

City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Regional Justice Information Network Project



Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For September 2014

Deliverable: RegJIN.C.23

V2.0 Final Version

10/9/2014

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 September 2014

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Executive Steering Committee Watch List	2
Project Status and Progress	2
Project QA Overview	3
Overall Project QA Health	4
Quality Focal Points Rated Alert	4
Quality Focal Points Rated Attention	4
Quality Focal Point Summary Chart	5
Quality Focal Points	6
Business Transition	6
Project Resources	7
Budget Planning and Tracking	8
Scope and Change Control	9
Testing (Non-Functional)	10
User Acceptance Process	11
Training	12
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	10/2/2014	Version for PSSRP Review.
V1.1	10/6/2014	Incorporate feedback from PSSRP POM. Version for PM Review.
V2.0	10/9/2014	Incorporate PM feedback. Final version.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For September 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. As of this report, the following item is on watch list:

NEW

- The City has had delays in hiring personnel for the Sustainment Team. The Sustainment Team will take over the RMS system shortly after the deployment. To assist with implementation tasks, to gain the necessary familiarity with the system, and to allow for training, BTS needs to hire staff in advance. The project is recommending that BTS *fast track* hiring for the manager’s position and other open positions.

Status: In order to lessen the workload on PPB/Police IT staff, PPB is decreasing other support tasks and requests for other projects. Also, PPB/Police IT is moving forward with the hiring process for the additional staff. The risk remains that they will not have a key management position filled by the time RMS goes live. In that case, PPB/Police IT will need to support RMS with existing staff that are also performing their other responsibilities. Future reports will update the impact of this risk and steps the project is taking to mitigate this risk. In future reports this topic will be dropped from the Watch List and detailed in QFP #10 Project Resources.

- Patrol officers in several of the agencies participating in Early MRE deployment have raised questions and concerns about how the new system operates. To investigate further, the project has attended some Roll Call at the precincts. They are finding a variety of causes: misunderstanding of system features, resistance to change, and areas where MRE is more difficult to work with. An issue tracking system is being implemented to insure that all complaints and questions are followed up correctly.

Status: The project has designated 24-hour support access. This support line will be available to answer user questions and handle routine issues such as password changes. In future reports this topic will be dropped from the Watch List and detailed in QFP #8 Business Transition.

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 23rd 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.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

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) template 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.

The Go-live date for the full RMS system was moved to April 2015. PSSRP has stated since September 2013 that they would make this decision in June 2014. The PPB Police Chief (Sponsor), the PSSRP Executive Steering Committee, and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) support the decision.

NEW

Both the City and CCSO (Clackamas County Sheriff's Office) are enthusiastic that CCSO joined RegJIN. System effectiveness will be enhanced. Also, the addition of a large agency may decrease the cost per agency. These advantages were balanced against the additional risk of including a new, large agency this late in the project. As a concession for joining the project late, CCSO will forego data migration to the new system. This removes the risk of starting a new data conversion and validation effort. CCSO will maintain their old system for existing cases. Furthermore, CCSO will provide space for training, forego data migration to the new system, and assist in the development of the LINX NW interface. These concessions and assistance will save some costs for the City.

The RegJIN PM is leading the Functional Acceptance testing effort with the assistance of the I-Team. Where appropriate, defects/issues are passed along to VTM for correction. Versaterra maintains a log of defects and issues. Testing is almost complete.

The Performance testing was conducted on 9/24/2014. The system passed all tests. After the tests to verify a heavy load on the system passed, the team overloaded the system. Performance under this load was also acceptable.

The Configuration for partner agencies is almost complete. Only CCSO remains to be configured and they will be configured 10/16/2014.

Other major workflows also remain on schedule. They include:

- Functional Acceptance Testing,
- Training Materials development,
- Data Conversion,
- Technical tasks performed by BTS.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

Overall Project QA Health

Overall Rating: **Stable**

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

Health Factor	Rating	Comments
Schedule	Stable	The full RMS System Go-Live date is April 2015. All major workflows are on schedule.
Budget	Stable	The RegJIN project has a budget that is adequate for the project. Recent new costs, including costs due to additional MRE's (MDC and Terminal Services licenses) fit into the existing budget. Additional costs associated with the April 2015 deployment also fit within the existing budget.
Scope	Stable	The product scope was clearly defined in the RFP. All scope changes that arose during the Configuration Workshops were resolved with the vendor.

Quality Focal Points Rated **Alert**

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

Quality Focal Points Rated **Attention**

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

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart¹

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

¹ The Quality Focal Point ratings are explained in Appendix A.

² The Next Month arrows are explained in Appendix A.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 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.

8	<h3>Business Transition</h3> <p>Business Process Re-engineering is adequately planned. This QFP assesses the preparation for managing and conducting the business transition.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert <div style="position: absolute; top: -10px; left: 20%; width: 20%; height: 10px; background-color: #00ff00;"></div> </p>
8.1	<p>Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been defined? Finding: In process. The project will not develop a separate Business Transition Plan document. The Business Transition Plan is the major component of the Training Plan.</p>
8.2	<p>Has the Business Process Re-engineering Plan been reviewed and approved? Finding: The Integration Design Document (IDD) describes customizations that the vendor will make to the systems. It also includes descriptions of how the City staff will conduct certain activities. That document is approved.</p>
8.3	<p>Has the COTS vendor’s workflow been assessed relative to changes from the City’s “as-is” processes? Finding: In Process - The project assembled a 23-member I-Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies. The team is committed to the project until the final cutover. The I-Team will work with each agency to ensure that the agency configuration supports the business process.</p>
8.4	<p>Are end users receiving appropriate support? Finding: In process - Patrol officers in several of the agencies participating in Early MRE deployment have raised questions and concerns about how the new system operates. To investigate further, the project has attended some Roll Call at the precincts. They are finding a variety of causes: misunderstanding of system features, resistance to change, and areas where MRE is more difficult to work with. An issue tracking system is being implemented to insure that all complaints and questions are followed up correctly.</p> <p>Status: The project has designated 24-hour support access. This support line will be available to answer user questions and handle routine issues such as password changes.</p>

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

10	<h3>Project Resources</h3> <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: #90EE90; border: 1px solid black;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 50%; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-left: 5px;"></div> <div style="display: inline-block; width: 25%; height: 10px; border: 1px solid black; margin-left: 5px;"></div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%; font-size: small; margin-top: 5px;"> Stable Attention Alert </div> </p>
10.1	<p>Is the level of effort planned for each project deliverable at an appropriate activity level; and, is it reasonable? Finding: Yes – PSSRP and VTM have developed a schedule.</p> <p>BTS developed drafts of their schedule. Early drafts were difficult to cross-reference to the PSSRP master schedule. The PM incorporated the BTS schedule into the PSSRP master schedule. See QFP #3.</p> <p>Task work, durations, and dependencies are defined. The project determined it has sufficient resources, with appropriate priority to complete them by the agreed-to dates.</p>
10.2	<p>Are appropriate staff resources (skill set and quantity) available and assigned to complete the project? Finding: Yes – During the Baseline Evaluation respondents indicated concerns about resources to complete the project. They cited partner agencies and their resource commitments. They also cited City resources and the potential need for significantly more resources.</p> <p>Since then the project assembled a 23-member Implementation Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies. The team is committed to the project for 18 months.</p> <p>PSSRP allocated funds for BTS work.</p> <p>The BTS schedule is detailed enough to confirm the appropriate resource level.</p> <p>The City has other important projects that may compete for BTS resources.</p>
10.3	<p>Are appropriate staff support resources (skill and quantity) available and assigned to provide on-going operations support? Finding: In Process – PSSRP identified funding for PPB support staff through to cutover to live operations. The support team will need 2 FTEs.</p> <p>The City has had delays in hiring personnel for the Sustainment Team. The Sustainment Team will take over the RMS system shortly after the deployment. To assist with implementation tasks, to gain the necessary familiarity with the system, and to allow for training, BTS needs to hire staff in advance. The project is recommending that BTS <i>fast track</i> hiring for the manager’s position and other open positions.</p> <p>Status: In order to lessen the workload on PPB/Police IT staff, PPB is decreasing other support tasks and requests for other projects. Also, PPB/Police IT is moving forward with the hiring process for the additional staff. The risk remains that they will not have a key management position filled by the time RMS goes live. In that case, PPB/Police IT will need to support RMS with existing staff that are also performing their other responsibilities.</p>

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

12	<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 </p>
12.1	<p>Is the RegJIN Project Budget thoroughly planned and Budget to Actuals reported in a timely manner? Finding: Yes – The PM is tracking all project costs and reporting them in the twice-monthly “RegJIN RMS Status Reports.”</p>
12.2	<p>Are the appropriate funds budgeted in order to conduct required activities and complete and support the project? Finding: Yes – Funds are budgeted for the project.</p> <p>In the prior QA Report, “RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – July 2014,” CAI reported: The number of MRE licenses required/requested by the partner agencies exceeds the number of MRE licenses included in the Versaterm contract. This is a budget increase risk, although the projected increase should still be within the allocated project budget. To address this, the Sponsor asked agencies to reassess their MRE license requests.”</p> <p>Also, the City and Versaterm agreed to minimize the number of required licenses by using a terminal services environment. With this technical solution, agencies that requested MRE licenses for their in-office desktops will be able to use the MRE application via a server. The server will be located within RegJIN server clusters. The maximum number of concurrent users will be set at 265.</p> <p>The City will purchase 475 additional MRE licenses for new MDCs. This number includes 175 for CCSO. The additional cost is within budget.</p> <p>The additional costs for the new deployment date of April 2015 are also within the project budget.</p>
12.3	<p>Does the Project Manager maintain a tracking report of expenditure? Finding: Yes – The PM has access to all project expenditures. He reports the expenditures compared to the budget in each status report.</p>

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

13	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Scope and Change Control</h3> <p>The project scope is appropriately controlled. Scope and Change Control assesses the implementation and adherence to change requests.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert </p>
13.1	<p>Scope is being adhered to? Note: Changes in scope usually impact budget. Finding: Yes. Defining the project’s scope was an important part of the contract negotiations with Versaterm. Scoping sessions were conducted with Versaterm to verify and validate the project’s scope during the week of January 14, 2013. Decisions and action items (tasks) resulting from the scoping sessions have been documented.</p> <p>The project had recent discussions with the Clackamas County SO (CCSO) regarding their possible inclusion in RegJIN. The addition of a large agency would enhance system effectiveness as well as reduce sustainment costs for all participants. The Project Sponsor will balance those advantages against the added risk of trying to include a large agency this late in the project. An option is to bring on CCSO soon after the project cutover.</p> <p>Status: CCSO (Clackamas County Sherriff’s Office) joined RegJIN. Both the City and CCSO are enthusiastic about CCSO joining RegJIN. System effectiveness will be enhanced. Also, the addition of a large agency may decrease the cost per agency. These advantages were balanced against the additional risk of including a new, large agency this late in the project. As a concession for joining the project late, CCSO will forego data migration to the new system. This removes the risk of starting a new data conversion and validation effort. CCSO will maintain their old system for existing cases. Furthermore, CCSO will provide space for training, forego data migration to the new system, and assist in the development of the LINX NW interface. These concessions and assistance will save the City significant costs.</p>
13.2	<p>Are change requests appropriately identified, escalated, and resolved in a timely manner? Finding: Yes – There have been three “no cost, no timeline” change orders, and one contract amendment.</p> <p>The City and Versaterm agreed to contract amendments to cover additional costs for the new deployment date as well as the new MRE’s.</p> <p>The decision to include CCSO was the result of careful consideration by the RegJIN PM, the Sponsor, and CCSO. They balanced the additional risk against the benefits and decided to proceed.</p>
13.3	<p>Are change requests effectively recognized, analyzed for impact, and approved prior to inclusion in the project scope? Finding: Yes.</p> <p>The PM and VTM prepare Change Orders and contract amendments when appropriate.</p>

NEW

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

20	<p>Testing (Non-Functional)</p> <p>The project is appropriately tested. Appropriate, capacity and performance acceptance testing processes and plans are in place and meet the operational needs of the system and verify and validate acceptable compliance to requirements.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert <div style="position: absolute; left: 20%; width: 15%; height: 10px; background-color: green; border: 1px solid black;"></div> </p>
20.1	Has a formal Test Management Plan been developed? Finding: Yes - The SOW lists responsibilities for the City and VTM. The RegJIN PM developed a Test Management Plan. The Performance Testing was moved to September.
20.2	Is the Plan being followed? Finding: Yes. The Performance testing was conducted on 9/24/2014. The system passed all tests. After the tests to verify a heavy load on the system passed, the team overloaded the system. Performance under this load was also acceptable.
20.3	Are the non-functional acceptance test processes appropriate and are results monitored and tracked? Finding: Yes.
20.4	Is comprehensive end-to-end functional, capacity and performance acceptance testing planned and performed for all software, hardware, and telecommunication components? Finding: Yes – It was conducted 9/24/14.
20.5	Are infrastructure conditions (down to the computing hardware level) that may affect the application being considered, tested and resolved? Finding: Yes – The tests were conducted on the <i>production</i> environment using a database of converted data.
20.6	Was a defect log maintained and effective corrective actions taken? Finding: Yes.

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

21	<h3 style="margin: 0;">User Acceptance Process</h3> <p style="margin: 0;">The User Acceptance Process defines the test plans, test procedures, and test results required to ensure the delivered system meets requirements.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Risk Level Stable Attention Alert </p>
21.1	<p>Has a User Acceptance Test Plan been prepared? Finding: Yes – The contract contains a “Schedule B-3 Acceptance Test Plan.” It is a description of the various types of testing and the Roles/Responsibilities for the City and Versaterm. This Acceptance Test Plan is final and reviewed by Versaterm. The PM developed the Test Management Plan.</p>
21.2	<p>Are the acceptance test scripts complete? Finding: Yes – They are complete and have been reviewed by Versaterm.</p>
21.3	<p>Are testing standards understood and followed? Finding: Yes – The RegJIN PM is leading the testing effort with the assistance of the I-Team.</p>
21.4	<p>Is a defect log maintained and are corrective actions effective? Finding: Yes –Where appropriate, defects/issues are passed along to VTM for correction. Versaterm maintains a log of defects and issues.</p>
21.5	<p>Are user acceptance criteria met? Finding: In progress – Testing is continuing and is almost complete. The project team and Versaterm are addressing issues as they arise.</p>

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For September 2014

22	<h3>Training</h3> <p>The project staff and system users are appropriately trained in a timely manner. Assessment of training plans and materials.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert </p>
22.1	<p>Has a formal Training Plan been developed? Finding: Yes - The high-level approach to training is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Super User” training session delivered by Versaterm. These Super Users become the in-house experts for the new system. • “Train the Trainers” sessions. The Super Users train the trainers at each of the agencies. Versaterm to be onsite to critique and support the Super Users during the first “Train the Trainer” sessions. • The End User training to span 12 weeks. Note that at this point, many LEO’s will already be using the Mobile Report Entry (MRE) in the field. <p>The Contract T&C describe the Training Plan in detail.</p> <p>The need for effective training was one of the main factors to move the RMS cut-over date to April 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.</p> <p>The PM developed the formal training plan for the full RMS rollout.</p>
22.2	<p>Are the Plans being followed? Finding: Yes. The I-Team received system training during all four Configuration Workshops.</p> <p>The Early MRE Train-The-Trainer sessions proceeded as planned. Based on experience during the training, the team modified training materials. All training labs are in operation.</p> <p>For the RMS training, the I-Team is developing their training materials in close cooperation VTM. The final versions of materials are due to be delivered to VTM by 10/3/14.</p> <p>On 9/30/14, RegJIN held a meeting with the participating agencies to present the training plans. The RegJIN presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The various training levels, including Super Trainers, Trainers, and trainees. • Versaterms’s role in training. • The training locations and the agencies assigned to each. • A high-level schedule for the training. <p>From there the agencies will assign “Super Trainers” and the remaining trainers.</p> <p>RegJIN will coordinate the training assignments.</p> <p>They are on schedule and will be ready for the Super User training in November.</p>

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For September 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 September 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	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – August 2014	RegJIN.C.22
2. Requirements Management	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
3. Project Schedule	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – July 2014	RegJIN.C.21
4. Communications	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – June 2014	RegJIN.C.20
5. Risk and Issue Management	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
6. IT Acquisition	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
7. Technical Transition	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – January 2014	RegJIN.C.15
8. Business Transition	This report.	
9. Project Organization and Leadership	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – June 2014	RegJIN.C.20
10. Project Resources	This report.	
11. Project/Quality Management and Reporting	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – November 2013	RegJIN.C.13
12. Budget Planning and Tracking	This report.	
13. Scope and Change Control	This report.	
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 – July 2014	RegJIN.C.21
18. Data Conversion/Migration	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – August 2014	RegJIN.C.22
19. Configuration/Construction	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – May 2014	RegJIN.C.19
20. Testing (Non-Functional)	This report.	
21. User Acceptance Testing	This report.	
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 September 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 9/2/14, 9/16/14, 9/30/14
 RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting 9/8/14, 9/15/14, 9/29/14
 Project Sponsor 9/2/14
 RegJIN Implementation Team 9/2/14, 9/4/14, 9/9/14, 9/16/14, 9/23/14, 9/30/14

Documents Reviewed

RegJIN PAC Meeting Minutes 091714-Final
 20140917 PAC Agenda and Presentation V1
 Performance Test Results
 RegJIN Master Project Schedule - BTS v2.4
 20140912 RegJIN RMS project status report- Project Manager's Status Report
 20140829 RegJIN RMS project status report
 RegJIN PUNCH LIST – 09.24.2014

Documents Delivered

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for August 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.22*

Documents in Process

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for September 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.23*

Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None.