance measurement and dynamic analysis

Performance measurement and dynamic analysis tools are essential in supporting performance and load testing activities, as these activities cannot effectively be done manually. Examples of these tools include:

- Performance testing tools
- Dynamic analysis tools (D)

Tool support for specialized testing needs

In addition to tools that support the general test process, there are many other tools that support more specific testing for non-functional characteristics.

6.1.2 Benefits and Risks of Test Automation

Simply acquiring a tool does not guarantee success. Each new tool introduced into an organization will require effort to achieve real and lasting benefits. There are potential benefits and opportunities with the use of tools in testing, but there are also risks. This is particularly true of test execution tools (which is often referred to as test automation).

Potential benefits of using tools to support test execution include:

- Reduction in repetitive manual work (e.g., running regression tests, environment set up/tear down tasks, re-entering the same test data, and checking against coding standards), thus saving time

- Greater consistency and repeatability (e.g., test data is created in a coherent manner, tests are executed by a tool in the same order with the same frequency, and tests are consistently derived from requirements)
- More objective assessment (e.g., static measures, coverage)
- Easier access to information about testing (e.g., statistics and graphs about test progress, defect rates and performance)

Potential risks of using tools to support testing include:

- Expectations for the tool may be unrealistic (including functionality and ease of use)
- The time, cost and effort for the initial introduction of a tool may be under-estimated (including training and external expertise)
- The time and effort needed to achieve significant and continuing benefits from the tool may be under-estimated (including the need for changes in the test process and continuous improvement in the way the tool is used)
- The effort required to maintain the test work products generated by the tool may be under-estimated
- The tool may be relied on too much (seen as a replacement for test design or execution, or the use of automated testing where manual testing would be better)
- Version control of test work products may be neglected
- Relationships and interoperability issues between critical tools may be neglected, such as requirements management tools, configuration management tools, defect management tools and tools from multiple vendors
- The tool vendor may go out of business, retire the tool, or sell the tool to a different vendor
- The vendor may provide a poor response for support, upgrades, and defect fixes
- An open source project may be suspended
- A new platform or technology may not be supported by the tool
- There may be no clear ownership of the tool (e.g., for mentoring, updates, etc.)

6.1.3 Special Considerations for Test Execution and Test Management Tools

In order to have a smooth and successful implementation, there are a number of things that ought to be considered when selecting and integrating test execution and test management tools into an organization.

Test execution tools

Test execution tools execute test objects using automated test scripts. This type of tools often requires significant effort in order to achieve significant benefits.

- **Capturing test approach:** Capturing tests by recording the actions of a manual tester seems attractive, but this approach does not scale to large numbers of test scripts. A captured script is a linear representation with specific data and actions as part of each script. This type of script may be unstable when unexpected events occur, and require ongoing maintenance as the system's user interface evolves over time.

- **Data-driven test approach:** This test approach separates out the test inputs and expected results, usually into a spreadsheet, and uses a more generic test script that can read the input data and execute the same test script with different data.
- **Keyword-driven test approach:** This test approach, a generic script processes keywords describing the actions to be taken (also called action words), which then calls keyword scripts to process the associated test data.

The above approaches require someone to have expertise in the scripting language (testers, developers or specialists in test automation). When using data-driven or keyword-driven test approaches testers who are not familiar with the scripting language can also contribute by creating test data and/or keywords for these predefined scripts. Regardless of the scripting technique used, the expected results for each test need to be compared to actual results from the test, either dynamically (while the test is running) or stored for later (post-execution) comparison.

Further details and examples of data-driven and keyword-driven testing approaches are given in ISTQB-CTAL-TAE, Fewster 1999 and Buwalda 2001.

Model-Based testing (MBT) tools enable a functional specification to be captured in the form of a model, such as an activity diagram. This task is generally performed by a system designer. The MBT tool interprets the model in order to create test case specifications which can then be saved in a test management tool and/or executed by a test execution tool (see ISTQB-CTFL-MBT).

Test management tools

Test management tools often need to interface with other tools or spreadsheets for various reasons, including:

- To produce useful information in a format that fits the needs of the organization
- To maintain consistent traceability to requirements in a requirements management tool
- To link with test object version information in the configuration management tool

This is particularly important to consider when using an integrated tool (e.g., Application Lifecycle Management), which includes a test management module, as well as other modules (e.g., project schedule and budget information) that are used by different groups within an organization.

6.2 Effective Use of Tools

6.2.1 Main Principles for Tool Selection

The main considerations in selecting a tool for an organization include:

- Assessment of the maturity of the own organization, its strengths and weaknesses
- Identification of opportunities for an improved test process supported by tools
- Understanding of the technologies used by the test object(s), in order to select a tool that is compatible with that technology
- Understanding the build and continuous integration tools already in use within the organization, in order to ensure tool compatibility and integration
- Evaluation of the tool against clear requirements and objective criteria
- Consideration of whether or not the tool is available for a free trial period (and for how long)

- Evaluation of the vendor (including training, support and commercial aspects) or support for non-commercial (e.g., open source) tools
- Identification of internal requirements for coaching and mentoring in the use of the tool
- Evaluation of training needs, considering the testing (and test automation) skills of those who will be working directly with the tool(s)
- Consideration of pros and cons of various licensing models (e.g., commercial or open source)
- Estimation of a cost-benefit ratio based on a concrete business case (if required)

As a final step, a proof-of-concept evaluation should be done to establish whether the tool performs effectively with the software under test and within the current infrastructure or, if necessary, to identify changes needed to that infrastructure to use the tool effectively.

6.2.2 Pilot Projects for Introducing a Tool into an Organization

After completing the tool selection and a successful proof-of-concept, introducing the selected tool into an organization generally starts with a pilot project, which has the following objectives:

- Gaining in-depth knowledge about the tool, understanding both its strengths and weaknesses
- Evaluating how the tool fits with existing processes and practices, and determining what would need to change
- Deciding on standard ways of using, managing, storing, and maintaining the tool and the test work products (e.g., deciding on naming conventions for files and tests, selecting coding standards, creating libraries and defining the modularity of test suites)
- Assessing whether the benefits will be achieved at reasonable cost
- Understanding the metrics that you wish the tool to collect and report, and configuring the tool to ensure these metrics can be captured and reported

6.2.3 Success Factors for Tools

Success factors for evaluation, implementation, deployment, and on-going support of tools within an organization include:

- Rolling out the tool to the rest of the organization incrementally
- Adapting and improving processes to fit with the use of the tool
- Providing training, coaching, and mentoring for tool users
- Defining guidelines for the use of the tool (e.g., internal standards for automation)
- Implementing a way to gather usage information from the actual use of the tool
- Monitoring tool use and benefits
- Providing support to the users of a given tool
- Gathering lessons learned from all users

It is also important to ensure that the tool is technically and organizationally integrated into the software development lifecycle, which may involve separate organizations responsible for operations and/or third party suppliers. See Graham 2012 for experiences and advice about using test execution tools.

7 References

Standards

ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-1 (2013) Software and systems engineering - Software testing - Part 1: Concepts and definitions

ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-2 (2013) Software and systems engineering - Software testing - Part 2: Test processes

ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-3 (2013) Software and systems engineering - Software testing - Part 3: Test documentation

ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119-4 (2015) Software and systems engineering - Software testing - Part 4: Test techniques

ISO/IEC 25010, (2011) Systems and software engineering – Systems and software Quality Requirements and Evaluation (SQuaRE) System and software quality models

ISO/IEC 20246: (2017) Software and systems engineering — Work product reviews

UML 2.5, Unified Modeling Language Reference Manual, <http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/2.5.1/>, 2017

ISTQB® documents

ISTQB® Glossary

ISTQB® Foundation Level Overview 2018

ISTQB-CTFL-MBT Foundation Level Model-Based Tester Extension Syllabus

ISTQB-CTFL-AT Foundation Level Agile Tester Extension Syllabus

ISTQB-CTAL-TA Advanced Level Test Analyst Syllabus

ISTQB-CTAL-TTA Advanced Level Technical Test Analyst Syllabus

ISTQB-CTAL-TM Advanced Level Test Manager Syllabus

ISTQB-CTAL-SEC Advanced Level Security Tester Syllabus

ISTQB-CTAL-TAE Advanced Level Test Automation Engineer Syllabus

ISTQB-CTEL-TM Expert Level Test Management Syllabus

ISTQB-CTEL-ITP Expert Level Improving the Test Process Syllabus

Books and Articles

- Beizer, B. (1990) *Software Testing Techniques (2e)*, Van Nostrand Reinhold: Boston MA
- Black, R. (2017) *Agile Testing Foundations*, BCS Learning & Development Ltd: Swindon UK
- Black, R. (2009) *Managing the Testing Process (3e)*, John Wiley & Sons: New York NY
- Buwalda, H. et al. (2001) *Integrated Test Design and Automation*, Addison Wesley: Reading MA
- Copeland, L. (2004) *A Practitioner's Guide to Software Test Design*, Artech House: Norwood MA
- Craig, R. and Jaskiel, S. (2002) *Systematic Software Testing*, Artech House: Norwood MA
- Crispin, L. and Gregory, J. (2008) *Agile Testing*, Pearson Education: Boston MA
- Fewster, M. and Graham, D. (1999) *Software Test Automation*, Addison Wesley: Harlow UK
- Gilb, T. and Graham, D. (1993) *Software Inspection*, Addison Wesley: Reading MA
- Graham, D. and Fewster, M. (2012) *Experiences of Test Automation*, Pearson Education: Boston MA
- Gregory, J. and Crispin, L. (2015) *More Agile Testing*, Pearson Education: Boston MA
- Jorgensen, P. (2014) *Software Testing, A Craftsman's Approach (4e)*, CRC Press: Boca Raton FL
- Kaner, C., Bach, J. and Pettichord, B. (2002) *Lessons Learned in Software Testing*, John Wiley & Sons: New York NY
- Kaner, C., Padmanabhan, S. and Hoffman, D. (2013) *The Domain Testing Workbook*, Context-Driven Press: New York NY
- Kramer, A., Legeard, B. (2016) *Model-Based Testing Essentials: Guide to the ISTQB® Certified Model-Based Tester: Foundation Level*, John Wiley & Sons: New York NY
- Myers, G. (2011) *The Art of Software Testing*, (3e), John Wiley & Sons: New York NY
- Sauer, C. (2000) "The Effectiveness of Software Development Technical Reviews: A Behaviorally Motivated Program of Research," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, Volume 26, Issue 1, pp 1-
- Shull, F., Rus, I., Basili, V. July 2000. "How Perspective-Based Reading can Improve Requirement Inspections." *IEEE Computer*, Volume 33, Issue 7, pp 73-79
- van Veenendaal, E. (ed.) (2004) *The Testing Practitioner* (Chapters 8 - 10), UTN Publishers: The Netherlands
- Wieggers, K. (2002) *Peer Reviews in Software*, Pearson Education: Boston MA
- Weinberg, G. (2008) *Perfect Software and Other Illusions about Testing*, Dorset House: New York NY

Other Resources (not directly referenced in this Syllabus)

- Black, R., van Veenendaal, E. and Graham, D. (2019) *Foundations of Software Testing: ISTQB® Certification (4e)*, Cengage Learning: London UK
- Hetzel, W. (1993) *Complete Guide to Software Testing (2e)*, QED Information Sciences: Wellesley MA

8 Appendix A – Syllabus Background

History of this Document

This document is the ISTQB® Certified Tester Foundation Level Syllabus, the first level international qualification approved by the ISTQB® (www.istqb.org).

This document was prepared during June to August of 2019 by a Working Group comprised of members appointed by the International Software Testing Qualifications Board (ISTQB®). Updates were added after review input from member boards who has used the Foundation Syllabus 2018.

The previous Foundation Syllabus 2018 was prepared between 2014 and 2018 by a Working Group comprised of members appointed by the International Software Testing Qualifications Board (ISTQB®). The 2018 version was initially reviewed by representatives from all ISTQB® member boards, and then by representatives drawn from the international software testing community.

Objectives of the Foundation Certificate Qualification

- To gain recognition for testing as an essential and professional software engineering specialization
- To provide a standard framework for the development of testers' careers
- To enable professionally qualified testers to be recognized by employers, customers and peers, and to raise the profile of testers
- To promote consistent and good testing practices within all software engineering disciplines
- To identify testing topics that are relevant and of value to industry
- To enable software suppliers to hire certified testers and thereby gain commercial advantage over their competitors by advertising their tester recruitment policy
- To provide an opportunity for testers and those with an interest in testing to acquire an internationally recognized qualification in the subject

Objectives of the International Qualification

- To be able to compare testing knowledge across different countries
- To enable testers to move across country borders more easily
- To enable multinational/international projects to have a common understanding of testing issues
- To increase the number of qualified testers worldwide
- To have more impact/value as an internationally-based initiative than from any country-specific approach
- To develop a common international body of understanding and knowledge about testing through the syllabus and terminology, and to increase the level of knowledge about testing for all participants
- To promote testing as a profession in more countries

- To enable testers to gain a recognized qualification in their native language
- To enable sharing of knowledge and resources across countries
- To provide international recognition of testers and this qualification due to participation from many countries

Entry Requirements for this Qualification

The entry criterion for taking the ISTQB® Certified Tester Foundation Level exam is that candidates have an interest in software testing. However, it is strongly recommended that candidates also:

- Have at least a minimal background in either software development or software testing, such as six months experience as a system or user acceptance tester or as a software developer
- Take a course that has been accredited by one of the ISTQB-recognized member boards to ISTQB® standards.

Background and History of the Foundation Certificate in Software Testing

The independent certification of software testers began in the UK with the British Computer Society's Information Systems Examination Board (ISEB), when a Software Testing Board was set up in 1998 (www.bcs.org.uk/iseb). In 2002, ASQF in Germany began to support a German tester qualification scheme (www.asqf.de). This syllabus is based on the ISEB and ASQF syllabi; it includes reorganized, updated and additional content, and the emphasis is directed at topics that will provide the most practical help to testers.

An existing Foundation Certificate in Software Testing (e.g., from ISEB, ASQF or an ISTQB-recognized member board) awarded before this International Certificate was released, will be deemed to be equivalent to the International Certificate. The Foundation Certificate does not expire and does not need to be renewed. The date it was awarded is shown on the Certificate.

Within each participating country, local aspects are controlled by a national or regional ISTQB-recognized Software Testing Board. Duties of member boards are specified by the ISTQB®, but are implemented within each country. The duties of the member boards are expected to include accreditation of training providers and the setting of exams.

9 Appendix B – Learning Objectives/Cognitive Level of Knowledge

The following learning objectives are defined as applying to this syllabus. Each topic in the syllabus will be examined according to the learning objective for it.

Level 1: Remember (K1)

The candidate will recognize, remember and recall a term or concept.

Keywords: Identify, remember, retrieve, recall, recognize, know

Examples:

Can recognize the definition of “failure” as:

- “Non-delivery of service to an end user or any other stakeholder” or
- “Deviation of the component or system from its expected delivery, service or result”

Level 2: Understand (K2)

The candidate can select the reasons or explanations for statements related to the topic, and can summarize, compare, classify, categorize and give examples for the testing concept.

Keywords: Summarize, generalize, abstract, classify, compare, map, contrast, exemplify, interpret, translate, represent, infer, conclude, categorize, construct models

Examples:

Can explain the reason why test analysis and design should occur as early as possible:

- To find defects when they are cheaper to remove
- To find the most important defects first

Can explain the similarities and differences between integration and system testing:

- Similarities: the test objects for both integration testing and system testing include more than one component, and both integration testing and system testing can include non-functional test types
- Differences: integration testing concentrates on interfaces and interactions, and system testing concentrates on whole-system aspects, such as end-to-end processing

Level 3: Apply (K3)

The candidate can select the correct application of a concept or technique and apply it to a given context.

Keywords: Implement, execute, use, follow a procedure, apply a procedure

Examples:

- Can identify boundary values for valid and invalid partitions
- Can select test cases from a given state transition diagram in order to cover all transitions

Reference (For the cognitive levels of learning objectives)

Anderson, L. W. and Krathwohl, D. R. (eds) (2001) *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, Allyn & Bacon: Boston MA

10 Appendix C – Release Notes

ISTQB® Foundation Syllabus 2018 V3.1 is a minor update of the release 2018. A separate Release Note 2018 V3.1 have been created with an overview per chapter. Additionally a version of the Foundation Syllabus 2018 V3.1 with track changes has been release,

ISTQB® Foundation Syllabus 2018 is a major update and rewrite of release 2011. For this reason, there are no detailed release notes per chapter and section. However, a summary of principal changes is provided here. Additionally, in a separate Release Notes document, ISTQB® provides traceability between the learning objectives in the 2011 version of the Foundation Level Syllabus and the learning objectives in the 2018 version of the Foundation Level Syllabus, showing which have been added, updated, or removed.

At the start of 2017 more than 550,000 people in more than 100 countries have taken the foundation exam, and more than 500,000 are certified testers worldwide. With the expectation that all of them have read the Foundation Syllabus to be able to pass the exam, this makes the Foundation Syllabus likely to be the most read software testing document ever!

This major update is made in respect of this heritage and to improve the value the ISTQB® delivers to the next 500,000 people in the global testing community.

In this version, all learning objectives have been edited to make them atomic, and to create clear traceability from each learning objective to the content section(s) (and exam questions) that are related to that learning objective, and to have clear traceability from the content section(s) (and exam questions) back to the associated learning objective. In addition, the chapter time allocations have been made more realistic than those in the 2011 version of the syllabus, by using proven heuristics and formulas used with other ISTQB® syllabi, which are based on an analysis of the learning objectives to be covered in each chapter.

While this is a Foundation syllabus, expressing best practices and techniques that have withstood the test of time, we have made changes to modernize the presentation of the material, especially in terms of software development methods (e.g., Scrum and continuous deployment) and technologies (e.g., the Internet of Things). We have updated the referenced standards to make them more recent as follows:

1. ISO/IEC/IEEE 29119 replaces IEEE Standard 829.
2. ISO/IEC 25010 replaces ISO 9126.
3. ISO/IEC 20246 replaces IEEE 1028.

In addition, since the ISTQB® portfolio has grown dramatically over the last decade, we have added extensive cross-references to related material in other ISTQB® syllabi, where relevant, as well as carefully reviewing for alignment with all syllabi and with the ISTQB® Glossary. The goal is to make this version easier to read, understand, learn, and translate, focusing on increasing practical usefulness and the balance between knowledge and skills.

For a detailed analysis of the changes made in the Foundation Syllabus 2018 release, see the ISTQB® Certified Tester Foundation Level Release Notes 2018.

11 Index

- acceptance testing 13, 27, 30, 36–39, 41–42, 63, 67
- action words *see* keyword-driven testing
- ad hoc review 45, 52
- Agile development 14, 18, 29–30, 32, 46, 50, 63–64, 68, 70, 72
- alpha and beta testing 36–37
- audience, for test reports 72
- automated component regression tests 31–32
- automation 29, 41, 66, 68, 78, 84
- banking application example, test types and test levels 41–42
- beta testing *see* alpha and beta testing
- black-box test techniques 20, 39–40, 55, 56–60
 - boundary value analysis (BVA) 40, 55, 58
 - decision table testing 35, 55, 58–59
 - equivalence partitioning 55, 57–58
 - state transition testing 55, 59
 - use case testing 55, 59–60
- boundary value analysis 40, 55, 58
- buddy check *see* informal review
- change-related testing 41
- checklist-based review 52
- checklist-based testing 55, 61
- code coverage 13, 40, 79–80
- code coverage tools 40, 79–80
- commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software 27, 29, 37, 39, 43, 68
- component integration testing 14, 27, 32–34, 40–42, 66
 - see also* integration testing
- component testing 13, 14, 27, 30–32, 34, 35, 40–42, 68
- configuration management 62, 64, 73, 80, 81–82
- confirmation bias 25–26
- confirmation testing 14, 21, 27, 39, 41, 76–77
- context 12–13, 17–18, 27, 29, 30, 56, 64, 67–68, 72, 76
- contractual acceptance testing 27, 36–37, 39
- coverage 12, 14, 18–20, 23–24, 39–42, 47, 52, 55, 57–61, 69, 71–72, 79–81
 - black-box testing 57–60
 - checklist-based 52
 - code 14, 40, 79–80
 - decision 55, 60
 - decision table 59
 - equivalence partitioning 57
 - experience-based 61
 - functional 39
 - non-functional 40
 - state transition 59
 - statement 55, 60
 - use case 59–60
 - white-box testing 40, 56, 60
- data-driven testing 78, 82
- debugging 12, 14
- decision table 35, 55, 58–59
- decision coverage 42, 55, 60
- decision testing 31, 60
- defect management 22, 64, 74, 76–77
- defect reports 22, 24–25, 49, 63, 76–77
- defects 12, 15–17
 - acceptance testing, typical 38
 - clusters 16
 - component testing, typical 31–32
 - integration testing, typical 33–34
 - necessity of testing 14
 - pesticide paradox 17
 - psychology 25
 - root causes of 16
 - static testing benefits 46–47
 - system testing, typical 35
 - test analysis 19–20
 - testing principles and 16–17
- development lifecycle model *see* software development lifecycle model
- developer
 - component testing 32, 34
 - debugging 14
 - independent testing 63
 - mindset compared to tester's 25–26
 - tools for 79–80
- dry runs *see* scenario-based review
- dynamic analysis, tool support for 80
- early testing 16
- entry and exit criteria 19, 22, 62, 68–69, 71–72, 74
 - for reviews 48–49, 52–53
- equivalence partitioning 55, 57–58
- error guessing 55, 61

- errors 15–16
 - absence is, fallacy 17
- estimation
 - techniques 70
 - test 62, 67, 69
 - tool selection 82–83
 - see also* test planning
- exhaustive testing 16
- exit criteria *see* entry and exit criteria
- experience-based test techniques 20–21, 55, 56, 57, 61
 - checklist-based testing 61
 - error guessing 61
 - exploratory testing 55, 61
- expert-based estimation technique 70
- exploratory testing 21, 23, 61, 68
- failures 12–16, 21, 27
 - acceptance testing, typical 38
 - change-related 41
 - component testing, typical 31–32
 - defect management, in 76
 - equivalence partitioning 57–58
 - error guessing 61
 - errors, defects and 15–16
 - independent testers 64
 - integration testing, typical 33–34
 - non-functional testing 38
 - static and dynamic testing 41
 - system testing, typical 35
 - test execution, in 20
 - psychology 25
- false negatives 16, 36
- false positives 16, 21, 36, 76
- functional testing 27, 30–31, 35, 39–40, 56, 61
- impact analysis 27, 43–44
- incident reports *see* defect reports
- incremental development models 28–32, 41
 - see also* iterative development models
- independent testers and testing 26, 36–37, 63, 66
- informal review 45, 48, 50, 52
- inspection 45, 48, 51–52, 54
- integration strategy 34
- integration testing 27, 29–30, 32–34, 40–43, 57, 66, 79
 - see also* component integration testing, system integration testing
- Internet of Things (IoT) systems 30, 41, 43
- interpersonal skills 25
- intrusive (tool) 79
- ISO Standards
 - 25010 40
 - 20246 48, 50
 - 29119-1 14
 - 29119-2 18
 - 29119-3 22, 66, 71, 76
 - 29119-4 57
- iterative development models 28–29, 31–32, 39, 66
 - see also* incremental development models
- Kanban 29
- keyword-driven testing 77, 81
- logging
 - defect management 76
 - tool support for 80
- maintenance testing 27, 42–44
- management *see* configuration management, defect management, project management, quality management, test management
- management, tool support for 22, 24, 78–79, 82–83
- metrics-based estimation technique 69
- metrics used in reviews 49, 52
- metrics used in testing 19, 63, 65, 67, 70–71, 82
- mindset, tester and developer compared 25–26
- mobile application
 - contextual testing factors 17–18, 68
 - non-functional coverage 40, 42
- model-based testing (MBT)
 - strategy 67–68
 - testing 46
 - tools 80, 82
- monitoring tools 79–80
- non-functional coverage 40
- non-functional testing 27, 30–31, 35, 40, 41, 57, 62
- objectives
 - defect reports 76
 - reviews 45, 47–48, 50, 53–54
 - test levels 27–28, 30–32, 34, 36–36
 - test objectives 12–15, 17–20, 25, 56, 62, 65, 67–69, 71
 - test types 39
 - pilot project 83
- open source tools 79, 83
- operational acceptance testing (OAT) 36–37
- performance testing 37, 40–41, 43, 53, 64, 67
 - tools 78, 79–80
- perspective-based reading 45, 52–53
- pesticide paradox 17

- pilot project, introducing tool into organization 82
- planning
 - integration 34, 65
 - migration 73
 - planning poker 69
 - review 48–49, 53
 - test *see* test planning
 - work products *see* test plan
 - see also* estimation
- probe effect 78
- product quality 24–25, 40, 47, 52, 65, 69, 71–72, 74–76
- product risk 17, 19, 29, 62, 68, 71, 73, 75
- product risk analysis 63, 68, 75
- project risk 17, 29, 36, 62, 73–74
- proof-of-concept (tool) 82
- prototyping 30
- psychology 25
- purpose
 - configuration management 72
 - confirmation and maintenance testing 27, 41
 - monitoring and control 71
 - reviews 48, 50–52
 - test plan 64, 66
 - test report 63, 71
 - testing 14–16, 56
 - tools 78–79
- quality 12–15, 19, 31–32, 34, 36, 64, 68, 79
 - cost of 47
 - data quality 35, 81
 - product *see* product quality
- quality characteristics 39–40, 42, 48, 67, 69, 72
- quality assurance 12, 15, 65
- quality control 15, 53
- quality risk *see* product risk
- quality management 15
- Rational Unified Process 29
- reactive test strategies 62, 68
- regression
 - averse 67
 - defects (aka regressions) 17, 41, 43
 - testing 17, 21, 27, 29, 34, 39, 41, 43, 46, 79
 - tests 31–32, 35, 42, 68–69
 - tools 80–81
- regulatory acceptance testing 37
- regulatory requirements 13, 17, 35–38, 48, 56
- requirements elicitation error 15
- retirement, maintenance testing and 43
- review
 - decision 48
 - findings 25, 48, 74
 - meeting 50–52, 54, 76
 - objectives 48, 53
 - peers 51–52
 - planning 48
 - process 20, 45, 48–50
 - requirements, review of 14, 25, 46, 65
 - review types 45, 48–52, 54
 - roles 36, 45, 47–50, 53
 - reports 51–52, 76
 - success factors 45, 53–54
 - tools to support 79
 - work products 13, 28, 45–46, 48–49, 52–53, 65–66
- risk 73–75
 - definition 73
 - product *see* product risk
 - project *see* project risk
 - risk analysis 16, 19, 34–35, 37, 62, 67, 74
 - risk-based testing 62, 66–67, 74
 - test automation risks 79–81
- role-based review 53
- root cause analysis 13, 15–16, 32, 51
- safety-critical systems 17, 26, 29, 37, 46, 60
- safety requirements 37, 56
- scenario-based review 45, 52
- scripting language 81
- Scrum 29
- self-organizing teams 29
- sequential development models 17–18, 27–29, 32, 39, 66
- shift left *see* early testing
- software development lifecycle 13, 17, 26, 27–31, 39, 56, 63, 65, 75, 82
 - see also* incremental development models, iterative development models, sequential development models
- software testing and development 28–29
- specialized testing needs, tool support for 79
- Spiral 29
- state transition testing 55, 59
- statement testing and coverage 60
- static analysis 45–46, 75, 79
- static testing 13, 36, 45–47, 76, 79
- structural coverage, white-box testing 40
- success
 - factors for reviews 45, 49, 53–54
 - factors for tools 78, 82
 - testing's contributions to 14–15

- system integration testing 27, 32–34, 41–42
 - defects and failures 33–34
 - responsibility for 34
- system testing 27, 30, 32, 34–36, 39, 41–42, 66
- tasks
 - activities and 12, 18, 21, 65, 81
 - system 34–35, 79
 - test manager 62, 64–65
 - tester 62–65
 - testing 36–37, 70–71, 78
- technical review 45, 51–52
- test analysis 12, 18–21, 23, 28, 56, 65–66
 - work products 23
- test basis 12, 18–24, 27, 30, 57, 65, 67–68
 - acceptance testing, examples 37–38
 - component testing, examples 31
 - integration testing, examples 33
 - system testing, examples 35
 - traceability 24, 44, 47
- test completion 12, 18, 22, 24, 71
 - work products 24
- test control see test monitoring and control
- test design 12, 18, 20–21, 23, 40, 56, 65–66
 - tool support for 80
 - work products 23
- test driven development (TDD) 32
- test effort 16, 56
 - estimation 69
- test estimation techniques 62, 69
- test execution 12–13, 18–19, 21–25, 47, 62–63, 65, 68–69, 76, 79–81
 - schedule 12, 21, 23, 66, 69
 - tool support for 78–79, 82
 - work products 24
- test implementation 12, 18, 21, 23, 56, 65
 - tool support for 79
 - work products 23
- test levels 13–14, 17, 19, 22, 27–32, 34, 39–41, 43, 45, 58–60, 63–67, 71, 75
 - acceptance testing 36–39
 - component testing 31–32
 - integration testing 32–34
 - system testing 34–36
 - test types and 41–42
- test management 62, 64
 - tools 22, 24, 78–79, 81
- test manager 62, 64–65, 71, 73, 75
- test monitoring and control 12, 18–19, 22, 24, 63, 67, 71–72, 75
 - metrics used in testing 19, 62, 64, 66, 69–70
 - test reports 22, 62, 71
 - work products 22
- test organization 62–65
 - independent testing 62, 63
 - tasks of test manager and tester 64–65
- test plan see test planning, work products
- test planning 12–13, 18, 62, 66, 72, 74
 - work products 22
- test process 12–13, 17–24, 28, 30, 65–67, 69, 72, 75, 78, 79–81
 - activities and tasks 18–22
 - context 17–18
 - traceability 24
 - work products 22–24
- test reports 22, 62, 71
- test strategy 17, 62, 64, 66–67
- test techniques 14, 16, 55–61, 67, 74
 - black-box 55, 57–60
 - categories 55, 56
 - choosing 55, 56–57
 - experience-based 55, 56, 61
 - white-box 40, 55, 56–57, 60
- test tools 20–24, 40, 44, 46, 50, 56, 65–66, 69, 73–74, 78–82
 - benefits and risks of test automation 81–82
 - effective use of 81–82
 - intrusive 79
 - pilot projects for introducing 82
 - tool selection 81–82
 - success factors 82
 - types of tool 78–79
- test types 17, 27, 34, 39–43, 61, 63, 65–67
 - change-related testing 41–42
 - functional testing 39–40
 - non-functional testing 40
 - test levels and 41–42
 - white-box testing 40
- test work products see work products
- tester, tasks of 65
- testing
 - contextual factors 17–18
 - debugging, and 14
 - definition 13–14
 - errors/defects/failures 15–16
 - psychology of 25–26
 - purpose of 14–16
 - quality assurance and 15
 - seven principles 16–17
 - typical objectives of 13–14

- tools *see* test tools
- traceability 12, 18, 20–23, 24, 39–40, 44, 47, 65, 72, 78, 81
- triggers for maintenance 27, 43
- use case 19, 33, 35, 37, 39, 52, 55, 56, 59–60
- use case testing 55, 59–60
- user acceptance testing (UAT) 36
- user stories 13, 19–20, 28, 35–37, 39, 44, 46, 56, 63, 65, 67–68, 70, 75
- V-model 28, 30
- walkthrough 45, 51
- Waterfall model 28
- white-box test techniques 20, 40, 55, 57, 60–62
 - decision testing and coverage 60
 - statement testing and coverage 60
 - value of statement and decision testing 60
- white-box testing 27, 40, 60
 - examples 41–42
- Wideband Delphi estimation technique 69
- work products 22–24
 - acceptance testing 37–38
 - component testing 31
 - integration testing 33
 - monitoring and control 22
 - review process 48–54
 - static testing 46–47
 - system testing 35
 - test analysis 23
 - test completion 24
 - test design 23
 - test execution 24
 - test implementation 23
 - test planning 22
 - traceability 24