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Defect Prevention versus Defect Detection

• Defect Prevention
  Techniques that are designed to find defects “before” the artifact has been developed

• Defect Detection
  Techniques that are designed to find defects after the artifact “under test” has been developed
Why is Defect Prevention so important?

The cost factor for discovering and fixing defects in later phases versus early phases can be up to 100:1.
Stage Containment

In a typical IT organization, most defects are injected into a system in its early stages.
Stage Containment

in a typical IT organization, most defects are injected into a system in its early stages and fixed in its later stages.
Quality Assurance

• Activities that modify the development process to prevent the introduction of flaws
  – Staff function
  – Implements management’s quality policies
  – Responsible for continuous improvement of the software development process

• Proactive approach focused on defect prevention

• Examples:
  – Defining change control procedures
  – Facilitating post-project reviews
  – Analyzing metrics to identify opportunities for process improvement
Quality Control

• Activities within the development process to detect the introduction of flaws
  – Test planning and execution
  – Quality control measures a product against the existence of an attribute
  – Determines whether the product conforms to a standard or procedure (also known as compliance checking).

• Proactive approach focused on defect detection

• Examples:
  – Writing and executing test cases and scripts
  – Participating in verification and validation activities
  – Reporting defects to identify opportunities for process improvement
Defect Prevention Techniques

Examples of Defect Prevention:

- Risk Based Testing
- Inspections
- Reviews
- Walkthroughs
Risk Based Testing

Business Value
Risk-based testing is a structured method for reducing testing effort based on component risk. It is a proven practice in testing which relies on strong business and IT participation to deliver real business value. As applied to the development lifecycle, risk management provides a means to focus testing efforts where they will make the greatest difference. Accenture's unique utilization of Risk-Based Testing together with our proprietary assets in this space will make it easier to engage the business units early in the lifecycle, especially for applications where requirements have not been documented thoroughly.

Objectives of Risk-Based Testing
• Minimize threats to the solution delivery objectives.
• Provide a systematic approach for:
  • Evaluating and improving the quality of requirements;
  • Improve both test effectiveness and efficiency;
  • Monitoring and reporting progress in reducing risk;
  • Adjusting risk reduction actions (e.g. test scope) based upon the effectiveness of prior actions or additional knowledge.
• Gain consensus on high risk requirements
Implementing Risk-Based Testing
The Process within the Solution Life Cycle

The following illustrates the iterative “risk re-assessment” that takes place at each point where a ⋅ is shown below. Participation from key business, IT, and QA reps is important at each reassessment point.

Integration of Test Metrics, Test Phase Entry/Exit Criteria and Service Level Agreements (SLA)

Risk Assessment Key Players / Approvers
Test Lead, Release Manager, Reporting Team, Application Lead, Architects, SME, Business Process Analyst, Design Lead, Interface Team
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Risk Assessment Analysis
Risk Factor Distribution

It is important to understand the primary factors driving the assessed risk level.

Impact
Quantifies the “true” impact of each risk, also referred to as the ‘level of damage’ potentially caused by the change. This is an estimate of the overall scale of impact if a defect related to the change were found in production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probability
This is an assessment of the likelihood of an error being delivered into production at a point in time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Control
Indicates the relative control which can be exerted on the probability of the risk occurring in production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Control</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidence Level
Indicates the Confidence level of the Risk evaluated. In a typical situation, as we understand and get more clarity on requirements confidence level increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Total Control … 1 = No Control
5 = Very High … 1 = Very Low
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Defect Prevention Techniques

Inspections

- Create an Inspection Plan
- Inspections should raise the quality of an application
- Inspections should find faults with requirements, test plan documents, design documents.
- Similar to a Peer Review
Defect Prevention Techniques

Reviews

- Establish a Peer Review Process
- Identifies issues/risks in Test Planning
- Types of Reviews:
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - Facilitated
  - Unfacilitated
Defect Prevention

Walkthroughs

- No Formal Plan
- Peer/Lead Checks
- Typically done in a group setting while walking through a test script or document
- Feedback given by attendees during walkthrough
## Defect Prevention – Type of Defects Found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work product elements that are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent or mismatched (such as interface specifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conforming (fail to follow processes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect (deviate from requirements and rules or standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-testable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defect Prevention – What Can Be Reviewed?

- Specifications
  - Requirements
  - Design
- Memos
- Proposals
- Plans
- Policies
- Procedures
- Brochures
- Statements of work
- Contracts
Defect Prevention – Value of Reviews

- Provide early quality assessments (verification) of the work products
  - Detecting dependencies and inconsistencies in software models, such as links
  - Improved maintainability of code and design

- Colleagues will see what you can’t

- Catch bugs earlier
  - It’s cheaper to prevent a defect than to repair one later in the life cycle

- Identification of defects not easily found by dynamic testing
Defect Prevention – Value of Reviews (cont.)

• Early warning about suspicious aspects of the code or design (high complexity measures)

• Opportunities for process improvements
  – Prevention of defects, if lessons are learned in development

• Reduce overall project time scales

• Potential opportunities for communication and learning
Defect Detection Techniques

Examples of Defect Detection:

- Functional
- Structural
Defect Detection Techniques - Functional

Functional:

- Functional testing is based on requirements and functionality.
- Functional testing covers how well the system executes the functions and features.
- Functional testing is not based on any knowledge of internal software design or code.
- Functional testing covers the front-end functions, as well as the back-end operations such as security and how upgrades affect the system.
- Generally functional testing is often done toward the end of the development cycle.
- It is recommended to be started earlier such as individual components and processes.
- Black Box, Acceptance, Closed box and Integration testing are functional testing techniques.
Defect Detection Techniques – Structural

- Structural testing is typically based on the architecture of the system
  - Aspects such as a calling hierarchy, data flow diagram, design specification, etc.

- Structural (white-box) testing may be performed at all test levels
  - System, system integration, or acceptance testing levels (e.g., to business models or menu structures)

- Structural techniques are best used after specification-based techniques
Defect Detection Techniques – Structural

• Structural testing is primarily about coverage
  – Coverage is the degree to which a structure has been exercised by the set of tests
    • Typically it is expressed as a percentage of the items being covered
    • More on coverage later

• Tools can be used at all test levels to measure the code coverage of elements, such as statements or decisions
  – Tools are especially useful at component and component integration testing
Black Box Versus White Box

Black box testing focuses on functional testing, not based on any knowledge of internal software design or code, whereas White box testing focuses on knowledge of the internal logic of an application's code.

Black box testing is based on requirements and functionality, whereas White box testing is based on coverage of code statements, branches, paths and conditions.

Equivalence Partitioning, Boundary Analysis and Error Guessing are successful techniques for managing the amount of input data for Black box testing.

Statement Coverage, Decision Coverage, Condition Coverage, Decision/Condition Coverage and Multiple Condition Coverage are five important techniques for White box testing.
Static Versus Dynamic

- Static testing is performed using the software documentation. The code is not executing during static testing whereas Dynamic testing requires the code to be in an executable state to perform the tests.
- Most verification techniques are static tests whereas validation tests are dynamic tests.
- Feasibility Reviews and Requirements Reviews are examples of Static testing.
- Unit, Integrated, System and User Acceptance testing are examples of Dynamic testing.
The “V” Testing Concept

Operational or Business Need
Verify Operational or Business Need
Define Requirements
Verify Requirements
Design System
Verify Design
Build System
Verify Construction

Acceptance Test
Validate Operational or Business Need
System Test
Validate Requirements
Integration Test
Validate Design
Unit Test
Validate Construction

Validates
Validates
Validates
Validates

Static
Dynamic
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Key Metrics that drive Process Improvement

- Defect Discovery Phase
  - Phase of the SDLC in which the defect was found
- Defect Discovery Method
  - Testing method that found the defect
- Defect Origination Phase
  - Phase of the SDLC in which the defect was originated or “first” introduced into the product
- Root Cause
  - Primary reason why the defect occurred
- Defect Resolution Type
  - How the defect was resolved
- Defect Leakage Reason
  - Root cause to determine method defect escaped the testing phase
## Root Cause Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Origination Phase</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concept</td>
<td>• Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyze – (Requirements)</td>
<td>• Ambiguous/vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design</td>
<td>• Wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build</td>
<td>• Changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing</td>
<td>• Inconsistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beta</td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Root Cause Examples

**Defect Origination Phase**
- Concept
- Analyze – (Requirements)
- Design
- Build
- Testing
- Beta
- Deployment
- Production
- Other

**Root Cause**
- Missing
- Ambiguous/vague
- Logic Wrong
- Logic Changed
- Logic Inconsistent
- Other
## Root Cause Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Origination Phase</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concept</td>
<td>– Code Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirements</td>
<td>– Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design</td>
<td>– Bad data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build</td>
<td>– Begin-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing</td>
<td>– Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beta</td>
<td>– Duplicate code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deployment</td>
<td>– Initialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production</td>
<td>– Local/global mismatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td>– Logic Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Memory Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Root Cause Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Origination Phase</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concept</td>
<td>– Test Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirements</td>
<td>– Test Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design</td>
<td>– Tester Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build</td>
<td>– Test Script Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing</td>
<td>– Configuration Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective Execution (Quality Assurance)

Goal: Effectively execute all of our projects (delivering high-quality software, on budget and on schedule)

Questions: Are defects detected early in the SDLC? Where are we discovering defects? How are we discovering our defects? Are defects escaping to later test phases?

Metrics:
- Defect detection by discovery phase
- Defect detection by discovery method
QA Metrics – Defects by Discovery Phase

- Analyze: 10 defects, 1%
- Design: 50 defects, 4%
- Build: 100 defects, 8%
- Test: 1000 defects, 82%
- Production: 60 defects, 5%
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QA Metrics – Defects by Discovery Phase

Key Observations/Recommendations

• 82% of defects are found in Testing
  • Too much pressure on the test team to find defects
  • More defects must be found upstream
  • Recommend more unit testing and/or tracking unit test defects.
QA Metrics – Defects by Test Phase

- Component: 300 (15%)
- Integration: 1000 (50%)
- System (E2E): 500 (25%)
- User Acceptance: 200 (10%)
QA Metrics – Defects by Test Phase

Key Observations/Recommendations

• 50% of defects are found in Integration Testing
  • Is this acceptable?
  • Should more defects be found in Component Test?
QA Metrics – Defects by Discovery Method

None: 140 (15%)
Automated Test: 110 (11%)
Unit Test: 40 (4%)
Developer Test (During formal QA): 200 (21%)
Manual Test: 470 (49%)
QA Metrics – Defects by Discovery Method

Key Observations/Recommendations

• Very low % of automated versus manual tests
  • How much are you investing in automated tests?
  • Are you getting your expected ROI on automation?
• How are developers finding such a high % of defects in formal testing?
  • Understand how/what type of testing the developers are doing to find these defects
  • Incorporate these findings into the formal testing process
• 15% (140 Defects) were found but no method was recorded
  • This is valuable data that we are missing
  • Remove the option to select None from your test management tool
Effective Execution (Development)

Goal: Effectively execute all of our projects (delivering high-quality software, on budget and on schedule)

Questions: How effective is our inspection process?
           Where are injecting defects into our products?
           How are we resolving defects in our products?
           How much time are we spending resolving defects?
           What are the primary root causes for our defects?

Metrics:
- Defect detection from Fagan tools
- Defect detection by injection phase
- Defect resolution type
- Total resolution time/Total Verify time
- Defect root cause
Development Metrics – Defects by Origination Phase

- **Analyze**: 90 defects, 9%
- **Design**: 70 defects, 7%
- **Build**: 410 defects, 42%
- **Test**: 180 defects, 19%
- **Production**: 30 defects, 3%
- **None**: 190 defects, 20%

The graph shows the distribution of defects by development phase.
Development Metrics – Defects by Origination Phase

Key Observations/Recommendations

• Note the high % of defects found in Test. Is this accurate?
• 42% of defects originated in Build
  • This is a large number of coding defects
  • Are developers unit testing?
  • Recommend that coding standards, tracking unit test defects and peer reviews
• 9% of defects originated in Analyze? Is this accurate?
• 20% of defects are not accounted for
Development Metrics – Defects by Resolution

- Obsolete: 2%
- Resolved in Another Project: 1%
- Posted to Wrong Project: 1%
- Change Not Justifiable: 5%
- Not Reproducible: 7%
- Duplicate: 8%
- As Designed: 13%
- Change Implemented: 63%
Development Metrics – Defects by Resolution

Key Observations/Recommendations

- 13% defects were closed As Designed
  - Is there a disconnect between the specifications and the application? Why are so many defects invalid?
- 8% defects were closed as Duplicate
  - Are testers not communicated with each other or searching for outstanding defects prior to entering their own?
- 7% defects were closed as Not Reproducible
  - Why are so many defects non reproducible? Are there environment or data variables?
  - Is the tester doing something abnormal during the execution of the test?
  - Is the developer trying to reproduce it in a different environment?
Understanding the Cost of Poor Quality (CoPQ)

Cost of Poor Quality: The cost of rework associated with fixing any defects in the product. This includes support and maintenance costs associated with a product.

Cost of Quality: The regularly schedule cost for testing a product. This includes unit testing as well as the cost for each test phase.

REWORK!!
Rework by Resolution
Key Observations/Recommendations

• Over 10K hours were spent fixing defects
  • Is this acceptable?
  • Do you want a further breakdown of this? (see next slide)
• 2K hours were spent “investigating” defects that were invalid due to the application working as designed
  • Is this acceptable?
### Rework by Resolution By Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Dev Hours</th>
<th>Test Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing rework by resolution by severity](image_url)
## Rework by Resolution By Severity/Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Dev Hours</th>
<th>Test Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>42500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost:**
- Dev = 100
- Test = 75

![Cost Chart](chart.png)
Root Cause Frequency

Fields Used: Origination Phase; Root Cause

Number of CRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Count of Root Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logic Wrong</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Other</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic Error</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Other</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Handling</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Validation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Root Cause Frequency

Key Observations/Recommendations

• Almost 200 defects (CRs) are caused due to Logic errors
  • This project is having serious issues with their design logic
  • Are requirements clear?
  • Are these inexperienced developers?
  • Do they truly understand how the system is built?
• Over 170 defects are due to UNKNOWN reasons
  • Unacceptable
  • We have no idea how to fix these issues because the root cause is unknown
THANK YOU!!

QUESTIONS???

❖ CONTACT INFO:
❖ Mike.w.ennis@accenture.com