Unit Test Evidence

User Story Reference:

Date:

Developer:

Workstream:

Unit tests performed <to be completed by developer>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Test | Step | Has the test been automated |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Screen shots of unit tests performed <to be completed by developer>

Known issues (if applicable):

Unit testing coverage target

The format of the unit test template is less important that the fact it is done. Testing should aim to ensure for screen based systems that:

* Every field is filled in with both valid and invalid values
* For numerical fields, we test boundaries and limits
* Interface and connectors are checked, at a minimum to a dummy interface and preferably to a real working interface.
* Both positive and negative routes are tested (i.e., what happens if we do the wrong thing)
* All buttons and links work
* All dropdown values are tested:
* All drop down values that drive processing, regardless of source
* All values hardcoded inside Pega
* For values from an external DB, a sample of the values, if they are just data
* Check PegaRULES logs for errors (different from Alert and Security logs)