City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Fire Information Systems Re-Platform Project

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For the Month of March 2013
Deliverable: FIS.C.5

V2.0 Final
4/10/2013

Prepared By:

CASE
Associates
Incorporated

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Table of Contents

Summary of Project QA Progress and Status 3
- Overall Project QA Status 3
- Overall Project Health 4
- Quality Focal Points Rated Alert 5
- Quality Focal Points Rated Attention 5

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart 7

Quality Focal Points 8
- Milestones 8
- Requirements Management 9
- Project Schedule 10
- Communications 12
- Risk and Issue Management 13
- Technical Transition and Business Process Re-Engineering 14
- Project Organization and Leadership 15
- Project Resources 16
- Project & Quality Management and Reporting 17
- Budget Planning and Tracking 18
- Scope and Change Control 19
- Roles and Responsibilities and Communications 20
- IT Architecture 21
- Project Library and Configuration Management 21
- System Design Process 22
- Data Conversion and Migration 22
- Configuration and Construction Process 23
- Testing (Functional, Capacity, and Performance) 24
- Training 25
- Implementation Process 25
- Deployment Process 26

Purpose and Methodology 27
- Purpose of the Monthly Report 27
- Methodology 27

Version	Date	Comments
V1.0	4/8/2013	For PSSRP Review
V1.3	4/9/2013	Incorporated POM's comments. Version for PM Review.
V2.0	4/10/2013	Final Version

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Summary of Project QA Progress and Status

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

CASE Associates Inc. (CAI) was selected to perform the independent QA on the City of Portland PSSRP which includes the FIS Project. This is the fifth monthly FIS Periodic QA Evaluation Report intended to assess the health of the project, and provide independent observations (positive or negative) and recommendations for avoiding and/or responding to any future negative impacts.

Overall Project QA Status

January's report stated that "PSSRP and BTS took decisive steps to improve FIS Project Management. The PSSRP Project Manager left City service. BTS redefined their manager's role from Project Manager to Product Manager. Both groups also agreed that the new PSSRP Project Manager is to have full access to all project resources as well as control over the planning and execution processes."

February's report stated that, "However, the new planning processes are not yet complete and the Quality Focal Points (QFP) rated Alert and Attention remain as they were in the last report. Most QFP upgrades will depend on an effective planning process that results in a Replatform Plan and an accepted schedule."

In the past month the Project Manager, BTS and PF&R developed the Project Plan for the project. To define a scope that can be completed within the available budget, the Project Sponsor made some decisions that impacted the approach and the schedule. These decisions are:

- The FIS project will not include new tracking functionality in the Incident system. BTS will add new functionality to the legacy system. Then after the project completes the Incident replatform, BTS will then add the new functionality to the new Incident system as part of their ongoing support efforts.
- Fires2000 is no longer in the project scope.
- All five systems will be deployed together in a combined cut-over.
- The list of reports to include in the day-1 implementation of the Personnel system is final.

The Project Sponsor approved the Project Plan and the schedule. The Project Sponsor also approved the updated Project Charter and Project Governance documents.

The project now has a schedule that accomplishes agreed-to scope within budget. This is reflected in the improved project health ratings in the next section.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Overall Project Health

Overall Rating: Attention

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

Health Factor	Rating	Comments
Schedule	Attention	The project has an approved schedule. With this schedule the FIS project can: • Track and communicate progress • Validate that the budget will support the project • Validate that all the functionality can be delivered PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R collaboratively developed a description of the project approach. The approach includes discussions of requirements, development, deployment, testing, training, and support. PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R finalized the decisions listed last month: (1) No new functionality will be added to the Incident system, (2) The Fires2000 system is removed from scope, (3) The replatformed systems will be deployed all at once, (4) Day-1 reports for Personnel are determined. The schedule should include resource assignments in the Post-Replatform Project Activities. Task dependencies should be at a lower level to facilitate project Monitoring and Control.
Budget	Stable	PSSRP received money for the FIS project. PSSRP does not expect additional funds for the project. The current schedule indicates that the project will be completed within the budget.
Scope	Stable	The scope has been decreased to eliminate the Fires2000 system. The project also established strict scope control measures.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Quality Focal Points Rated Alert

There are no findings in this QA report that CAI believes need immediate attention. Last month's report contained three QFP's in this category.

Quality Focal Points Rated Attention

There are three findings in this QA report that CAI believes need attention. Last month's report contained eight QFP's in this category:

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

  The project must develop a clear description of the project approach. In January 2013 the project started referring to this as a Replatform Plan. This should be developed collectively with BTS, PF&R and PSSRP. Participants should include a system architect, developers, end users, trainers, testers, and deployment staff. The approach will include discussions of requirements, development, deployment (including phased deployments), testing, training, support, and retirement of the old system. The approach may include other sections. This document should be detailed enough to be used as input to the schedule.

  Status 4/8/13 - PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R finalized the decisions listed last month: (1) No new functionality will be added to the Incident system, (2) The Fires2000 system is removed from scope, (3) The replatformed systems will be deployed all at once, (4) Day-1 reports for Personnel are determined. The project has an approved schedule. The schedule should include resource assignments in the Post-Replatform Project Activities. Task dependencies should be at a lower level to facilitate project Monitoring and Control.

- **Project/Quality Management and Reporting, QFP#9 Attention**

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

  Status 4/8/13 - The Replatform Plan and schedule are approved. They describe how the project will proceed. The schedule should include additional resource assignments and some task dependencies should be defined at a lower level. The schedule starts after delivery of the Personnel system. Then it can be used for tracking and reporting purposes.

- **Testing, QFP#18 Attention**

  Coding the Personnel system is expected to be complete at the end of April. The project needs a Test Plan to explain how the project will address various types of testing. The plan will include the logistics of testing, such as place, timing, equipment used, staff to conduct testing. It will also detail the defect reporting/triage/resolution cycles. The plan will explain how the test cases are developed. PF&R and the PM will collaborate on this document.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Definition of Risk Factors:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart

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

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Quality Focal Points

1	Milestones **Project milestones are being met on schedule.** The Milestone QFP assesses the scheduled completion of interim and major project milestones and their impact on overall project completion. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
1.1	Are project milestones being met so far? **Finding:** The project refined the WBS into an accepted schedule. The schedule contains milestones to effectively monitor progress. The new schedule begins with the Incident system. Coding and BTS testing of the Personnel system will complete in April. Then the Personnel system will be delivered to PF&R for review by Training.
1.2	Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project by the committed completion date? **Finding:** Yes – BTS is gaining experience with the new development platform. The team is comfortable with the completion dates.

Recommendation: For the project to reliably track its progress against milestones, the project should take a collaborative planning approach and refine the current Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) into a project schedule. A refined project schedule should contain tasks to complete the project objectives within the budget.

Status 2/5/13 – The new PM is developing a Replatform Plan and a new schedule.

Status 3/4/13 – The PM is working with BTS and PF&R to develop the approach for the project. Decisions to be made are: (1) When to add new tracking functionality to the Incident system, (2) Whether to remove one system from the project scope to reduce development time and costs, (3) Whether to deploy the system in a phased implementation or a big bang approach, (4) Which reports to include in the day-1 release of the Personnel system. After PF&R, BTS, and the PM make these decisions the PM can develop a Replatform Plan and develop the project schedule, including Milestones.

Status 4/8/13 – PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R finalized the decisions listed last month: (1) No new functionality will be added to the Incident system, (2) The Fires2000 system is removed from scope, (3) The replatformed systems will be deployed all at once, (4) Day-1 reports for Personnel are determined. The project has an approved schedule. The next milestone is the 5/6/13 delivery of the Personnel system to PF&R. The delivery date for Personnel is consistent with prior plans. This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

2	Requirements Management **The Requirements Management process is appropriate and thorough.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
2.1	Are the System and Business Requirements understood and confirmed? **Finding:** Yes – The project removed the Fires2000 system from scope. Any changes to the legacy system are also out of scope. BTS will incorporate any changes to the legacy system that must be reflected in the replatformed. This will be completed as ongoing system support and not funded by the FIS project. PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R all agree to this approach.
2.2	Are requirements traceable to design? **Finding:** TBD – The design document is not yet developed.
2.3	Are requirement change impacts understood and documented? **Finding:** Yes – The project expects no requirement changes. BTS will incorporate any requirement changes to the legacy system into the replatformed system as part of ongoing system support (non-project time).
2.4	Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? **Finding:** TBD – The Test Cases are not yet developed.

Recommendation: The project should define future approved enhancements to be included in the requirements document. (Some used the term "stub out the architecture.") The users cite expectations that should be verified.

In future reports CAI will monitor the Requirements Management process and verify that future enhancements are included in project documentation.

Status 2/5/13 – The new PM is planning with PF&R and the BTS development team. This should give the PM better control over the requirements for the new systems.

Status 3/4/13 – BTS has an established Change Control process that the PM will apply to the FIS project. The new data tracking and reporting requests for the Incident system will go through this process.

Status 4/8/13 – PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R agreed to strict controls on requirements.

This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

3	Project Schedule **The project is appropriately planned.** The Planning QFP provides an assessment of project planning, scope definition, scheduling and external dependencies. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
3.1	Are all appropriate tasks identified in the work breakdown structure (WBS) and/or schedule? **Finding:** Yes – The schedule includes developer and PF&R tasks. It includes some integration with project management tasks and other end user tasks. Further detail should be included in the Test Plan and Cutover Plan.
3.2	Are dependencies among tasks identified, including decision dependencies? **Finding:** Partially - Most task dependencies are at a high level. Some high-level tasks are more than two months in duration. Dependencies at this level make the schedule less useful for project monitoring and control.
3.3	Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? **Finding:** Yes – The schedule is established. PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R agreed to strict scope controls.
3.4	Is the schedule clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? **Finding:** Partially - The schedule assigns resources to the developer tasks. It does not assign resources to other tasks, particularly in the "Post-Replatform Project Activities" section. Task dependencies are assigned to group-level tasks. Some of these tasks are over two months in duration. Dependencies at this level make the schedule less useful for project monitoring and control.
3.5	Is the schedule used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? **Finding:** TBD – The newly-approved schedule begins after conclusion of the Personnel system. The current work on the Personnel system is not included.
3.6	Are external project dependencies identified in the schedule? **Finding:** N/A
3.7	Has the schedule been reviewed, approved and signed off by the project Stakeholders? **Finding:** Yes – The Sponsor approved the schedule, as well as the Governance and Charter, in April.
3.8	Is there an appropriate process for updating the project schedule with actuals and tracking project progress? **Findings:** TBD – The project has not begun maintaining the schedule. It begins after the Personnel system development is complete.
3.9	Is the schedule reasonable to manage the project? **Finding**: Partially – The developer tasks are defined and resources assigned. The task dependencies are at a high level. Monitoring and Control will be more effective with the dependencies at a lower level. Resources should be assigned to the Test, Training, and Deployment activities.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

3	Project Schedule **The project is appropriately planned.** The Planning QFP provides an assessment of project planning, scope definition, scheduling and external dependencies. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert

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

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

Status 2/5/13 – PSSRP and BTS made personnel changes and committed to a more collaborative project. The PM is working on the Replatform Plan and the refined schedule. They are not yet complete.

Status 3/4/13 – The PM is working with BTS and PF&R to develop the approach for the project. Decisions to be made are: (1) When to add new tracking functionality to the Incident system, (2) Whether to remove one system from the project scope to reduce development time and costs, (3) Whether to deploy the system in a phased implementation or a big bang approach, (4) Which reports to include in the day-1 release of the Personnel system. After PF&R, BTS, and the PM make these decisions the PM can develop a Replatform Plan and develop the project schedule, including Milestones.

Status 4/8/13 - PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R finalized the decisions listed last month: (1) No new functionality will be added to the Incident system, (2) The Fires2000 system is removed from scope, (3) The replatformed systems will be deployed all at once, (4) Day-1 reports for Personnel are determined. The project has an approved schedule. The schedule should include resource assignments in the Post-Replatform Project Activities. Task dependencies should be at a lower level to facilitate project Monitoring and Control.

This QFP is now rated as Attention.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

4	Communications **The project communications are effective and adequately controlled.** Assessment of the Communications QFP examines the project status reporting and communication processes for task completion and budget. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
4.1	Have communications been planned, identified and documented? **Finding:** Yes – The Project Management Plan (PMP) contains a brief Communication Plan.
4.2	Is the Communications Plan being followed? **Finding:** Yes.
4.3	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? **Finding:** Yes
4.4	Is project status being monitored and accurately reported in enough detail and with enough frequency to ensure early detection of problems or schedule slippage? **Finding:** Yes – The PM is monitoring and reporting progress in the weekly status reports.

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

Status 2/5/13, 3/4/13 – The new PM is planning with PF&R and the BTS development team. When they have a Replatform Plan and a schedule, they will be able to communicate progress against the plan.

Status 4/8/13 - PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R collaboratively developed the Project Plan and schedule. All parties are aware of strict scope control. Progress is communicated via weekly status reports.

This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

5	Risk and Issue Management **Project risks are identified and appropriately managed.** The Risk Management QFP provides an assessment of the risk identification, mitigation strategy and contingency planning for high probability and/or high impact risks. It also assesses the continuing validity of high impact assumptions. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
5.1	Are project risks and issues identified and categorized as to likelihood and impact? **Finding:** Partially – The Project Manager has a Risk list and also identifies critical risks in the project status reports.
5.2	Are appropriate risk and issue mitigation strategies in place with appropriate monitoring measures? **Finding**: Partially – The PM and other managers are resolving issues and risks. The PMP does not describe an effective escalation process.
5.3	For high probability or high impact risks, are contingency plans developed in case the risk mitigation strategy fails? **Finding**: Partially –The PM's status reports contain the Issues/Risk log, including plans for mitigation. One Risk/Issue describes a contingency. It does not include contingencies for all Risks/Issues.
5.4	Are ongoing risk identification, assessment and management processes in place and operating effectively? **Finding**: Partially – The Project Manager restarted maintaining the Issues/Risks log in December.
5.5	Have project assumptions been verified & appropriate monitoring measures been put in place to ensure failed assumptions do not become risks? **Finding**: TBD - There are no assumptions in the PMP or Charter. Risk and Issue Management will be more effective now that the project has an approved Project Plan and schedule.

Recommendation: The project should define an effective escalation process for issues and risks.

Status 2/5/13, 3/4/13 – The new PM has not yet had time to address this QFP.

Status 4/8/13 - The project is effectively managing key risks with appropriate escalation to the Project Sponsor, BTS leadership, and PSSRP leadership.

Recommendation: The Issues/Risks management process should include mitigation and contingency activities.

Status 2/5/13, 3/4/13 – The new PM has not yet had time to address this QFP. The PM will include and enhanced Risk and Issue Management section in an updated Project Management Plan (PMP).

Status 4/8/13 - The project is effectively addressing issues and risks.

This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

6	Technical Transition and Business Process Re-Engineering **The Technical Transition is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the technical transition. **Business Process Re-engineering is adequately planned.** This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the business transition. **Technical Transition Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert **Business Process Re-Engineering Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert N/A
6.1T	Has the Technical Transition Plan been defined? **Finding:** In Progress – This plan is part of the Project Plan. The BTS Project Manager was responsible for this plan. The PSSRP PM will take responsibility for developing this document.
6.2T	Has the Technical Transition Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:** No
6.3T	Has the architecture been assessed relative to the City's architecture? **Finding:** Yes- the project is using the current City's architecture.
6.4T	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Technical Transition Plan? **Finding:** Yes – Resource requirements for a Technical Transition are minimal.
6.5B	Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been defined? **Finding:** N/A to this project.
6.6B	Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been reviewed and approved? **Finding:** N/A to this project.
6.7B	Has the COTS vendor's workflow been assessed relative to changes from the City's "as-is" processes? **Finding:** N/A to this project.
6.8B	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? **Finding:** TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

7	Project Organization and Leadership **The project is appropriately organized.** The Organization QFP assesses the breadth and depth of the project's organization and the commitment to the project within the organization. This determines if the project's organizational structure can manage both tactical and strategic project issues. **Risk Level** Stable Attention Alert
7.1	The Steering Committee is comprised of executive decision-makers and is functioning? **Finding:** Yes - The Executive Steering Committee (ESC) meets regularly. The Governance, including the Executive Steering Committee was redefined in August 2012. At the January ESC meeting, members expressed concern about the lack of clear tasks for the ESC. A new member, the BTS CTO, offered to initiate a task to identify decisions expected of the ESC.
7.2	Executive Sponsors have been designated? **Finding:** Yes – The sponsor is designated in the Governance document.
7.3	Project Management roles and responsibilities with lines of authority and accountability have been defined, assigned and agreed upon? **Finding**: Yes- PSSRP assigned a PM from the Radio project. This new PM now has authority to manage and plan the project and direct resources.
7.4	Executive management is committed to the project. **Finding:** Yes – PF&R, PSSRP, and BTS management are all committed to the project.
7.5	Functional management and staff are committed to the project. **Finding**: Yes – The PF&R, PSSRP, and BTS staff are assigned and working on the project.
7.6	Are other Stakeholders/users committed to the project? **Finding**: Yes
7.7	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Change Management Plan? **Finding:** Yes – Because this is a replatform project, organizational change will be minimal.

Recommendation: Prior Periodic Reviews contained the following:

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

Status 2/5/13 – PSSRP and BTS made personnel changes and committed to a more collaborative project. The PM is working on the Replatform Plan and the refined schedule. They are not yet complete. However, since the project has improved morale, the team is working in a more collaborative mode, and the PM is working on the necessary plans: This QFP is upgraded to "Attention" from "Alert."
Status 3/4/13 – The PM now has the authority to monitor and direct project resources. PF&R, BTS, and PSSRP are working collaboratively to define the project and eventually develop a project approach and schedule.
Status 4/8/13 – PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R are now working collaboratively to plan and execute the project. Project roles are clearer.
This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

8	Project Resources **The project is appropriately resourced.** The Resources Quality Focal Point assesses three resource components: The capacity and skill set of the assigned project staff, supporting tools and facilities, and budget or financial resources. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
8.1	Is the level of effort estimated planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? **Finding:** Yes – The tasks are defined in the schedule. The Sponsor approved the schedule.
8.2	Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? **Finding:** Yes – The developers are acquiring the necessary skills as the project progresses. PF&R has the resources needed to complete its tasks, though resources are not yet assigned in the schedule.
8.3	Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? **Finding:** Yes – The staff that builds the product will remain in a support role.
8.4	Are appropriate tools and other necessary facilities available and effectively utilized? **Finding:** Yes
8.5	Is the Budget (financial resources) sufficient to support the Project? **Finding:** Yes – The project removed the Fires2000 system from scope. The project also placed strict controls on scope change, including necessary maintenance to the legacy systems. Based on current timelines and current burn rates, the budget now supports this project to completion. The project is using approximately $50,000/month. The current budget will be exhausted in July 2014. The project cut-Over is scheduled for July 2014.

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

Status 2/5/13 – The new PM is planning with PF&R and the BTS development team. When they have a complete Replatform Plan and schedule, the project will be able to validate the resource need against the available resources.

Status 3/4/13 – The PM is working with BTS and PF&R to develop the approach for the project. Decisions to be made are: (1) When to add new tracking functionality to the Incident system, (2) Whether to remove one system from the project scope to reduce development time and costs, (3) Whether to deploy the system in a phased implementation or a big bang approach, (4) Which reports to include in the day-1 release of the Personnel system. After PF&R, BTS, and the PM make these decisions the PM can develop a Replatform Plan and develop the project schedule, to validate the level of project resources.

Status 4/8/13 – The project scope is reduced. PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R agreed to strict scope controls. The budget now supports the project through to completion.

This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

9	Project & Quality Management and Reporting **The project is appropriately managed and controlled.** Assessment of the Project Management, Quality Assurance and Quality Control Processes and Plans. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
9.1	Have formal Project Management (PMP) and Quality Management Plans (QMP) been developed? **Finding:** In Progress - The new PM is updating the PMP to describe the approach to analysis, development, testing, deployment, and support for the new products. These plans are not yet final.
9.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** The project developed a detailed schedule for the systems. Staff is assigned and is developing the first of five systems. This QFP will be reassessed when Quality Management Plans are available.
9.3	Have objective quality metrics been put in place for project deliverables? **Finding:** No - Quality Gates have not been defined for the development process.
9.4	Are Project Progress and Deliverables measured against the metrics? **Finding:** No - The QMP has not been developed.
9.5	Are the results of the metric measurements reported to the appropriate sponsor, users, and other stakeholders? **Finding:** TBD
9.6	Are appropriate corrective actions put in place when measurements are not acceptable? **Finding:** TBD
9.7	Are status reports prepared and accurately tracking all project tasks? **Finding:** TBD – The project has an accepted schedule that starts after the Personnel system. Currently, the project is developing the Personnel system. When the developers complete the Personnel system the schedule will be used for tracking progress.

Recommendation: The Project Manager should have the necessary authority and should finalize the PMP, QMP, OCMP, and Replatform Plan. These will all have significant input to the project schedule.

Status 2/5/13, 3/4/13 – Recent personnel changes give more authority and responsibility to the Project Manager. The Project Manager should complete the QMP, the PMP, and the Replatform Plan. These will provide significant input to the project schedule.

Status 4/8/13 – The Replatform Plan is approved. The PM should develop the Testing Plan to help PF&R further define activities for the Personnel system.

Recommendation: The project should refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule should be a primary tool for tracking and reporting progress.

Status 2/5/13 – The new PM is planning with PF&R and the BTS development team. When they have a complete Replatform Plan and schedule, the project will be able to report progress against the plan and schedule.

Status 3/4/13 – The PM is working with BTS and PF&R to develop the approach for the project. Decisions to be made are: (1)When to add new tracking functionality to the Incident system, (2) Possibly removing one system from the project scope to reduce development time and costs, (3)Phased implementation vs. a big bang approach, (4)The list of go-live reports for the Personnel system. After PF&R, BTS, and the PM make these decisions the PM can develop a Project Approach narrative and develop the project schedule, including Milestones.

Status 4/8/13 - The Project Plan and schedule are approved. They describe how the project will proceed. The schedule should include additional resource assignments and some task dependencies should be defined at a lower level. The schedule starts after delivery of the Personnel system. Then it can be used for tracking and reporting purposes.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

10	Budget Planning and Tracking **The project budget is appropriately planned, managed and tracked.** Assessment of the Project Budget Planning and Tracking Processes. Are the Plans in place and followed to ensure project deliverables meet requirements and are accomplished on time and within budget? **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
10.1	Do the Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? **Finding:** Yes
10.2	Is the Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? **Finding:** Yes – Actuals are reported to the ESC at a high level.
10.3	Are the appropriate funds budgeted in order to conduct required activities and complete and support the project? **Finding:** Yes – Fires2000 was removed from scope and strict scope control is agreed to. Based on current timelines and current burn rates, the budget now supports this project to completion.
10.4	Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? **Finding:** Yes- Expenses are tracked at a high level.

Recommendation: The project should develop a formal approach document for the project. Then the project can refine the WBS into a schedule. The schedule should be the major tool to validate the adequacy of funds budgeted. The schedule should also be a primary tool for tracking progress.

Status 2/5/13, 3/4/13 – The new PM is planning with PF&R and the BTS development team. When they have a complete Replatform Plan and schedule, the project will be able to validate the budget needs against available funds.

Status 4/8/13 – PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R agreed to new project scope that now fits within the available budget. They also agreed to strict scope controls to keep the project within budget.

This QFP is now rated Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

11	Scope and Change Control **The project scope is appropriately controlled.** Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
11.1	Is Scope being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. **Finding:** Yes - PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R agreed to reduced scope as well as strict scope control measures.
11.2	Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? **Finding:** TBD – No new change requests have been submitted since the parties agreed to the new scope.
11.3	Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? **Finding:** TBD – No new change requests have been submitted since the parties agreed to the new scope.

Recommendation: The project should finalize the product scope.

Status 2/5/13 – The new PM is planning with PF&R and the BTS development team. This should give the PM better control over the requirements for the new systems.

Status 3/4/13 – The Sponsor directed that the Incident system be changed to include roughly 50-60 new fields. The project does not yet know what reporting or other processing is included. The PM is directing that the project use the established BTS Change Control process to track, analyze and estimate these changes.

Status 4/8/13 – PSSRP, BTS, and PF&R agreed to reduced scope as well as strict scope control measures.

This QFP is now rated as Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

12	Roles and Responsibilities and Communications **The project is staffed with appropriate roles and responsibilities. Communications are effective.** Assessment of the project status reporting and communication. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
12.1	Has a formal Communications Plan been developed? **Finding:** Yes - The Communication Plan is contained in the FIS Project Mgt Plan.
12.2	Is the Communications Plan being executed? **Finding:** Yes – The PM will have better data to report when the project is executing according to the new schedule, (after the Personnel system is completed).
12.3	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? **Finding:** Yes – All parties are aware of new project plans. Status reporting will continue to keep stakeholders up to date on progress.
12.4	Are the external project communication dependencies included in project status reporting? **Finding:** N/A
12.5	Are the project roles and responsibilities documented and understood by all parties? **Finding:** Yes – Projects roles are clearer now, particularly regarding Project Management.

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

Status 2/5/13 – The recent personnel and process changes have improved clarity of roles and responsibilities. The PM now has access to all project resources, including the BTS developers. The PM is responsible for developing a Replatform Plan and the schedule. These are in process. When the project is communicating progress against an accepted plan and schedule, this QFP will be upgraded to "Stable."

Status 3/4/13- Clarity of roles and communications remain improved. BTS and PSSRP are still working out the responsibility for some of the planning documents.

Status 4/8/13 – Roles and responsibilities are clearer, particularly regarding Project Management. The parties are working collaboratively.

This QFP is now rated Stable.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

13	IT Architecture **The project adheres to architecture standards.** Verification that the Project conforms to IT Architecture standards. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
13.1	The computing environment supports connectivity, portability, scalability, and interoperability. **Finding:** Yes – The .NET architecture is a standard architecture that will improve connectivity, portability, scalability, and interoperability.
13.2	The Project supports the Architecture Framework? **Finding:** Yes - The .NET architecture is a standard architecture that will improve connectivity, portability, scalability, and interoperability.
13.3	The Project supports the Architecture Framework strategic objectives? **Finding:** Yes – With the new architecture, PF&R will eventually be able to implement their Mobile applications.

14	Project Library and Configuration Management **The project has an appropriate Project Library in place to support Project Management and a Configuration Management Process in place to support System Delivery.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert NOT ASSESSED IN THIS REPORT
14.1	A Secure library has been defined? **Finding:**
14.2	Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? **Finding:**
14.3	Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? **Finding**:
14.4	There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. **Finding:**
14.5	There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? **Finding**:

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

SYSTEM DELIVERY - Quality Focal Points

15	System Design Process **The system design process is appropriate and thorough.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
15.1	Are specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? **Finding:** Yes – The project does not have formal system design specifications. They are using the current systems as the design specifications for the replatformed system. The developers of the new system are very familiar with the existing systems.
15.2	Are the application specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** Yes - The existing system is a very detailed system specification for this project. However, it is too specific to be used as input to testing. The lack of a typical application specification means that the Test Plan will need to identify another source of test cases for the software.
15.3	Is the system architecture reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** Yes – The .NET architecture is a standard architecture that supports the system and business requirements.
15.4	Are the Interface specifications reasonable and acceptable? **Finding:** Yes – The new .NET system will use essentially the same format as the current system, while incorporating common features available on the new platform.

16	Data Conversion and Migration **The data conversion and migration process is appropriate for migrating data to the new system** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
16.1	Are the Data Conversion/Migration Strategy and Plans reasonable? **Finding:** Yes – The project is writing a new User Interface only. That is to say that the project is not creating a new database. Therefore, there may be no data conversion. It is possible that the project may decide to improve the database as part of the project. In that case, the project will evaluate the impact on the budget and schedule.
16.2	Do the plans include data cleanup, testing, and user acceptance criteria **Finding:** N/A
16.3	Is the Data Migration complete? **Finding:** N/A
16.4	Has the converted/migrated data been tested to verify they function according to the specifications? **Finding:** N/A

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

17	Configuration and Construction Process **The configuration and development of the new system are appropriate.** **Risk Level** Stable Attention Alert
17.1	The configuration specifications have been verified to meet project requirements. **Finding:** Yes – The configuration specifications have been verified by several proof of concept and demonstration versions.
17.2	The Development Methodology is appropriate and is followed. **Finding:** Yes – The System Architect is leading the development effort and the team is following the methodology.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

18	Testing (Functional, Capacity, and Performance) **The project is appropriately tested.** Appropriate functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing processes and plans are in place. **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert
18.1	Has a formal Test Management Plan been developed? **Finding:** No – The PM and PF&R will develop the test plan and test cases. Both must be completed in time to plan for Personnel System testing. The Personnel system is scheduled to be delivered to PF&R on 5/6/2013.
18.2	Is the Plan being followed? **Finding:** N/A
18.3	Do the documented functional specifications meet the business needs? **Finding:** Partially - The current systems are being used as the system specifications. But the Test Manager will not have a typical set of functional specifications from which to develop test cases.
18.4	Are the business users involved in establishing the functional acceptance testing scope and standards? **Finding:** Yes – PF&R and the PM are both developing the Test Plan and test cases.
18.5	Are the functional acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? **Finding:** TBD
18.6	Do the capacity and performance specifications match operational needs? **Finding:** TBD
18.7	Are the capacity and performance acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? **Finding:** TBD
18.8	Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all software and hardware? **Finding:** TBD
18.9	Are infrastructure conditions (down to the computing hardware level) that may affect the application being considered, tested and resolved? **Finding:** TBD
18.10	Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? **Finding:** TBD
Recommendation: Coding the Personnel system is expected to be complete at the end of April. The project needs a Test Plan to explain how the project will address various types of testing. The plan will include the logistics of testing, such as place, timing, equipment used, staff to conduct testing. It will also detail the defect reporting/triage/resolution cycles. The plan will explain how the test cases are developed. PF&R and the PM will collaborate on this document.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

19	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
19.1	Has formal Training Plan been developed? **Finding:** In Progress – PF&R is developing the Training Plan.
20.2	Are the Plans being followed? **Finding:** TBD

20	Implementation Process **The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
20.1	The installation specification is complete and reasonable. **Finding:** TBD – BTS, PF&R, and the PM are finalizing decisions that will impact system implementation.
21.2	The training plans and the new Business Processes (workflows and procedures) are complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
21.3	The actual training was acceptable. **Finding:**
21.4	System documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:**
21.5	The implementation acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:**

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

21	Deployment Process **The new system has been successfully deployed.** **Risk Level** Stable / Attention / Alert — NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME
21.1	Deployment Plans are complete and reasonable. **Finding:** TBD – BTS, PF&R, and the PM are finalizing decisions that will impact system deployment.
22.2	Training City staff was complete and acceptable. **Finding:** TBD
22.3	User documentation is complete and acceptable. **Finding:** TBD
22.4	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. **Finding:** TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report
For March 2013

Purpose and Methodology

CASE Associates Inc. (CAI) started its current QA effort for the City's Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program (PSSRP) in September, 2012. This Periodic QA Evaluation Report is delivered monthly as specified in the Quality Assurance Management Plan (QAMP).

Purpose of the Monthly Report

With this report, CAI provides independent observations about the PSSRP Fire Information Systems Re-Platform project. Included with the observations are recommendations and suggestions for avoiding and/or responding to any negative impacts.

Methodology

CAI Consultants use the following methodology each month to prepare this report:

1. Review project documents and deliverables. The documents that are reviewed are listed in the Documents Reviewed section of the Monthly QA Status Report (separate deliverable).
    a. Project Manager's weekly status reports
    b. Development teams status reports
    c. Issues and Risk logs
    d. Charter and other initiating documents
    e. The Project Management Plan (PMP) and other associated plans
    f. The Work Breakdown Structure and Project Schedule
2. Attend meetings and conduct interviews. The Interviews Conducted and Meetings Attended are reported in the Documents Reviewed section of the Monthly QA Status Report (separate deliverable).
    a. Weekly Project Managers' meeting
    b. Monthly PAC meetings
    c. Meetings as needed with the Project Manager, Project Office Manager (POM)
    d. Meetings with other project participants as needed
3. Based on CAI's informed judgment and the documents and evidence reviewed, meetings attended, and interviews conducted, CAI comes to an independent, unbiased opinion of the status of the project and the health of the project. When CAI determines that the project status needs improvement, CAI develops recommendations and includes them in this report.

CAI's knowledge and experience is based upon the following:

1. Project Management Institute, "Project Management Body of Knowledge" (PMBOK). We guide and mentor our clients in applying project management and quality assurance methodologies.
2. Total Quality Management concepts and the Institute of Internal Auditors Process Audit Standards.
3. The Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology (CobiT) standards developed by the Information Systems Audit and Control Foundation for use in Information Technology audits.
4. The tenets of software management, including the functions of Quality Assurance (QA) (Per IEEE-Std 730) and Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V), that is found in Managing the Software Process by Watts Humphrey.
5. The processes described in CAI's Business/System Process Improvement Project, and further documented in the article The Process of Managing System Transitions by David Sharon of CASE Associates Inc. Mr. Sharon's article is based on his personal experiences in managing complex transition projects and documents and recommends a road map for a successful project Quality Assurance and Risk Management experience.