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Master Test Plan Checklist

**Program:** VAHCS Million Veteran Program (MVP) **Version:** Release 3

**Application:** Genomic Information System for Integrated Science Genisis 2 (Genisis2) **Patch #:** N/A

**Date Review:** 06/16/2017

| Item # | Checklist Question | Yes | No | N/A |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Does the Master Test Plan conform to the Master Test Plan template? | X |  |  |
| 2. | Is the Master Test Plan tailored in a reasonable manner? | X |  |  |
| 3. | Are the scope and objectives for the testing clearly defined? | X |  |  |
| 4. | Are the features to be tested and features not to be tested clearly defined? | X |  |  |
| 5. | Is the test strategy consistent with the scope and objectives of the testing? | X |  |  |
| 6. | If iterative development is performed, does the plan address testing upon the completion of the iteration? Is an Iteration test Plan referenced? | X |  |  |
| 7. | Are the responsibilities for creating and maintaining the test environment adequately specified? | X |  |  |
| 8. | Has the creation, acquisition and populating of test data been adequately addressed? | X |  |  |
| 9. | Have tests for the enterprise requirements of the application been planned? Security, privacy and Section 508 requirements? | X |  |  |
| 10. | Are all the testing deliverables listed? | X |  |  |
| 11. | Are training needs addressed? | X |  |  |
| 12. | Does the schedule address the size, complexity and importance of the testing? | X |  |  |
| 13. | Are risks that may jeopardize the testing effort specified here or in a tracking tool? | X |  |  |
| 14. | Are key testing terms and acronyms defined in the plan? | X |  |  |
| 15. | Is there a mechanism in place to track changes to the Master Test Plan? | X |  |  |
| 16. | Is this Master Test Plan feasible? | X |  |  |
| 17. | Is there a mechanism in place to tract defects? | X |  |  |
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Review Findings Summary Instructions

A Review Findings Summary is a tool created to document and track anomalies and issues identified during reviews.

The Review Findings Summary contains the following information:

| Item | Definition |
| --- | --- |
| **Review Type** | Peer Review or Formal Review |
| **Artifact** | The category of the artifact under review, such as: Requirements Specification Document, Software Design Document, Prototype, Code, Documentation (Release Notes, User Manual, Technical Manual, Installation Guide, Security Guide), Patch Description (if released through National Patch Module), Test Plans, and Test Package. |
| **Author** | The person who created the work product under review. |
| **Project** | The official project name. |
| **Application** | The name of the software application to which this work product pertains. |
| **Version** | The version number of the software application pertinent to this work product. |
| **Patch** | If the software is to be released via the National Patch Module, enter the patch number. |
| **Date Review Started** | The date of the review meeting. |
| **Date Review Closed** | The date all anomalies, issues and action items are closed. |
| **Identifier** | A unique identifier that permits identification and sorting; suggested Project acronym + sequential number (i.e., SUR0001) |
| **Anomaly Category** | CM=Configuration Management, CO=Coding, CS=Coding Standards, DC=Documentation Content, DE=Design, DP=Documentation Presentation, IA=Integration Agreement, PE=Performance, SP=Specification, TR=Traceability, TP=Test Plan, TS=Test Script |
| **Anomaly or Issue** | Items identified and described during the review. |
| **Resolution** | The solution for the identified anomaly. |
| **Date Resolved** | The date an issue was resolved and the Review Team agrees it was resolved correctly. |
| **Status** | The various states through which an anomaly passes on the way to resolution and closure. The anomaly states are:   * **Submitted** – when an item is logged and reported for repair. * **Assigned** – when an item is assigned for repair. * **Opened** – when an anomaly is assigned for correction. * **Deleted** – when an item is originally reported as an anomaly, but later deleted because the item is either a duplicate or not an anomaly. * **Resolved** - when an anomaly is corrected and sent for review or verification. * **Re-Opened** – when an anomaly is closed and then reopened for modification. * **Returned** – when an anomaly is reviewed, verified as "incorrect", and returned to author. * **Verified** – when an anomaly is reviewed and verified as "correct". * **Closed** – when an anomaly is successfully reviewed and closed with a resolution and resolution date. * **Deferred** – when an anomaly is designated for correction at a later date. * **Duplicated** – when an item is assessed to be a duplicate of a prior record. * **Escalated** – when an item requires evaluation by management.   *Note: The statuses listed above reflect the use of Rational ClearQuest for anomaly tracking. Manual tracking may use a simplified list of statuses.* |
| **Impact** | The classification of anomalies according to their potential damage to the software, systems, patient, personnel or operating systems. They are classified in three levels:   * **High Impact** - an error or absence of functionality that may severely jeopardize patient or personnel safety; adversely impacts all users; represents a significant value or cost; is governed by Congressional mandate; affects either a large database or critical data; requires Food and Drug Administration (FDA) certification/approval; affects Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN) issues; or negatively impacts the interdependence of applications. * **Medium Impact** - an error or absence of functionality that adversely affects the safety of veteran issues or users of large applications (i.e., Pharmacy, Lab); represents a high value or cost; sponsored or initiated by the National Program Office; or negatively impacts essential operational or business processing. * **Low Impact** - an error or absence of functionality that may cause operator/user inconvenience and minimally affects operational functionality. |

Genomic Information System for Integrated Science 2 (Genisis2) Technical Services

Review Findings Summary

**Application:** Genisis2 **Release:** Release 3 **Date** **Review Begun:** N/A

**Author:** Booz Allen Hamilton **Patch:** N/A **Date Review Closed:** June 16, 2017

| Project Acronym-Number | Anomaly Category | Anomaly or Issue | Date Resolved | Status | Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rational # 487928 | UI | Data Destination Manager Role: The filter for the Requestor columns on the Data Destination Manager Request Page does not filter properly. Refer to TC0006. | 6/2/2017 | Closed | Minor |
| Rational#  53663 | UI | DDM & DSM Roles: Negative response buttons in the Action column on the Request Page allows the user to advance the workflow without entering required comments. | TBD | Open (Scheduled for Release 4) | Minor |