City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Fire Information Systems Re-Platform Project

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

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

V2.0 FINAL
12/27/2012

Prepared By:

CASE
Associates
Incorporated

Clifford Smith, PMP, Project Lead, Quality Assurance Consultant
David Sharon, QA Consultant and Engagement Manager
Dick Sperry, PMP, QA 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 ALERT 4
- QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED ATTENTION 4

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart 6

Quality Focal Points 7
- *Milestones* 7
- *Requirements Management* 7
- *Project Schedule* 8
- *Communications* 9
- *Risk and Issue Management* 10
- *IT Acquisition* 11
- *Technical Transition and Business Process Re-Engineering* 12
- *Project Organization and Leadership* 13
- *Project Resources* 14
- *Project & Quality Management and Reporting* 15
- *Budget Planning and Tracking* 16
- *Scope and Change Control* 16
- *Roles and Responsibilities and Communications* 17
- *IT Architecture* 17
- *IT Acquisition Management* 18
- *Project Library and Configuration Management* 18
- *System Design Process* 19
- *Data Conversion and Migration* 19
- *Configuration and Construction Process* 20
- *Testing (Functional, Capacity, and Performance)* 20
- *User Acceptance Process and Business Process Transition* 21
- *Training* 21
- *Implementation Process* 22
- *Deployment Process* 22

Purpose and Methodology 23
- PURPOSE OF THE MONTHLY REPORT 23
- METHODOLOGY 23
- BASELINE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS TO QFPS 24

Version	Date	Comments
.1	12/3/2012	Initial Version
1	12/10/2012	Delivery for first review
1.1	12/18/2012	Revisions from review with POM. Review with PMs.
2.0	12/27/2012	Final Version

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

Summary of Project QA Progress and Status

The PSSRP Fire Information Systems (FIS) Re-Platform Project is intended to port the Portland Fire and Rescue's (PF&R's) FIS to a current and supported platform.

Case Associates Inc. (CAI) was selected to perform the independent QA on the City of Portland PSSRP which includes the FIS Project. This is the first monthly FIS 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.

Overall Project QA Status

Prior to the development of this Periodic QA Evaluation Report CAI performed a Baseline Evaluation Report on the FIS project. The Baseline Evaluation report provided the project with three recommendations to address concerns expressed by the people CAI interviewed as part of the evaluation process. The recommendations are still to be addressed. Each is carried forward in one or more of the following Quality Focal Points (QFPs) in the following sections. (See the Purpose and Methodology section for a mapping of the recommendations to the QFPs.)

Overall Project Health

Overall Rating: Alert

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

Schedule	Alert	The project is proceeding without an accepted schedule. Without a schedule, the FIS project cannot: • Communicate progress • Validate that the budget will support the project • Validate that all the functionality can be delivered
Budget	Alert	PSSRP received money for the FIS project. PSSRP does not expect additional fund for the project. The current timelines in the WBS indicate that the project will not be completed within the budget. The project should develop a formal approach document for the project. Then the project can refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule will be the major tool to validate the adequacy of funds budgeted. The schedule will also be a primary tool for tracking progress.
Scope	Attention	The product scope is generally agreed to as the six FIS systems. The project is considering some enhancements. These enhancements should be finalized.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

Quality Focal Points Rated Alert

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

- Project Schedule, QFP#3 Alert

  The project must develop a clear description of the project approach. This should be a developed collectively among FIS, BTS, and PSSRP. Participants should include a system architect, developers, end users, trainers, testers, and deployment staff. The approach will include discussions of requirements, development, deployment (including phased deployments), data migration, testing, training, support, and retirement of the old system. The approach may include other sections. This document should be detailed enough to be used as input to the schedule.

- Project Organization and Leadership, QFP#8 Alert

  The project should define a single person that can approve scope change. The project should define a single Project Manager that is responsible for all project deliverables. Communications and Issue resolution processes, including escalation need clear definitions.

- Project Resources, QFP#9 Alert

  The project should refine the WBS into a schedule that indicates level of effort for the assigned resources at the task level. The schedule will be the major tool to validate the adequacy of funds budgeted. The schedule will also validate whether the project has the correct skills in the correct quantity.

- Budget Planning and Tracking, QFP#11 Alert

  The project should refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule will be the major tool to validate the adequacy of funds budgeted. The schedule will also be a primary tool for tracking progress.

Quality Focal Points Rated Attention

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

- Meeting Milestones, QFP#1 **Attention**

  The project should take a collaborative planning approach and refine the current Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) into a project schedule.

- Requirements Management, QFP#2 **Attention**

  The project should define future approved enhancements to be included in the requirements document.

- Communications, QFP#4 **Attention**

  The project should refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule will be used as the primary tool to detect problems or schedule slippage. Then the Project Manager can communicate progress to stakeholders.

- Risk and Issue Management, QFP#5 **Attention**

  The project should define an effective escalation process for issues and risks. The project should also restart issues and risks identification and management.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

- Project/Quality Management and Reporting, QFP#10 **Attention**

  The project should finalize planning documents that will have an impact on the schedule. Then the project should finalize a schedule that can be used as a basis for progress reporting.

- Scope and Change Control, QFP#12 **Attention**

  The project should finalize the product scope.

- Roles, Responsibilities and Communications, QFP#13 **Attention**

  The project should redefine roles and responsibilities to identify a Project Manager with the access to all project staff and artifacts. The PM should also have responsibility for schedule development.

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[1]	Current as of: 12/5/2012
1. Meeting Milestones	High	NR[2]	Attention
Quality Planning	**Impact**	**Prior as of: 11/5/12**	**Current as of: 12/5/2012**
2. Requirements Management	Low	NR	Attention
3. Project Schedule	High	NR	ALERT
4. Communications	Medium	NR	Attention
5. Risk and Issue Management	Low	NR	Attention
6. IT Acquisition	Low	NR	NR
7. Tech. Transition and Business Proc. Re-engr'g	Low	NR	Stable
Quality Assurance / Quality Control	**Impact**	**Prior as of: 11/5/12**	**Current as of: 12/5/2012**
8. Project Organization and Leadership	High	NR	ALERT
9. Project Resources	High	NR	ALERT
10. Project/Quality Management and Reporting	Medium	NR	Attention
11. Budget Planning and Tracking	High	NR	ALERT
12. Scope and Change Control	Low	NR	Attention
13. Roles, Responsibilities and Communications	High	NR	Attention
14. IT Architecture	Low	NR	NR
15. IT Acquisition Management	Low	NR	NR
16. Project Library and Configuration Management	Low	NR	NR
System Delivery	**Impact**	**Prior as of: 11/5/12**	**Current as of: 12/5/2012**
17. System Design Process	Medium	NR	NR
18. Data Conversion/Migration	Medium	NR	NR
19. Configuration/Construction	High	NR	NR
20. Testing (Functional, Capacity, Performance)	High	NR	NR
21. User Acceptance, Business Process Transition	High	NR	NR
22. Training	Medium	NR	Stable
23. Implementation Process	High	NR	NR
24. Deployment Process	High	NR	NR

[1] This is the first Periodic QA Evaluation. In following reports, this column will include the prior month's ratings.
[2] "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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:** The project WBS is not elaborated into an accepted schedule. The schedule will contain the Milestones. Without a project schedule, CAI cannot verify that the project is progressing as planned.
1.2	Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? **Finding:** The current WBS is not yet refined into an agreed-to schedule. The final schedule will represent a committed completion date. However, the WBS, as presented in October does not fit within the budget.
Mitigation: For the project to reliably track its progress against milestones, the project should take a collaborative planning approach and refine the current Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) into a project schedule. A refined project schedule will contain tasks to complete the project objectives within the budget.	

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:** Partially – The FIS systems to be replatformed are defined. There is no formal requirements document that explicitly states the functional requirements or the system enhancements.
2.2	Are requirements traceable to design? **Finding:** TBD – The design document is not yet developed.
2.3	Are requirement change impacts understood and documented? **Finding:** TBD - The project requires an accepted schedule as a tool to analyze impacts of change.
2.4	Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? **Finding:** TBD – The Test Cases are not yet developed.
Mitigation: CAI's Baseline Evaluation included a recommendation regarding requirements management: The project should define future approved enhancements to be included in the requirements document. (Some used the term "stub out the architecture.") The users cite expectations that should be verified. In future reports CAI will monitor the Requirements Management process and verify that future enhancements are included in project documentation.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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 schedule? **Finding:** No – The WBS includes developer tasks and some PF&R tasks. It does not include integration with project management tasks and other end user tasks.
3.2	Are dependencies among tasks identified, including decision dependencies? **Finding:** No – The WBS as of October identified the developer tasks. Task dependencies are at a high level. The dependencies are not explained in task notes and serve to keep the system development in a predetermined order.
3.3	Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? **Finding:** No – The WBS as defined is not achievable with the current project budget.
3.4	Is the schedule clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? **Finding:** No – The WBS includes developer tasks for each system, though it does not assign individual resources to the tasks. The WBS does not integrate project management activities or enough end user activities.
3.5	Is the schedule used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? **Finding:** No – The WBS is not yet refined to a schedule. The WBS does not reflect progress status on tasks started, in progress, or completed. The next iteration of the WBS is expected January 2013.
3.6	Are external project dependencies identified in the schedule? **Finding:** N/A
3.7	Have appropriate interim and major milestones been defined? **Finding:** No – The WBS contains tasks for development. When the WBS is refined to a schedule, it should contain those milestones.
3.8	Has the schedule been reviewed, approved and signed off by the project Stakeholders? **Finding:** No – The WBS has not yet been refined to a schedule.
3.9	Is there an appropriate process for updating the project schedule with actuals and tracking project progress? **Findings:** No – The development team reports progress but it cannot be confirmed because there is no formal schedule against which to compare.
3.10	Is the schedule reasonable to manage the project? **Finding**: No – The WBS should be refined to a schedule that includes task dependencies, resources and effort.

Mitigation: The WBS should be refined to a schedule that includes task dependencies, resources and effort. Scheduling assumptions should be collaboratively reviewed and accepted. The schedule should be supported by the project budget.

CAI's Baseline Evaluation included a recommendations regarding project approach:

The project must develop a clear description of the project approach. This should be a developed collectively among FIS, BTS, and PSSRP. Participants should include a system architect, developers, end users, trainers, testers, and deployment staff. The approach will include discussions of requirements, development, deployment (including phased deployments), data migration, testing, training, support, and retirement of the old system. The approach may include other sections. This document should be detailed enough to be used as input to the schedule.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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 – The Project Management Plan (PMP) contains a brief communication plan.
4.2	Is the Communications Plan being followed? **Finding:** Yes, though the Organizational Change Management Plan (OCMP) is being updated and may change the communications.
4.3	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? **Finding:** Yes
4.4	Is project status being monitored and accurately reported in enough detail and with enough frequency to ensure early detection of problems or schedule slippage? **Finding:** No – An early indicator of schedule slippage would entail comparing current progress against an approved schedule. The WBS is not yet refined to a schedule. The project develops activity-oriented status reporting. But this cannot be used to detect schedule slippage.
Mitigation: The project should refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule will be used as the primary tool to detect problems or schedule slippage. Then the Project Manager can communicate progress to stakeholders.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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:** Partially – The Project Manager has a detailed Risk list and also identifies critical risks in the project status reports. The latest updates to the Risk List were in September.
5.2	Are appropriate risk and issue mitigation strategies in place with appropriate monitoring measures? **Finding**: No – The project faces significant risks and issues. For instance, the project is proceeding without an accepted schedule or a Replatform plan. The PM and other managers have not been able to resolve these issues and risks. The PMP does not describe an effective escalation process nor does it have enough detail as to the relative roles and responsibilities for the managers on the project.
5.3	For high probability or high impact risks, are contingency plans developed in case the risk mitigation strategy fails? **Finding**: Partially – The most recent Issues/Risk log is from September 2012 and contains plans for mitigation and contingency.
5.4	Are ongoing risk identification, assessment and management processes in place and operating effectively? **Finding**: Partially – The project stopped maintaining the Issues/Risks log in September.
5.5	Have project assumptions been verified & appropriate monitoring measures been put in place to ensure failed assumptions do not become risks? **Finding**: TBD - There are no assumptions in the PMP or Charter. The team is not far enough along the planning process to document scheduling assumptions.
Mitigation: The project should define an effective escalation process for issues and risks.	
Mitigation: The project should restart its Issues/Risks management processes. It should update the risk/issues, including the mitigation and contingency activities.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

6	IT Acquisition **The IT Acquisition is adequately planned and executed.** The IT Acquisition QFP assesses the breadth and depth of the project's procurement process, RFP and vendor contract. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS PROJECT
6.1	The RFP was prepared per procurement guidelines**. Finding:**
6.2	The RFP defines deliverables that meet the business requirements. **Finding:**
6.3	The RFP included appropriate scoring and evaluation instructions. **Finding**:
6.4	Is the Pre-Award Plan completed and understood by Evaluation Team? **Finding**:
6.5	Is the Pre-Award Plan being followed? **Finding**:
6.6	Are contract negotiations proceeding as planned? **Finding**:
Note: This section may be used in the future when the project acquires hardware and/or software.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

7	Technical Transition and Business Process Re-Engineering **The Technical Transition is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the technical transition. **Business Process Re-engineering is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the business transition. **Technical Transition Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert **Business Process Re-Engineering Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert N/A
7.1T	Has the Technical Transition Plan been defined? **Finding:** In Progress – This Plan is part of the Replatform Plan. The BTS Project Manager is developing this document.
7.2T	Has the Technical Transition Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:** No
7.3T	Has the architecture been assessed relative to the City's architecture? **Finding:** Yes- the project is using the current City's architecture
7.4T	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Technical Transition Plan? **Finding:** TBD – The plan is not yet fully developed.
7.5B	Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been defined? **Finding:** N/A to this project.
7.6B	Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:** N/A to this project
7.7B	Has the COTS vendor's workflow been assessed relative to changes from the City's "as-is" processes? **Finding:**
7.8B	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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 - It is functioning as specified in the governance document.
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**: No – The PMP defines three Project Manager roles: PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R. The managers regularly disagree over responsibility and authority.
8.4	Executive management is committed to the project. **Finding:** Yes – PF&R, PSSRP, and BTS management are all committed to the project.
8.5	Functional management and staff are committed to the project. **Finding**: Yes – The PF&R, PSSRP, and BTS staff are assigned and working on the project.
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:** Yes – Because this is a replatform project, organizational change will be minimal.

Mitigation: CAI's Baseline Evaluation included recommendations regarding project management.

a) The project should define a single person that can approve scope change.
b) The project should define a single Project Manager that is responsible for all project deliverables. The Project Manager should have access to all project staff, develop the schedule, and manage the staff on its project-related activities. The other managers assigned to the project should be cooperative with the Project Manager.
c) Communications and Issue resolution processes, including escalation need clear definitions.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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:** No – The project does not have an accepted schedule. The level of effort is contained in a project schedule. The project does not have an accepted schedule.
9.2	Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? **Finding:** Yes – It appears that the staff skills are appropriate. This will be reassessed when the WBS is refined to an accepted schedule.
9.3	Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? **Finding:** Yes – The staff that builds the product will remain in a support role.
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 Project? **Finding:** No – Based on current timelines and current burn rates, the budget does not support this project to completion. The project is using approximately $50,000/month. The current budget will be exhausted early in 2014. The timelines in the WBS extends to mid-2015. This will be reassessed when the WBS is refined to an accepted schedule.
Mitigation: The project should refine the WBS into a schedule that indicates level of effort for the assigned resources at the task level. The schedule will be the major tool to validate the adequacy of funds budgeted. The schedule will also validate whether the project has the correct skills in the correct quantity.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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
10.1	Have formal Project Management (PMP) and Quality Management Plans (QMP) been developed? **Finding:** In Progress - The Project Manager is not developing a Quality Management Plan, it is assigned to BTS. The PM is updating the PMP. The Development Manager is developing a Replatform Plan to describe the approach to analysis, development, testing, deployment, and support for the new products. The Business Liaison is developing an Organizational Change Management Plan (OCMP). The OCMP will describe PF&R activities in development, testing and training. These plans are not yet final.
10.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** Some aspects of the draft plan are being followed. The project developed a detailed Work Breakdown Structure for the systems. Staff is assigned and is developing the first of six systems. However, the project is proceeding without an accepted schedule. This QFP will be reassessed when final plans are available.
10.3	Have appropriate metrics and processes been put in place to successfully manage the project? **Finding:** No - Quality metrics are not defined.
10.4	Have objective quality metrics been put in place for project deliverables? **Finding:** No - Quality Gates have not been defined for the development process.
10.5	Are Project Progress and Deliverables measured against the metrics? **Finding:** No - The project does not have an accepted schedule against which to report progress.
10.6	Are the results of the metric measurements reported to the appropriate sponsor, users, and other stakeholders? **Finding:** TBD
10.7	Are appropriate corrective actions put in place when measurements are not acceptable? **Finding:** TBD
10.8	Are status reports prepared and accurately tracking all project tasks? **Finding:** No – The project prepares some activity-based reports. But they cannot be compared to an accepted schedule. The schedule will be used as a basis for tracking progress. See 4.4 – status reporting
Mitigation: The Project Manager should have the necessary authority and should finalize the PMP, QMP, OCMP, and Replatform Plan. These will all have significant input to the project schedule.	
Mitigation: The project should refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule will be a primary tool for tracking and reporting progress.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

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 Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? **Finding:** Yes
11.2	Is the Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? **Finding:** No – Based on current timelines and current burn rates, the budget does not support this project to completion. This will be reassessed when the WBS is refined to an accepted schedule.
11.3	Are the appropriate funds budgeted in order to conduct required activities and complete and support the project? **Finding:** No – Based on current timelines and current burn rates, the budget does not support this project to completion. This will be reassessed when the WBS is refined to an accepted schedule.
11.4	Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? **Finding:** Yes- Expenses are tracked at a high level.
Mitigation: The project should develop a formal approach document for the project. Then the project can refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule will be the major tool to validate the adequacy of funds budgeted. The schedule will also be a primary tool for tracking progress.	

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
12.1	Is Scope being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. **Finding:** Partially - The product scope has been limited to a replatform of the FIS systems. The users have identified other enhancements for the product.
12.2	Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? **Finding:** No – The project identified some enhancements to the product that may be included in the final product. These have not been finalized.
12.3	Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? **Finding:** Partially – The project is considering some enhancements. These enhancements should be finalized.
Mitigation: The project should finalize the product scope.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

13	Roles and Responsibilities and Communications **The project is staffed with appropriate roles and responsibilities. Communications are effective.** Assessment of the Monitoring and Control QFP examines the project status reporting and communication processes. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
13.1	Has a formal Communications Plan been developed? **Finding:** Yes - The Communication Plan is contained in the FIS Project Mgt Plan. Additional communications will be in the Organizational Change Management Plan and the Replatform Plan.
13.2	Is the Communications Plan being executed? **Finding:** Yes – The PM will have better data to report when the WBS is refined into a schedule.
13.3	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? **Finding:** No – Communications will be more effective when the PM is reporting project performance compared to the approved schedule.
13.4	Are the external project communication dependencies included in project status reporting? **Finding:** N/A
13.5	Are the project roles and responsibilities documented and understood by all parties? **Finding"** No – CAI's Baseline Evaluation included recommendations regarding project management: The project should define a single Project Manager that is responsible for all project deliverables.
Mitigation: The project should redefine roles and responsibilities to identify a Project Manager with the access to all project staff and artifacts. The PM should also have responsibility for schedule development.	

14	IT Architecture **The project adheres to architecture standards.** Verification that the Project conforms to IT Architecture standards. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
14.1	The computing environment supports connectivity, portability, scalability, and interoperability. **Finding:**
14.2	The Project supports the Architecture Framework? **Finding:**
14.3	The Project supports the Architecture Framework strategic objectives? **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

15	IT Acquisition Management **The vendor deliverables meet the Project requirements and standards per the Contract Terms and Conditions.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS PROJECT

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 — NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
16.1	A Secure library has been defined? **Finding:**
16.2	Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? **Finding:**
16.3	Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? **Finding**:
16.4	There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. **Finding:**
16.5	There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? **Finding**:

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

SYSTEM DELIVERY - Quality Focal Points

17	System Design Process **The system design process is appropriate and thorough.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
17.1	Are specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? **Finding:**
17.2	Are the application specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:**
17.3	Is the system architecture reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:**
17.4	Are the Database Conversion and Migration specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:**
17.5	Are the Interface specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:**

18	Data Conversion and Migration **The data conversion and migration process is appropriate for migrating data to the new system** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
18.1	Are the Data Conversion/Migration Strategy and Plans reasonable? **Finding:**
18.2	Do the plans include data cleanup, testing, and user acceptance criteria **Finding:**
18.3	Is the Data Migration complete? **Finding:**
18.4	Has the converted/migrated data been tested to verify they function according to the specifications? **Finding:**
18.5	Are the unit test scripts are complete and thorough with respect to the business processes. **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

19	Configuration and Construction Process **The configuration and development of the new system are appropriate.** Stable / Attention / Alert **Risk Level** NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
19.1	The configuration specifications have been verified to meet Radio requirements. **Finding:**
19.2	The Development Methodology is appropriate and is followed. **Finding:**
19.3	The Test Plans have been updated to reflect the configuration specifications **Finding:**
19.4	The specific system modules are tested to verify they function according to the specifications. **Finding:**
19.5	Has the converted/migrated data been tested to verify they function according to the specifications? **Finding:**
19.6	Are the unit test scripts are complete and thorough with respect to the business processes. **Finding:**

20	Testing (Functional, Capacity, and Performance) **The project is appropriately tested.** Appropriate functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing processes and plans are in place. Stable / Attention / Alert **Risk Level** NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
20.1	Has a formal Test Management Plan been developed? **Finding:**
20.2	Is the Plan being followed? **Finding:**
20.3	Do the documented functional specifications meet the business needs? **Finding:**
20.4	Are the business users involved in establishing the functional acceptance testing scope and standards? **Finding:**
20.5	Are the functional acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? **Finding:**
20.6	Do the capacity and performance specifications match operational needs? **Finding:**
20.7	Are the capacity and performance acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? **Finding:**
20.8	Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all software and hardware? **Finding:**
21.9	Are infrastructure conditions (down to the computing hardware level) that may affect the application being considered, tested and resolved? **Finding:**
20.10	Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

21	User Acceptance Process and Business Process Transition **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 ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
21.1	A User Acceptance Test Plan has been prepared. **Finding:**
21.2	The acceptance test scripts are complete. **Finding:**
21.3	Testing standards are understood and followed. **Finding:**
21.4	A defect log was maintained and corrective actions were effective. **Finding:**
21.5	The Business Process Changes have been effectively tested. **Finding:**
21.6	User acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

22	Training **The project staff and system users are appropriately trained in a timely manner.** Assessment of training plans and materials. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
22.1	Has formal Training Plan been developed? **Finding:** In Progress – PF&R is developing the OCMP which includes a high-level training plan. The formal training plan will be developed later.
22.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November 2012

23	Implementation Process **The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
23.1	The installation specification is complete and reasonable. **Finding:**
23.2	The training plans and the new Business Processes (workflows and procedures) are complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
23.3	The actual training was acceptable. **Finding:**
23.4	System documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
23.5	The implementation acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

24	Deployment Process **The new system has been successfully deployed.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
24.1	Deployment Plans are complete and reasonable. **Finding:**
24.2	Training City staff was complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
24.3	User documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
24.4	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

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 Fire Information Systems Re-Platform 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.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For November, 2012

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.

Baseline Evaluation Recommendations to QFPs

Prior to the development of this Periodic QA Evaluation Report CAI performed a Baseline Evaluation Report on the FIS project. The Baseline Evaluation report provided the project with three recommendations to address concerns expressed by the people CAI interviewed as part of the evaluation process. Each is carried forward in one or more of the following Quality Focal Points (QFPs) in the following sections.

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
Recommendation 1: a) The project should define a single person that can approve scope change. b) The project should define a single Project Manager that is responsible for all project deliverables. c) Communications and Issue resolution processes, including escalation need clear definitions.	QFP#8 QFP#12
Recommendation 2: The project should define future enhancements for which the project is to prepare the product.	QFP#12
Recommendation 3: The project must develop a clear description of the project approach. This should be a developed collectively among FIS, BTS, and PSSRP. Participants should include a system architect, developers, end users, trainers, testers, and deployment staff. The approach will include discussions of requirements, development, deployment (including phased deployments), data migration, testing, training, support, and retirement of the old system. The approach may include other sections. This document should be detailed enough to be used as input to the schedule.	QFP#1 QFP#3 QFP#9 QFP#10 QFP#11 QFP#13