City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Regional Justice Information Network Project

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For March 2014

Deliverable: RegJIN.C.17

V2.1 Final Version
4/8/2014

Prepared By:

CASE
Associates
Incorporated

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2
- Executive Steering Committee Watch List 2

Project Status and Progress 2
- Project QA Overview 2
- Overall Project QA Health 4
- Quality Focal Points Rated Alert 4
- Quality Focal Points Rated Attention 4
- Quality Focal Points Rated Stable With a Suggestion 4

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart 5

Quality Focal Points 6
- Milestones 6
- Project Schedule 7
- Testing (Non-Functional) 9
- User Acceptance Process 10
- Implementation Process 11
- Deployment Process 12

Appendix A – QFP Chart Definitions A

Appendix B – Cross-reference to Previous QFP Reports B

Appendix C – CASE Associates Status Report C

Version	Date	Comments
V1.0	4/2/2014	Version for PSSRP Review
V1.1	4/3/2014	Incorporated PSSRP POM feedback. Version for PM Review.
V2.1	4/8/2014	Incorporated PM Feedback. Final Version.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

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.

For this report, there are no items on the Watch List.

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 17th 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

NEW

The Master IGA was completed and distributed to the partner agencies for review. Thirty-two agencies have signed IGAs. Of the agencies that will use the Mobile Report Entry (MRE), one remains to be signed.

The Participant IGA (P-IGA) is being finalized. The final costs in the P-IGA will depend on the number of agencies, how many sworn and correctional officers they have, and how many inquiry-only agencies sign up to use the system. (Note: The project is authorizing agency use of Early MRE without the signed Participant IGA.)

NEW

RegJIN received a UASI grant extension for the interface work. As a result, the project will be able to complete the Tiburon interface with UASI funds. The PM was not able to finalize plans to complete the Intergraph interface within the UASI grant's terms. This interface will be paid for with project contingency funds.

The Go-live date for Mobile Report Entry (MRE) is May 2014. End-user training starts May 12. They will start using the system immediately after training. The team developed a technical tasks list and an "Early MRE Punchlist" to monitor readiness for the Go-live.

NEW

There are multiple benefits from the Early MRE deployment. It will get the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) substantially off an unstable, past end-of-life field based reporting systems that loses partially and fully completed reports on a regular basis. Other benefits include:

- By training almost 1000 users in May and June, the project significantly reduces the number of trainees that must be trained just prior to the full RMS Go-live in December.
- Early MRE exposes a majority of the Oregon Officers to O-NIBRS reporting which is significantly different from the current statistical reporting associated with Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) of the FBI.
- It helps identify any business process and system bugs that would be exposed during the cutover to live operations.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

The Go-live date for the full RMS system 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 April 2015. Training will take 12 weeks.

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

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	The RegJIN PM incorporated the BTS schedule into the master schedule. The PM, VTM, and BTS are maintaining the schedule. The System Go-Live date remains December 2014. This date has been constant in project status reports since early 2013. The date for Mobile Report Writing (MRE) is May 2014. That date has been constant since mid-2013.
Budget	Stable	The RegJIN project has a budget that is adequate for the project.
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 require attention at the time.

Quality Focal Points Rated Stable With a Suggestion

The following QFP's are rated as Stable because it they are not impacting the project at this time. They include a **Suggestion.** The suggested action is a preventive measure to keep the QFP stable.

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

  Suggestion: The Master Project Schedule includes some task groups that do not have successor tasks defined. Assigning successor tasks to those groups of tasks will clarify the impact on the overall schedule if there are any task delays or changes. (See the suggestion in QFP #3 Project Schedule for specific examples.)

- **User Acceptance Process, QFP #21 Stable**

  Suggestion: 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 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 Versaterm
  - A breakdown of the 20-day testing period

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart[1]

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of 2/6/14	Prior as of 3/5/14	Current as of 4/2/14	Next Month[2]
1. Meeting Milestones	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	⇔
Planning	**Impact**				⇔
2. Requirements Management	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
3. Project Schedule	High	Attention	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	Stable	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	Stable	Stable	Stable	
20. Testing (Non-Functional)	High	NR[3]	NR	Stable	
21. User Acceptance Testing	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
22. Training	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
23. Implementation Process	High	NR	NR	Stable	
24. Deployment Process	High	NR	NR	Stable	

[1] The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained in Appendix A.
[2] The Next Month arrows are explained in Appendix A.
[3] "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

Quality Focal Points

NOTE: Only the Quality Focal Points that are ATTENTION or ALERT or have changed since the prior report or have new findings and/or suggestions are being reported each month per agreement with the PSSRP Program Office Manager. For a cross-reference to the most recent Periodic QA Evaluation Report for the other QFPs, see Appendix B.

1	Milestones **Project milestones are being met on schedule.** The Milestone QFP assesses the scheduled completion of interim and major project milestones and their impact on overall project completion. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
1.1	Are project milestones being met so far? **Finding**: Yes –The 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. The fourth and final Configuration Workshop occurred. All four Configuration Workshops were conducted as scheduled. The training facility set up is progressing. All training facilities will be completed by the time they are needed for the "Early MRE" training. The infrastructure was scheduled to be available to VTM in November 2013. It was completed January 2014. The PM adjusted the schedule accordingly. The delays used the available slack in the project schedule. Further delays are likely to affect the overall project timeline.
1.2	Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? **Finding:** Yes – The schedule shows the project completing on time, with a go-live date of December 2014. This date has been constant in project status reports since early 2013.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

3	Project Schedule **The project is appropriately planned.** The Planning QFP provides an assessment of the breadth and depth of project planning, scope definition, scheduling and identification of external dependencies. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
3.1	Are all appropriate tasks identified in the work breakdown structure (WBS) and/or project schedule? **Finding:** Yes - The PM and VTM developed a RegJIN master schedule. The BTS schedule and RegJIN master schedule were difficult to cross-reference to each other. To address this the PM incorporated the tasks from the BTS schedule into the RegJIN master schedule.
3.2	Are dependencies among tasks identified? **Finding:** In Progress – Most tasks have dependencies identified to help identify the effect of changes to the schedule. Some task groups do not have successor tasks identified. (See the Suggestion below.)
3.3	Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? **Finding:** Yes – RegJIN and VTM established a master schedule. The RegJIN PM incorporated the BTS tasks from the BTS schedule into the RegJIN master schedule.
3.4	Is the plan clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? **Finding:** Yes – The RegJIN master schedule is detailed enough for project monitoring, including the BTS effort.
3.5	Is the project plan used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? **Finding:** Yes – RegJIN, VTM, and BTS are cooperatively managing their schedule, including %complete for individual tasks. Tasks in progress are being monitored and progress documented in the schedule. RegJIN, VTM, and BTS are maintaining the master schedule.
3.6	Are external project dependencies identified in the plan? **Finding:** Yes – The schedule contains tasks for external agencies as well as dependencies for those 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.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

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

Suggestion: The Master Project Schedule includes some task groups that do not have successor tasks defined. Assigning successor tasks to those groups of tasks will clarify the impact on the overall schedule if there are any task delays or changes.

Examples:

- Group task "Modify GIS Mapping and Analysis Tools for RegJIN" (WBS #8) is comprised of 4 group tasks. The final task in each group has no successor task defined. Though each of these group tasks is overdue, if there is any impact on the overall project timeline, it is not clear from the schedule.
- Group task "Interface Development" (WBS #10.4) has numerous group tasks that each end with a task "Test and Refine" or "Test and Adjust". Those final tasks have no successors.
- Group task "Clark County Warrant Upload" (WBS #10.8) has 4 sequential tasks that were due in March. The final task, "Test and Refinement" has no successor.
- Group task "EARLY MRE Connectivity" (WBS #13.4.6.4.6) has 4 sequential tasks that were due in February. The final task has no successor.
- Group task "Setup Cognos 10.2" (WBS #13.6.2) has 4 sequential tasks. The final task has no successor.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

20	Testing (Non-Functional) **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. **Risk Level** Stable Attention Alert
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. The PM is developing a Test Management Plan.
20.2	Is the Plan being followed? **Finding: TBD**
20.3	Are the non-functional acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? **Finding: TBD**
20.4	Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all software, hardware, and telecommunication components? **Finding: TBD**
20.5	Are infrastructure conditions (down to the computing hardware level) that may affect the application being considered, tested and resolved? **Finding: TBD**
20.6	Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? **Finding: TBD**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

21	User Acceptance Process **The User Acceptance Process defines the test plans, test procedures, and test results required to ensure the delivered system meets requirements.** **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. The PM is developing the Test Management Plan. (See suggestion below.)
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 documented functional specifications. The Configuration Workshops verified that the project will meet the business needs.
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).
21.4	Are testing standards understood and followed? **Finding:** TBD
21.5	Is a defect log maintained and are corrective actions effective? **Finding:** TBD
21.6	Are user acceptance criteria met? **Finding:** TBD

Suggestion: 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 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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

23	Implementation Process **The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
23.1	The installation specification is complete and reasonable. **Finding:** Yes, for the training facilities and the MRE.
23.2	The training plans and the new Business Processes (workflows and procedures) are complete and acceptable. **Finding:** The support staff has been involved in the implementation. There is no separate training effort for system support staff.
23.3	The actual training was acceptable. **Finding:** See above.
23.4	System documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:** Yes.
23.5	The implementation acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:** TBD
Note: For this report, this QFP relates to the Early MRE implementation. Future reports will include discussion of the RMS implementation.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

24	Deployment Process **The new system has been successfully deployed.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
24.1	Deployment Plans are complete and reasonable. **Finding:** Yes – The deployment plans, including end-user training, are reasonable.
24.2	Training City staff was complete and acceptable. **Finding:** TBD
24.3	User documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:** In progress – The project is finalizing the MRE training courses. VTM is reviewing the scenarios and Training Guide to be used in Early MRE training.
24.4	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:** TBD
Note: For this report, this QFP relates to the Early MRE deployment. Future reports will include discussion of the RMS deployment.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

Appendix A – QFP Chart Definitions

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 March 2014

Appendix B – Cross-reference to Previous QFP Reports

Per agreement with the PSSRP Program Office Manager, the body of this report contains only the Quality Focal Points (QFP) that are rated ATTENTION or have changed since the prior report.

This Appendix is a cross-reference to prior CAI Periodic QA Evaluation reports containing the most recent updates for each QFP.

Quality Focal Point	Most Recent Report	CAI Deliverable
1. Meeting Milestones	This report.	
2. Requirements Management	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
3. Project Schedule	This report.	
4. Communications	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – January 2014	RegJIN.C.15
5. Risk and Issue Management	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
6. IT Acquisition	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
7. Technical Transition	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – January 2014	RegJIN.C.15
8. Business Transition	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
9. Project Organization and Leadership	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
10. Project Resources	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – January 2014	RegJIN.C.15
11. Project/Quality Management and Reporting	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
12. Budget Planning and Tracking	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
13. Scope and Change Control	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
14. IT Architecture	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
15. IT Acquisition Management	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
16. Project Library and Configuration Mgt.	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
17. System Design Process	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
18. Data Conversion/Migration	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
19. Configuration/Construction	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
20. Testing (Non-Functional)	This report.	
21. User Acceptance Testing	This report.	
22. Training	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
23. Implementation Process	This report.	
24. Deployment Process	This report.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2014

Appendix C – CASE Associates Status Report

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

Meetings Attended

PSSRP POM 3/3/14
PSSRP RegJIN PM 3/10/14, 3/24/14, 3/26/14
RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting 3/3/14, 3/10/14, 3/17/14, 3/24/14
RegJIN Functional Managers Meeting 3/18/14
RegJIN PAC Meeting 3/11/14
PSSRP Executive Steering Committee Meeting 3/19/14
RegJIN Implementation Team 3/13/14, 3/14/14, 3/27/14

Documents Reviewed

20140324 RegJIN Master Project Schedule (pdf of the Project Schedule)
20140324 RegJIN Master Project Schedule - Late Tasks
20140317 RegJIN Master Project Schedule
20140317 RegJIN Master Project Plan20140212_RegJIN I-Team Reps_updated (List of Implementation members and the agencies they represent)
20140218 RegJIN Early MRE Punch List
20140328 RegJIN RMS project status report - Project Manager's Status Report
20140314 RegJIN RMS project status report
20140307 RegJIN RMS project status report

Documents Delivered

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for February 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.16*

Documents in Process

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for March 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.17*

Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None