

# PUBLIC SAFETY SYSTEMS REVITALIZATION PROJECT (PSSRP)



## City of Portland PSSRP Initiative Monthly Quality Assurance Report For the Period: 7.23.09 - 8.18.09

Author: Cit Com, Inc  
Creation Date: August 18, 2009  
Last Revised: August 31, 2009  
Version: v1.1 (Final)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.0 REPORT PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY ..... 2
- 2.0 PSSRP PROJECT ASSESSMENT ..... 4
- 3.0 OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 9
- 4.0 PRIOR RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 13

## 1.0 Report Purpose and Methodology

---

### 1.0.1 Period Covered

This monthly report is intended to communicate the results of the independent quality assurance (QA) review of the PSSRP initiative to the City of Portland's Executive Steering Committee (ESC) for the period between July 23, 2009 and August 18, 2009.

### 1.0.2 Document Version Control

This table provides a history of the document's review:

Version	Date	Reviewed By	Role	Sections Reviewed
v 1.0	8/18/09	Cit Com, Inc	Report Author	All
v 1.0	8/24/09	SEARCH	Consultant/Advisor	All
v 1.0	8/26/09	Lisa Vasquez	PSSRP POM	All
v 1.1	8/27/09	Mark Greinke	Business Bureau Sponsor	All
v 1.1	8/27/09	Lisa Turley	Business Bureau Sponsor	All
v1.1	8/27/09	John Klum	Business Bureau Sponsor	All
v1.1	8/27/09	Larry O'Dea	Business Bureau Sponsor	All

### 1.0.3 Personnel Interviewed During the Period

The consultants interviewed the following people associated with the PSSRP initiative prior to developing the final report:

Person Interviewed	Date
Mark Greinke	August 11, 2009
John Klum	August 11, 2009
Lisa Turley	August 11, 2009
Jerry Schlesinger	August 12, 2009
Larry O'Dea	August 12, 2009
Kalei Taylor	August 14, 2009
Jim Finch	August 14, 2009
Lisa Vasquez	August 19, 2009

#### 1.0.4 Project Materials Reviewed During the Period

The consultants reviewed the following project-related documents during the period:

##### **Status Reports**

- **CAD Next:** 7/21/09, 7/28/09, 8/4/09, 8/11/09
- **PPDS:** 7/30/09, 8/4/09, 8/11/09, 8/18/09
- **Radio:** 7/30/09, 8/4/09, 8/12/09, 8/18/09

##### **Other Related Documents**

- None

## 2.0 PSSRP Project Assessment

### 2.0.1 Executive Summary

This report is the tenth monthly quality assurance report of the PSSRP initiative. While the following subsections explore specific observations and recommendations that impact the monthly color assignment, this Executive Summary provides a graphical comparison between the current period and the preceding four periods.

#### 2.0.1.1 Global PSSRP Initiative Summary



#### 2.0.1.2 CAD Next Summary



#### 2.0.1.3 PPDS RMS Summary



#### 2.0.1.4 800 MHz Radio Summary



## 2.0.2 Summary Assessment

The following tables provide the City with an assessment of “what has changed” during the current period.

### TABLE LEGEND:

---

	<b>Green</b> - On target, good performance against plan.
	<b>Yellow</b> - Caution, ability to meet project objectives may be threatened, may need intervention.
	<b>Red</b> - Serious issues and/or go-live in jeopardy, intervention and/or corrective action needed.

	<b>Up</b> - Positive changes outweigh negative.
	<b>Equal</b> - No change, or positive changes offset by negative.
	<b>Down</b> - Negative changes outweigh positive.

PSSRP Evaluation Metrics	Prior Rating	Change Direction	Current Rating	Comments
<p><b>Global PSSRP Initiative Summary</b> Reflects status of overall initiative (CAD, PD+FD RMS, Radio)</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As the ESC adapts to the new governance model, many questions that pertain the ESC’s authority and reach must be addressed (i.e., should change orders of a pre-defined order of magnitude warrant a mandatory ESC review and/or approval?). The QA consultants recommend an immediate review of such issues to be incorporated into the revised PSSRP Project Charter.</li> <li>▪ During the period, PSSRP achieved a long-term goal of staffing the core PSSRP projects with qualified, experienced, full-time personnel.</li> <li>▪ Updating the PSSRP portfolio’s Project Charters has been a recommendation for ten months, and is a priority. The POM has directed each Project Manager to update their respective Project Charters by mid-late September. The revised charters will also enable the QA consultants to re-baseline the core project activities to allow for a more accurate monthly review.</li> </ul> <p><b>(See Section 3.0.1 for detailed Global PSSRP Observations)</b></p>
<p><b>CAD Next Project Summary</b></p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Versaterm contract was officially complete on August 19 (with Versaterm supplying the City with the required insurance and bonding instrument).</li> <li>▪ The first significant Versaterm effort is underway (“Implementation Session 1” or “Workshop 1”). The task is geared toward defining how BOEC wishes to configure various features within the Versadex CAD, and is expected to be complete by August 21.</li> <li>▪ Mr. Mark Tanner began work on the project during the period. Mr. Tanner’s exact role (as one of three Project Managers listed in the CAD Next Phase III Project Charter) is still being codified.</li> </ul> <p><b>(See Section 3.0.2 for detailed CAD Next Observations)</b></p>

PSSRP Evaluation Metrics	Prior Rating	Change Direction	Current Rating	Comments
<b>PPDS RMS Project Summary</b>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The draft PPDS RMS RFP continues to cycle through a widespread review process (which has proven to be beneficial through the period). Based on the current momentum, and a compartmentalization of the RFP (to maximize efficiencies during BoP and Legal reviews), it appears that the RFP will be released by November 1.</li> <li>▪ Nine vendors responded to the City’s Request for Information (RFI) for the PPDS replacement (not to be confused with the RFP that is currently in draft form, the RFI is intended to solicit information, not proposals, from the vendor community). The Project Manager is coordinating eight on-site demonstrations from several of the responding vendors.</li> <li>▪ With the increasing number of participating agencies, and revised requirements, the PPDS RMS budget will change in the next 60 days. The QA consultants recommend PPB update the PPDS RMS replacement budget forecast based on the content of the final RFP.</li> </ul> <p><b>(See Section 3.0.3 for detailed PPDS RMS Observations)</b></p>
<b>800 MHz Radio Project Summary</b>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Portland Stability Plan remains under development (as a reminder, the plan is intended to provide Portland with an internal plan in the event that the regional effort doesn’t materialize).</li> <li>▪ A Kick-off meeting occurred on August 7 with iXP (Planning Consultant), Deltawrx, and AdComm Engineering present. The Project Manager reported positive interaction amongst the members and consultants.</li> </ul> <p><b>(See Section 3.0.4 for detailed Regional Radio Observations)</b></p>

### 2.0.3 Detailed Project Change Assessment

Each month, the QA consultants assess forty five critical project management areas for the PSSRP core projects (CAD Next, PPDS RMS, and 800 MHz Regional Radio). The following tables reflect any significant changes within those areas.

#### 2.0.3.1 CAD Next Change

No significant metric changes occurred during the period.

#### 2.0.3.2 PPDS RMS Change

Evaluation Metrics	Prior Rating	Change Direction	Current Rating	Comments
16. Are the changes in requirements achievable given the project scope, schedule, and funding?	 (Sometimes)		 (No)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without a budget, it is not possible to accurately gauge the impact of requirement changes on the budget. The POM has directed the PPDS Project Manager to update the budget as part of the Project Charter refresh (currently underway). This category will resume a normal status after the draft RFP review is complete and the budget has been adapted accordingly (in case there are any significant technical or functional requirement changes which emerge from the review).</li> </ul>
42. Are industry best practices being used (in regards to Project Management)?	 (Partially)		 (Yes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPB has incorporated industry best practices in managing law enforcement technology.</li> </ul>

Note that the numbering of metrics in the first column (Evaluation Metrics) references the Baseline Report categories. Gaps in the numbering sequence merely reflect the fact that some categories remain unchanged from the prior reporting period.

#### 2.0.3.3 800 MHz Regional Radio Change

11. Is a Risk Assessment and Risk Management plan in place?	 (No)		 (Yes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The internal stability plan, while not finalized, is substantially complete and reflects a positive risk management activity.</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--	---

## 3.0 Observations and Recommendations

---

### 3.0.1 Global PSSRP Observations and Recommendations

**3.0.1.1 Although PSSRP Governance Codified, Gaps Remain:** As previously reported, the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) adopted a governance model as presented by Olympic Performance on June 16. The project controls have been revised to facilitate a more efficient and horizontal project management philosophy by centering greater project accountability and authority with the Project Office Manager (POM). This was the first period governed by the new project governance model, and it was quickly clear that many operational questions remain unanswered.

For example, the initial CAD Next change request (to provide internal reporting as part of the cutover suite of functionality) was forecast by the CAD Next implementation team to carry a potential cost of approximately \$500,000. As that information was disseminated to the ESC, questions emerged over whether the ESC was supposed to be playing a role in reviewing a change that affected a project's scope, time, cost or quality. We asked ESC members whether they would be asking the same questions if the change order was valued at something less, perhaps \$50,000, and learned that they were far less concerned.

**Recommendation:** As the ESC adapts to the new governance model, many questions that pertain the ESC's authority and reach must be addressed (i.e., should change orders of a pre-defined order of magnitude warrant a mandatory ESC review and/or approval?). The earlier these types of issues are discussed and codified, the better. When "rules", or "decision making parameters" are formed late in an initiative, they carry significantly less authority and appear unfairly tailored toward a particular purpose. Most governance models include such parameters in the Project Charter, and we recommend that the current PSSRP Project Charter redraft effort include a section on ESC issue management to define what global, and project-specific, issues warrant a review and/or action by the ESC.

**3.0.1.2 All Core Project Managers Employed:** During the period, PSSRP achieved a long-term goal of staffing the core PSSRP projects with qualified, experienced, personnel.

The City now employs the following full-time personnel:

Project Office Manager:	Lisa Vasquez
CAD Next and Fire RMS Project Manager:	Mark Tanner
PPDS RMS Project Manager:	Jerry Schlesinger
800 MHz Radio Project Manager:	Karl Larson

The entire PSSRP portfolio is now being managed by trained Project Managers who possess knowledge and experience in planning, acquiring, implementing and managing public safety technology initiatives.

**3.0.1.3 Project Charter(s) Require Updates:** The PSSRP initiative continues to rely upon a Charter written largely by former CIO Matt Lampe in early 2006. The QA Consultants have been reporting on the critical importance of establishing contemporary Project Charter materials for over ten months. An adjunct reason for creating and maintaining a contemporary Project Charter (beyond the fundamental industry best practices, which have been discussed in several of the past QA reports) is the inaccurate monthly measurement of failure and success as reflected in the QA reports.

Each month, the QA team must measure PSSRP's health against 45 metrics which were defined in the 2006 Project Charter. As a result, some metrics (such as "Is the project on track to meet the current phase deadline) act to permanently anchor down the project's performance and preclude an accurate measurement from being taken.

The POM has directed each Project Manager to prepare a draft Project Charter. The drafts are due in mid-late September.

**Recommendation:** By October, 2009, revised Project Charters should be in place for each core project. The ESC should provide the POM with any requested human or financial resources necessary to accomplish this task.

### 3.0.2 CAD Next Observations and Recommendations

**3.0.2.1 Versaterm Contract Delayed, Then Approved:** Although the last three QA reports reported that the agreement with Versaterm had been signed, the agreement was actually not officially agreed-upon and executed until August 19, 2009.

The final challenge was associated with correcting errors and clarifying language in the Versaterm-provided insurance certificate (the issuer used terminology common in Canada which

was not sufficient for the City's purposes). The issues have since been corrected (per an August 20, 2009 project update from Jim Finch).

**3.0.2.2 First Major Implementation Task Underway:** The first significant Versaterm effort is underway ("Implementation Session 1" or "Workshop 1"). The task is geared toward defining how BOEC wishes to configure various features within the Versadex CAD, and is expected to be complete by August 21.

**3.0.2.3 CAD Next "Project Manager B" Employed:** Mr. Mark Tanner began work on the project during the period. Mr. Tanner's exact role (as one of three Project Managers listed in the CAD Next Phase III Project Charter) is still being codified.

**3.0.2.4 CAD Next Advisory Team Expansion:** As part of a global PSSRP effort lead by the POM, the number of participants of the CAD Advisory Board has expanded, and a meeting is scheduled to occur during the week of August 31.

### **3.0.3 PPDS Observations and Recommendations**

**3.0.3.1 PPDS RMS RFP Under Review:** PPB continues to solicit feedback from the subscriber agencies and internal PPB personnel alike. The Project Manager is incorporating the information gained from the review sessions, and has divided the document into logical sections to maximize the efficiency of a final review (by the Bureau of Purchases and City Legal). Currently, the project schedule indicates that the RFP will be released to the vendors in mid-October. However, it may require the full month of October to finalize the review (which is at least partially dependent on whether the information learned during the RFI process alters the RFP content in some way).

**3.0.3.2 Request for Information (RFI) Update:** Nine vendors responded to the City's Request for Information (RFI) for the PPDS replacement (not to be confused with the RFP that is currently in draft form, the RFI is intended to solicit information, not proposals, from the vendor community). The Project Manager is coordinating eight on-site demonstrations from several of the responding vendors. The demonstrations will occur through September.

**3.0.3.3 Subscriber Agency Participation Clarified:** During the period, Mr. Schlesinger continued to meet with the subscriber agencies and expanded the Bureau’s “Regional Integrated Justice Information Network” (RegJIN) “Project Advisory Council” (PAC). The meetings are yielding valuable information and expanded participation in the initiative. The economies of scale associated with a regional records management solution are proving valuable to cash-strapped law enforcement agencies. As a result, it appears that more agencies in the regional are expressing an interest in participating in the PPDS RMS replacement. That interest is largely being driven by the directed efforts of the POM and the Project Manager.

**3.0.3.4 Project Budget Evolving:** With the increasing number of participating agencies, and revised requirements, the PPDS RMS budget will change in the next 60 days. Beyond solid project management practices, the need to clearly identify the “rough order of magnitude” (ROM) of the PPDS RMS effort is growing increasingly important in order to identify funding paths in outlying years.

**Recommendation:** As part of the PPDS Project Charter update, PPB must also refresh the budget forecast based on the content of the final RFP.

### **3.0.4 Radio Observations and Recommendations**

**3.0.4.1 Portland Stability Plan Update:** The Portland Stability Plan remains under development (as a reminder, the plan is intended to provide Portland with an internal plan in the event that the regional effort doesn’t materialize). The project team interviewed Motorola, Raytheon, Harris, P25 Power and other vendors to gain information regarding city and regional requirements. Cost and internal upgrade requirements have been sought from Motorola, and are expected to be provided in the coming weeks.

**3.0.4.2 Advisory Committee Project Kickoff on August 7:** A Kick-off meeting occurred on August 7 with iXP (Planning Consultant), Deltawrx, and AdComm Engineering present. The Project Manager reported positive interaction amongst the members and consultants.

## 4.0 Prior Recommendations

### 4.0.1 Prior Recommendation Status

The following chart depicts a record of previous QA recommendations, describing any actions taken by the project team. The chart is updated on a monthly basis. Unaddressed recommendations appear with red font.

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.1	The PSSRP requires horizontal vision. Currently, the core projects are operating nearly in a vacuum from one another. Very soon, the organization will begin to suffer from this lack of vision as installation tasks associated with integrating CAD and RMS become apparent and costly. We recommend a comprehensive analysis be undertaken immediately, to identify, triage, and solve, the challenges associated with the present stove-piped approach to the core PSSRP initiatives.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.8 (vi, viii)
Baseline 5.0.1.1	We strongly recommend that the PSSRP Project Charter be rewritten to reflect contemporary scope, budget, timeline, values, objectives, reporting structures, risks and more. It no longer accurately reflects the nature of the initiative.	<p>Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.4</p> <p>6/09: This recommendation was re-activated (the Project Chart must be updated to reflect the new governance model).</p> <p><b>8/09 Update:</b> The recommendation is 10 months old, but remains incomplete. The lack of a contemporary Project Charter places the entire portfolio at risk of failure and should be considered an urgent matter.</p>

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.1	<p>With regard to ieSolutions, we credit the organization with aiding BOEC in their successful CAD vendor selection. However, ieSolutions' lack of prior public safety technology installation experience appears to be in conflict with the degree to which they can, legitimately, be defined as the sole source for integration services (even with their knowledge of the Portland environment, which can be learned). Moreover, the public safety technology consulting marketplace includes many experienced integrators, who have previously assisted police and fire agencies with complex CAD installations (including some that have recently installed Versaterm technology). In light of the observations regarding the subject (See Subsection 1.0.3.2. of the Baseline Assessment), we are highly confident that one or more consulting firms will protest an additional sole source contract for ieSolutions. Therefore, to avoid a bid protest, and the resultant delays, we recommend the City immediately prepare and release a request for proposal (RFP) for professional services to assist with installing the Versadex CAD.</p>	Declined 12/08: 3.0.1.3
Baseline 5.0.1.2	<p>A careful examination of the benefits, risks, and costs of a shared PSSRP CAD/RMS/Mobile solution (across police, fire and EMS), with a comprehensive message switching component should be undertaken immediately (during the 60 day CAD contract suspension). Having worked with Versaterm for over four years (in a full time plus capacity), our QA team is highly knowledgeable about the technical, and functional, relationship between the Versadex CAD and the Versaterm RMS, and the Versaterm AFR product [Mobile Report Entry (MRE)]. Of the 40+ CAD/RMS vendors in the industry, Versaterm is certainly in the top percentile of vendors whose suite of products are very, very tightly integrated (unlike some products wherein the CAD and RMS are merely interfaced). In many instances, root CAD functionality can only be actualized through the acquisition of a complementary RMS/MRE feature set. These are merely examples of the barriers which would exist should the City continue down the path of isolating CAD from the RMS and Mobile technologies.</p>	Adopted 12/08: This concept has been adopted and is reflected in the draft project reorganization structure (which includes horizontal business and technical personnel).
Baseline 5.0.1.2	<p>The City should develop language to protect the City's financial interest, should it ever decide to select Versaterm as the RMS/AFR provider and make it a part of the current Versaterm CAD agreement. This is a very common practice in the industry, as police and fire agencies frequently must pay for project elements over a span of years (particularly when projects are funded by grants).</p>	Adopted 12/08: 3.0.2.5 7/09: Not Executed (no such language was incorporated into the final agreement with Versaterm).
Baseline 5.0.1.2	<p>The City must undertake a comprehensive review of the current Versaterm pricing, which appears to be much higher than other recent Versadex CAD costs. Per the POM, BOP is researching this matter as of the date of report publication.</p>	Adopted 12/08: 3.0.2.4

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.3	In light of our previous recommendations to evaluate PPDS relative to the balance of the PSSRP initiatives, releasing the RFP at this point would be counterproductive. Additionally, the RFP is still in draft form and requires a careful functional review (to be certain that the requirements accurately reflect both PPB as well as the 18 subscriber agencies), prior to being released to the vendor community.	Adopted 12/08: 3.0.3.1 The RFP is in draft form and has not been released.  <b>8/09 Update:</b> The RFP is under review, and will likely be released in the fall of 2009.
Baseline 5.0.1.3 Reactivated: 2/09 3.0.3.3	On balance, most RMS initiatives eclipse the complexity, scope, range and cost of CAD initiatives. Yet, since 2006; while much attention and resources were devoted to the CAD Next project, far less has been assigned to PPDS. The current Project Manager is assigned multiple law enforcement initiatives and has an unconventional reporting chain of command that lends itself to a lack of accountability. In our estimation, there are no current employees with previous experience with effectively orchestrating a successful RMS initiative that is used by 19 law enforcement agencies, and relied upon by 25 external entities for data exchange. And, given the embedded governmental problems associated with hiring Project Managers, we have no confidence in the City's ability to find a qualified Project Manager for this complex and mission critical endeavor. Even if the selection process could be fast-tracked, it is still extremely unlikely that a qualified and experienced RMS professional would accept the City's present salary offering for this assignment. The ESC should, immediately, authorize the retention of external, professional services to undertake the recommendations outlined in this QA report and place the PPDS initiative on a stable course.	Initially Declined 12/08: 3.0.3.8 (v) Rather than retaining a consultant, the city is attempting to retain a full time employee. Accepted 5/09: A full time Project Manager started on May 28, 2009.
Baseline 5.0.1.3 Restated 3/09 3.0.3.3	The PPDS project needs a Project Charter that reflects (at the absolute minimum) a basic and accurate budget, detailed timeline, and comprehensive scope statement.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.3.5  6/09: This recommendation was re-activated as part of the governance reform. The new PPDS Project Manager should create a contemporary Project Charter.  <b>8/09 Update:</b> PPB is revising the 6/09 forecast to reflect the revised RFP content (requirements).

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.3	The PPDS technology is in such widespread use, yet there is relatively little involvement on behalf of the participating agencies. Many agencies have no representation at all. And, others appear on forms and websites by name only (they have not actively participated in the initiative). Consortia RMS projects are difficult to manage, and require constant effort. In the current environment, most agencies have lost interest (after all, this has been underway for two years without significant activity), while some are considering how to acquire their own RMS technologies. The PPDS effort must be centered on a collaborative platform that takes into account the project's assumptions, constraints and barriers. Accepting a lack of communication, or collaboration, is not acceptable.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.3.2
Baseline 5.0.1.4	The initiative requires a Regional Project Charter replete with system definition, development, and implementation before getting to the point of retaining an OE (in fact, such retention should be a component of the Project's Charter). And, ownership must pass to all stakeholders in proportion to their commitment in the regional project.	Concept Attempted 12/08: 3.0.4.5
Baseline 5.0.1.4	The project is in clear need of an Owner's Engineer (OE) with the requisite skills and experience necessary to lead a large scale, regional radio initiative. Priority attention should be given to the development, and approval, of this RFP (which is presently only in conceptual format).	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.4.4 Enacted 6/09
Baseline 5.0.1.5	With regard to any core PSSRP initiative, the ESC should assign control of that resource to the POM (whether it be contractor or full time employee).	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.8 Enacted 6/09
Baseline 5.0.1.6	The PSSRP requires the backing of a senior Executive Sponsor (perhaps an elected official) who holds the authority to recognize the PSSRP initiative as a mission critical, high priority, endeavor. The ESC should identify such a person, who would act as the project's advocate whenever necessary, to place focus and prioritization on project tasks.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.3 Enacted 6/09
Baseline 5.0.1.6	To the degree that it is feasible, the ESC should determine the best method for raising the salaries for the core PSSRP Project Managers, as well as the POM to an amount more in line with contemporary market demand. Naturally, this would require additional financial resources to be allocated into the budget. However, failing to make change in this area will cost far more in lost project momentum, and potentially a failed project state.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.5 Enacted 1/09 Employees Hired 6-7/09

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.7	The City retain a public safety technology business process analysis consultant immediately. With the CAD installation set to begin in less than 90 days, we suggest that the consultant be retained through a sole source contract, as an exigent circumstance requirement. The scope of services would document the baseline business processes that are, or could be, impacted by technology. This methodology would provide a structured approach for developing a baseline business process “snapshot” of the current environments to confirm or reject various assumptions about the business environments (not to conduct detailed business process mapping).	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.8 (viii) Enacted 4/09
12/08 3.0.1.7	When the Versaterm contract is signed, and the PPDS RFP is released, the POM should document the known intersections, and prepare a migration plan accordingly.	<b>8/09 Update:</b> Underway.
1/09 3.0.2.1 (1)	The ESC should direct the CAD Next project team to prepare four implementation schedules, assuming the Versaterm agreement is ratified in March, April, May or June. Although it is unlikely that the agreement will be delayed until May or June, it is important to prepare a contingency plan that is proactive, and takes into account the potential implementation problems associated with starting the project during the early summer months. The four permutations should be presented to the ESC upon completion.	Concept Adopted 1/09 by ESC.  <b>8/09 Update:</b> While the ESC adopted the concept, the four options were not presented to the ESC. The project is underway with a Spring/2011 target cutover, although the ESC does not have a clear understanding of potential quality/cost sacrifices. This recommendation is linked to 5/09 3.0.2.2 (below).
1/09 3.0.2.1 (2)	Assuming that a post-March contract execution would negatively impact BOEC’s ability to implement the Versaterm products in 2009, the ESC should identify methods for prioritizing the technical, business and legal resources necessary to finalize the Versaterm agreement in a 45-60 day period.	This recommendation was rendered inactive based on the preceding actions.
2/09 3.0.1.3	The QA consultants recommend a facilitated discussion with the current ESC to review “national standards” and examples of similar project governance structures from large municipal public safety technology engagements. As part of the dialogue, the ESC should collaboratively harness the available resources of its members, and proactively assign themselves to specific responsibilities beyond the role of project oversight.	Adopted 7/09 by ESC: The project’s key stakeholders adopted the Olympic Performance report recommendations.

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
2/09 3.0.2.1	(a) BOEC should consider extending the forecast contract completion date to allow for a 6-8 week process. (b) The City should consider creating a written contract development plan. (c) The ESC should give consideration to videotaping (or audio taping) the contract development session (as many large public safety agencies have adopted this practice in recent years).	(a) N/A (b) Not written, but strategized. (c) Not enacted.
2/09 3.0.3.2	PPB should confirm that each Partner Agency has a clear expectation of what the new PPDS RMS will offer in terms of modules and features.	Adopted 3/09
3/09 3.0.2.1	The City (should) set a “date certain” for contract finalization of April 3 (two full weeks prior to the actual deadline), with weekly contract checkpoint meetings (to reinforce urgency, and prevent procrastination). The City should immediately communicate to Versaterm the consequences of failing to reach an agreement in time.	Recommendation rendered inactive when agreement was not reached after April 3.
3/09 3.0.3.3	Developing the PPDS replacement project budget is an urgent, critical recommendation that should be undertaken immediately. The QA consultants have a very low level of confidence in the current ROM forecast.	Adopted 4/09
4/09 3.0.1.2	The May ESC Meeting should be held, regardless of the status of the ESC reform efforts.	Adopted 4/09
4/09 3.0.2.2	Recognizing that the Versaterm agreement was not ratified by the April 20 deadline, BOEC should recalibrate the Phase III timeline (and associated planning materials) to reflect the early Fall/2009 start date described by Director Turley. Additionally, the ESC should direct the POM to craft a contract finalization schedule which reflects a Summer/2009 completion date (with elected official approval at least one month prior to the project kickoff).	The Phase III implementation timeline continues to reflect a Spring, 2011 completion date.
5/09 3.0.2.2	The ESC should review the merits, limitations, risks and issues associated with the Phase III timeline compression and evaluate whether the various implementation alternatives may impact the remaining PSSRP initiatives.	The issue was raised during the May ESC Meeting. However, no action was taken. ESC members continue to express an interest in gaining a comprehensive understanding of the implementation timeline, costs and associated risks.  <b>8/09 Update:</b> An update will be provided to the ESC in September.
6/09 3.0.1.2	Following the June ESC meeting, the POM should revise the PSSRP Project Charter to align with the many structural changes associated with the final governance reform.	This recommendation was folded into 6/09 3.0.3.1.

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
6/09 3.0.2.3	Following the June ESC meeting, ieSolutions should revise the Phase III Project Charter to align with the many structural changes associated with the final governance reform. Additionally, the Project Charter should include (at a minimum) the project's budget, timeline, methodology and risks.	<b>8/09 Update:</b> The CAD Next Phase III Project Charter is undergoing adjustments to align it with the global PSSRP Project Charter.
6/09 3.0.3.1	Following the June ESC meeting, PPB should revise the PPDS Project Charter to align with the many structural changes associated with the final governance reform. Additionally, the Project Charter should include (at a minimum) the project's budget, timeline, methodology and risks.	<b>8/09 Update:</b> The PSSRP Project Charter is under development, and should be complete during the next period.
7/09 3.0.1.3	The PPDS RFP is currently undergoing a final re-scoping exercise. Once the RFP content has been finalized (in terms of functional and technical requirements), the project team should prepare a revised project budget to confirm whether the \$4M placeholder is sufficient. Concurrently, the project team should evaluate all PSSRP expenses in an effort to ensure affordability of the core technologies (specifically; ensuring that the project will yield the stated goals and objectives).	<b>8/09 Update:</b> Re-scoping efforts are still underway.