HEAD ON COLLISION: AGILE QA DRIVING IN A WATERFALL WORLD
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Professional Background
- Started in QA 16 years ago
- Work at Manheim
- QA lead over a CRM application for 4 years
- Current team has been practicing Agile for 6 years
- How Agile life sprang forth for team
Corporate Background

- Manheim is a dealer to dealer automotive auction business under Cox Enterprises
Manheim is a House Divided

- One side
  - Brick and mortar auctions and supporting technologies
  - Waterfall methodology
- Other side
  - Online customer facing applications and supporting technologies
  - Agile practitioners and evangelists
OF MANHEIM METHODOLOGIES

- Waterfall
  - Linear in process—one group doesn’t begin until first one is complete
  - Saturation of documentation and approvals before moving forward
  - Requirements and development have to be fully baked before testing

- Agile
  - Iteration is 3 weeks
  - Estimation session
    - QA accesses story cards shortly after BA begins specifications
    - Estimations of story cards involve all team members in one room
    - QA begins to write tests and point out possible risks
  - BA phase
    - BA’s run Acceptance Tests before code moves to QA
    - Automation writes tests on cards and executes while BA’s test
  - QA phase
    - Dev’s run quick hit smoke tests upon deploying to QA
    - Automated regression runs on first day of QA
    - Risk Assessment document delivered to business
What Is an Arbitration?

- Arbitrations is when a dealer believes their car purchase was misrepresented by a seller
- Current Process Adjectives
  - Very manual process
  - No analytics
  - Fragile and old technology used to handle a complicated process
Goals of Project

- Change manual processes to automated
- Build scalability of system
- Create reliability and robustness
- Standup up analytics
- Less painful for our customers
THE CHALLENGE

- Agile and Waterfall teams working intimately together
- ‘Butterfly effect’—many undocumented legacy system dependencies
- Waterfall team reluctant to retool their functions into other applications
- Legacy applications—AS 400 copyright 1997
- ‘Old Guard’ mentality with Waterfall teams
- Waterfall team siloed in their knowledge
- Agile team’s perceptions of Waterfall
- Agile was the new young kid
What Went Well

- Business stakeholders bought into Agile having a heavy role in Arbitrations project
  - Proved they had faith in Agile
- Agile brought all team members together early to write and review requirements
  - QA pointed out risks and began writing tests
  - Could begin tackling integration testing strategy very early
- Unorthodox Agile QA decisions had big payoffs
  - Brought in Waterfall QA lead early to cultivate an Agile sympathizer
  - Augmented Waterfall QA group with Agile QA
    - Brought knowledge of CRM application to Waterfall side
    - Brought Agile QA influence to Waterfall testing approach
  - Volunteered to be vocational lead on project for QA
    - QA decisions could take an Agile bent, had pulse of project
What To Improve

 Have a good huddle at project genesis
  o Remove edge, build team spirit, reverse bad perceptions
 Not enough transparency about each team’s process
  o Could have avoided conflicts in testing development work early
 Calculate what key meetings should occur and have them frequently to improve communication flow
  o Not having frequent touch points allowed problems to fester
ELEVATOR PITCH

- Different methodologies can attract and WIN
- Take lead positions to influence
- Be transparent with your process—people fear what they don’t understand
QUESTIONS