

City of Portland

# Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

## Radio Replacement Project



# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For the Month of November, 2012  
Deliverable: Radio.C.1

V2.0 FINAL

12/20/2012

**Prepared By:**

**CASE**  
**Associates**  
Incorporated

Clifford Smith, PMP, Project Lead, Quality Assurance Consultant  
Peter van den Berg, Quality Assurance Consultant  
Contract # 30002849

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For November, 2012

### Table of Contents

Summary of Project QA Progress and Status	3
OVERALL PROJECT QA STATUS	3
OVERALL PROJECT HEALTH	3
QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED <b>ALERT</b>	4
QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED <b>ATTENTION</b>	4
Quality Focal Point Summary Chart	5
Quality Focal Points	6
<i>Milestones</i>	6
<i>Requirements Management</i>	6
<i>Project Schedule</i>	7
<i>Communications</i>	8
<i>Risk and Issue Management</i>	9
<i>Radio System Acquisition</i>	10
<i>Technical &amp; Operational Transition</i>	10
<i>Project Organization and Leadership</i>	11
<i>Project Resources</i>	12
<i>Project &amp; Quality Management and Reporting</i>	13
<i>Budget Planning and Tracking</i>	14
<i>Scope and Change Control</i>	15
<i>Roles and Responsibilities and Communications</i>	15
<i>Radio System Architecture</i>	16
<i>Radio System Acquisition Management</i>	16
<i>Project Library and Configuration Management</i>	17
<i>System Design Process</i>	18
<i>Testing (Functional and Performance)</i>	19
<i>User Acceptance Process</i>	20
<i>Training</i>	20
<i>Implementation &amp; Integration Process</i>	21
<i>Deployment Process</i>	21
Purpose and Methodology	22
PURPOSE OF THE MONTHLY REPORT	22
METHODOLOGY	22
BASELINE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS TO QFPs	23

Version	Date	Comments
.1	12/3/2012	Initial Version
1	12/10/2012	Delivery for first review
1.2	12/18/2012	Revisions from review with POM. Review with PMs.
1.3	12/20/2012	Revisions from review with PMs.
2.0	12/21/2012	Final version.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

### Summary of Project QA Progress and Status

The PSSRP Radio Replacement Project is intended to replace the current City of Portland Public Safety radio communications system with a modern all digital P25 Phase I compliant system. Case Associates Inc. (CAI) was selected to perform the independent QA on the City of Portland PSSRP which includes the Radio Replacement Project. This is the first monthly Radio Replacement Project Periodic QA Evaluation Report intended to assess the health of the project and provide independent observations (positive or negative) for avoiding and/or responding to any future negative impacts.

The Radio Replacement Project is in two major phases:

1. Phase I - Infrastructure. The project is in this phase. This Periodic QA Evaluation Report focuses on this phase.
2. Phase II - Subscriber Units. CAI will include reviews of this phase when appropriate.

### Overall Project QA Status

Prior to the development of this Periodic QA Evaluation Report CAI performed a Baseline Evaluation Report on the project. The Baseline report provided the project with four recommendations to address concerns expressed by the people CAI interviewed as part of the evaluation process. Three recommendations will be better addressed when the vendor is selected at the end of the RFP process. The fourth recommendation, listed a series of documents that should be created or updated to facilitate project planning and monitoring. (See the Purpose and Methodology section for a mapping of the recommendations to the QFPs.)

CAI also conducted an in-depth review of the Radio RFP prior to its release. CAI found no critical problems with the RFP. The Radio RFP review yielded a set of recommendations designed to add clarity and facilitate contract negotiations. With the exception of one, all recommendations were adopted in the released version of the Radio RFP. As for the exception, CAI recommended that the project conduct a site survey to give vendors more data for their proposals. The project decided that to conduct a survey now would duplicate work. CAI concurs with that decision. The project released the RFP on schedule.

### Overall Project Health

Overall Rating: **Stable**

The overall health of the project is based on the three main areas described in the table below:

<b>Schedule</b>	<b>Attention</b>	<p>A detailed project schedule is not be feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected and the system design is approved, CAI recommends that the project develop a schedule to include procurement activities, development of selection criteria and other activities leading to a final contract and approved system design</p> <p>The RFP was released a few days later than originally scheduled. The short delay had no effect on the overall procurement schedule.</p>
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Stable</b>	<p>The project has a budget and contingency. Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations. The adequacy of the budget will be reassessed then.</p>
<b>Scope</b>	<b>Stable</b>	<p>The project scope is clearly defined in the RFP and the Project Charter.</p>

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

### **Quality Focal Points Rated **Alert****

No Quality Focal Points were rated as needing immediate attention.

### **Quality Focal Points Rated **Attention****

There are two findings in this QA report that CAI believes need attention:

- Project Schedule, QFP#3 **Attention**

Although a detailed project schedule will not be feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected, CAI recommends that from now until the selection of the radio vendor, the project develop a schedule to include procurement activities, development of selection criteria and other activities leading to a final contract.

- Project Library and Configuration Management, QFP#16 **Attention**

CAI recommends that PSSRP adopt a standardized document content and management procedures to support version controls. PSSRP should implement a Document Management System to control access and versioning of the project library. Each PSSRP project would benefit by the convenience and control offered by such a system.

#### **Definition of Risk Factors:**

- Stable** - the Quality Focal Point is stable and not currently impacting the project
- Attention** - the Quality Focal Point needs some improvement so it won't impact the project
- Alert** - the Quality Focal Point is impacting the project and needs immediate attention

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

### Quality Focal Point Summary Chart

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of: 11/5/12 <sup>1</sup>	Current as of: 12/5/2012
1. Meeting Milestones	High	NR	Stable
<b>Quality Planning</b>			
	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Prior as of: 11/5/12</b>	<b>Current as of: 12/5/2012</b>
2. Requirements Management	High	NR <sup>2</sup>	Stable
3. Project Schedule	High	NR	Attention
4. Communications	High	NR	Stable
5. Risk and Issue Management	High	NR	Stable
6. Radio System Acquisition	High	NR	Stable
7. Tech. & Operational Transition	High	NR	NR
<b>Quality Assurance / Quality Control</b>			
	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Prior as of: 11/5/12</b>	<b>Current as of: 12/5/2012</b>
8. Project Organization and Leadership	High	NR	Stable
9. Project Resources	High	NR	Stable
10. Project/Quality Management and Reporting	Medium	NR	NR
11. Budget Planning and Tracking	Medium	NR	Stable
12. Scope and Change Control	High	NR	NR
13. Roles, Responsibilities and Communications	High	NR	Stable
14. Radio System Architecture	High	NR	NR
15. Radio System Acquisition Management	High	NR	NR
16. Project Library and Configuration Management	Medium	NR	Attention
<b>System Delivery</b>			
	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Prior as of: 11/5/12</b>	<b>Current as of: 12/5/2012</b>
17. System Design Process	High	NR	Stable
18. Testing (Functional and Performance)	High	NR	NR
19. User Acceptance Process	High	NR	NR
20. Training	High	NR	NR
21. Implementation & Integration Process	High	NR	NR
22. Deployment Process	High	NR	NR

<sup>1</sup> This is the first Periodic QA Evaluation. In following reports, this column will include the prior month's ratings.

<sup>2</sup> "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012


### Quality Focal Points

<b>1</b>	<h3>Milestones</h3> <p><b>Project milestones are being met on schedule.</b> The Milestone QFP assesses the scheduled completion of interim and major project milestones and their impact on overall project completion.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; position: relative;"> <span style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: -5px;">Stable</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 40%; top: -5px;">Attention</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 80%; top: -5px;">Alert</span> <div style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: 5px; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green;"></div> </span></p>
<b>1.1</b>	Are project milestones being met so far? <b>Finding:</b> YES – The major milestone, the RFP, went out a few days later than the original schedule. This short delay had no effect on the overall procurement schedule.
<b>1.2</b>	Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – The project schedule will be developed during negotiations with the selected vendor. A detailed project schedule is not be feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected and the system design is approved,
<b>2</b>	<h3>Requirements Management</h3> <p><b>The Requirements Management process is appropriate and thorough.</b></p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; position: relative;"> <span style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: -5px;">Stable</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 40%; top: -5px;">Attention</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 80%; top: -5px;">Alert</span> <div style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: 5px; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green;"></div> </span></p>
<b>2.1</b>	Are the System and Business Requirements understood and confirmed? <b>Finding:</b> YES –The requirements are clearly articulated in the RFP. The Radio Project Charter contains high-level project objectives.
<b>2.2</b>	Are requirements traceable to design? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The requirements are traceable to the Conceptual Design provided by the project consultants, Federal Engineering, as accepted by the City. The proposed designs that are submitted with vendor proposals will be compared to the requirements to evaluate compliance or to identify advantages of the proposed design over the conceptual one.
<b>2.3</b>	Are requirement change impacts understood and documented <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>2.4</b>	Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? <b>Finding:</b> TBD

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012


<b>3</b>	<p><b>Project Schedule</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately planned.</b> The Planning QFP provides an assessment of the breadth and depth of project planning, scope definition, scheduling and identification of external dependencies.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 15px; margin-left: 10px;"> <span style="float: left; margin-right: 10px;">Stable</span> <span style="float: right; margin-left: 10px;">Alert</span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 50px; height: 100%; background-color: yellow; vertical-align: middle;"></span> <span style="float: right; margin-left: 10px;">Attention</span> </span></p>
<b>3.1</b>	Are all appropriate tasks identified in the work breakdown structure (WBS) and/or project plan? <b>Finding:</b> No – A detailed project schedule is not be feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected and the system design is approved, CAI recommends that the project develop a schedule to include procurement activities, development of selection criteria and other activities leading to a final contract and approved system design.
<b>3.2</b>	Are dependencies among tasks identified, including decision dependencies? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>3.3</b>	Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – The plan and schedule should include contingencies to allow for possible delays and costs due to infrastructure upgrades.
<b>3.4</b>	Is the schedule clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>3.5</b>	Is the schedule used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>3.6</b>	Are external project dependencies identified in the plan? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>3.7</b>	Have appropriate major milestones been defined? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – For the RFP phase, appropriate major milestones are articulated. When the radio vendor is selected, more detail will be developed.
<b>3.8</b>	Has the schedule been reviewed, approved and signed off by the project Stakeholders? <b>Finding:</b> Yes, in the RFP phase context. After the radio vendor is selected, more detail will be developed and will require stakeholder review and approval.
<b>3.9</b>	Is there an appropriate process for updating the project schedule with actuals and tracking project progress? <b>Findings:</b> TBD
<b>3.10</b>	Is the schedule reasonable to manage the Project? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<p><b>Mitigation:</b> From now until the selection of the radio vendor, develop a schedule to include procurement activities, development of selection criteria and other activities leading to a final contract and approved system design.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>4</b>	<p><b>Communications</b></p> <p><b>The project communications are effective and adequately controlled.</b> Assessment of the Communications QFP examines the project status reporting and communication processes for task completion and budget.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="margin-left: 20px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-left: 100px;">Attention</span> <span style="margin-left: 100px;">Alert</span></p> 
<b>4.1</b>	Have communications been planned, identified and documented? <b>Finding:</b> Yes
<b>4.2</b>	Is the Communications Plan being followed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes –The project has regular communications with stakeholders. When a detailed schedule is available, it will be easier to compare communication activities to the Communication Plan.
<b>4.3</b>	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? <b>Finding:</b> Yes
<b>4.4</b>	Are project status and activities being monitored and reported in enough detail and with enough frequency to ensure early detection of problems or schedule slippage? <b>Finding:</b> Yes, weekly reports are sufficient for the RFP phase. More detail will be available once the schedule is developed.
<p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Radio project should update the Charter and Governance documents to reflect current executives and sponsors. The Radio project should update the Communication Plan to reflect current assignments. These updates can wait until the vendor is on board. At that point, the Communication Plan will address more communication needs for other external stakeholders.</p> <p>(See Related Recommendations in QFP#8 and QFP#13.)</p>	




## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>5</b>	<p><b>Risk and Issue Management</b></p> <p><b>Project risks are identified and appropriately managed.</b> The Risk Management QFP provides an assessment of the risk identification, mitigation strategy and contingency planning for high probability and/or high impact risks. It also assesses the continuing validity of high impact assumptions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> </p>
<b>5.1</b>	Are project risks and issues identified and categorized as to likelihood and impact? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Risks are a significant part of the regular status reporting.
<b>5.2</b>	Are appropriate risk and issue mitigation strategies in place with appropriate monitoring measures? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The regular status reporting includes “Actions Completed/Planned.” As the project progresses through the procurement phase, the decision making and issue resolution processes will be tested. The project should monitor the processes and look for ways that to increase awareness and document any necessary changes to the governance and decision making processes.
<b>5.3</b>	For high probability or high impact risks, are contingency plans developed in case the risk mitigation strategy fails? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The regular status reporting includes “Actions Completed/Planned.”
<b>5.4</b>	Are ongoing risk identification, assessment and management processes in place and operating effectively? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The regular status reporting includes “Actions Completed/Planned.”
<b>5.5</b>	Have project assumptions been verified & appropriate monitoring measures been put in place to ensure failed assumptions do not become risks? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Critical assumptions are identified in the risk list of the status reports.
<p><b>Recommendation:</b> The project should develop a Risk Management Plan to formally describe mitigation strategies and monitoring measures.</p>	






## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>9</b>	<p><b>Project Resources</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately resourced.</b> The Resources Quality Focal Point assesses three resource components: The capacity and skill set of the assigned project staff, supporting tools and facilities, and budget or financial resources.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; text-align: center;">Stable</div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50%; text-align: center;">Attention</div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; text-align: center;">Alert</div> </span></p> 
<b>9.1</b>	Is the level of effort estimated planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? <b>Finding:</b> Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.
<b>9.2</b>	Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? <b>Finding:</b> Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.
<b>9.3</b>	Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>9.4</b>	Are appropriate tools and other necessary facilities available and effectively utilized? <b>Finding:</b> Yes
<b>9.5</b>	Is the Budget (financial resources) sufficient to support the Radio Project? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The budget is suitable, including a contingency.



## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

11	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Budget Planning and Tracking</h3> <p><b>The project budget is appropriately planned, managed and tracked.</b> Assessment of the Project Budget Planning and Tracking Processes. Are the Plans in place and followed to ensure project deliverables meet requirements and are accomplished on time and within budget?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> </p>
11.1	Do the Radio Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
11.2	Is the Radio Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations.
11.3	Are the appropriate funds budgeted in order to conduct required activities and complete and support the project? <b>Finding:</b> TBD - Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations.
11.4	Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Budget management and tracking is performed by the city’s finance office in consultation with the PM and providing regular budget reports to the PM

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>12</b>	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Scope and Change Control</h3> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>The project scope is appropriately controlled.</b> Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests.</p> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span></p> <p style="margin: 0; text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p style="margin: 0; text-align: right;"><b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>12.1</b>	Scope is being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? <b>Finding:</b>

<b>13</b>	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Roles and Responsibilities and Communications</h3> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>The project is staffed with appropriate roles and responsibilities. Communications are effective.</b> Assessment of the Monitoring and Control QFP examines the project status reporting and communication processes.</p> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span></p> <p style="margin: 0; text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p>
<b>13.1</b>	Has a formal Communications Plan been developed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes
<b>13.2</b>	Is the Communications Plan being executed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<b>13.3</b>	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<b>13.4</b>	Are the external project communication dependencies included in project status reporting? <b>Finding:</b> No – The current Communication Plan will require updates when a vendor is selected.
<b>13.5</b>	Are the project roles and responsibilities documented and understood by all parties? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Radio project should update the Charter and Governance documents to reflect current executives and sponsors. The Radio project should update the Communication Plan to reflect current assignments. These updates can wait until the vendor is on board. At that point, the plans will require more extensive updates. At that point the project should also add plans for other external stakeholders.</p> <p>(See Related Recommendations in QFP#4 and QFP#8.)</p>	


## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>14</b>	<p><b>Radio System Architecture</b></p> <p><b>The project adheres to Radio System architecture standards.</b> Verification that the Project conforms to Radio Architecture standards.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>14.1</b>	The Project supports the Radio System Architecture Framework? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – There is a Conceptual Design. The final Radio Architecture solution will depend on the outcome of the Radio RFP.
<b>14.2</b>	The Project supports the Radio System Architecture Framework strategic objectives? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>14.3</b>	The project supports the Radio System architecture with respect to geographical coverage, functionality, capacity, and interoperability. <b>Finding:</b>

<b>15</b>	<p><b>Radio System Acquisition Management</b></p> <p><b>The vendor deliverables meet the Project requirements and standards per the Contract Terms and Conditions.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>15.1</b>	Procedures are defined and documented to monitor and track vendor deliverables. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>15.2</b>	Procedures are defined and documented to measure vendor deliverables against project requirements and standards per the contract terms and conditions. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>15.3</b>	Project staff understands and follow documented procedures regarding vendor deliverables requirements. <b>Findings:</b>



## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>16</b>	<p><b>Project Library and Configuration Management</b></p> <p>The project has an appropriate Project Library in place to support Project Management and a Configuration Management Process in place to support System Delivery.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="margin-left: 50px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-left: 100px;">Attention</span> <span style="margin-left: 100px;">Alert</span></p> 
<b>16.1</b>	A Secure library has been defined? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The Radio project uses a hierarchical file system to manage all project related documentation. Access is limited to people with appropriate system accounts.
<b>16.2</b>	Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? <b>Finding:</b> Yes - Project uses standard IT system administration procedures for configuring and maintaining the file system which holds all project related documentation.
<b>16.3</b>	Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? <b>Finding:</b> No – CAI recommends that PSSRP adopt a standardized document content and management procedures to support version controls. PSSRP should implement a Document Management System to control access and versioning of the project library. Each PSSRP project would benefit by the convenience and control offered by such a system.
<b>16.4</b>	There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. <b>Finding:</b> Yes – These are based on IT general contractor system access rules.
<b>16.5</b>	There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? <b>Finding:</b> No – The file system has no procedures for reviewing changes in the library.
<p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Radio project should adopt standardized document content and management procedures to support version controls. The project should implement a Document Management System to control access and versioning of the project library.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

### SYSTEM DELIVERY - Quality Focal Points

17	<p><b>System Design Process</b></p> <p>The system design process is appropriate and thorough.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 5px;"> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; background-color: green; height: 10px;"></span> </span></p>
17.1	Are radio system specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Requirements are clearly defined in the RFP.
17.2	Are the radio system specifications reasonable and acceptable? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The specifications are in accordance with generally accepted industry standards, such as P25 Phase 1 and future Phase 2.
17.3	Is the current Public Safety Radio system infrastructure (towers, shelters, microwave, power, etc.) capable to support the new voice communication Public Safety Radio? <b>Finding:</b> TBD –The vendor and the City will conduct site surveys to confirm that the current infrastructure will support the new Radio system.
17.4	Does the radio system architecture allow for full interoperability among Portland and other metro area jurisdictions? <b>Finding:</b> TBD

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>18</b>	<p><b>Testing (Functional and Performance)</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately tested.</b> Appropriate functional and performance acceptance testing procedures and plans are in place and meet the operational needs of the system and verify and validate acceptable compliance to requirements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>18.1</b>	Has a formal Test Management Plan been developed? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – A high-level testing approach will be determined during contract negotiations.
<b>18.2</b>	Is the Plan being followed? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.3</b>	Do the documented functional specifications meet the business needs? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.4</b>	Are the end users involved in establishing the functional acceptance testing scope and standards? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.5</b>	Are the functional, capacity, and performance acceptance test procedures appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.6</b>	Do the functional, capacity, and performance specifications match operational needs? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.7</b>	Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity, and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all Radio System components, including supporting infrastructure? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.8</b>	Are infrastructure conditions that may affect the radio system being considered, tested and resolved? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.9</b>	Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? <b>Finding:</b>

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>19</b>	<h3>User Acceptance Process</h3> <p>The User Acceptance Process is appropriate and defines the methods, test plans, test procedures, and test results required to ensure the delivered system meets customer requirements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input style="width: 200px;" type="checkbox"/> <input style="width: 200px;" type="checkbox"/> <input style="width: 200px;" type="checkbox"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>19.1</b>	A User Acceptance Test Plan has been prepared. <b>Finding:</b> TBD – A high-level testing approach will be determined during contract negotiations. A detailed Test Plan will be developed later in the project.
<b>19.2</b>	The acceptance test procedures are complete. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>19.3</b>	Testing standards are understood and followed. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>19.4</b>	A defect log was maintained and corrective actions were effective. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>19.5</b>	User acceptance criteria have been met. <b>Finding:</b>

<b>20</b>	<h3>Training</h3> <p>The radio system technical staff and end users are appropriately trained in a timely manner. Assessment of training plans and materials.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input style="width: 200px;" type="checkbox"/> <input style="width: 200px;" type="checkbox"/> <input style="width: 200px;" type="checkbox"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>20.1</b>	Have formal end user and technical Training Plans been developed? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – The RFP requires the vendor to address training. A Training Plan will be developed later in the project. The project should include training and operations support in the schedule.
<b>20.2</b>	Are the Plans being followed? <b>Finding:</b>

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

<b>21</b>	<p><b>Implementation &amp; Integration Process</b></p> <p><b>The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>21.1</b>	The installation specification is complete and reasonable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>21.2</b>	The integration specification is complete and reasonable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>21.2</b>	The end user and technical training plans are complete and acceptable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>21.3</b>	The actual training was acceptable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>21.4</b>	System documentation is complete and acceptable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>21.5</b>	The implementation and integration acceptance criteria have been met. <b>Finding:</b>

<b>22</b>	<p><b>Deployment Process</b></p> <p><b>The new system has been successfully deployed.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>22.1</b>	Deployment Plans are complete and reasonable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>22.2</b>	Training end users and technical staff was complete and acceptable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>22.3</b>	User and technical documentation is complete and acceptable. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>22.4</b>	Is there an appropriate Operations & Maintenance Plan in place to assure the new system is appropriately supported in accordance with (to be?) established Service Level Agreements (SLAs)? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>22.5</b>	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. <b>Finding:</b>

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For November, 2012

### Purpose and Methodology

CASE Associates Inc. (CAI) started its current QA effort for the City's Public Safety Systems Revitalization Project (PSSRP) in September, 2012. This Periodic QA Evaluation Report is delivered monthly as specified in the Quality Assurance Management Plan (QAMP).

#### ***Purpose of the Monthly Report***

With this report, CAI provides independent observations about the PSSRP Radio Replacement project. Included with the observations are recommendations for avoiding and/or responding to any negative impacts.

#### ***Methodology***

CAI Consultants use the following methodology each month to prepare this report:

1. Review project documents and deliverables. The documents that are reviewed are listed in the Documents Reviewed section of the Monthly QA Status Report (separate deliverable).
  - a. Project Manager's weekly status reports
  - b. Development teams status reports
  - c. Issues and Risk logs
  - d. Charter and other initiating documents.
  - e. The Project Management Plan (PMP) and other associated plans
  - f. The Work Breakdown Structure and Project Schedule
2. Attend meetings and conduct interviews. The Interviews Conducted and Meetings Attended are reported in the Documents Reviewed section of the Monthly QA Status Report (separate deliverable).
  - a. Weekly Project Managers' meeting
  - b. Monthly PAC meetings
  - c. Meetings as needed with the Project Manager, Project Office Manager (POM)
  - d. Meetings with other project participants as needed
3. Based on CAI's informed judgment and the documents and evidence reviewed, meetings attended, and interviews conducted, CAI comes to an independent, unbiased opinion of the status of the project and the health of the project. When CAI determines that the project status needs improvement, CAI develops recommendations and includes them in this report.

CAI's knowledge and experience is based upon the following:

1. Project Management Institute, "Project Management Body of Knowledge" (PMBOK). We guide and mentor our clients in applying project management and quality assurance methodologies.
2. Total Quality Management concepts and the Institute of Internal Auditors Process Audit Standards.
3. The Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology (CobIT) standards developed by the Information Systems Audit and Control Foundation for use in Information Technology audits.
4. The tenets of software management, including the functions of Quality Assurance (QA) (Per IEEE-Std 730) and Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V), that is found in Managing the Software Process by Watts Humphrey.
5. The processes described in CAI's Business/System Process Improvement Project, and further documented in the article The Process of Managing System Transitions by David Sharon of CASE Associates Inc. Mr. Sharon's article is based on his personal experiences in managing complex transition projects and documents and recommends a road map for a successful project Quality Assurance and Risk Management experience.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For November, 2012

### **Baseline Evaluation Recommendations to QFPs**

Prior to the development of this Periodic QA Evaluation Report CAI performed a Baseline Evaluation Report on the project. The Baseline report provided the project with four recommendations to address concerns expressed by the people CAI interviewed as part of the evaluation process. Three recommendations will be better addressed when the vendor is selected at the end of the RFP process. The fourth recommendation, listed a series of documents that should be created or updated to facilitate project planning and monitoring.

The following table cross-references the recommendations from the Baseline Evaluation to the QFPs in this report:

Recommendation from Baseline Evaluation	QFP to Carry Recommendation Forward
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> Respondents indicated confidence in the project scope and product performance. However, many answers were accompanied by “But, I am concerned about ...” They specifically cited interoperability and coverage. This will be difficult to address until the vendor is selected during the procurement process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The RFP should require the vendor to clearly describe how they will meet the City’s needs. (<i>Note:</i> This was addressed in the RFP.)</li> <li>2. Then the PM can decrease the concerns of stakeholders.</li> </ol>	QFP#4
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> Respondents indicated concern about infrastructure and potential effect on an aggressive timeline. The project should address this risk by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assessing the shelters, power, cooling, and towers to see that it will support the new system. (<i>Note:</i> This was addressed in the RFP.)</li> <li>2. The project should develop a timeline and budget with contingencies to allow for possible delays and costs due to infrastructure upgrades.</li> </ol>	QFP#3
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> Respondents indicated concerns with training and support for the operations staff.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The RFP should require the vendor to commit to training and support.</li> <li>2. The project should include training and operations support in the plans and schedule.</li> </ol>	QFP#20
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> Documentation should be created to manage the Radio Replacement Project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Charter and Governance documents should be updated.</li> <li>2. The Project Management Plan (PMP) should be developed to include the critical subsidiary plans. It should be a ‘living’ document that describes the project approach in enough detail to be used as input into the project schedule.</li> <li>3. The project should have a detailed schedule. This will be feasible only after signing. From now until then, the schedule should include procurement activities, development of selection criteria and other activities described in the PMP.</li> <li>4. The project should continue its current level of communications, focusing on roles and responsibilities. As the project progresses beyond the procurements phase, it will become clear if the roles and responsibilities need additional definition or modification.</li> <li>5. As the project progresses through the procurement phase, the decision making and issue resolution processes will be tested. The project should monitor the processes and look for ways to increase awareness and document any necessary changes to the governance and decision making processes.</li> </ol>	QFP#3 QFP#4 QFP#5 QFP#8 QFP#13