

City of Portland

# Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

## Radio Replacement Project



# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For the Month of April 2013

Deliverable: Radio.C.6

V2.1 Final

5/20/2013

**Prepared By:**



Clifford Smith, PMP, Project Lead, Quality Assurance Consultant

David Sharon, QA Consultant and Engagement Manager

Peter van den Berg, Quality Assurance Consultant

Contract # 30002849

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For April 2013

### Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
EXECUTIVE STEERING ACTION ITEMS	3
Project Status and Progress	3
OVERALL PROJECT QA STATUS	3
WATCH LIST	3
OVERALL PROJECT HEALTH	4
QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED <b>ALERT</b>	4
QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED <b>ATTENTION</b>	4
Quality Focal Point Summary Chart	5
Quality Focal Points	7
Milestones	7
Requirements Management	7
Project Schedule	8
Communications	9
Risk and Issue Management	10
Radio System Acquisition	11
Technical & Operational Transition	12
Project Organization and Leadership	13
Project Resources	14
Project & Quality Management and Reporting	15
Budget Planning and Tracking	16
Scope and Change Control	17
Roles and Responsibilities and Communications	17
Radio System Architecture	18
Radio System Acquisition Management	18
Project Library and Configuration Management	19
System Design Process	20
Testing (Functional and Performance)	21
User Acceptance Process	22
Training	22
Implementation & Integration Process	23
Deployment Process	23
Appendix A – CASE Associates Status Report	A

Version	Date	Comments
V1.2	5/9/2013	Initial Version for PSSRP Review
V1.3	5/14/2013	Incorporate Comments from PSSRP POM
V2.0	5/15/2013	Final Version
V2.1	5/20/2013	Add explanation for Next Month Indicators Remove Methodology section

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

## Executive Summary

### ***Executive Steering Action Items***

There are no issues that require Executive action.

## Project Status and Progress

The PSSRP Radio Replacement Project is to replace the current City of Portland Public Safety radio communications system with a modern all digital P25 Phase I compliant system.

CASE Associates Inc. (CAI) was selected to perform the independent QA on the City of Portland PSSRP which includes the Radio Replacement Project. This is the sixth monthly Radio Replacement Project 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.

The Radio Replacement Project is in two major phases:

1. Phase I - Infrastructure. The project is in this phase. This Periodic QA Evaluation Report focuses on this phase.
2. Phase II - Subscriber Units. CAI will include reviews of this phase when appropriate.

### ***Overall Project QA Status***

The Radio project is in the Procurement phase. The City received one proposal each from Motorola, Harris, and Tait. All three proposals are compliant with requirements stated in the RFP, and moved to the evaluation phase.

The Evaluation Team is on target to complete proposal evaluations and announce the award on 5/31/2013, as planned.

Contract negotiations with the successful vendor are scheduled for June through August 2013.

During January, one of the Project Managers was assigned to also manage another PSSRP project. The Project Managers will monitor how this may affect Project Management duties as the Radio project proceeds through the Proposal Evaluation phase.

All Quality Focal Points (QFP) are rated "Stable."

The Overall Health rating is also "Stable," reflecting that the project is well run and requires no immediate intervention.

### ***Watch List***

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

1. Completion of the BTS coverage testing.
2. Radio tower capacity for the new equipment.
3. Completion of the proposal selection and notice of the award.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

### Overall Project Health

Overall Rating: **Stable**

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

Health Factor	Rating	Comments
<b>Schedule</b>	<b>Stable</b>	The project responded to CAI's mitigation recommendations by developing an interim milestone list. This milestone list will serve as a schedule through the remainder of the Procurement phase, expected through November 2013. During contract negotiations, the Project Managers will also augment the milestone list with an expected due date for the approved system design.
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Stable</b>	The project has a budget and contingency. Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations. The adequacy of the budget will be reassessed then.
<b>Scope</b>	<b>Stable</b>	The project scope is clearly defined in the RFP and the Project Charter.

### Quality Focal Points Rated **Alert**

NONE - No Quality Focal Points are impacting the project at this time.

### Quality Focal Points Rated **Attention**

NONE - No Quality Focal Points need attention so they won't impact the project.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

### Quality Focal Point Summary Chart<sup>1</sup>

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of: 3/6/13	Prior as of: 4/3/13	Current as of: 5/6/13	Next Month <sup>2</sup>
1. Meeting Milestones	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	↔
<b>Quality Planning</b>					↔
2. Requirements Management	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
3. Project Schedule	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
4. Communications	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
5. Risk and Issue Management	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
6. Radio System Acquisition	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
7. Tech. & Operational Transition	High	NR <sup>3</sup>	NR	NR	
<b>Quality Assurance / Quality Control</b>					↔
8. Project Organization and Leadership	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
9. Project Resources	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
10. Project/Quality Management and Reporting	Medium	NR	NR	NR	
11. Budget Planning and Tracking	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
12. Scope and Change Control	High	NR	NR	NR	
13. Roles, Responsibilities and Communications	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
14. Radio System Architecture	High	NR	NR	NR	
15. Radio System Acquisition Management	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
16. Project Library and Configuration Management	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
<b>System Delivery</b>					↔
17. System Design Process	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
18. Testing (Functional and Performance)	High	NR	NR	NR	
19. User Acceptance Process	High	NR	NR	NR	
20. Training	High	NR	NR	NR	
21. Implementation & Integration Process	High	NR	NR	NR	
22. Deployment Process	High	NR	NR	NR	

<sup>1</sup> The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained on the next page.

<sup>2</sup> The Next Month arrows are explained on the next page.

<sup>3</sup> "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.






# Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 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.

## 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 April 2013

### Quality Focal Points

<b>1</b>	<h3>Milestones</h3> <p><b>Project milestones are being met on schedule.</b> The Milestone QFP assesses the scheduled completion of interim and major project milestones and their impact on overall project completion.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #00ff00;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #ffff00;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #ff0000;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> </span> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 150px; margin-left: 10px; font-size: small;"> <span>Stable</span> <span>Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </div> </p>
<b>1.1</b>	<p>Are project milestones being met so far? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Three proposals were received as scheduled on 3/1/2013. The next major milestone is the “Publish Award Announcement.” The date for the announcement moved to 5/31/2013 to allow for the thorough evaluation process. The project is on track to meet or beat that date.</p>
<b>1.2</b>	<p>Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – The project schedule will be developed during negotiations with the selected vendor. Contract Negotiations with the vendor are scheduled for June through August 2013. A detailed project schedule is not feasible until the Radio vendor has been selected and the system design is approved.</p>
<b>2</b>	<h3>Requirements Management</h3> <p><b>The Requirements Management process is appropriate and thorough.</b></p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #00ff00;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #ffff00;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #ff0000;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></div> </span> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 150px; margin-left: 10px; font-size: small;"> <span>Stable</span> <span>Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </div> </p>
<b>2.1</b>	<p>Are the System and Business Requirements understood and confirmed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes –The requirements are clearly articulated in the RFP. The Radio Project Charter contains high-level project objectives.</p>
<b>2.2</b>	<p>Are requirements traceable to design? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The requirements are traceable to the Conceptual Design provided by the project consultants, Federal Engineering. The City accepted the requirements and conceptual design. The proposed designs that are submitted with vendor proposals will be compared to the requirements to evaluate compliance or to identify advantages of the proposed design over the conceptual one.</p>
<b>2.3</b>	<p>Are requirement change impacts understood and documented <b>Finding:</b> TBD</p>
<b>2.4</b>	<p>Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? <b>Finding:</b> TBD</p>










## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

6	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Radio System Acquisition</h3> <p><b>The Radio System Acquisition is adequately planned and executed.</b> The Radio System Acquisition QFP assesses the breadth and depth of the project’s procurement process, RFP and vendor contract.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> </p>
6.1	The RFP was prepared per the City’s Procurement Office guidelines. <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The RFP went through extensive reviews by all necessary stakeholders.
6.2	The RFP defined deliverables that meet the business requirements. <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
6.3	The RFP included appropriate scoring and evaluation instructions. <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The RFP contains these instructions.
6.4	Is the Pre-Award Plan completed and understood by Evaluation Team? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The evaluators understand their roles. The SMEs discuss the makeup of the team, including the team’s technical advisors.
6.5	Is the Pre-Award Plan being followed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The vendors submitted three proposals by 3/1/2013. The evaluation team will began work on the first of the qualified proposals on 3/15/2013. The award announcement is expected on 5/31/2013. The project adjusted the scheduled evaluation period to allow for the thorough evaluation process.
6.6	Are contract negotiations proceeding as planned? <b>Finding:</b> TBD

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>7</b>	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Technical &amp; Operational Transition</h3> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>The Technical Transition is adequately planned.</b> This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the technical transition.</p> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>The Operational Transition is adequately planned.</b> This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the operational transition.</p>	
<b>Risk Level</b>		<b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b>
<b>7.1</b>	Has the Technical Transition Plan been defined? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – A Technical Transition Plan will not be available until after the radio vendor and the City sign a contract.	
<b>7.2</b>	Has the Technical Transition Plan been reviewed and approved? <b>Finding:</b>	
<b>7.3</b>	Has the Radio vendor’s Radio System architecture been assessed relative to the City’s current Radio System architecture? <b>Finding:</b>	
<b>7.4</b>	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? <b>Finding:</b>	
<b>7.5</b>	Has the Operational Transition Plan been defined and approved? <b>Finding:</b>	
<b>7.6</b>	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? <b>Finding:</b>	



## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>9</b>	<p><b>Project Resources</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately resourced.</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #00FF00;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"></div> </span>   <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; width: 150px; margin-left: 10px; font-size: small;"> <span>Stable</span> <span>Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </div> </p>
<b>9.1</b>	<p>Is the level of effort planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? <b>Finding:</b> Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.</p>
<b>9.2</b>	<p>Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? <b>Finding:</b> Yes for the RFP phase. The Evaluation Team is skilled and from various stakeholder groups (PSSRP, COP, Wash. County, Multnomah County, and two citizen evaluators.) They are backed up by expert technical advisors. TBD for the implementation phase.</p>
<b>9.3</b>	<p>Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? <b>Finding:</b> TBD</p>
<b>9.4</b>	<p>Are appropriate tools and other necessary facilities available and effectively utilized? <b>Finding:</b> Yes</p>
<b>9.5</b>	<p>Is the Budget (financial resources) sufficient to support the Radio Project? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The budget is suitable, including a contingency. This will be further evaluated after contract negotiations, June through August 2013.</p>

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>10</b>	<p><b>Project &amp; Quality Management and Reporting</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately managed and quality controlled.</b> Assessment of the Project Management, Quality Assurance and Quality Control Processes and Plans. Are the Plans in place and followed to ensure project deliverables meet requirements and are accomplished on time and within budget?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 400px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"></span> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>10.1</b>	Have formal Project Management and Quality Management Plans been developed? <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>10.2</b>	Are the Plans being followed? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>10.3</b>	Have appropriate metrics and processes been put in place to successfully manage the project? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Have objective quality metrics been put in place for project deliverables? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>10.5</b>	Are Project Progress and Deliverables measured against the metrics? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Are the results of the metric measurements reported to the appropriate sponsor, users, and other stakeholders? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Are appropriate corrective actions put in place when measurements are not acceptable? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>10.8</b>	Are appropriate status reports prepared for tracking and monitoring all project tasks? <b>Finding:</b>
<p><b>Suggestion:</b> The project should develop a detailed and formal Quality Management Plan (QMP). The City and the vendor will collaboratively develop the QMP. The plan will describe reviews and Quality Control and Quality Assurance steps to ensure that the vendor is progressing according to the City's needs. The QMP should be finalized shortly after contract negotiations are complete.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

11	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Budget Planning and Tracking</h3> <p><b>The project budget is appropriately planned, managed and tracked.</b> 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?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="checkbox"/></p>
11.1	Do the Radio Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
11.2	Is the Radio Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations.
11.3	Are the appropriate funds budgeted in order to conduct required activities and complete and support the project? <b>Finding:</b> TBD - Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations.
11.4	Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Budget management and tracking is performed by the city’s finance office in consultation with the PM and providing regular budget reports to the PM.



## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>12</b>	<p><b>Scope and Change Control</b></p> <p><b>The project scope is appropriately controlled.</b> Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 33%; text-align: center; font-size: small;">Stable</span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 33%; text-align: center; font-size: small;">Attention</span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 33%; text-align: center; font-size: small;">Alert</span> </span> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>12.1</b>	Scope is being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. <b>Finding:</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? <b>Finding:</b>

<b>13</b>	<p><b>Roles and Responsibilities and Communications</b></p> <p><b>The project is staffed with appropriate roles and responsibilities. Communications are effective.</b> Assessment of the project status reporting and communication.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin: 0 10px;"> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 33%; text-align: center; font-size: small;">Stable</span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 33%; text-align: center; font-size: small;">Attention</span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 33%; text-align: center; font-size: small;">Alert</span> </span></p>
<b>13.1</b>	Has a formal Communications Plan been developed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes
<b>13.2</b>	Is the Communications Plan being executed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<b>13.3</b>	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<b>13.4</b>	Are the external project communication dependencies included in project status reporting? <b>Finding:</b> No – The current Communication Plan will require updates when a vendor is selected.
<b>13.5</b>	Are the project roles and responsibilities documented and understood by all parties? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<p><b>Suggestion:</b> The Radio project should update the Charter and Governance documents to reflect current executives and sponsors. The Radio project should update the Communication Plan to reflect current assignments. These updates can wait until the vendor and the City sign the contract. At that point, the plans will require more extensive updates. At that point the project should also add plans for other external stakeholders. (See Related Suggestions in QFP#4 and QFP#8.)</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>14</b>	<p><b>Radio System Architecture</b></p> <p><b>The project adheres to Radio System architecture standards.</b> Verification that the Project conforms to Radio Architecture standards.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>14.1</b>	The Project supports the Radio System Architecture Framework? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – There is a Conceptual Design. The final Radio Architecture solution will depend on the outcome of the Radio RFP process.
<b>14.2</b>	The Project supports the Radio System Architecture Framework strategic objectives? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>14.3</b>	The project supports the Radio System architecture with respect to geographical coverage, functionality, capacity, and interoperability. <b>Finding:</b>

<b>15</b>	<p><b>Radio System Acquisition Management</b></p> <p><b>The vendor deliverables meet the Project requirements and standards per the Contract Terms and Conditions.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>15.1</b>	Procedures are defined and documented to monitor and track vendor deliverables. <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The RFP is explicit regarding the Proposal content. The project defined and is following the RFP process.
<b>15.2</b>	Procedures are defined and documented to measure vendor deliverables against project requirements and standards per the contract. <b>Finding:</b> TBD
<b>15.3</b>	Project staff understands and follows documented procedures regarding vendor deliverables requirements. <b>Findings:</b> Yes – The Evaluation Team understands and is following the defined process.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>16</b>	<p><b>Project Library and Configuration Management</b></p> <p>The project has an appropriate Project Library in place to support Project Management and a Configuration Management Process in place to support System Delivery.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green; vertical-align: middle;"></div> <span style="margin-left: 10px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-left: 50px;">Attention</span> <span style="margin-left: 50px;">Alert</span> </span></p>
<b>16.1</b>	A Secure library has been defined? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The Radio project uses a hierarchical file system to manage all project related documentation. Access is limited to people with appropriate system accounts.
<b>16.2</b>	Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? <b>Finding:</b> Yes - Project uses standard IT system administration procedures for configuring and maintaining the file system which holds all project related documentation.
<b>16.3</b>	Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? <b>Finding:</b> No – The project does not have a check-in-and-out process. CAI recommends that PSSRP adopt a standardized document content and management procedures to support version controls. PSSRP should implement a Document Management System to control access and versioning of the project library. Each PSSRP project would benefit by the convenience and control offered by such a system.
<b>16.4</b>	There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. <b>Finding:</b> Yes – These are based on IT general contractor system access rules.
<b>16.5</b>	There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? <b>Finding:</b> No – The file system has no procedures for reviewing changes in the library.
<p><b>Suggestion:</b> The Radio project should adopt standardized document content and management procedures to support version controls. Version control has not been a major issue for the project. It could become more important as the project gets larger and the number of documents shared and reviewed increases. CAI suggests PSSRP implement a Document Management System to control access and versioning of the project library. A DMS could benefit all the PSSRP projects.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

### SYSTEM DELIVERY - Quality Focal Points

17	<p><b>System Design Process</b></p> <p>The system design process is appropriate and thorough.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 100px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; position: relative; top: -5px;"> <span style="background-color: green; width: 25%; display: inline-block;"></span> </span></p>
17.1	<p>Are radio system specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – Requirements are clearly defined in the RFP.</p>
17.2	<p>Are the radio system specifications reasonable and acceptable? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The specifications are in accordance with generally accepted industry standards, such as P25 Phase 1 and future Phase 2.</p>
17.3	<p>Is the current Public Safety Radio system infrastructure (towers, shelters, microwave, power, etc.) capable to support the new voice communication Public Safety Radio? <b>Finding:</b> TBD –The vendor and the City will conduct site surveys to confirm that the current infrastructure will support the new Radio system.</p>
17.4	<p>Does the radio system architecture allow for full interoperability among Portland and other metro area jurisdictions? <b>Finding:</b> TBD</p>

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

<b>18</b>	<p><b>Testing (Functional and Performance)</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately tested.</b> Appropriate functional and performance acceptance testing procedures and plans are in place and meet the operational needs of the system and verify and validate acceptable compliance to requirements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable                      Attention                      Alert</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</b></p>
<b>18.1</b>	Has a formal Test Management Plan been developed? <b>Finding:</b> TBD – A high-level testing approach will be determined during contract negotiations.
<b>18.2</b>	Is the Plan being followed? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.3</b>	Do the documented functional specifications meet the business needs? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.4</b>	Are the end users involved in establishing the functional acceptance testing scope and standards? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.5</b>	Are the functional, capacity, and performance acceptance test procedures appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.6</b>	Do the functional, capacity, and performance specifications match operational needs? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.7</b>	Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity, and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all Radio System components, including supporting infrastructure? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.8</b>	Are infrastructure conditions that may affect the radio system being considered, tested and resolved? <b>Finding:</b>
<b>18.9</b>	Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? <b>Finding:</b>





## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For April 2013

### Appendix A – CASE Associates Status Report

This section summarizes activities and deliverables completed for the Radio Replacement Project during April 2013.

When applicable, it includes:

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

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

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

#### Meetings Attended

Meeting with the Project Managers, 4/23/2013  
Executive Steering Committee, 4/17/2013

#### Documents Reviewed

COP Radio Status report week ending 4-5-2013 Final – Project Managers’ Report  
COP Radio Status report week ending 4-12-2013 Final  
COP Radio Status report week ending 4-19-2013 Final  
COP Radio Status report week ending 4-26-2013 Final

#### Documents Delivered

Radio CAI Monthly QA Status Report for March 2013, deliverable *Radio.F.7*  
Radio CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for March 2013, deliverable *Radio.C.54*

#### Documents in Process

Radio CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for March 2013, deliverable *Radio.C.6*

#### Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

#### Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None