

City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Radio Replacement Project



Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For the Month of May 2013

Deliverable: Radio.C.7

V2.0 FINAL

6/14/2013

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 May 2013

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
EXECUTIVE STEERING WATCH LIST	3
Project Status and Progress	3
OVERALL PROJECT QA STATUS	3
WATCH LIST	3
OVERALL PROJECT HEALTH	4
QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED ALERT	4
QUALITY FOCAL POINTS RATED ATTENTION	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	6/5/2013	Initial Version for PSSRP Review
V1.3	6/12/2013	Incorporate PSSRP POM Comments
V1.4	6/13/2013	Incorporate PSSRP PM Comments
V2.0	6/14/2013	Final Version

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

Executive Summary

Executive Steering Watch List

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

1. The design of the tower at Walter’s Hill. The design of a replacement tower could affect coverage in that area.

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 seventh 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 Evaluation Team completed proposal evaluations and announced the award on 5/22/2013, nine days earlier than planned. The seven day protest period elapsed with none received.

Contract negotiations with Motorola, the successful vendor, are scheduled to start 6/12/2013 and last through August 2013.

The Bureau of Technology Services (BTS) completed the street-level coverage analysis. This data is necessary for the contract negotiations and will be used as a baseline against which to compare the new system.

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. Radio tower capacity for the new equipment.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

Status: Analysis of the radio tower capacity will be scheduled during contract negotiations.

2. Contract negotiations with Motorola

Status: Contract negotiations begin 6/12/2013.

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
Schedule	Stable	The milestone list will serve as a schedule through the remainder of the Procurement phase, expected through November 2013. During contract negotiations, June through August the Project Managers will also augment the milestone list with an expected due date for the approved system design.
Budget	Stable	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.
Scope	Stable	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 to avoid impacting the project.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart¹

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of: 4/3/13	Prior as of: 5/6/13	Current as of: 6/5/13	Next Month ²
1. Meeting Milestones	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	↔
Quality Planning					↔
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 ³	NR	NR	
Quality Assurance / Quality Control					↔
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	
System Delivery					↔
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	

¹ The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained on the next page.

² The Next Month arrows are explained on the next page.

³ "NR" indicates Not Rated for this report.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 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 May 2013

Quality Focal Points

1	<p>Milestones</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert <div style="position: absolute; left: 10%; width: 15%; height: 10px; background-color: green; border: 1px solid black;"></div> </p>
1.1	<p>Are project milestones being met so far? Finding: Yes – Three proposals were received as scheduled on 3/1/2013. The project announced that Motorola received the award. The announcement was 5/22/2013, nine days ahead of schedule. Contract negotiations will begin on 6/12/2013, on schedule.</p>
1.2	<p>Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? Finding: 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 system design is approved.</p>

2	<p>Requirements Management</p> <p>The Requirements Management process is appropriate and thorough.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert <div style="position: absolute; left: 10%; width: 15%; height: 10px; background-color: green; border: 1px solid black;"></div> </p>
2.1	<p>Are the System and Business Requirements understood and confirmed? Finding: Yes –The requirements are clearly articulated in the RFP. The Radio Project Charter contains high-level project objectives.</p>
2.2	<p>Are requirements traceable to design? Finding: 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>
2.3	<p>Are requirement change impacts understood and documented Finding: TBD</p>
2.4	<p>Are test conditions defined to validate requirements compliance? Finding: TBD</p>


Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

3	<p>Project Schedule</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable Attention Alert</p> <p>Risk Level <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
3.1	<p>Are all appropriate tasks identified in the work breakdown structure (WBS) and/or project plan? Finding: Yes, for the Procurement phase – A detailed project schedule is not feasible until the system design is approved. The project developed an interim milestone list that ends with the contract start (expected through November 2013). Sometime during the contract negotiations (expected from June through August) the project will derive a date to expect the approved system design. When the project approves the system design, it will then be in a position to develop a detailed project schedule.</p>
3.2	<p>Are dependencies among tasks identified, including decision dependencies? Finding: TBD</p>
3.3	<p>Has a schedule been established and is it reasonable based on resources (budget), productivity assumptions and dependencies? Finding: TBD – The plan and schedule should include contingencies to allow for possible delays and costs due to infrastructure upgrades.</p>
3.4	<p>Is the schedule clear and detailed enough to monitor progress? Finding: TBD</p>
3.5	<p>Is the schedule used to track progress and updated on a regular basis? Finding: TBD</p>
3.6	<p>Are external project dependencies identified in the plan? Finding: TBD</p>
3.7	<p>Have appropriate major milestones been defined? Finding: Yes – For the RFP phase, appropriate major milestones are articulated. When the radio vendor is selected, more detail will be developed.</p>
3.8	<p>Has the schedule been reviewed, approved and signed off by the project Stakeholders? Finding: Yes, in the RFP phase context. After the system design is approved, more detail will be developed and will require stakeholder review and approval.</p>
3.9	<p>Is there an appropriate process for updating the project schedule with actuals and tracking project progress? Findings: TBD</p>
3.10	<p>Is the schedule reasonable to manage the Project? Finding: TBD for the Implementation phase. For the remainder of the Procurement phase, the project developed a milestone list that will serve as a schedule.</p>


Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

4	<p>Communications</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable Attention Alert</p> <p>Risk Level <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
4.1	Have communications been planned, identified and documented? Finding: Yes
4.2	Is the Communications Plan being followed? Finding: Yes –The project has regular communications with stakeholders. When a detailed schedule is available, it will be easier to compare communication activities to the Communication Plan.
4.3	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? Finding: Yes
4.4	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 , weekly reports are sufficient for the RFP phase. More detail will be available once the schedule is developed.
<p>Suggestion: 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 Communication Plan will address more of the communication needs of other external stakeholders.</p> <p>(See Related Suggestion in QFP#13.)</p>	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

5	<p>Risk and Issue Management</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Stable Attention Alert </p> <p>Risk Level </p>
5.1	Are project risks and issues identified and categorized as to likelihood and impact? Finding: Yes – Risks are a significant part of the regular status reporting.
5.2	Are appropriate risk and issue mitigation strategies in place with appropriate monitoring measures? Finding: Yes – The regular status reporting includes “Actions Completed/Planned.” As the project progresses through the procurement phase, the decision making and issue resolution processes will be tested.
5.3	For high probability or high impact risks, are contingency plans developed in case the risk mitigation strategy fails? Finding: Yes – The regular status reporting on risks and includes “Actions Completed/Planned.” This column describes contingencies for high impact risks.
5.4	Are ongoing risk identification, assessment and management processes in place and operating effectively? Finding: Yes – The regular status reporting includes risks.
5.5	Have project assumptions been verified & appropriate monitoring measures been put in place to ensure failed assumptions do not become risks? Finding: TBD – Project assumptions will be documented as the project develops a detailed schedule.
<p>Suggestion: The project should develop a Risk Management Plan to formally describe mitigation strategies and monitoring measures. The RMP should be finalized before contract negotiations are complete.</p>	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

6	<p>Radio System Acquisition</p> <p>The Radio System Acquisition is adequately planned and executed. 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;"> Stable Attention Alert </p> <p>Risk Level </p>
6.1	The RFP was prepared per the City’s Procurement Office guidelines. Finding: Yes – The RFP went through extensive reviews by all necessary stakeholders.
6.2	The RFP defined deliverables that meet the business requirements. Finding: Yes.
6.3	The RFP included appropriate scoring and evaluation instructions. Finding: Yes – The RFP contains these instructions.
6.4	Is the Pre-Award Plan completed and understood by Evaluation Team? Finding: 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? Finding: Yes – The Evaluation Team completed proposal evaluations and announced the award on 5/22/2013, nine days earlier than planned. The seven day protest period elapsed with none received. Contract negotiations with Motorola, the successful vendor, are scheduled to start 6/12/2013 and last through August 2013.
6.6	Are contract negotiations proceeding as planned? Finding: TBD - Contract negotiations start 6/12/2013, on schedule.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

7	<p>Technical & Operational Transition</p> <p>The Technical Transition is adequately planned. This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the technical transition.</p> <p>The Operational Transition is adequately planned. This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the operational transition.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 400px; height: 15px; margin: 5px 0;"></div> <p style="text-align: right; background-color: #cccccc; padding: 5px;">NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
7.1	Has the Technical Transition Plan been defined? Finding: TBD – A Technical Transition Plan will not be available until after the radio vendor and the City sign a contract.
7.2	Has the Technical Transition Plan been reviewed and approved? Finding:
7.3	Has the Radio vendor’s Radio System architecture been assessed relative to the City’s current Radio System architecture? Finding:
7.4	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? Finding:
7.5	Has the Operational Transition Plan been defined and approved? Finding:
7.6	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Plan? Finding:

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

8	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Project Organization and Leadership</h3> <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable Attention Alert</p> <p>Risk Level </p>
8.1	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. The Steering Committee members are active during ESC meetings.
8.2	Executive Sponsors have been designated? Finding: Yes - The sponsor is designated in the Governance document.
8.3	Project Management roles and responsibilities with lines of authority and accountability have been defined, assigned and agreed upon? Finding: Yes – The project has two Project Managers assigned. Their individual roles are listed in a separate document; “Responsibility matrix – Co PMs.” In January 2013, one of the PMs was assigned to another PSSRP project. The Radio PMs are working well together to balance the load for the PM managing two projects.
8.4	Management is committed to the project. Finding: Yes
8.5	Management and Staff are committed to the project. Finding: Yes
8.6	Are other Stakeholders/users committed to the project? Finding: Yes
8.7	Are there appropriate resources to implement the Change Management Plan? Finding: TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

9	<p>Project Resources</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Risk Level <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; height: 10px; background-color: green; vertical-align: middle;"></div> Stable Attention Alert </p>
9.1	Is the level of effort planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? Finding: Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.
9.2	Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? Finding: Yes for the RFP phase. Jeff Baer will lead the Contract Negotiation Team. TBD for the implementation phase.
9.3	Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? Finding: TBD
9.4	Are appropriate tools and other necessary facilities available and effectively utilized? Finding: Yes for the RFP phase. TBD for the implementation phase.
9.5	Is the Budget (financial resources) sufficient to support the Radio Project? Finding: Yes – The budget is suitable, including a contingency. This will be further evaluated after contract negotiations, June through August 2013.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

10	<p>Project & Quality Management and Reporting</p> <p>The project is appropriately managed and quality controlled. Assessment of the Project Management, Quality Assurance and Quality Control Processes and Plans. Are the Plans in place and followed to ensure project deliverables meet requirements and are accomplished on time and within budget?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Stable Attention Alert </p> <p>Risk Level NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
10.1	Have formal Project Management and Quality Management Plans been developed? Finding: TBD
10.2	Are the Plans being followed? Finding:
10.3	Have appropriate metrics and processes been put in place to successfully manage the project? Finding:
10.4	Have objective quality metrics been put in place for project deliverables? Finding:
10.5	Are Project Progress and Deliverables measured against the metrics? Finding:
10.6	Are the results of the metric measurements reported to the appropriate sponsor, users, and other stakeholders? Finding:
10.7	Are appropriate corrective actions put in place when measurements are not acceptable? Finding:
10.8	Are appropriate status reports prepared for tracking and monitoring all project tasks? Finding:
<p>Suggestion: 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 May 2013

11	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Budget Planning and Tracking</h3> <p>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?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Stable Attention Alert </p> <p>Risk Level <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/></p>
11.1	Do the Radio Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? Finding: Yes.
11.2	Is the Radio Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? Finding: 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? Finding: TBD - Most expenditures will be planned during and shortly after contract negotiations.
11.4	Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? Finding: 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 May 2013

12	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Scope and Change Control</h3> <p style="margin: 0;">The project scope is appropriately controlled. Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Risk Level Stable Attention Alert NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
12.1	Scope is being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. Finding:
12.2	Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? Finding:
12.3	Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? Finding:

13	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Roles and Responsibilities and Communications</h3> <p style="margin: 0;">The project is staffed with appropriate roles and responsibilities. Communications are effective. Assessment of the project status reporting and communication.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Risk Level Stable Attention Alert </p>
13.1	Has a formal Communications Plan been developed? Finding: Yes
13.2	Is the Communications Plan being executed? Finding: Yes.
13.3	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? Finding: Yes.
13.4	Are the external project communication dependencies included in project status reporting? Finding: No – The current Communication Plan will require updates when a vendor is selected.
13.5	Are the project roles and responsibilities documented and understood by all parties? Finding: Yes.
<p>Suggestion: The Radio project should update the Charter 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 Suggestion in QFP#4.)</p>	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

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

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

16	<p>Project Library and Configuration Management</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>Risk Level <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green; vertical-align: middle;"></div> Stable Attention Alert </p>
16.1	A Secure library has been defined? Finding: Yes – The Radio project uses a hierarchical file system to manage all project related documentation. Access is limited to people with appropriate system accounts.
16.2	Procedures are documented for configuring and maintaining the library? Finding: Yes - Project uses standard IT system administration procedures for configuring and maintaining the file system which holds all project related documentation.
16.3	Procedures are documented for checking items in and out of the library? Finding: 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.
16.4	There are contractor controls and monitoring in place. Finding: Yes – These are based on IT general contractor system access rules.
16.5	There are procedures for reviewing changes to items in the library? Finding: No – The file system has no procedures for reviewing changes in the library.
<p>Suggestion: 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> <p>Update 6/13/13: The vendor may provide the document control. This will be clearer as the project progresses through contract negotiations.</p>	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

SYSTEM DELIVERY - Quality Focal Points

17	<p>System Design Process</p> <p>The system design process is appropriate and thorough.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert </p>
17.1	Are radio system specifications/designs in agreement with the system/business requirements? Finding: Yes – Requirements are clearly defined in the RFP.
17.2	Are the radio system specifications reasonable and acceptable? Finding: Yes – The specifications are in accordance with generally accepted industry standards, such as P25 Phase 1 and future Phase 2.
17.3	Is the current Public Safety Radio system infrastructure (towers, shelters, microwave, power, etc.) capable to support the new voice communication Public Safety Radio? Finding: TBD –The vendor and the City will conduct site surveys to confirm that the current infrastructure will support the new Radio system.
17.4	Does the radio system architecture allow for full interoperability among Portland and other metro area jurisdictions? Finding: TBD

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

19	<h3 style="margin: 0;">User Acceptance Process</h3> <p style="margin: 0;">The User Acceptance Process is appropriate and defines the methods, test plans, test procedures, and test results required to ensure the delivered system meets customer requirements.</p> <p style="margin: 0;"> Stable Attention Alert </p> <p style="margin: 0;">Risk Level <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
19.1	A User Acceptance Test Plan has been prepared. Finding: TBD – A high-level testing approach will be determined during contract negotiations. A detailed Test Plan will be developed later in the project.
19.2	The acceptance test procedures are complete. Finding:
19.3	Testing standards are understood and followed. Finding:
19.4	A defect log was maintained and corrective actions were effective. Finding:
19.5	User acceptance criteria have been met. Finding:

20	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Training</h3> <p style="margin: 0;">The radio system technical staff and end users are appropriately trained in a timely manner. Assessment of training plans and materials.</p> <p style="margin: 0;"> Stable Attention Alert </p> <p style="margin: 0;">Risk Level <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
20.1	Have formal end user and technical Training Plans been developed? Finding: TBD – The RFP requires the vendor to address training. A Training Plan will be developed later in the project. The project should include training and operations support in the schedule.
20.2	Are the Plans being followed? Finding:

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 2013

21	<p>Implementation & Integration Process</p> <p>The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable Attention Alert</p> <p>Risk Level <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
21.1	The installation specification is complete and reasonable. Finding:
21.2	The integration specification is complete and reasonable. Finding:
21.2	The end user and technical training plans 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 and integration acceptance criteria have been met. Finding:

22	<p>Deployment Process</p> <p>The new system has been successfully deployed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stable Attention Alert</p> <p>Risk Level <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> NOT APPLICABLE AT THIS TIME</p>
22.1	Deployment Plans are complete and reasonable. Finding:
22.2	Training end users and technical staff was complete and acceptable. Finding:
22.3	User and technical documentation is complete and acceptable. Finding:
22.4	Is there an appropriate Operations & Maintenance Plan in place to assure the new system is appropriately supported in accordance with (to be?) established Service Level Agreements (SLAs)? Finding:
22.5	Deployment acceptance criteria have been met. Finding:

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For May 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, 5/16/2013

Documents Reviewed

COP Radio Status report week ending 5-3 and 5-10-2013 Final – Project Managers’ Report
COP Radio Status report week ending 5-17-2013 Final
COP Radio Status report week ending 5-24-2013 Final
COP Radio Status report week ending 5-31-2013 Final
Governance-Radio Final v2 2-2013

Documents Delivered

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

Documents in Process

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

Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None