

City of Portland

Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program

Regional Justice Information Network Project



Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For January 2015

Deliverable: RegJIN.C.27

V2.0 Final Version

2/11/2015

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 January 2015

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 Alert	4
Quality Focal Points Rated Attention	4
Quality Focal Point Summary Chart	5
Quality Focal Points	6
Project Resources	6
User Acceptance Process	7
Training	8
Implementation Process	10
Appendix A – QFP Chart Definitions	A
Appendix B – QFP Cross-reference to Previous Reports	B
Appendix C – CASE Associates Status Report	C

Version	Date	Comments
V1.0	2/5/2015	Version for PSSRP Review.
V1.1	2/7/2015	Incorporate PSSRP POM feedback. Version for PSSRP PM Review.
V2.0	2/11/2015	Incorporate PM feedback. Final version.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For January 2015

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 General Offense (GO) format changes are taking longer than planned and may not be ready for go-live. When the Sponsor directed this change, he stated that it would not be a go-live prerequisite.
- Some agencies in Washington requested changes to the IGA. Some requested changes relate to Washington-specific requirements to which RegJIN may not want to include in the IGA. Discussions are continuing in February.

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 27th 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.

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: They are Hillsboro and their contract city North Plains. Both are waiting for the final Participant IGA before signing the Master IGA.

The final P-IGA version went out to partner agencies 12/10/2014. As of this writing, 11P-IGAs are signed. Approximately 24 are in process. The current goal is to have them all signed by 3/1/2015. In order to use the system, each agency must sign both the M-IGA and P-IGA. There will be no exceptions.

Both the City and CCSO (Clackamas County Sheriff’s Office) are enthusiastic that CCSO joined RegJIN. The ability to share law enforcement data across all five counties and agencies will enhance system effectiveness. Also, the addition of a large agency may decrease the cost per agency.

BTS selected a method to implement terminal services, VMWare. Current indications are that this solution is simple and effective. Therefore it will not entail new BTS resources to implement or support. Also, the need to have MRE on desktops for sergeant approval has been removed. RegJIN now only needs the server for MREs on report writing area desktops. This reduces the quantity needed to between 100 and 150 at most. The decision on how to implement the Terminal Services does not risk the Go-Live date. If necessary, RegJIN will resort to alternative methods to accomplish what would be accomplished by Terminal Server. The cost for the infrastructure will fit within the project budget.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For January 2015

The Police Chief (Sponsor) directed that RegJIN simplify and shorten the General Offense (GO) format. Online Business Systems (OBS) completed a pilot study to confirm the effort required for the new GO format.

- The GO stylesheet enhancements are *not* a requirement for the April 2015 go-live. Though RegJIN and OBS expect to complete the work in time. If this work is delayed, the project will go live with the current GO stylesheet.
- The costs for the additional OBS work fit within the project budget.

NEW

The project team developed a “Punch List” to help navigate the final months up to the April 2015 rollout. BTS also created a corresponding task list that will be incorporated into the main project Punch List. The project teams are using the Punch List as the central topic for status discussions.

“Super Trainer” sessions started as planned on 11/3/14 and continued through November. In December the CAI QA consultant attended three days of Train-The-Trainer sessions at three different locations. The sessions went extremely well.

- The instructors were very well prepared and polished for the classes.
- The students were very attentive.
- Class sessions went smoothly.
- The training process is “self-improving.”

NEW

BTS is proceeding with the hiring process for the sustainment team. They interviewed three candidates from the 20 respondents. The hiring process has not been *fast tracked* enough to ensure that they will have the key management position filled by the time RMS goes live. If they do not, PPB/Police IT will need to support RMS with existing staff that are also performing their other responsibilities.

NEW

The team will conduct the End-to-End test in March 2015. The test will include newly-finished functions such as interfaces, and the Cognos datamart and report writing tools.

NEW

RegJIN will set up a new training facility specifically for Agency System Administrators. The project team knew of the need for this training and planned to deliver it after go-live. But the agencies have asserted their need for training before go-live. In response, the new facility will be in the Portland Justice Building. They will deliver the training in March 2015.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For January 2015

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 fit into the existing budget. They include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional MRE's (MDC and Terminal Services licenses), • The new GO stylesheet, • Costs associated with the April 2015 deployment.
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. Recent scope increases include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A terminal services environment for additional MRE's, • The addition of Clackamas County Sheriff's Office, • A new, shorter GO stylesheet.

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 this time.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For January 2015

Quality Focal Point Summary Chart¹

Quality Focal Point	Impact	Prior as of 12/4/14	Prior as of 1/8/15	Current as of 2/5/15	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	

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 January 2015

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.

10	<p>Project Resources</p> <p>The project is appropriately resourced. Assessment of the capacity and skill set of the assigned project staff, supporting tools and facilities.</p> <p>Risk Level <div style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green; margin-right: 5px;"></div> Stable Attention Alert </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>The Implementation Team; 40% City/PPB staff and 60% partner agencies is committed to the project for 18 months.</p> <p>BTS selected a method to implement terminal services, VMWare. They are piloting the solution. Current indications are that this solution is simple, inexpensive, and will entail no additional resources to implement or support.</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 recruitment efforts for the Sustainment Team have not yet resulted in a hire. The Sustainment Team will assume responsibility for the RMS system within a few months after 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>PPB/Police IT interviewed three candidates from the 20 respondents. BTS is proceeding with the hiring process. The hiring process has not been <i>fast tracked</i> enough to ensure that they will have the key management position filled by the time RMS goes live. If they do not, 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 January 2015

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 <div style="position: absolute; left: 20px; top: 0; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green;"></div> </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 were passed along to VTM for correction. Versaterm maintained a log of defects and issues.</p>
21.5 NEW	<p>Are user acceptance criteria met? Finding: In progress – Testing is complete. The project team and Versaterm are addressing some remaining issues, though none are show stoppers.</p> <p>Some functionality is not yet ready for testing. Some system interfaces have not yet been completed. The Cognos report writing and datamart functions have been installed the past month. The project team will test these functions in a comprehensive “End to End” test. The team will conduct the End-to-End test in March 2015.</p>

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For January 2015

22	<p>Training</p> <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 <div style="position: absolute; top: 5px; left: 20px; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #00ff00;"></div> </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.</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.</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. • Versaterm’s role in training. • The training locations and the agencies assigned to each. • A high-level schedule for the training. <p>Agencies assigned “Super Trainers” and the remaining trainers. RegJIN will coordinate the training assignments.</p> <p>“Super Trainer” sessions started as planned on 11/3/14. Additional sessions were held through the month. As with any training being delivered for the first time, the initial sessions uncovered some issues with the materials. The trainers, trainees, and the Implementation Team addressed most issues. Later training sessions continued to improve.</p> <p>The PPB Chief sent out a special order to all sworn members to sign up for and attend the RegJIN end user training.</p>

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For January 2015

22	<h2 style="margin: 0;">Training</h2> <p style="margin: 0;">The project staff and system users are appropriately trained in a timely manner. Assessment of training plans and materials.</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Risk Level Stable Attention Alert</p>
----	---

Special notes on Train-The-Trainer sessions attended in December 2014

In December the CAI QA consultant attended three days of Train-The-Trainer sessions at three different locations. The sessions went extremely well.

- The instructors were very well prepared and polished for the classes. In groups of three, they took turns instructing, manning the PC projector, and handling questions on the floor. All instructors were comfortable at all roles and the transitions went smoothly.
- The students were very attentive. The December classes were comprised of future trainers, so one may expect that they will be attentive. They were exceptionally so.
- Class sessions went smoothly. The materials were handed out in small sections. This kept students from losing attention and proceeding on their own. This strategy was very effective.
- The training process is “self-improving.” As can be expected of materials being used for the second or third time, there were improvements to be made. The project has a process whereby suggestions and corrections are directed back to the I-Team. Then the I-Team improves the documents. This process is used effectively.

NEW

Additional Training for Administrators

RegJIN will set up a new training facility specifically for Agency System Administrators. The project team knew of the need for this training and planned to deliver it after go-live. But the agencies have asserted their need for training before go-live.

In response, the new facility will be in the Portland Justice Building. They will deliver the training in March 2015.

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For January 2015

23	<h3>Implementation Process</h3> <p>The new system has been successfully moved into the production environment.</p> <p>Risk Level Stable Attention Alert </p>
23.1	<p>The installation specification is complete and reasonable. Finding: In Process.</p> <p>The BTS PM called out the need for a detailed Implementation Plan. BTS will host a meeting to start the plan on 11/17/14. BTS, PPB/Police IT, and RegJIN staff are invited.</p> <p>On 11/17/14 BTS held a meeting to review the need for, and potential contents of a BTS-specific Implementation Plan. Due to the weather, the meeting was lightly attended. Based on input from those in attendance, BTS may not need a plan separate from that being developed by the project team.</p> <p>The project team developed a “Punch List” to help navigate the final months up to the 4/14/15 rollout. BTS also created a corresponding task list that will be incorporated into the main project Punch List. Discussions continued through January.</p>
23.2	<p>The training plans and the new support processes are complete and acceptable. Finding: In process - The support staff has been involved in the implementation. There is no separate training effort for system support staff.</p> <p>The support process is being refined. PPB/Police IT is looking into possible contract resources to take initial calls from the field. Details are not yet available, such as how much support users can expect from a contract call center, or how they will direct calls to the necessary support staff.</p>
23.3	<p>System documentation is complete and acceptable. Finding: Yes.</p>
23.4	<p>The implementation acceptance criteria have been met. Finding: TBD</p>

NEW

Periodic QA Evaluation Report

For January 2015






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 January 2015

Appendix B – QFP Cross-reference to Previous 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	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – September 2014	RegJIN.C.23
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	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – October 2014	RegJIN.C.24
13. Scope and Change Control	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – October 2014	RegJIN.C.24
14. IT Architecture	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation –December 2014	RegJIN.C.26
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)	RegJIN Periodic QA Evaluation – September 2014	RegJIN.C.23
21. User Acceptance Testing	This report.	
22. Training	This report.	
23. Implementation Process	This report.	

Periodic QA Evaluation Report For January 2015

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 1/6/15

RegJIN Sponsor 1/7/15

RegJIN BTS Project Team Meeting 1/5/15, 2/2/15

RegJIN Implementation Team 1/6/15, 1/8/15, 1/13/15, 1/15/15, 1/20/15, 1/22/15, 1/27/15, 1/29/15

PAC Meeting 1/28/15

PSSRP ESC 1/21/15

Documents Reviewed

20150128 PAC Agenda and Presentation

RegJIN PAC Meeting Minutes 01-28-2015

20150116 RegJIN RMS project status report- Project Manager's Status Report

20150102 RegJIN RMS project status report

20150203 RegJIN Cutover Punch List – Detailed tasks to complete before go-live

20141230 RegJIN Cutover Punch List

Documents Delivered

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for December 2014, deliverable *RegJIN.C.26*

Documents in Process

RegJIN CAI Periodic QA Evaluation Report for January 2015, deliverable *RegJIN.C.27*

Delayed Items

Item	Description of problem	Schedule Impact	Recommended Solution
None			

Other Issues/Problems/Concerns

None.