City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Radio Replacement Project

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For the Month of January 2013
Deliverable: Radio.C.3

V2.0 FINAL
2/13/2013

Prepared By:

CASE
Associates
Incorporated

Clifford Smith, PMP, Project Lead, Quality Assurance Consultant
David Sharon, QA Consultant and Engagement Manager
Peter van den Berg, Quality Assurance Consultant
Contract # 30002849

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

Table of Contents

Summary of Project QA Progress and Status 3
- OVERALL PROJECT QA STATUS 3
- OVERALL PROJECT HEALTH 4
- QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED ALERT 4
- QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED ATTENTION 4

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart 5

Quality Focal Points 6
- *Milestones* 6
- *Requirements Management* 6
- *Project Schedule* 7
- *Communications* 8
- *Risk and Issue Management* 9
- *Radio System Acquisition* 10
- *Technical & Operational Transition* 10
- *Project Organization and Leadership* 11
- *Project Resources* 12
- *Project & Quality Management and Reporting* 13
- *Budget Planning and Tracking* 14
- *Scope and Change Control* 15
- *Roles and Responsibilities and Communications* 15
- *Radio System Architecture* 16
- *Radio System Acquisition Management* 16
- *Project Library and Configuration Management* 17
- *System Design Process* 18
- *Testing (Functional and Performance)* 19
- *User Acceptance Process* 20
- *Training* 20
- *Implementation & Integration Process* 21
- *Deployment Process* 21

Purpose and Methodology 22
- PURPOSE OF THE MONTHLY REPORT 22
- METHODOLOGY 22

Version	Date	Comments
V0.1	2/5/2013	Initial Version
V1.0	2/6/2012	Initial delivery for PSSRP Review
V2.0	2/13/2012	Final version incorporating suggestions from PSSRP

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

Summary of Project QA Progress and Status

The PSSRP Radio Replacement Project is 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 third monthly Radio Replacement Project Periodic QA Evaluation Report intended to assess the health of the project and provide independent observations (positive or negative) and recommendations 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

The Radio project is in the Procurement phase. The RFP is released to the vendors. The project is developing answers to questions from the vendors. The RFP submission date is 3/1/2013.

In the meantime, the Project Managers responded to CAI mitigation recommendations by developing an interim milestone list that the project will use through the Procurement phase, ending in November 2013. In response to this work, CAI upgraded QFP#3 (Project Schedule) to “Stable.”

Consequently, the Project Health Factor, Schedule, is also upgraded to “Stable.”

The Overall Health rating is also “Stable,” reflecting that the project is well run and requires no immediate intervention.

During January, one of the Project Managers was assigned to also manage another PSSRP project. The Project Managers will see how this may affect how they share Project Management duties on the Radio project. Considering that the Radio project is in the Procurement stage, the impact should be minimal.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

Overall Project Health

Overall Rating: Stable

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

Health Factor	Rating	Comments
Schedule	Stable	In last month's Periodic Evaluation, QFP#3 (Project Schedule) was rated as needing attention. Since then the QFP is upgraded to "Stable." The project responded to mitigation recommendations by developing an interim milestone list. This milestone list will serve as a schedule through the remainder of the Procurement phase, expected in November 2013. During contract negotiations, the Project Managers will also augment the milestone list with an expected due date for the approved system design.
Budget	Stable	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.
Scope	Stable	The project scope is clearly defined in the RFP and the Project Charter.

Quality Focal Points Rated Alert

NONE - No Quality Focal Points are impacting the project at this time.

Quality Focal Points Rated Attention

NONE - No Quality Focal Points need attention so they won't impact the project.

Definition of Risk Factors:

Stable - The Quality Focal Point is stable and not currently impacting the project.

CAI may include a **Suggestion** in a QFP rated as Stable. CAI rated the QFP as stable because it is not impacting the project at this time. The suggested action is a preventive measure to keep the QFP stable.

Attention - The Quality Focal Point needs some improvement so it won't impact the project.

CAI includes a **Recommendation** for every QFP rated Attention. The recommended action is a corrective measure to improve the QFP so it won't impact the project.

Alert - The Quality Focal Point is impacting the project and needs immediate attention.

CAI includes a **Recommendation** for every QFP rated Alert. The recommended action is a corrective measure to improve the QFP that is currently impacting the project.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart

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

[1] "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

Quality Focal Points

1	Milestones **Project milestones are being met on schedule.** The Milestone QFP assesses the scheduled completion of interim and major project milestones and their impact on overall project completion. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
1.1	Are project milestones being met so far? **Finding**: 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.
1.2	Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? **Finding:** TBD – The project schedule will be developed during negotiations with the selected vendor. A detailed project schedule is not feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected and the system design is approved.

2	Requirements Management **The Requirements Management process is appropriate and thorough.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
2.1	Are the System and Business Requirements understood and confirmed? **Finding:** YES –The requirements are clearly articulated in the RFP. The Radio Project Charter contains high-level project objectives.
2.2	Are requirements traceable to design? **Finding:** Yes – The requirements are traceable to the Conceptual Design provided by the project consultants, Federal Engineering. The City accepted the requirements and conceptual design. 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.
2.3	Are requirement change impacts understood and documented **Finding:** TBD
2.4	Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? **Finding:** TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

3	Project Schedule **The project is appropriately planned.** The Planning QFP provides an assessment of the breadth and depth of project planning, scope definition, scheduling and identification of external dependencies. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
3.1	Are all appropriate tasks identified in the work breakdown structure (WBS) and/or project plan? **Finding:** Yes, for the Procurement phase – A detailed project schedule is not feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected and the system design is approved. The project developed an interim milestone list that ends with the contract start (expected in November 2013). Sometime during the contract negotiations (expected from June through August) the project will derive a date to expect the approved system design. When the project approves the system design, it will then be in a position to develop a detailed project schedule. Because the project responded to earlier recommendations by developing an interim milestone list, this QFP has been upgraded to "Stable."
3.2	Are dependencies among tasks identified, including decision dependencies? **Finding:** TBD
3.3	Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? **Finding:** TBD – The plan and schedule should include contingencies to allow for possible delays and costs due to infrastructure upgrades.
3.4	Is the schedule clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? **Finding:** TBD
3.5	Is the schedule used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? **Finding:** TBD
3.6	Are external project dependencies identified in the plan? **Finding:** TBD
3.7	Have appropriate major milestones been defined? **Finding:** Yes – For the RFP phase, appropriate major milestones are articulated. When the radio vendor is selected, more detail will be developed.
3.8	Has the schedule been reviewed, approved and signed off by the project Stakeholders? **Finding:** Yes, in the RFP phase context. After the radio vendor is selected, and the system design approved, more detail will be developed and will require stakeholder review and approval.
3.9	Is there an appropriate process for updating the project schedule with actuals and tracking project progress? **Findings:** TBD
3.10	Is the schedule reasonable to manage the Project? **Finding**: TBD for the Implementation phase. For the remainder of the Procurement phase, the project developed a milestone list that will serve as a schedule.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

4	Communications **The project communications are effective and adequately controlled.** Assessment of the Communications QFP examines the project status reporting and communication processes for task completion and budget. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
4.1	Have communications been planned, identified and documented? **Finding:** Yes
4.2	Is the Communications Plan being followed? **Finding:** 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.
4.3	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? **Finding:** Yes
4.4	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? **Finding:** Yes, weekly reports are sufficient for the RFP phase. More detail will be available once the schedule is developed.
Suggestion: 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 and the City sign the contract. At that point, the Communication Plan will address more communication needs for other external stakeholders. (See Related Suggestions in QFP#8 and QFP#13.)	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

5	Risk and Issue Management **Project risks are identified and appropriately managed.** 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. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
5.1	Are project risks and issues identified and categorized as to likelihood and impact? **Finding:** Yes – Risks are a significant part of the regular status reporting.
5.2	Are appropriate risk and issue mitigation strategies in place with appropriate monitoring measures? **Finding**: 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.
5.3	For high probability or high impact risks, are contingency plans developed in case the risk mitigation strategy fails? **Finding**: Yes – The regular status reporting on risks and includes "Actions Completed/Planned."
5.4	Are ongoing risk identification, assessment and management processes in place and operating effectively? **Finding**: Yes – The regular status reporting on risks includes "Actions Completed/Planned."
5.5	Have project assumptions been verified & appropriate monitoring measures been put in place to ensure failed assumptions do not become risks? **Finding**: Yes – Critical assumptions are identified in the risk list of the status reports.
Suggestion: The project should develop a Risk Management Plan to formally describe mitigation strategies and monitoring measures.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

6	Radio System Acquisition **The Radio System Acquisition is adequately planned and executed.** The Radio System Acquisition QFP assesses the breadth and depth of the project's procurement process, RFP and vendor contract. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
6.1	The RFP was prepared per the City's Procurement Office guidelines**. Finding:** Yes – The RFP went through extensive reviews by all necessary stakeholders.
6.2	The RFP defines deliverables that meet the business requirements. **Finding:** Yes.
6.3	The RFP included appropriate scoring and evaluation instructions. **Finding**: Yes – The RFP contains these instructions.
6.4	Is the Pre-Award Plan completed and understood by Evaluation Team? **Finding**: TBD
6.5	Is the Pre-Award Plan being followed? **Finding**: Yes – As the project proceeds through the RFP Q&A steps, they are following the prescribed process.
6.6	Are contract negotiations proceeding as planned? **Finding**: TBD

7	Technical & Operational Transition **The Technical Transition is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the technical transition. **The Operational Transition is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the operational transition. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
7.1	Has the Technical Transition Plan been defined? **Finding:** TBD – A Technical Transition Plan will not be available until after the radio vendor and the City sign a contract.
7.2	Has the Technical Transition Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:**
7.3	Has the Radio vendor's Radio System architecture been assessed relative to the City's current Radio System architecture? **Finding:**
7.4	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? **Finding:**
7.5	Has the Operational Transition Plan been defined and approved? **Finding:**
7.6	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

8	Project Organization and Leadership **The project is appropriately organized.** The Organization QFP assesses the breadth and depth of the project's organization and the commitment to the project within the organization. This determines if the project's organizational structure can manage both tactical and strategic project issues. **Risk Level** Stable Attention Alert
8.1	The Steering Committee is comprised of executive decision-makers and is functioning? **Finding:** Yes – The Executive Steering Committee (ESC) meets regularly. The Governance, including the Executive Steering Committee was redefined in August 2012. At the January ESC meeting, members expressed concern about the lack of clear tasks for the ESC. A new member, the BTS CTO, offered to initiate a task to identify decisions expected of the ESC.
8.2	Executive Sponsors have been designated? **Finding:** Yes - The sponsor is designated in the Governance document.
8.3	Project Management roles and responsibilities with lines of authority and accountability have been defined, assigned and agreed upon? **Finding**: Yes – The project has two Project Managers assigned. Their individual roles are listed in a separate document; "Responsibility matrix – Co PMs." This month, one of the PMs was assigned to another PSSRP project. Considering that the project is in the Procurement phase (RFP released and the submittals are not due until 3/1/13) of this project, this additional responsibility should not cause a problem.
8.4	Management is committed to the project. **Finding:** Yes
8.5	Management and Staff are committed to the project. **Finding**: Yes
8.6	Are other Stakeholders/users committed to the project? **Finding**: Yes
8.7	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Change Management Plan? **Finding:** TBD
Suggestion: 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 and the City sign the contract. At that point, the Communication Plan will address more communication needs for other external stakeholders. (See Related Recommendations in QFP#4 and QFP#13.)	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

9	Project Resources **The project is appropriately resourced.** 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. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
9.1	Is the level of effort estimated planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? **Finding:** Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.
9.2	Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? **Finding:** Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.
9.3	Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? **Finding:** TBD
9.4	Are appropriate tools and other necessary facilities available and effectively utilized? **Finding:** Yes
9.5	Is the Budget (financial resources) sufficient to support the Radio Project? **Finding:** Yes – The budget is suitable, including a contingency.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

10	Project & Quality Management and Reporting **The project is appropriately managed and quality controlled.** Assessment of the Project Management, Quality Assurance and Quality Control Processes and Plans. Are the Plans in place and followed to ensure project deliverables meet requirements and are accomplished on time and within budget? **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
10.1	Have formal Project Management and Quality Management Plans been developed? **Finding:** TBD
10.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:**
10.3	Have appropriate metrics and processes been put in place to successfully manage the project? **Finding:**
10.4	Have objective quality metrics been put in place for project deliverables? **Finding:**
10.5	Are Project Progress and Deliverables measured against the metrics? **Finding:**
10.6	Are the results of the metric measurements reported to the appropriate sponsor, users, and other stakeholders? **Finding:**
10.7	Are appropriate corrective actions put in place when measurements are not acceptable? **Finding:**
10.8	Are appropriate status reports prepared for tracking and monitoring all project tasks? **Finding:**
Suggestion: The project should develop a detailed and formal Quality Management Plan. The City and the vendor will collaboratively develop the QMP. The plan will describe reviews and Quality Control steps to ensure that the vendor is progressing according to the City's needs.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

11	Budget Planning and Tracking **The project budget is appropriately planned, managed and tracked.** 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? **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
11.1	Do the Radio Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? **Finding:** Yes.
11.2	Is the Radio Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? **Finding:** 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? **Finding:** TBD - Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations.
11.4	Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? **Finding:** 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 January 2013

12	Scope and Change Control **The project scope is appropriately controlled.** Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
12.1	Scope is being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. **Finding:**
12.2	Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? **Finding:**
12.3	Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? **Finding:**

13	Roles and Responsibilities and Communications **The project is staffed with appropriate roles and responsibilities. Communications are effective.** Assessment of the project status reporting and communication. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
13.1	Has a formal Communications Plan been developed? **Finding:** Yes
13.2	Is the Communications Plan being executed? **Finding:** Yes.
13.3	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? **Finding:** Yes.
13.4	Are the external project communication dependencies included in project status reporting? **Finding:** No – The current Communication Plan will require updates when a vendor is selected.
13.5	Are the project roles and responsibilities documented and understood by all parties? **Finding:** Yes.

Suggestion: 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 and the City sign the contract. At that point, the plans will require more extensive updates. At that point the project should also add plans for other external stakeholders.

(See Related Suggestions in QFP#4 and QFP#8.)

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

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

15	Radio System Acquisition Management **The vendor deliverables meet the Project requirements and standards per the Contract Terms and Conditions.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
15.1	Procedures are defined and documented to monitor and track vendor deliverables. **Finding:**
15.2	Procedures are defined and documented to measure vendor deliverables against project requirements and standards per the contract terms and conditions. **Finding:**
15.3	Project staff understands and follow documented procedures regarding vendor deliverables requirements. **Findings:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

16	Project Library and Configuration Management **The project has an appropriate Project Library in place to support Project Management and a Configuration Management Process in place to support System Delivery.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
16.1	A Secure library has been defined? **Finding:** Yes – The Radio project uses a hierarchical file system to manage all project related documentation. Access is limited to people with appropriate system accounts.
16.2	Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? **Finding:** Yes - Project uses standard IT system administration procedures for configuring and maintaining the file system which holds all project related documentation.
16.3	Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? **Finding**: No – The project does not have a check-in-and-out process. 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.
16.4	There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. **Finding**: Yes – These are based on IT general contractor system access rules.
16.5	There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? **Finding**: No – The file system has no procedures for reviewing changes in the library.
Suggestion: The Radio project should adopt standardized document content and management procedures to support version controls. Version control has not been a major issue for the project. It could become more important as the project gets larger and the number of documents shared and reviewed increases. CAI suggests PSSRP implement a Document Management System to control access and versioning of the project library. A DMS could benefit all the PSSRP projects.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

SYSTEM DELIVERY - Quality Focal Points

17	System Design Process **The system design process is appropriate and thorough.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
17.1	Are radio system specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? **Finding:** Yes – Requirements are clearly defined in the RFP.
17.2	Are the radio system specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** 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? **Finding:** 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? **Finding:** TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

19	User Acceptance Process **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.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
19.1	A User Acceptance Test Plan has been prepared. **Finding:** TBD – A high-level testing approach will be determined during contract negotiations. A detailed Test Plan will be developed later in the project.
19.2	The acceptance test procedures are complete. **Finding:**
19.3	Testing standards are understood and followed. **Finding:**
19.4	A defect log was maintained and corrective actions were effective. **Finding:**
19.5	User acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

20	Training **The radio system technical staff and end users are appropriately trained in a timely manner.** Assessment of training plans and materials. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
20.1	Have formal end user and technical Training Plans been developed? **Finding:** 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.
20.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

21	Implementation & Integration Process **The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
21.1	The installation specification is complete and reasonable. **Finding:**
21.2	The integration specification is complete and reasonable. **Finding:**
21.2	The end user and technical training plans are complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
21.3	The actual training was acceptable. **Finding:**
21.4	System documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
21.5	The implementation and integration acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

22	Deployment Process **The new system has been successfully deployed.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
22.1	Deployment Plans are complete and reasonable. **Finding:**
22.2	Training end users and technical staff was complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
22.3	User and technical documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
22.4	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)? **Finding:**
22.5	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

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 and suggestions 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. Issues and Risk logs
    c. Charter and other initiating documents
    d. The Project Management Plan (PMP) and other associated plans
    e. The Work Breakdown Structure and Project Schedule
2. Attend meetings and conduct interviews with Radio Project Managers, project team members, project participants and stakeholders in order to determine the project's status and identify possible issues and risks. 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 and the Program 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 suggestions for 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.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For January 2013

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.