City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Regional Justice Information Network Project

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For May 2014

Deliverable: RegJIN.C.19

V2.0 Final Version
6/12/2014

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 May 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 5
- Quality Focal Points Rated Alert 5
- Quality Focal Points Rated Attention 5
- Quality Focal Points Rated Stable With a Suggestion 5

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart 7

Quality Focal Points 8
- Milestones 8
- Project Schedule 9
- Communications 11
- Business Transition 12
- IT Architecture 13
- Configuration and Construction Process 14
- Training 15
- Deployment Process 16

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	6/5/2014	Version for PSSRP Review
V1.1	6/5/2014	Incorporated feedback from PSSRP POM. Version for PM Review.
V2.0	6/12/2014	Incorporated feedback from PM. Final Version.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 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 is one item on the Watch List:

CJIS Compliant LDAP Authentications

The Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) controls access to the Versadex RMS. The current LDAP in use by Versaterm supports access for everyone using the same ID/Password.

The FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS) has rules regarding access to applications that store Criminal Justice Information. Specifically, CJIS requires that each user have an individual ID/Password so that their access to the system housing criminal justice information can be attributed to a single individual.

Versaterm is developing a CJIS-compliant LDAP, which in addition to having unique User IDs and passwords will also enable agency level functionality. This functionality will only allow system admin User ID and password transactions to be accomplished within the User's home agency.

NEW

The new LDAP is necessary for go-live. Versaterm will deliver the new LDAP in August 2014. Then the City will test and install it for the CAD system. (Note: The prior report state that the new LDAP would be installed in July.)

This item will no longer be addressed in the Watch List. It will be tracked in QFP #14 "IT Architecture."

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 19th 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.

NEW

Project QA Overview

The Master IGA was completed and distributed to the partner agencies for review. Of the 41 agencies participating in RegJIN, only four agencies remain to sign the Master IGA. Three of the four un-signed agencies are very small. The remaining agency is waiting for the final Participant IGA before signing the Master IGA.

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 authorized use of Early MRE without the signed Participant IGA.)

NEW

Mobile Report Entry (MRE) Train-The-Trainer sessions began in April. End-user training started May 12. The next day, Gresham started using Early MRE in production mode. The same day, the first reports made it through the entire process: From report writing through review and revisions, and finally on to Records.

The team is addressing some issues with the MRE deployment:

- Minor issues with some fields - These have been quickly resolved.
- Issue(s) with report transmittal - Sporadically, some reports do not transmit correctly. In some cases, reports are transmitted without all the narrative. The problem seems to be network related. Versaterm is looking into it.

NEW

CAI conducted a survey for the RegJIN Project. The survey focused on the interviewees' opinions and perceptions. The 13 interviewees represent a variety of agencies participating in RegJIN. For example: Five of the interviewees are from agencies that are not participating in Early MRE, eight are from agencies that are using Early MRE. Also, six interviewees are from agencies represented on the Implementation Team (I-Team); seven interviewees are from agencies not on the I-Team. Interviewees were also from agencies of various sizes; small, medium and large.

The confidential interviews helped determine if stakeholders had sufficient input into the system configuration process and if they were knowledgeable about the project's status. Some questions gave them an opportunity to identify issues and express concerns.

The Survey Report highlights:

- Project areas working well – Agencies understand their roles, understand the resources needed to ensure success, are willing to allocate resources, and that status reporting is working well.
- Project areas working but could be improved – Agencies not directly represented in the I-Team felt they needed more system understanding. They felt that they did not get enough information, either from the configuration workshops or from their I-Team representative.
- Project areas needing improvement – There were no questions that had an average response low enough to be in this category.

The Survey Report also contains recommendations:

- To enhance communication - Ensure that meeting minutes and presentations are posted to the RegJIN website within a day or two of the meeting. *Note:* The PM will get these materials posted within one week.
- To enhance system understanding - Assemble overview materials for the non-I-Team agencies. The materials could be an update of system demos from earlier in the project. Describe expected enhancements for the RMS software version that will go live. Possibly deliver these materials in a webinar format.
- Also for system understanding - Emphasize the need for I-Team members to communicate with their partner agencies. *Note about this and the prior recommendation:* As the Survey Report was being finalized, the project decided to deploy RMS in the spring of 2015, instead of December 2014. To enhance system understanding, the project will use the additional time to help non-I-Team agencies through their configuration process.

CAI presented an overview of the Survey report at the 5/28/2014 RegJIN PAC Meeting. CAI also distributed the report to the participants. The report is available on the RegJIN website.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

NEW

The Go-live date for the full RMS system was moved to spring 2015. In May the project team assessed the viability of a December 2014 full RMS launch. They determined that selecting a spring 2015 launch would reduce project risk. Many factors influenced the decision. They include:

- The need for additional attention for non-I-Team agencies.
- The difficulty of completing all training before the December Go-Live.
- "In Service" training scheduled at the same time as the RMS training.

PSSRP has stated since September 2013 that they would make this decision in June 2014. Based on their evaluation of the work needed between now and the RMS deployment, they decided to deploy in spring 2015.

The PPB Police Chief (Sponsor) and the PSSRP Executive Steering Committee support the decision.

The PM is revising the schedule to reflect the new launch date. He is coordinating with Versaterm (vendor), the I-Team (users) and BTS (technical team) to finalize the new schedule.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 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	Mobile Report Writing (MRE) was deployed as schedule, in May 2014. The full RMS System Go-Live date has been moved to spring 2015. The move reduces risk and makes the remaining work more manageable than a December 2014 deployment. PSSRP had stated since September 2013 that it would assess the need for this move.
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. All scope changes that arose during the Configuration Workshops were resolved with the vendor.

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 they are not impacting the project at this time. They include a **Suggestion.** The suggested actions are preventive measures to keep the QFP's 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.)

  Status: The new BTS Interim PMO Manager is taking action on this suggestion. Most open tasks have successor tasks defined.

  This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

- **Communications, QFP #4 Stable**

  Suggestion 1: Ensure that meeting minutes and presentation are posted to the RegJIN website within a day or two of the meeting.

  Suggestion 2: Emphasize the need for the I-Team members to communicate with the partner agencies.
  Status: The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need for I-Team members to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover.

  This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.

- **Business Transition, QFP #8 Stable**

  Suggestion: Assemble overview materials for the non-I-Team agencies. The materials could be an update of system demos from earlier in the project. Describe the expected enhancements for the RMS software version that will go live. Possibly deliver these materials in a Webinar format, recorded, and post them to the RegJIN website.

  Status: The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need deliver more system education to non-I-Team agencies. The I-Team will use the additional time to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover.

  This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart[1]

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of 4/2/14	Prior as of 5/7/14	Current as of 6/4/14	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	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	Stable	Stable	Stable	
21. User Acceptance Testing	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
22. Training	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
23. Implementation Process	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
24. Deployment Process	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	

[1] The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained in Appendix A.
[2] The Next Month arrows are explained in Appendix A.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 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. All four Configuration Workshops were conducted as scheduled. All training facilities are fully operational for the "Early MRE" training. Early MRE went live as scheduled in May. 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. There have been no further delays and the overall timeline is unaffected. Interfaces developed under the UASI grant were completed and their integration tested.
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 the newly-moved go-live of spring 2015.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 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 RegJIN PM and VTM developed a 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. Most open tasks that do not have dependencies assigned are BTS tasks. The BTS Interim PMO Mgr. is actively addressing all such tasks. The "suggestion" below has been addressed and is now complete.
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. Since then, BTS and PSSRP separated the schedules. BTS will maintain its own detail schedule. The main schedule will have higher-level tasks identified and tracked by the PM.
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. BTS is actively managing their tasks in the schedule at weekly status meetings. RegJIN, VTM, and BTS are maintaining their respective schedules.
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 May 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 "Setup Cognos 10.2" (WBS #13.6.2) has 4 sequential tasks. The final task has no successor.

Status: The BTS Interim PMO Mgr. is actively addressing this suggestion. Most such tasks have successor tasks defined.
This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

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, 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 – In prior months, Communication between the project team and the BTS technical team has been ineffective. According to BTS, they had not received enough explanation of the overall project approach and what is required of them. The project team was not receiving enough regular BTS status to give them time to address schedule issues. Since December communications have been more robust. The PMs established weekly meetings to review status, issues, schedule requirements and upcoming deliverables.
4.4	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? **Finding:** Yes – As issues are escalated to the executives and sponsors, they are responsive and helpful.
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:** Yes - 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. BTS and PSSRP are communicating issues and status at regular team meetings.
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.

Suggestion 1: Ensure that meeting minutes and presentation are posted to the RegJIN website within a day or two of the meeting.
This suggestion comes from participants in the CAI survey.

Suggestion 2: Emphasize the need for the I-Team members to communicate with the partner agencies.
Status: The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need for I-Team members to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover.
This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

8	Business Transition **Business Process Re-engineering is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the business transition. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
8.1	Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been defined? **Finding:** In process. The project will not develop a separate Business Transition Plan document. 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. That document is approved.
8.3	Has the COTS vendor's workflow been assessed relative to changes from the City's "as-is" processes? **Finding:** In Process - The project assembled a 23-member I-Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies. The team is committed to the project for 18 months. The I-Team is going through critical business process making sure that it works. The I-Team works with Versaterm to resolve issues as they arise.

Suggestion: Assemble overview materials for the non-I-Team agencies. The materials could be an update of system demos from earlier in the project. Describe the expected enhancements for the RMS software version that will go live. Possibly deliver these materials in a Webinar format, recorded, and post them to the RegJIN website.

Status: The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need deliver more system education to non-I-Team agencies. The I-Team will use the additional time to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover.
This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

14	IT Architecture **The project adheres to architecture standards.** Verification that the Project conforms to IT Architecture standards. **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**: In Process- The Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) controls access to the Versadex RMS. The current LDAP in use by Versaterm supports access to the network for everyone using the same ID/Password. The FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS) has rules regarding access to application that store Criminal Justice Information. Specifically, CJIS requires that each user have an individual ID/Password so that their access to the system housing criminal justice information can be attributed to a single individual. Versaterm is developing a CJIS-compliant LDAP, which in addition to having unique User IDs and passwords will also enable agency level functionality. This functionality will only allow system admin User ID and password transactions to be accomplished within the User's home agency. The new LDAP is necessary for go-live. The project will test and install the new LDAP in August 2014. (The prior report stated that the LDAP would be installed in July.) Notes: - The RegJIN PM includes this active issue in his project status report. - This is listed as a Watch List item earlier in this report.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

19	Configuration and Construction Process **The configuration and development of the new system are appropriate.** **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 is following their own methodology for their development. The City and partner agencies are following their own methodology. The I-Team, with Versaterm support, developed several general configurations to be used by the agencies. They are designed for use by small, medium or large agencies. To prepare for RMS go-live, the I-Team will help the non-I-Team agencies *configure* their own agencies starting with the base configuration that best suits them. This additional I-Team help is made possible by the move of the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015.
19.3	The vendor verifies the delivered system modules according to the specifications. **Finding**: Yes
19.4	Did the vendor use converted/migrated data while testing the software? **Finding:** Yes – The vendor will use converted data for testing the RMS. Note: Early MRE did not require converted data.
19.5	Are the unit test scripts complete and thorough? **Finding:** In Process – The I-Team is developing scripts for the Functional Acceptance Testing (FAT). Tests for critical functions will be executed in September 2014. (The prior QA report stated that testing would occur in May. The later RMS deployment allows this testing date to be moved to September.)

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

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 a formal Training Plan been developed? **Finding:** In Progress - The high-level approach to training is: • "Super User" training session delivered by Versaterm. These Super Users become the in-house experts for the new system. • "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. • The End User training to span 12 weeks. Note that at this point, many LEO's will already be using the Mobile Report Entry (MRE) in the field. The final SOW lists the respective duties of PSSRP and VTM. The Contract T&C describe the Training Plan in greater detail. The final Training Plan will be elaborated during the system implementation. The need for effective training was one of the main factors to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015. The team decided it would be less risky to move the start of training to after the winter holidays instead of trying to get it all done before December.
22.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** Yes. The I-Team received system training during all four Configuration Workshops. The Early MRE Train-The-Trainer sessions have been proceeding as planned. Based on experience during the training, the team modified training materials. End User Training begins 5/12/14. All training labs are in operation.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 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:** In Process – The Train-The-Trainer sessions are complete. End User Training is progressing.
24.3	User documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:** In progress – The project is finalizing the MRE training courses. The I-Team and the training participants are improving the training materials as they proceed.
24.4	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:** Yes.
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 May 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 May 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	This report.	
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	This report.	
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	This report.	
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	This report.	
20. Testing (Non-Functional)	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – April 2014	RegJIN.C.18
21. User Acceptance Testing	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – March 2014	RegJIN.C.17
22. Training	This report.	
23. Implementation Process	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – March 2014	RegJIN.C.17
24. Deployment Process	This report.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For May 2014

Appendix C – 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.

Meetings Attended

PSSRP RegJIN PM 5/9/14, 5/13/14
PSSRP Executive Steering Meeting 5/20/14 (preparation), 5/21/14
RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting 5/5/14, 5/12/14, 5/19/14, 6/2/14
RegJIN PAC Meeting 5/28/14
RegJIN Implementation Team 5/1/14, 5/22/14

Documents Reviewed

RegJIN_newsletter_May2014
RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting Minutes_2014_05_12
RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting Minutes_2014_05_05
20140504 Functional Acceptance Test Script
140409 Integration Testing Agenda - April 14-17 2014
BTS RegJIN Monthly Billing Report
BTS Milestone Tracking
RegJIN PAC Meeting 20130528 - CAI Notes
20140515 RegJIN Master Project Plan (pdf of the Project Schedule)
20140505 RegJIN Master Project Plan
20140428 RegJIN Master Project Plan
20140505 RegJIN Master Project Plan – Late Tasks
20140428 RegJIN Master Project Plan – Late Tasks
20140508 RegJIN Master Project Schedule (PMO Analysis)
20140523 RegJIN RMS project status report - Project Manager's Status Report
20140509 RegJIN RMS project status report

Documents Delivered

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for February 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.18*
CAI RegJIN Survey Report 20140512 v1.1

Documents in Process

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for March 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.19*

Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None.