City of Portland

# Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

# Regional Justice Information Network Project

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

**For October 2013**

**Deliverable: RegJIN.C.12**

V2.0 Final Version
11/13/2013

**Prepared By:**

**CASE**
**Associates**
Incorporated

Clifford Smith, PMP, Lead Quality Assurance Consultant
David Sharon, QA Consultant and Engagement Manager
Contract # 30002849

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

## Table of Contents


Executive Summary 3
- Executive Steering Committee Watch List 3

Project Status and Progress 5
- Project QA Overview 5
- Overall Project QA Health 6
- Quality Focal Points Rated Alert 6
- Quality Focal Points Rated Attention 6

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart 7

Quality Focal Points 9
- Milestones 9
- Requirements Management 10
- Project Schedule 11
- Communications 12
- Risk and Issue Management 13
- IT Acquisition 14
- Technical Transition 15
- Business Transition 16
- Project Organization and Leadership 17
- Project Resources 18
- Project & Quality Management and Reporting 19
- Budget Planning and Tracking 20
- Scope and Change Control 21
- IT Architecture 22
- IT Acquisition Management 22
- Project Library and Configuration Management 23
- System Design Process 24
- Data Conversion and Migration 25
- Configuration and Construction Process 26
- Testing (Non-Functional) 27
- User Acceptance Process 28
- Training 29
- Implementation Process 30
- Deployment Process 30

Appendix A – CASE Associates Status Report A


| Version | Date | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| V1.0 | 11/6/2013 | Version for PSSRP Review |
| V1.1 | 11/13/2013 | Incorporate PSSRP POM Feedback |
| V2.0 | 11/13/2013 | Incorporate PM Feedback<br>Final Version |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

# Executive Summary

### *Executive Steering Committee Watch List*

This section identifies potential issues that the ESC should be watching closely. The "watch list" documents program related concerns that have come to CAI's attention but have not yet been completely assessed. As of this report, the following are on the watch list:

1. Resolving Public Record Disclosure Request Law differences between Washington and Oregon.

   Status: PSSRP is working with PPB and Clark County to draft a policy paper that will address this issue. All parties agreed to a solution to the Public Record Disclosure Request issue.

   NEW

   To participate in the early MRE rollout, all partner agencies will be required to have a fully executed IGA.

   The wording for the IGA is resolved.

   The project asked partners to indicate their interest in early MRE by the end of 2013.

   This item will be dropped from future reports.

2. UASI Grant Fund must be spent by March 2014. Completing the tasks funded by the grant.

   Status: PSSRP sent a budget to the State for review. The State approved the UASI budget. PSSRP published intent to award a sole-source contract to develop an Enterprise Services Bus (ESB) and develop interfaces for the partner agencies.

   The ESB and interfaces are the largest of the UASI Grant expenditures. Others expenditures are planned for the grant funds. For the ESB and interfaces, PSSRP filed an Ordinance to seek City Council approval. The Ordinance went before Council 9/25/13, and was approved.

   Others expenditures are planned for the grant funds. They include: Building interfaces between the RegJIN system and Coplogic; Assisting with completion of Washington County Sheriff's Office Training facility; Procuring driver's license scanners for mobile report writing devices.

3. Additional Interfaces for Clark County.

   Clark County requested that the project provide nine additional interfaces to their existing system. The Project Manager identified this as a Risk in the recent Project Status Reports. The status report says, "Interface requests are being analyzed by the City and Versaterm. Implementation of the additional interfaces may delay the project and increase costs."

   NEW

   Status: Versaterm (VTM) will develop two of the nine interfaces requested. Clark County will fund the development. Of the remaining interfaces, some are not as critical as originally thought; others were already in the project scope.

   This item will be dropped from future reports.

   NEW

4. Technical difficulties with infrastructure for training.

   The project incurred difficulty with the "Internals Training for the Database" scheduled to begin 10/23/13. They had difficulty getting the report writing tool installed for the training session. When they did get the report writing tool, they could not connect to the database.

   Microsoft Support is looking into the technical cause.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

NEW

This issue should be further investigated to see where additional managerial communication, testing, or other improvements could avoid this situation.

5. Availability of the BTS schedule for technical infrastructure tasks.

PSSRP needs a schedule for infrastructure tasks to be performed by BTS. The BTS PM has a task list that describes the tasks to be completed and their costs. However it does not have a schedule. This topic is mentioned in several QFPs (Milestones, Schedule, Technical Transition, and Resources).

In order to keep the project from incurring additional risk, this should be further investigated to determine when the project can expect the schedule, and when the project will begin to incur additional risks.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

# Project Status and Progress

The PSSRP Regional Justice Information Network (RegJIN) Records Management System (RMS) Project is to replace the existing Portland Police Data System (PPDS) and the Clark County Records Management and Electronic Police Reporting systems (CRMS and EPR). RegJIN will also increase integration between the various system components and enhance their core capabilities.

This is the 12th monthly RegJIN 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.

### *Project QA Overview*

The Project officially started in July 2013 with the Configuration Workshop.

The Master IGA and the draft Participant IGA (P-IGA) were completed and distributed to the partner agencies for review. Clark County and the City of Vancouver identified an issue that requires a change to the IGA. The public records disclosure law differs between Washington and Oregon. The attorneys determined a theory and approach for resolving the issue. All parties agreed to the resolution.

NEW

The Project is progressing according to the schedule. The Implementation Team is working through the configuration tasks as scheduled. Recent activities include Workflow, Case Routing, MRE Configuration, Security Configuration, and Arrest and Property table set up.

The project incurred difficulty with the "Internals Training for the Database." They intended to use SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) as the report writing tool. They did not get SSRS installed for the training session. When they did get the report writing tool, they could not connect to the database. (See the Watch List *above.*)

The training session continued. But the project will probably need to convene a follow up session to ensure that the participants have the training they need.

The PSSRP and VTM managers are maintaining the schedule regularly.

The go-live date remains December 2014. A December go-live requires that training start in September 2014. If December 2014 is not possible, then go-live must be moved to March 2015. Training will take 10 weeks. To prepare for December 2014 go-live, training will begin in August 2014.

In the summer of 2014, the project will make a go/no-go decision for the December 2014 launch.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

### *Overall Project QA Health*

Overall Rating: Stable

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

| Health Factor | Rating | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **Schedule** | Stable | PSSRP and VTM developed a schedule. Both managers are maintaining the schedule. It is duration-based.<br>BTS developed a list of deliverables and costs for its work on the project. The BTS schedule will include tasks for BTS staff to implement the infrastructure for RegJIN. BTS is developing the schedule to validate resources and the overall schedule. |
| **Budget** | Stable | The RegJIN project has a budget that is adequate for the project.<br>PSSRP and CAI will review the budget and payment plan when the BTS list of deliverables and dates is available. |
| **Scope** | Stable | The product scope was clearly defined in the RFP. Scope was verified and validated with Versaterm during contract negotiations. |

### *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 at this time.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

# Quality Focal Point Summary Chart[1]

| Quality Focal Point | Impact | Prior as of 9/9/13 | Prior as of 10/9/13 | Current as of 11/6/13 | Next Month[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Meeting Milestones | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | ⇔ |
| **Planning** | **Impact** | | | | ⇔ |
| 2. Requirements Management | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 3. Project Schedule | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 4. Communications | Medium | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 5. Risk and Issue Management | Low | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 6. IT Acquisition | Low | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 7. Technical Transition | Medium | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 8. Business Transition | Medium | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| **Monitoring and Control** | **Impact** | | | | ⇔ |
| 9. Project Organization and Leadership | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 10. Project Resources | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 11. Project/Quality Management and Reporting | Medium | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 12. Budget Planning and Tracking | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 13. Scope and Change Control | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 14. IT Architecture | Low | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 15. IT Acquisition Management | Low | NR[3] | Stable | Stable | |
| 16. Project Library and Configuration Mgt. | Low | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| **Delivery** | **Impact** | | | | ⇔ |
| 17. System Design Process | Medium | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 18. Data Conversion/Migration | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 19. Configuration/Construction | High | NR | Stable | Stable | |
| 20. Testing (Non-Functional) | High | NR | NR | NR | |
| 21. User Acceptance Testing | High | NR | NR | Stable | |
| 22. Training | High | Stable | Stable | Stable | |
| 23. Implementation Process | High | NR | NR | NR | |
| 24. Deployment Process | High | NR | NR | NR | |

[1] The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained on the next page.
[2] The Next Month arrows are explained on the next page.
[3] "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

**Definition of QFP Ratings:**

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.

**Definition of Next Month Indicators:**

The next month indicators signify expected changes in the QFP ratings.

⇔ - This Quality Focal Point (or group of QFPs) is expected to have the same rating in next month's Periodic QA Evaluation.

- Risk is decreasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be upgraded to Stable in next month's evaluation.

- Risk is decreasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be upgraded to Attention in next month's evaluation.

- Risk is increasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be downgraded to Attention in next month's evaluation.

- Risk is increasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be downgraded to Alert in next month's evaluation.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

# Quality Focal Points

| | |
|---|---|
| **1** | Milestones<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
| **1.1** | Are project milestones being met so far? **Finding**: YES –The Versaterm contract negotiations were completed April 30, 2013. City Council authorization to execute the contract with Versaterm occurred on June 12. The City Attorney signed off on the contract July 1. Versaterm signed the contract July 10, 2013.<br>The Initial system installation and the configuration Workshop occurred as planned.<br>The training facility set up is progressing. Clark County and Beaverton are almost complete. The remaining tasks are to install software and connectivity on the PC's. Washington County is still in construction. All training facilities will be completed by the time they are needed, in April '14.<br>Other tasks are completing on time.<br>In weekly status reports, the PM reports progress against milestones selected from the project schedule. |
| **1.2** | Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? **Finding:** TBD – The schedule shows the project completing on time, with a go-live date of December 2014. The schedule seems to contain sufficient slack time.<br>BTS assigned a manager for the tasks to be conducted by internal BTS staff and charged back to PSSRP. That schedule is not yet available for review and CAI has not yet met with the BTS manager. |
| **Suggestion:** The PM and CAI should look further into schedule from BTS to determine when it will be available. If it is to be further delayed, then project management should determine when the project will incur additional risk. This issue is also mentioned in other QFPs: QFP 3, 7, and 10. | |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 2 | Requirements Management<br>**The Requirements Management process is appropriate and thorough.**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **2.1** | Are the System and Business Requirements understood and confirmed? **Finding:** Yes – Business and Technical Requirements were defined and documented in the RFP. These requirements and the project's scope were verified and validated as part of the negotiation process with Versaterm. Approved customizations were included in the contract. Scoping Sessions were conducted with Versaterm in January to address all subjects that impact costs, scope and timing. Business processes are being discussed by the Implementation Team at almost every meeting. Issues and questions are then addressed with Versaterm. All issues and questions are tracked. There are no major outstanding issues. |
| **2.2** | Are requirements traceable to design? **Finding:** TBD – As the RegJIN project is primarily a COTS installation, most requirements will not be represented in a design document. Requirements traceability will be from the RFP - Contract - Acceptance Testing.<br>All requirements that could not be met by the system were either dismissed during the contract's scoping sessions or incorporated into the SOW's Integration Design Document. They will be verified during acceptance testing.<br>As the project progresses, a sub-group will be formed to identify requirements that were not exercised by the Implementation team during configuration. The requirements still to be tested will have detailed testing scripts developed and then tested during Functional Testing. |
| **2.3** | Are requirement change impacts understood and documented? **Finding:** TBD – Changes to requirements were documented in Versaterm's proposal and in the Integration Design Document (IDD). |
| **2.4** | Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? **Finding:** Not Yet – The schedule calls for test case development and approval in March and April 2014. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 3 | Project Schedule<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **3.1** | Are all appropriate tasks identified in the work breakdown structure (WBS) and/or project plan? **Finding:** In Progress - The PM and VTM developed a schedule. It is duration-based and tasks are assigned at a high level (City and VTM).<br>The technical tasks that are to be performed by BTS are not yet available in a schedule. |
| **3.2** | Are dependencies among tasks identified? **Finding:** In Progress – Tasks in the PSSRP/VTM schedule have predecessors/successors defined.<br>The BTS schedule is not yet available. |
| **3.3** | Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? **Finding:** In Progress – The PSSRP and VTM established a schedule. That schedule contains some tasks that are too long and should be decomposed. The VTM efforts are fixed cost. The PSSRP expenses are simple enough to track without the schedule.<br>The BTS schedule is not yet available. The BTS schedule will be developed in multiple parts. It will consist of a timeline spreadsheet to indicate when tasks should be completed. It will also include a deliverables list that will indicate the effort and cost associated with each deliverable. |
| **3.4** | Is the plan clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? **Finding:** In Progress – The VTM/PSSRP schedule is detailed enough for project monitoring.<br>The BTS schedule is not yet available. |
| **3.5** | Is the project plan used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? **Finding:** In Progress – PSSRP and VTM are cooperatively managing their schedule, including %complete for individual tasks. Tasks in progress are being monitored and progress documented in the schedule.<br>The BTS schedule is not yet available. |
| **3.6** | Are external project dependencies identified in the plan? **Finding:** TBD – There are no external dependencies defined in the PSSRP/VTM schedule. When the OBS interface work is planned, it will be incorporated into the PSSRP/VTM schedule. When the BTS schedule is available, both schedules will likely have external dependencies on each other's tasks. |
| **3.7** | Has the project plan been reviewed, approved and signed off by the project Stakeholders? **Finding:** Yes – The PAC and ESC see the high-level schedule at every meeting.<br>The BTS schedule is not yet available, though it is not expected to affect the high-level schedule. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 4 | Communications<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **4.1** | Have communications been planned, identified and documented? **Finding:** Yes, in the Communications Plan**.** The plan was updated and approved in July 2013. |
| **4.2** | Is the Communications Plan being followed? **Finding:** Yes. |
| **4.3** | Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? **Finding:** Yes. |
| **4.4** | Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? **Finding:** Yes. |
| **4.5** | 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:** Partially - The Project Manager prepares a comprehensive Project Status Report every week and posts the Status Report on the RegJIN website. Team Meeting and PAC Meeting presentations and minutes are also posted on the RegJIN website.<br>The PM does not have a BTS schedule. It is a necessary tool to monitor project progress. |
| **4.6** | Do the RegJIN Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? **Finding:** Yes – The Sponsor is the Chief of Police and is also a member of the PSSRP Executive Steering Committee. His representatives for this project are the Asst. Chief and the Capt. of the Records Division. The PSSRP POM meets with the Asst. Chief occasionally and has ongoing communication with the Captain. The PM meets with the Capt. of Records regularly. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 5 | Risk and Issue Management<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **5.1** | Are project risks and issues identified and categorized as to likelihood and impact? **Finding:** Yes - in the RegJIN Risk Register. The initial Risk Register in the RMP is very thorough. The top 10 risks in that register are extensively analyzed for risk response plans.<br>The highest-level RegJIN Project Risks are presented and discussed at the PSSRP Executive Steering Committee Meetings.<br>The PM presents some risks in the weekly status reports. These are described in less detail. |
| **5.2** | Are appropriate risk and issue mitigation strategies in place with appropriate monitoring measures? **Finding**: Partially – The top 10 risks in the initial risk register are very thoroughly analyzed with risk response plans. The rest are less so. The risks in the weekly status reports are at a less detailed level of analysis.<br>The PM is leading weekly review of Risks during team meetings. The group goes through a subset (5 or so) of the risks each meeting. |
| **5.3** | For high probability or high impact risks, are contingency plans developed in case the risk mitigation strategy fails? **Finding**: No – the strategy is Mitigation for all top 10 risks. All activities described are for that strategy.<br>(Note: Risk Mitigation is a plan to reduce the probability and/or impact of a particular risk. Contingency is a planned response if certain events occur.)<br>There are no plans for contingency in the RegJIN Risk Register. This raises the possibility that the project does not have planned response if the risk occurs.<br>As the project team revisits risks at each Team Meeting, they update the probability/impact for each. Some risks drop in priority, others rise. PSSRP should ensure that mitigation and contingency plans are in place for the high-priority risks. |
| **5.4** | Are ongoing risk identification, assessment and management processes in place and operating effectively? **Finding**: Partially – The PM reports some risks in the weekly status and also at the monthly ESC meetings. The PM started risk reviews during Project Meetings. They started by reviewing the top priority risks in the original Risk Matrix.<br>The Implementation Team is prioritizing the Risk list by updating the Impact/Probability ratings. |
| **5.5** | Have project assumptions been verified & appropriate monitoring measures been put in place to ensure failed assumptions do not become risks? **Finding**: Partially – Assumptions from the Charter are represented in one form or another in the initial risk register, the top 10 of which are extensively analyzed. The remaining 15 risks are not analyzed. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 6 | IT Acquisition<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|

**Note:** The Acquisition for this project is complete. This QFP will no longer be updated.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **7** | Technical Transition<br>**The Technical Transition is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the technical transition.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
| **7.1** | Has the Technical Transition Plan been defined? **Finding:** Partially - In the Baseline Evaluation interviews, concern about available resources to support new technology while also supporting the current PPDS was expressed several times. Since then the project assembled a 23-member Implementation Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies. The team is committed to the project for 18 months. Also, PSSRP allocated funds and BTS committed resources to complete RegJIN's technical work.<br>The BTS timeline is not yet available.<br>The PSSRP, BTS and PPB identified funds to train and retain staff for eventual system support. These staff are likely to be moved into job slots being vacated by retired or retiring PPDS support staff. |
| **7.2** | Has the Technical Transition Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:** TBD |
| **7.3** | Has the COTS vendor's architecture been assessed relative to the City's architecture? **Finding:** Yes – BTS and PSSRP evaluated the vendor's architecture during contract negotiations.<br>The project selected SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) as the report writing tool. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **8** | Business Transition<br>**Business Process Re-engineering is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the business transition.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
| **8.1** | Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been defined? **Finding:** In process. The PAC Business Process Review Workgroup reviewed and documented the "as is" processes compared with Versaterm's "to-be" processes and identified affected business processes and desired changes based on the new system. The Workgroup prepared prioritized topics to present/discuss during 2 Configuration Workshops, the recent was in September<br>The Implementation Team (without Versaterm) is going through critical business process using the new system as configured to date and making sure that it works. When things do not go as planned, they either change the configuration or discuss with Versaterm how to get them accomplished.<br>In the Baseline Evaluation interviews, workflow changes and end-user resistance were the most common concerns expressed.<br>The project will not develop a separate Business Transition Plan. The Business Transition Plan is the major component of the Training Plan. |
| **8.2** | Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:** The Integration Design Document (IDD) describes customizations that the vendor will make to the systems. It also includes descriptions of how the City staff will conduct certain activities. |
| **8.3** | Has the COTS vendor's workflow been assessed relative to changes from the City's "as-is" processes? **Finding:** In Process - Clark County and the City of Vancouver identified a necessary procedural change: The public records disclosure law differs between Washington and Oregon. Attorneys from the City and Clark County are determining the best solution. The attorneys have determined a theory and approach for resolving the issue. The specific language for the IGA has been developed. There is no impact on the project. This procedural change will not require custom coding for the COTS system. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 9 | Project Organization and Leadership<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **9.1** | 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. |
| **9.2** | Executive Sponsors have been designated? **Finding:** Yes – The Executive Sponsor is represented by the Captain of the Records Division, Captain John Brooks. |
| **9.3** | Project Management roles and responsibilities with lines of authority and accountability have been defined, assigned and agreed upon?<br>**Finding**: Yes – in the Project Charter and Project Governance documents. |
| **9.4** | Are Management, RegJIN Staff and Partners committed to the project? **Finding:** Yes – PSSRP is funding some project staff. PPB and partner agencies committed their own staff to the project, at their own cost. |
| **9.5** | Is there is Stakeholder Support and Buy-in? **Finding**: Yes. It is not known at this time if there will be a loss of partner agency participation due to unacceptable terms and conditions in the Master and/or Partner IGAs or due to a rise in system sustainability costs.<br>In the Baseline Evaluation, interviewees cited loss of political support and opposition from unions as project risks. |
| **9.6** | Has a Change Management Plan been prepared? **Finding**: In Process |
| **9.7** | Are there appropriate resources to implement the Change Management Plan? **Finding:** TBD |
| **9.8** | Is the Change Management Process adequately supported by Bureau, PSSRP, and Partner Agency Management? **Finding:** TBD |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **10** | Project Resources<br>**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.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
| **10.1** | Is the level of effort planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? **Finding:** In Progress – PSSRP and VTM developed a schedule.<br>The BTS schedule is not yet available. The BTS schedule will be developed in multiple parts. It will consist of a timeline spreadsheet to indicate when tasks should be completed. It will also include a deliverables list that will indicate the effort and cost associated with each deliverable. |
| **10.2** | Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? **Finding:** TBD – During the Baseline Evaluation respondents indicated concerns about resources to complete the project. They cited partner agencies and their resource commitments. They also cited City resources and the potential need for significantly more resources that are currently assigned.<br>Since then the project assembled a 23-member Implementation Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies. The team is committed to the project for 18 months.<br>Also, PSSRP allocated funds and BTS committed resources to complete RegJIN's technical work. However, the BTS deliverables list is not yet available to confirm the appropriate resource level.<br>The City has other important projects that may occupy BTS. |
| **10.3** | Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? **Finding:** Yes – PSSRP identified funding for support staff through to cutover to live operations. The support team will need 2 FTEs. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **11** | Project & Quality Management and Reporting<br>**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?<br>**Risk Level** Stable Attention Alert |
| **11.1** | Have formal Project Management and Quality Management Plans been developed? **Finding:** CAI prepared a Quality Assurance Management Plan (QAMP). The Communication Plan is updated as a result of the contract with Versaterm. The RegJIN Project Manager updated the Project Charter and Project Governance documents.<br>The PM will not create a QMP for the project. The main components will be in other project plans: Training Plan, Acceptance Test Plan, Risk Management Plan, and the Communication Plan. |
| **11.2** | Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** Yes. CAI is following its QAMP. The other plans are updated now that the vendor is on board and work is proceeding. |
| **11.3** | Are appropriate status reports prepared for tracking and monitoring all project tasks? **Finding:** In Progress – The PM is reporting progress in regular weekly status reports. The Milestone list in that report is from the Statement of Work. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **12** | Budget Planning and Tracking<br>**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?<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
| **12.1** | Is the RegJIN Project Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? **Finding:** In Progress – PSSRP and VTM developed a schedule. (CAI recommends some improvements in QFP#3.)<br>The BTS costs are in a spreadsheet that indicates the effort and cost associated with each deliverable.<br>The project is reporting actual expenses weekly. |
| **12.2** | Are the appropriate funds budgeted in order to conduct required activities and complete and support the project? **Finding:** In Progress – Funds are budgeted for the project.<br>Further validation of budget will be possible when the BTS deliverable list is available. |
| **12.3** | Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? **Finding:** Yes - In the Weekly Status Reports. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 13 | Scope and Change Control<br>**The project scope is appropriately controlled.** Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **13.1** | Scope is being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. **Finding:** Yes. Defining the project's scope was an important part of the contract negotiations with Versaterm. Scoping sessions were conducted with Versaterm to verify and validate the project's scope during the week of January 14, 2013. Decisions and action items (tasks) resulting from the scoping sessions have been documented. The notes were reviewed and discussions took place with Versaterm to finalize the requirements and the system's functionality. The business process workflows affected by the new system were discussed with Versaterm in the Configuration Workshops the week of July 15. Further discussions between the Implementation Team and VTM are occurring daily. |
| **13.2** | Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? **Finding:** Yes – There have been two "no cost, no timeline" change orders. The PM is creating 4 new technology-related change orders. These new change orders are also "no cost, no timeline" changes.<br>There have been no changes orders affecting cost or project timeline. |
| **13.3** | Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? **Finding:** Yes.<br>Clark County is requested 9 new interfaces. After further analysis, Clark County only requires 2 new interfaces. VTM agreed to code the interfaces. Clark County will fund the effort. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 14 | IT Architecture<br>**The project adheres to architecture standards.** Verification that the Project conforms to IT Architecture standards.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **14.1** | The computing environment supports connectivity, portability, scalability, and interoperability. **Finding:** Yes – BTS participated in the vendor selection. The software selected supports all these technical requirements. |
| **14.2** | The Project supports the Architecture Framework? **Finding:** Yes – BTS participated in the vendor selection. The software selected supports all technical requirements. |

| 15 | IT Acquisition Management<br>**The vendor deliverables meet the Project requirements and standards per the Contract Terms and Conditions.**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **15.1** | Procedures are defined and documented to monitor and track vendor deliverables. **Finding**: Yes – The deliverables are defined in the contract SOW. The deliverables are in the schedule as tasks, clearly defined by the SOW number. |
| **15.2** | Procedures are defined and documented to measure vendor deliverables against project requirements and standards per the contract. **Finding**: Yes – The contract is specific about the measurements. For instance, SOW task 2.8 has 9 specific acceptance criteria that are to be met before the deliverable is accepted. Some tasks are in listed in the Payment Schedule of the contract, others are not. Whether or not the deliverable are in the Payment Schedule (that is to say, they have a dollar amount associated with them or not), the PM verifies the deliverables according to the contractual acceptance criteria. |
| **15.3** | Project staff understands and follows documented procedures regarding vendor deliverables requirements. **Finding:** Yes – The PM is following the contract specifications closely. For SOW tasks, the PM verifies the deliverable against the deliverable criteria in the contact. The PM follows the defined process for all SOW tasks, those that are in the Payment Schedule (for example, SOW Task 2.8 Configuration Workshop), and those that are not (for example SOW Task 2.6 Initial System Administration Testing). |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 16 | Project Library and Configuration Management<br>**The project has an appropriate Project Library in place to support Project Management and a Configuration Management Process in place to support System Delivery.**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **16.1** | A Secure library has been defined? **Finding:** Yes – The project has a website for non-sensitive information. It has a directory structure in the Police network. They keep interface specifications, technical infrastructure and other sensitive documents.<br>The vendor also keeps its own documents on its own network. |
| **16.2** | Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? **Finding:** The project has a tightly controlled Intranet site and a network drive hierarchy of documents. |
| **16.3** | Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? **Finding**: N/A |
| **16.4** | There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. **Finding**: Yes – These are based on network general contractor system access rules. |
| **16.5** | There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? **Finding**: No – Participants with access upload required changes as necessary. The file system has no procedures for reviewing changes in the library. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 17 | System Design Process<br>**The system design process is appropriate and thorough.**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **17.1** | Are specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? **Finding:** Yes – These were confirmed by scoping sessions and 2 Configuration Workshops. Also, the Interface Control Documents (ICD) specify the interfaces according to the requirements. All ICDs are complete.<br>The IDD contains all the customization specifications. |
| **17.2** | Are the application specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** Yes. |
| **17.3** | Is the system architecture reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** Yes – BTS participated in all stages of the acquisition. They agreed to the VTM architecture. |
| **17.4** | Are the Interface specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** Partially – The interfaces that were in the original scope are defined. Some work is to be completed by VTM. Interfaces at the 'system side' are to be completed by OBS.<br>Clark County requested that the project provide nine additional interfaces to their existing system. The Project Manager identified this as a Risk in the recent Project Status Reports. The status report says, "Interface requests are being analyzed by the City and Versaterm. Implementation of the additional interfaces may delay the project and increase costs." Clark County agreed to fund development for 2 interfaces (Online Business Systems will develop the interfaces). The other are either already part of the list by another name, or are not as necessary as previously thought. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 18 | Data Conversion and Migration<br>**The data conversion and migration process is appropriate for migrating data to the new system**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **18.1** | Are the Data Conversion/Migration Strategy and Plans reasonable? **Finding:** Yes.<br>In the Baseline Evaluation interviews, Data migration from the current systems was a commonly cited risk.<br>The SOW lists the respective responsibilities for VTM and the City.<br>The PSSRP/VTM schedule contains tasks for conversion from 3systems:<br>- PPDS – currently being used by 25 agencies.<br>- Clark County RMS – currently used by 8 agencies.<br>- Beaverton Property.<br>- There is some discussion about converting data for Clark County Sherriff Property and Washougal Property.<br>Data for 15 systems will be accessed by custom-developed interfaces.<br>Other systems will not be able to automatically get their data into the system. They will either start from *scratch*, or enter their reports manually. |
| **18.2** | Do the plans include data cleanup, testing, and user acceptance criteria? **Finding:** Yes – in the SOW and carried forward to the schedule. The converted data will be included in the User Acceptance Tests (UAT). |
| **18.3** | Is the Data Migration complete? **Finding:** No. |
| **18.4** | Has the converted/migrated data been tested to verify they function according to the specifications? **Finding:** No. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 19 | Configuration and Construction Process<br>**The configuration and development of the new system are appropriate.**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **19.1** | The configuration specifications have been verified to meet RegJIN Project requirements. **Finding:** Yes – The IDD contains all customization specifications. The project validated the IDD. |
| **19.2** | The Development Methodology is appropriate and is followed. **Finding:** Yes – The vendor will follow their own methodology for their development. The City will follow its own methodology. |
| **19.3** | The vendor verifies the delivered system modules according to the specifications. **Finding**: TBD |
| **19.4** | Did the vendor use converted/migrated data while testing the software? **Finding:** Yes – The vendor will use converted data for testing. |
| **19.5** | Are the unit test scripts complete and thorough? **Finding:** TBD – This will be indicated by the level of quality revealed by testing. |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **20** | Testing (Non-Functional)<br>**The project is appropriately tested.** Appropriate, capacity and performance acceptance testing processes and plans are in place and meet the operational needs of the system and verify and validate acceptable compliance to requirements.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME |
| **20.1** | Has a formal Test Management Plan been developed? **Finding:** The SOW lists responsibilities for the City and VTM. It is not a Test Plan.<br>The project will develop a TestMP in Jan/Feb 2014. |
| **20.2** | Is the Plan being followed? **Finding:** |
| **20.5** | Are the non-functional acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? **Finding:** |
| **20.6** | Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all software, hardware, and telecommunication components? **Finding:** |
| **20.7** | Are infrastructure conditions (down to the computing hardware level) that may affect the application being considered, tested and resolved? **Finding:** |
| **20.8** | Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? **Finding:** |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 21 | User Acceptance Process<br>**The User Acceptance Process defines the test plans, test procedures, and test results required to ensure the delivered system meets requirements.**<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
|---|---|
| **21.1** | Has a User Acceptance Test Plan has been prepared? **Finding:** Partially – The contract contains a "Schedule B-3 Acceptance Test Plan." It is a description of the various types of testing and the Roles/Responsibilities for the City and Versaterm. This Acceptance Test Plan is to be finalized by the City and reviewed by Versaterm.<br>The project will define the TestMP in Jan/Feb 2014. |
| **21.2** | Do the documented functional specifications meet the business needs? **Finding:** N/A – This is a COTS project and requirements are not typically elaborated into specifications, at least not in detail. |
| **21.3** | Are the acceptance test scripts complete? **Finding:** Not Yet – The Test Case development is scheduled for March/April 2014. The task is assigned to the City (Implementation Team) |
| **21.5** | Are testing standards understood and followed? **Finding:** TBD |
| **21.6** | Is a defect log maintained and are corrective actions effective? **Finding:** TBD |
| **21.7** | Are user acceptance criteria met? **Finding:** TBD |

**Suggestion:** The SOW contains extensive description of the types of testing to be conducted. But it does not contain some important detail.

The SOW calls for a final version for the Functional Acceptance Test Plan (SOW 4.6.1). The City is to develop this document. This new version should describe:

- Test Case development processes and requirements traceability
- Test locations, computing environment
- Defect tracking tools, and explanation and flow of defect states
- An explanation of the correction/promotion/retest process
- Staff assigned to testing, including support staff from the City and VTM
- A breakdown of the 20-day testing period
- Other sections that will define the testing specifics

Though the SOW does not call for a final version of an Acceptance Test Plan for the other types of testing, the PM should include detail that would be helpful to define the test processes for: Reliability, Interface Integration, Performance, Volume, Stress, and any other tests to be conducted.

**Suggestion:** The PM is responsible for developing a Test Management Plan (TestMP). This plan should include detailed description of the various tests to be conducted. The VTM/PSSRP schedule has not tasks for this document development. The schedule should contain these tasks in Jan/Feb 2014.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| **22** | Training<br>**The project staff and system users are appropriately trained in a timely manner.** Assessment of training plans and materials.<br>**Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert |
| **22.1** | Has a formal Training Plan been developed? **Finding:** In Progress - In the Baseline Evaluation interviews, effective and timely training for Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) and records technicians were concerns. CAI is concerned that the timeframe for training may be too short. During the SOW development, the PM is taking steps to enhance the training process. Items reviewed with Versaterm were:<br>• "Super User" training session. These Super Users become the in-house experts for the new system.<br>• "Train the Trainers" sessions. The Super Users train the trainers at each of the agencies. Versaterm to be onsite to critique and support the Super Users during the first "Train the Trainer" sessions.<br>• The End User training to span 10 weeks. Note that at this point, many LEO's will already be using the Mobile Report Entry (MRE) in the field.<br>The final SOW lists the respective duties of PSSRP and VTM. It is a good start.<br>The Contract T&C describe the Training Plan in greater detail. The final Training Plan will be elaborated during the system implementation. |
| **22.2** | Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** Yes. The Implementation Team received system training at both the Configuration Workshops.<br>The technical staff received initial system administration training at the first Configuration Workshop. The project schedule call for additional Admin Training (SOW 4.1.2) |

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report
## For October 2013

| 23 | Implementation Process<br>**The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.**<br>**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<br>**The new system has been successfully deployed.**<br>**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 October 2013

# Appendix A – CASE Associates Status Report

This section summarizes activities and deliverables completed for the Regional Justice Information Network Project.

When applicable, it includes:

- A list of any delayed items
- A description of the problem
- Schedule impact
- A recommended solution

Such items will be carried over to subsequent reports until the problem is resolved.

As of May 2013, this section replaces the "Quality Assurance Status Report." In prior months this section was delivered as a separate report.

Meetings Attended

Project Manager 11/5/13, 11/13/13
Captain John Brooks 10/11/13
RegJIN PAC Meeting 11/6/13
RMS Project Team Meeting 11/7/13

Documents Reviewed

20131101 RegJIN RMS project status report – Project Manager's Status Report
20131018 RegJIN RMS project status report
20131004 RegJIN RMS project status report
131001 Exhibit B - Schedule 1 Project Schedule
PSSRP-RegJIN Technology Task List - VFY 2013-14 (20130925a) – Tasks and hours estimated for BTS

Documents Delivered

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for August 2013, deliverable *RegJIN.C.11*

Documents in Process

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for September 2013, deliverable *RegJIN.C.12*

Delayed Items

| Item | Description of problem | Schedule Impact | Recommended Solution |
|---|---|---|---|
| None | | | |

Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None