

City of Portland

# **Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program**

## **Regional Justice Information Network Project**



# **Periodic QA Evaluation Report**

**For June 2014**

**Deliverable: RegJIN.C.20**

V2.0 Final Version

7/10/2014

**Prepared By:**



Clifford Smith, PMP, Lead Quality Assurance Consultant

David Sharon, QA Consultant and Engagement Manager

Jamie Hanson, QA Analyst

Contract # 30002849

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For June 2014

### Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Executive Steering Committee Watch List	2
Project Status and Progress	2
Project QA Overview	2
Overall Project QA Health	4
Quality Focal Points Rated <b>Alert</b>	4
Quality Focal Points Rated <b>Attention</b>	4
Quality Focal Points Rated <b>Stable</b> With a Suggestion	4
Quality Focal Point Summary Chart	6
Quality Focal Points	7
Milestones	7
Project Schedule	8
Communications	10
Business Transition	11
Project Organization and Leadership	12
Training	13
Appendix A – QFP Chart Definitions	A
Appendix B – Cross-reference to Previous QFP Reports	B
Appendix C – CASE Associates Status Report	C

Version	Date	Comments
V1.0	7/3/2014	Version for PSSRP Review
V2.0	7/10/14	Incorporate feedback from PM. Final Version.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For June 2014

### Executive Summary

#### **Executive Steering Committee Watch List**

This section identifies potential issues that the ESC should be watching closely. The “Watch List” documents program related concerns that have come to CAI’s attention but have not yet been completely assessed.

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

### Project Status and Progress

The PSSRP Regional Justice Information Network (RegJIN) Records Management System (RMS) Project is to replace the existing Portland Police Data System (PPDS) and the Clark County Records Management and Electronic Police Reporting systems (CRMS and EPR). RegJIN will also increase integration between the various system components and enhance their core capabilities.

This is the 20th monthly RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation Report intended to assess the health of the project and provide independent observations (positive or negative) and recommendations for avoiding and/or responding to any future negative impacts.

NEW

#### **Project QA Overview**

The Master IGA was completed and distributed to the partner agencies for review. Of the 41 agencies participating in RegJIN, only two agencies remain to sign the Master IGA. Both are waiting for the final Participant IGA before signing the Master IGA.

The Participant IGA (P-IGA) is final. The final costs in the P-IGA will depend on the number of sworn and correctional officers, number of inquiry-only agencies, and number of MRE licenses needed.

NEW

End-user training for Mobile Report Entry (MRE) started May 12. Currently, about 100 reports per day make it through the entire process: From report writing through review, revisions, and finally on to Records.

The team is addressing what seems to be a network-related issue: Sporadically, some reports do not transmit correctly. The project is testing a resolution that entails smaller network packet size transferred from MRE devices to the RegJIN servers. Results have been positive to date.

The Go-live date for the full RMS system was moved to spring 2015. In May, the project team assessed the viability of a December 2014 full RMS launch. PSSRP has stated since September 2013 that they would make this decision in June 2014. Based on their evaluation of the work needed between now and the RMS deployment, they decided to deploy in spring 2015.

NEW

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

The PM revised the schedule to reflect the new launch date; 4/14/2015. To finalize the new date, he met with project stakeholders, including Versaterm (vendor), the I-Team (users) and BTS (technical team).

As reported last month, CAI conducted a survey for the RegJIN Project. The survey focused on the interviewees’ opinions and perceptions. The confidential interviews helped determine if stakeholders had sufficient input to the system configuration process and if they were knowledgeable about the project’s status.

The Survey Report highlights:

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

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

The Survey Report also contains recommendations:

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

The report is available on the RegJIN website.

NEW

To add leadership and augment the resources needed for Change Management throughout the project, the Captain of the Records Division is focused full-time for the duration of the project. Additionally, one acting lieutenant and an additional officer are assigned full time to PPB starting this month. Clark County hired a new PM to help with the project load. Several other agencies added part and full time staff to the project team (Washington County Sherriff is an example).

NEW

The project received the in-vehicle scanners and printers purchased with the UASI funds. At the recent PAC meeting, the PM announced that they are available for pick-up.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

### Overall Project QA Health

Overall Rating: **Stable**

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

Health Factor	Rating	Comments
Schedule	<b>Stable</b>	Mobile Report Writing (MRE) was deployed as scheduled, in May 2014. The full RMS System Go-Live date has been moved to spring 2015. The ESC and the Sponsor support the move. Project stakeholders have been consulted and also support the April 2015 cutover.
Budget	<b>Stable</b>	The RegJIN project has a budget that is adequate for the project.
Scope	<b>Stable</b>	The product scope was clearly defined in the RFP. All scope changes that arose during the Configuration Workshops were resolved with the vendor.

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

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

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

NONE – No Quality Focal Points require attention at the time.

### Quality Focal Points Rated **Stable With a Suggestion**

*Note:* The following suggestions for QFP's 3, 4, and 8 were contained in the prior report (May 2014). Since there was no ESC meeting in June, they are included again in this report with an updated status.

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

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

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

**Status:** The new BTS Interim PMO Manager is taking action on this suggestion. Most open tasks have successor tasks defined. BTS has a much clearer understanding of their tasks and dependencies.

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

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

- **Communications, QFP #4** **Stable**

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

**Status:** The project committed to posting meeting minutes within a week. Though the suggestion was for a one- or two-day turnaround, the commitment from the PM addresses the suggestion.

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

**Suggestion 2:** Emphasize the need for the I-Team members to communicate with the partner agencies.

**Status:** The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need for I-Team members to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover. The additional time will allow the I-Team to pay more attention to each agency.

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

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

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

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

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

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For June 2014

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

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of 5/7/14	Prior as of 6/4/14	Current as of 7/2/14	Next Month <sup>2</sup>
1. Meeting Milestones	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	⇔
<b>Planning</b>	<b>Impact</b>				⇔
2. Requirements Management	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
3. Project Schedule	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
4. Communications	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
5. Risk and Issue Management	Low	Stable	Stable	Stable	
6. IT Acquisition	Low	Stable	Stable	Stable	
7. Technical Transition	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
8. Business Transition	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
<b>Monitoring and Control</b>	<b>Impact</b>				⇔
9. Project Organization and Leadership	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
10. Project Resources	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
11. Project/Quality Management and Reporting	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
12. Budget Planning and Tracking	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
13. Scope and Change Control	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
14. IT Architecture	Low	Stable	Stable	Stable	
15. IT Acquisition Management	Low	Stable	Stable	Stable	
16. Project Library and Configuration Mgt.	Low	Stable	Stable	Stable	
<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Impact</b>				⇔
17. System Design Process	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	
18. Data Conversion/Migration	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
19. Configuration/Construction	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
20. Testing (Non-Functional)	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
21. User Acceptance Testing	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
22. Training	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
23. Implementation Process	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	
24. Deployment Process	High	Stable	Stable	Stable	

<sup>1</sup> The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained in Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> The Next Month arrows are explained in Appendix A.

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For June 2014

### Quality Focal Points

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

1	<p><b>Milestones</b></p> <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%; height: 10px; background-color: #00ff00; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <span style="margin-right: 20px;">Stable</span> <span style="margin-right: 20px;">Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </span> </p>
1.1	<p>Are project milestones being met so far? <b>Finding:</b> Yes –The Versaterm contract negotiations were completed April 30, 2013. City Council authorization to execute the contract with Versaterm occurred on June 12. The City Attorney signed off on the contract July 1. Versaterm signed the contract July 10, 2013.</p> <p>All four Configuration Workshops were conducted as scheduled.</p> <p>All training facilities are fully operational for the “Early MRE” training. Early MRE went live in May, as scheduled.</p> <p>The infrastructure was scheduled to be available to VTM in November 2013. It was completed January 2014. The PM adjusted the schedule accordingly. The delays used the available slack in the project schedule. There have been no further delays and the overall timeline is unaffected.</p> <p>Interfaces developed under the UASI grant were completed and their integration tested.</p>
1.2	<p>Is there sufficient time (with appropriate slack) to complete the project before the committed completion date? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The schedule shows the project completing on time, with the newly-moved go-live of spring 2015.</p> <p>Stakeholders, including BTS, Versaterm, and partner agencies have reviewed and approved the System Live Date of April 2015.</p>





## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

3	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Project Schedule</h3> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>The project is appropriately planned.</b> 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="margin: 0;"><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: 20%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; background-color: #00ff00;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; text-align: center; margin-left: 10px;">Stable</div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; text-align: center; margin-left: 10px;">Attention</div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; text-align: center; margin-left: 10px;">Alert</div> </span></p>
<p><b>Suggestion:</b> The Master Project Schedule includes some task groups that do not have successor tasks defined. Assigning successor tasks to those groups of tasks will clarify the impact on the overall schedule if there are any task delays or changes.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group task “Modify GIS Mapping and Analysis Tools for RegJIN” (WBS #8) is comprised of 4 group tasks. The final task in each group has no successor task defined. Though each of these group tasks is overdue, if there is any impact on the overall project timeline, it is not clear from the schedule.</li> <li>Group task “Interface Development” (WBS #10.4) has numerous group tasks that each end with a task “Test and Refine” or “Test and Adjust”. Those final tasks have no successors.</li> <li>Group task “Clark County Warrant Upload” (WBS #10.8) has 4 sequential tasks that were due in March. The final task, “Test and Refinement” has no successor.</li> <li>Group task “Setup Cognos 10.2” (WBS #13.6.2) has 4 sequential tasks. The final task has no successor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status:</b> The BTS Interim PMO Mgr. is actively addressing this suggestion. Most such tasks have successor tasks defined and BTS has a much clearer understanding of their tasks and dependencies.</p> <p>This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

<b>4</b>	<p><b>Communications</b></p> <p><b>The project communications are effective and adequately controlled.</b> Assessment of the Communications QFP examines the project status reporting and communication processes for task completion and budget.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 100px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-left: 10px;"> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #00FF00; border: 1px solid black;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #FFFF00; border: 1px solid black;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #FFD700; border: 1px solid black;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #FFA500; border: 1px solid black;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #FF4500; border: 1px solid black;"></span> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #FF0000; border: 1px solid black;"></span> </span> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px; margin-top: 5px;"> <span>Stable</span> <span>Attention</span> <span>Alert</span> </div> </p>
<b>4.1</b>	Have communications been planned, identified and documented? <b>Finding:</b> Yes, in the Communications Plan. The plan was updated and approved in July 2013.
<b>4.2</b>	Is the Communications Plan being followed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes.
<b>4.3</b>	Are communications identified in the plan and produced by the Project effective? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – In prior months, Communication between the project team and the BTS technical team has been ineffective. Since December communications have been more robust. The PMs established weekly meetings to review status, issues, schedule requirements and upcoming deliverables.
<b>4.4</b>	Does the project receive appropriate and timely executive and project sponsor attention? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – As issues are escalated to the executives and sponsors, they are responsive and helpful.
<b>4.5</b>	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? <b>Finding:</b> Yes - The Project Manager prepares a comprehensive Project Status Report every week and posts the Status Report on the RegJIN website. Team Meeting and PAC Meeting presentations and minutes are also posted on the RegJIN website. BTS and PSSRP are communicating issues and status at regular team meetings.
<b>4.6</b>	Do the RegJIN Project Manager and the Project Sponsor meet on a regular basis? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The Sponsor is the Chief of Police and is also a member of the PSSRP Executive Steering Committee. His representatives for this project are the Asst. Chief and the Capt. of the Records Division. The PSSRP POM meets with the Asst. Chief occasionally and has ongoing communication with the Captain. The PM meets with the Capt. of Records regularly.
<p><b>Suggestion 1:</b> Ensure that meeting minutes and presentation are posted to the RegJIN website within a day or two of the meeting. This suggestion comes from participants in the CAI survey. <b>Status:</b> The project committed to posting meeting minutes within a week. Though the suggestion was for a one- or two-day turnaround, the commitment from the PM addresses the suggestion. This suggestion is complete and will be dropped from further reports.</p>	
<p><b>Suggestion 2:</b> Emphasize the need for the I-Team members to communicate with the partner agencies. <b>Status:</b> The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need for I-Team members to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover. The additional time will allow the I-Team to pay more attention to each agency. This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

**Note:** This QFP has not changed from the prior report. Since there was no ESC in June, it is included in this report to draw attention to the suggestion and its status.

<b>8</b>	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Business Transition</h3> <p><b>Business Process Re-engineering is adequately planned.</b> This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the business transition.</p> <p><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin-left: 10px;"> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20%; background-color: green; height: 10px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 40%; text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Stable</div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20%; text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Attention</div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20%; text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Alert</div> </span></p>
<b>8.1</b>	<p>Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been defined? <b>Finding:</b> In process. The project will not develop a separate Business Transition Plan document. The Business Transition Plan is the major component of the Training Plan.</p>
<b>8.2</b>	<p>Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been reviewed and approved? <b>Finding:</b> The Integration Design Document (IDD) describes customizations that the vendor will make to the systems. It also includes descriptions of how the City staff will conduct certain activities. That document is approved.</p>
<b>8.3</b>	<p>Has the COTS vendor’s workflow been assessed relative to changes from the City’s “as-is” processes? <b>Finding:</b> In Process - The project assembled a 23-member I-Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies. The team is committed to the project for 18 months. The I-Team is going through critical business process making sure that it works. The I-Team works with Versaterm to resolve issues as they arise.</p>
<p><b>Suggestion:</b> Assemble overview materials for the non-I-Team agencies. The materials could be an update of system demos from earlier in the project. Describe the expected enhancements for the RMS software version that will go live. Possibly deliver these materials in a Webinar format, recorded, and post them to the RegJIN website.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The decision to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015 was due in part to the need deliver more system education to non-I-Team agencies. The I-Team will use the additional time to help other agencies through their configuration process in the run up to the cutover. This suggestion is complete and will be removed from future reports.</p>	

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

<b>9</b>	<p><b>Project Organization and Leadership</b></p> <p><b>The project is appropriately organized.</b> 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><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; position: relative; top: -5px;"> <span style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: -5px;">Stable</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 350px; top: -5px;">Attention</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 500px; top: -5px;">Alert</span> <div style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: -5px; width: 100px; height: 10px; background-color: #00FF00; border: 1px solid black;"></div> </span></p>
<b>9.1</b>	The Steering Committee is comprised of executive decision-makers and is functioning? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The Executive Steering Committee (ESC) meets every other month.
<b>9.2</b>	Executive Sponsors have been designated? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The Executive Sponsor is represented by the Captain of the Records Division, Captain John Brooks.
<b>9.3</b>	Project Management roles and responsibilities with lines of authority and accountability have been defined, assigned and agreed upon? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – in the Project Charter and Project Governance documents.
<b>9.4</b>	Are Management, RegJIN Staff and Partners committed to the project? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – PSSRP is funding some project staff. PPB and partner agencies committed their own staff to the project, at their own cost. BTS assigned a high priority to the project.
<b>9.5</b>	Is there is Stakeholder Support and Buy-in? <b>Finding:</b> Yes. Most agencies signed the IGA’s. One large agency is waiting until the Participant IGA is available before signing the Master IGA.
<b>9.6</b>	Has a Change Management Plan been prepared? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – The PSSRP POM approved the CMP.
<b>9.7</b>	Is the Change Management Process adequately supported by Bureau, PSSRP, and Partner Agency Management? <b>Finding:</b> Yes – PSSRP provides resources to lead the Change Management Process. The I-Team, comprised of staff from the partner agencies, is primarily responsible for defining the processes for the agencies.  To augment the resources needed for Change Management throughout the project, the Captain of the Records Division is focused full-time for the duration of the project.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

22	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Training</h3> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>The project staff and system users are appropriately trained in a timely manner.</b> Assessment of training plans and materials.</p> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>Risk Level</b> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 150px; border-bottom: 1px solid black; position: relative; top: -10px;"> <span style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: -10px;">Stable</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 350px; top: -10px;">Attention</span> <span style="position: absolute; left: 500px; top: -10px;">Alert</span> </span></p>
22.1	<p>Has a formal Training Plan been developed? <b>Finding:</b> In Progress - The high-level approach to training is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Super User” training session delivered by Versaterm. These Super Users become the in-house experts for the new system.</li> <li>“Train the Trainers” sessions. The Super Users train the trainers at each of the agencies. Versaterm to be onsite to critique and support the Super Users during the first “Train the Trainer” sessions.</li> <li>The End User training to span 12 weeks. Note that at this point, many LEO’s will already be using the Mobile Report Entry (MRE) in the field.</li> </ul> <p>The final SOW lists the respective duties of PSSRP and VTM. The Contract T&amp;C describe the Training Plan in greater detail. The need for effective training was one of the main factors to move the RMS cut-over date to spring 2015. The team decided it would be less risky to move the start of training to after the winter holidays instead of trying to get it all done before December. The PM is developing the formal training plan for the full RMS rollout.</p>
22.2	<p>Are the Plans being followed? <b>Finding:</b> Yes. The I-Team received system training during all four Configuration Workshops. The Early MRE Train-The-Trainer sessions have been proceeding as planned. Based on experience during the training, the team modified training materials. End User Training began 5/12/14. All training labs are in operation.</p>

# Periodic QA Evaluation Report

## For June 2014

### Appendix A – QFP Chart Definitions

#### Definition of QFP Ratings:

##### Stable

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

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

##### Attention

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

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

##### Alert

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

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

#### Definition of Next Month Indicators:

The next month indicators signify expected changes in the QFP ratings.



- This Quality Focal Point (or group of QFPs) is expected to have the same rating in next month's Periodic QA Evaluation.



- Risk is decreasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be upgraded to **Stable** in next month's evaluation.



- Risk is decreasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be upgraded to **Attention** in next month's evaluation.



- Risk is increasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be downgraded to **Attention** in next month's evaluation.



- Risk is increasing on the Quality Focal Point. It may be downgraded to **Alert** in next month's evaluation.

## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

### Appendix B – Cross-reference to Previous QFP Reports

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

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

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



## Periodic QA Evaluation Report For June 2014

### Appendix C – CASE Associates Status Report

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

When applicable, it includes:

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

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

#### Meetings Attended

PSSRP RegJIN PM 6/3/14  
 RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting 6/2/14, 6/9/14, 6/16/14, 6/23/14, 6/30/14  
 RegJIN PAC Meeting 6/25/14  
 RegJIN Implementation Team 6/24/14

#### Documents Reviewed

RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting Minutes\_2014\_06\_09  
 20140611 Schedule 1 -- Rebaselined Project Plan (mpp of the Project Schedule)  
 RegJIN PAC Meeting Minutes 052814-Final  
 RegJIN BTS Scrub (PMO Analysis)  
 20140620 RegJIN RMS project status report - Project Manager's Status Report  
 20140606 RegJIN RMS project status report  
 201405236 RegJIN RMS project status report

#### Documents Delivered

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for May 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.19*  
 CAI RegJIN Survey Report 20140512 v1.1

#### Documents in Process

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for June 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.20*

#### Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

#### Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None.