PUBLIC SAFETY SYSTEMS REVITALIZATION PROJECT (PSSRP)



City of Portland PSSRP Initiative Monthly Quality Assurance Report For the Period: 9.16.09 - 10.27.09

Author: Cit Com, Inc

Creation Date: October 27, 2009

Last Revised: October 30, 2009

Version: Final (v1.1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	REPORT PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY	2
2.0	PSSRP PROJECT ASSESSMENT	4
3.0	OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
4.0	PRIOR RECOMMENDATIONS	24

1.0 Report Purpose and Methodology

1.0.1 Period Covered

This monthly report is intended to communicate the results of the independent quality assurance (QA) review of the PSSRP initiative to the City of Portland's Executive Steering Committee (ESC) for the period between September 16, 2009 and October 27, 2009.

1.0.2 Document Version Control

This table provides a history of the document's review:

Version	Date	Reviewed By	Role	Sections Reviewed
v 1.0	10/27/09	Cit Com, Inc	Report Author	All
v 1.0	10/28/09	SEARCH	Consultant/Advisor	All
v 1.0	10/30/09	Lisa Vasquez	PSSRP POM	All

1.0.3 Personnel Interviewed During the Period

The consultants formally interviewed the following people associated with the PSSRP initiative prior to developing the final report (additional oral discussions and email correspondence were exchanged as well). Additionally, the POM is typically interviewed on a weekly basis regarding subjects reviewed with project participants.

Person Interviewed	Date		
Larry O'Dea	9-30-09		
Mark Greinke	10-5-09		
Lisa Turley	10-19-09		
Karl Larson	10-21-09		
Mark Ellwood	10-21-09		
Jerry Schlesinger	10-22-09		
John Klum	10-22-09		
Larry O'Dea (2)	10-23-09		
Mark Greinke (2)	10-23-09		
Lisa Vasquez	10-26-09		
Robin Hamblet	10-27-09		
Mark Tanner	10-30-09		

1.0.4 Project Materials Reviewed During the Period

The consultants reviewed the following project-related documents during the period:

Status Reports

- CAD Next: 9/22/09, 9/29/09, 10/6/09, 10/13/09, 10/20/09, 10/27/09
- RegJIN: 9/22/09, 9/29/09, 10/6/09, 10/13/09, 10/20/09, 10/27/09
- Radio: 9/22/09, 9/29/09, 10/6/09, 10/13/09, 10/20/09, 10/27/09

Other Related Documents

- Reviewed the Olympic Performance Final Report (second review)
- Finalized Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Charter
- PSSRP ESC September 2009 POM Presentation
- PSSRP ESC September 22 Final Meeting Notes
- TAC Minutes (9/28, 10/09, 10/16)
- TAC Agenda (10/23)
- PSSRP 2009-2010 Budget
- CAD Next Charter (vFinal 1.0b, 10/12)
- Draft PSSRP Charter (latest edition, 9/19)

2.0.1 Executive Summary - Month 12¹

2.0.1.1 **Global PSSRP Initiative Summary** JUN-09 JUL-09 AUG-09 SEP-09 0CT-09 2.0.1.2 **CAD Next Summary** JUN-09 JUL-09 AUG-09 SEP-09 0CT-09 G G **RegJIN RMS Summary** 2.0.1.3 JUN-09 JUL-09 AUG-09 SEP-09 0CT-09 800 MHz Radio Summary 2.0.1.4 JUN-09 JUL-09 AUG-09 SEP-09 0CT-09

¹ Fire RMS will be added as the fourth core PSSRP project under continuous evaluation on 1/1/10

2.0.2 Summary Assessment

The following tables provide the City with an assessment of "what has changed" during the current period.

TABLE LEGEND:



Green - On target, good performance against plan.



Yellow - Caution, ability to meet project objectives may be threatened, may need intervention.



Red - Serious issues and/or go-live in jeopardy, intervention and/or corrective action needed.



Up - Positive changes outweigh negative.



Equal - No change, or positive changes offset by negative.



Down - Negative changes outweigh positive.

PSSRP Evaluation Metrics	Prior Rating	Change Direction	Current Rating	Comments
Global PSSRP Initiative Summary Reflects status of overall initiative (CAD, PD+FD RMS, Radio)	Y		Y	 Although the ESC has, overwhelmingly, been decisive with regard to QA recommendations, there are nevertheless ten unaddressed recommendations that require ESC intervention. Whenever recommendations go unaddressed, risk emerges. Over the past year, the ESC has struggled to define its span of control and depth of authority. The longer these matters remain unsettled, the greater the risk to the health of the PSSRP portfolio. Establishing project controls is a mandatory facet of successful project management and the issue can no longer be forestalled. During the period, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) became fully operational. Weekly meetings and tight coordination between BTS, BOEC and Versaterm produced several positive results (including the adoption of a network design amongst the key stakeholders). (See Section 3.0.1 for detailed Global PSSRP Observations)
CAD Next Project Summary	G		G	 After three months of installation activities, the CAD Next project is on time, within budget, and meeting or exceeding the business and technical user's expectations. During the period, Versaterm spent the week of October 26 onsite, working with the City to define software configuration alternatives. The session was well-coordinated and achieved the stated goals and objectives. The CAD Next Charter has been modernized, although a key attribute (Project Manager role definition) requires further clarification. (See Section 3.0.2 for detailed CAD Next Observations)
RegJIN Project Summary	Y	1	Y	 During the period, the PPB finalized their request for proposal (RFP) content and transferred the file to the Bureau of Purchases (BoP) and Legal for review. The RegJIN Project Manager is working on a final budget estimate during the coming period (both initial and recurring). (See Section 3.0.3 for detailed RegJIN RMS Observations)

PSSRP Evaluation	Prior	Change	Current	Comments
Metrics	Rating	Direction	Rating	
800 MHz Radio Project Summary	Y		Y	 ixP distributed surveys to the regional partners to solicit detailed information regarding each agency's current environment. The Project Manager has been closely monitoring the availability and planned distribution of 700MHz frequencies for public safety. During the period, the City received a cost proposal from Motorola for replacing the controllers and providing necessary encryption. This information will be used for exploring local alternatives (as part of the Stability Plan) and the extent of any local activities on the regional efforts. (See Section 3.0.4 for detailed Regional Radio Observations)

2.0.3 Detailed Project Change Assessment

Each month, the QA consultants assess forty five critical project management areas for the PSSRP core projects (CAD Next, RegJIN, and 800 MHz Regional Radio). The following tables reflect any significant topics within those areas.

[Please note that the numbering of metrics in the first column (Evaluation Metrics) references the PMI numbering sequence in the Baseline Report. Gaps in the numbering sequence are normal.]

2.0.3.1 PSSRP Global Changes (applies to all core projects)

Evaluation Metrics	Prior Rating	Change Direction	Current Rating	Comments
4. Does a complete and current project plan ² exist in writing?	(Devlopment)		(No)	■ The PSSRP Global Project Charter does not contain detailed information regarding the governance committee's span of control and/or authority. The ESC members must participate in developing these parameters immediately (the recommendation to modernize the Global PSSRP Project Charter has been in place for a year).
15. Is there a formal Change Management Plan in place?	(In Progress>1 Month)		(In Progress>1 Month)	The revised governance structure was defined by the Olympic Performance report in July. The report identified the vision for addressing PSSRP change management (seeking consensus amongst the ESC members; ultimate authority is the ESC Chair). However, the report did not address specific change management procedures such as the following: Who may bring a subject before the ESC for review? Is there a pre-agreed project impact threshold for ESC review (i.e., dollar amounts, durations of time, quality sacrifices, etc). These specific metrics must be incorporated into the Global PSSRP Charter. While the governance report provided muchneeded reform, it was not intended to substitute for a global PSSRP Project Charter (Project Plan) and should not be relied upon for such purposes.

² The City of Portland uses the term Project Charter to define a Project Plan (in PMI terminology).

2.0.3.2 CAD Next Change

No significant metrics changed during the period.

2.0.3.3 RegJIN Change

No significant metrics changed during the period.

2.0.3.4 800 MHz Regional Radio Change

No significant metrics changed during the period.

3.0.1 Global PSSRP Observations and Recommendations

- **3.0.1.1** Aging QA Recommendations: Over the past year, a number of quality assurance observations and recommendations have been provided to the ESC in the monthly QA reports. The recommendations have been addressed by one of the following three ESC actions:
 - 1. Accepted and/or implemented
 - 2. Declined and/or rejected
 - 3. Suspended, pending future decisions or information

The ESC has, overwhelmingly, been decisive with regard to QA recommendations. However, there are ten recommendations which have either been suspended (Action 3) or unaddressed³. Recommendations which lack closure introduce project risk when they fail to address an underlying issue or problem. Based on the QA Consultants review of the aging recommendations, they appear to have been suspended or unaddressed as the result of one, or more, of the following:

- 1. No specific person was made accountable for enacting the recommendation.
- 2. The recommendation was indirectly addressed.
- 3. The recommendation was partially addressed.

Recommendation: As part of the December meeting, the ESC should review the aging QA recommendations in the table, below, and take action to accept or decline them. If accepted, the ESC should assign a specific individual as being accountable for adopting the recommendation, and set a target date for completion. Alternatively, if the ESC declines the recommendation, or cannot render a judgment, the POM should document the committee's position and officially close or suspend the issue, with an explanation (for maintaining the initiative's written evolution).

³ Some recommendations may have been simply acknowledged by the ESC (without an actionable directive). In such instances, the recommendation would have been suspended.

Date	Reference	Original Recommendation	Reported Status	October 2009 Comments
Nov 08	Baseline Report 5.0.1.1	QA recommends that the PSSRP Project Charter be rewritten to reflect contemporary scope, budget, timeline, values, objectives, reporting structures, risks and more. It no longer accurately reflects the nature of the initiative.	(12/08) Concept Adopted (06/09) Recommendation Re-Activated by QA (08/09) Recommendation prioritized by QA (09/09) CAD, RegJIN, and Radio Project Charters have been developed and are under review. A Global PSSRP Project Charter should be developed immediately. (10/09) Draft Charter Developed	This is the oldest and most important aging recommendation (in the opinion of the QA Consultants). Finalizing the charter will require significant participation from the ESC, particularly with respect to defining the committee's range and span of control. The PSSRP portfolio is complex on all levels, requiring very clearly delineated project roles and responsibilities. Without these elements, it is nearly impossible to hold individual stakeholders accountable for achieving the stated project goals and objectives. No POM is capable of single-handedly instituting global PSSRP charter changes without significant interaction and contributions from the ESC members.
Jan 09	3.0.2.1 (1)	The ESC should review the merits, limitations, risks and issues associated with the Phase III timeline compression and evaluate whether the various implementation alternatives may impact the remaining PSSRP initiatives.	(09/09) An update was to be provided to the ESC during the September meeting	None.
Jul 09	3.0.1.3	The project team should evaluate all PSSRP expenses in an effort to ensure affordability of the core technologies (specifically; ensuring that the project will yield the stated goals and objectives).	(09/09) Re-scoping efforts are still underway	As part of the Global PSSRP Charter update process, the ESC should confirm the goals and objectives of each initiative in the portfolio. Once finalized, the project management teams must analyze their respective project cost forecasts to confirm whether those goals and objectives can be achieved with the available funding.

Date	Reference	Original Recommendation	Reported Status	October 2009 Comments
Aug 09	3.0.1.1	As the ESC adapts to the new governance model, many questions that pertain the ESC's authority and reach must be addressed (i.e., should change orders of a pre-defined order of magnitude warrant a mandatory ESC review and/or approval?). The earlier these types of issues are discussed and codified, the better. When "rules", or "decision making parameters" are formed late in an initiative, they carry significantly less authority and appear unfairly tailored toward a particular purpose. Most governance models include such parameters in the Project Charter, and we recommend that the current PSSRP Project Charter redraft effort include a section on ESC issue management to define what global, and project-specific, issues warrant a review and/or action by the ESC.		This recommendation is an adjunct component of finalizing the Global PSSRP Project Charter. The ESC must define its role, reach and authority.
Aug 09	3.0.3.4	As part of the RegJIN Project Charter update, PPB must also refresh the budget forecast based on the content of the final RFP.	(09/09) The RFP remains in draft status. Once finalized, the budget will be calibrated (10/09) The RFP draft is complete and with City Bureau of Purchases and Legal. Elements which impact cost should be defined at this point	This recommendation is likely underway. However, the ESC should identify a date by when it expects to receive the updated budget.
Sep 09	3.0.1.1	The QA consultants recommend a more frequent ESC meeting interval (preferably monthly). If a physical meeting is too difficult, as a second alternative; the POM could explore the use of videoconferencing during non-meeting months (this has shown to be very effective in other large-scale public safety initiatives wherein the bureau's sponsors find monthly meetings difficult to maintain).		None.

Date	Reference	Original Recommendation	Reported Status	October 2009 Comments
Sep 09	3.0.1.2	Until the budget forecasts are finalized, the ESC should take the most conservative approach toward exploring alternatives for closing potential funding gaps. One such alternative is described in Section 3.0.3.3, wherein PPB would evaluate cost recovery models for multi-agency records management systems. The QA consultants recommend that similar evaluations occur for all core projects wherein the provision of information technology is extended to non City of Portland public safety agencies.		None.
Sep 09	3.0.1.3	In addition to the previous recommendations on this subject (from August 09 / 3.0.1.1), the QA consultants also recommend that the POM construct a revised issue management process that is efficient and thorough. Decisions which may impact the POM should be assigned to a neutral, third party, for analysis with recommendations left to the ESC.		This subject is further explored in Section 3.0.1.3 of this October QA report.
Sep 09	3.0.3.3	In the absence of a confirmed budget forecast, the QA consultants recommend that PPB explore cost recovery models (as a conservative approach), should the final cost forecast be greater than available funding. The models (often in the form of joint powers authorities, or memorandum of understanding) should be gathered by PPB during the following period, and analyzed over the next three months. Cost recovery models are common in regional initiatives, and are often considered a reasonable and necessary means for funding the initial and ongoing (total cost of ownership) acquisition of law enforcement technology.		This recommendation is an extension of the September, 09 (3.0.1.2) topic (at the top of this page).

Date	Reference	Original Recommendation	Reported Status	October 2009 Comments
Sep 09	3.0.4.3	The QA Consultants recommend the participants undertake a low-cost exploration into the current feasibility of regionalization through the use of a survey instrument and accompanying summary of findings. The recommendation is intended to provide: a) A conduit for agencies to refresh their abilities to commit human and financial resources, b) A "reality check" that contrasts agency positions during inception (2007) with current positions, and c) Provide the City of Portland with information which may be relevant when considering the impact of new controllers on nearby agencies.	(10/09) This may already be occurring through the survey instruments distributed by iXP	None.

3.0.1.2 Additional QA Evaluation Metrics Recommended: The four core PSSRP initiatives (CAD, Police RMS, Fire RMS, Regional Radio) continue to mature and transition into new phases of project activity (i.e., CAD shifting from procurement to implementation). Accordingly, the quality assurance evaluation metrics should be adapted to effectively measure performance. Currently, there are 45 baseline quality assurance evaluation metrics which are used as the "standard" for monitoring PSSRP project performance.

Recommendation: The ESC should consider adding the following two quality assurance evaluation metrics to the existing 45:

Evaluation Metric	Green	Yellow	Red	Evaluation Areas	Comments
46. Technical resources assigned to PSSRP are fulfilling the project's infrastructure, application, and interfacing requirements.	(Yes)	(Partially)	(No)	 Existence of a defined set of information technology standards which are applied across the PSSRP portfolio Justification for (and recording of) deviations from the standards Existence of a project-specific technical deployment plan Degree to which dependencies on other (non-PSSRP) projects and systems taken into account Degree to which technical limitations taken into account Degree to which staff limitations taken into account (training, experience, availability) Degree to which potential 	To gauge performance, the evaluator(s) must possess sufficient technical knowledge of the infrastructure, application(s), database(s), and best practices in information technology implementation and management. The performance would be assessed by conducting an independent audit of the following: Contractual requirements Technical documentation Deployment plans

Evaluation Metric	Green	Yellow	Red	Evaluation Areas	Comments
				skill deficits considered (IT training in specific areas impacted by PSSRP) Recognition of recurring demands on IT personnel Existence of a defined technical architecture for each initiative Documentation of technical architecture Fit between technical architecture and existing systems Technical architecture compliance with relevant city standards and policies Ability of technical architecture to support the addition of the vendor's technology Ability of technical architecture to support system operation and maintenance Extent to which technical architecture meets the technical requirements in the vendor agreement(s) Extent to which technical architecture is workable and proven Existence of a network plan Existence of a network plan Existence of a network plan Existence of a lead times in above plans Extent to which project's technical documentation is contemporary and complete Extent to which design documentation reflects an achievable design, given available human and financial resources Accessibility of technical documentation to relevant staff Availability of technical documentation for software packages used Frequency and regularity of technical documentation for software packages used Frequency and regularity of technical documentation reviews	 Project plans Network topology Interface control documentation Citywide technology standards Technical staff work breakdown structures Technical staff training and background (exclusively focused on any particular skill set or experience related to the person's role in PSSRP) Fit and gap documentation TAC Charter TAC agenda and minutes Internal support plan(s) Hardware/software acquisition plan(s) And by interviewing the following: Business Bureau Sponsor(s) The POM The CTO Vendor Representatives System Integrators Consultants Others at the direction of the ESC

Evaluation Metric	Green	Yellow	Red	Evaluation Areas	Comments
47. Contractor is meeting performance expectations.	(Yes)	(Partially)	(No)	The contractor's costs are within the predicted budget range for the current period The contractor is fulfilling the tasks within the City's agreed-upon timeframe Change orders are approved only after their impact to scope, schedule and budget have been evaluated and understood The contractor's agreement with the City is enforced A positive working relationship exists between the contractor and City employees	The performance would be assessed by conducting an independent audit of the following: Vendor contracts, focused on the Statement of Work, Timeline for Completion, Payment Schedule and Task Completion Criteria Change orders Task completion letters And by interviewing the following: Business Bureau Sponsor(s) The POM Project Manager Vendor Representatives System Integrators Consultants Others at the discretion of the ESC and POM

As part of the decision making process related to this recommendation, the ESC should consider what entity should be responsible for conducting these additional quality assurance tasks, and at what interval (monthly, quarterly, annually). The QA consultants cannot make a pecuniary recommendation (one that would result in a financial benefit to the consultant). Therefore, should the ESC determine that these additional evaluation points are appropriate, it should: a) Direct the POM to identify the most cost-effective manner for enacting the recommendations, b) Set a deadline for completion and, c) Identify a budget.

3.0.1.3 ESC Span of Control Requires Definition: Four months after adopting the recommendations cited in the Olympic Performance governance report, several PSSRP ESC members remain concerned that the governing body lacks a clearly-defined span of control and authority. According to the Olympic Performance report, the ESC is responsible for the following⁴:

- 1. Design approvals
- 2. Go-live approvals
- 3. Scope changes
- 4. Conflict or significant interaction between projects

⁴ Page 2: PSSRP Governance (last bullet on page)

- 5. Budget recommendations to Council
- 6. Resource needs
- 7. Policy issues

To fulfill their responsibilities, the voting and advisory ESC members are to be provided with a business-case presentation at least one week prior to their quarterly meetings. The packet (which is described in the report as being similar to a City Council decision packet) is intended to outline the issue, provide background and comparative research, and offer a staff recommendation. These packets are to be completed by the POM.

In August, some ESC members told the QA consultants that they wanted to review the parameters which governed the way issues could be brought forth to their committee. The members wanted to be certain that they were spending their time appropriately; by focusing on matters which warranted their input or vote (one member equated it to the manner in which the Supreme Court evaluates cases to be heard during a given court calendar). Those conversations led to members questioning the degree of power and authority ordained upon the ESC. In response, the QA consultants made the following recommendation in the August report⁵:

"As the ESC adapts to the new governance model, many questions that pertain to the ESC's authority and reach must be addressed (i.e., should change orders of a pre-defined order of magnitude warrant a mandatory ESC review and/or approval?). The earlier these types of issues are discussed and codified, the better. When "rules", or "decision making parameters" are formed late in an initiative, they carry significantly less authority and appear unfairly tailored toward a particular purpose. Most governance models include such parameters in the Project Charter, and we recommend that the current PSSRP Project Charter redraft effort include a section on ESC issue management to define what global, and project-specific, issues warrant a review and/or action by the ESC."

The August recommendation has not been adopted, and cannot be realized until the ESC works together toward delineating the committee's span of control and authority. The vague nature of the ESC's authority is reflected in the following questions (which were raised by various ESC members during the period):

What is the minimum financial value of a change order that

⁵ August 2009 PSSRP QA Report vFinal, Section 3.0.1.1

triggers the need for ESC oversight?

This is an excellent question for the ESC to define. The Olympic Performance report notes that the ESC is accountable for scope changes, resource needs and budget recommendations but does not specify a dollar amount that requires ESC review or approval. In most large scale public safety technology initiatives, the project's governance does hold the authority to approve and deny change orders (usually up to a value equivalent to the parent organization's sole source doctrine).

 Does the ESC hold the authority to institute cost recovery mechanisms for PSSRP-related technologies?

Some ESC members believe that the ESC acts as a governance body with control over all areas impacted by PSSRP, including cost recovery mechanisms.

 Does the ESC possess the authority to control individual Bureaulevel project changes?

Some ESC members believe that the ESC should be able to render decisions that speak to the global PSSRP interests more than individual project interests. The Olympic Performance report reinforces this concept, noting that the ESC is accountable for design approval, scope changes, conflict or significant interaction between projects, resource needs and budget recommendations.

 What is the process for placing a topic on the next ESC meeting agenda?

This question does not have a specific answer in the current project documentation. The Olympic Performance report states: "If a decision is needed (related to the ESC's responsibilities), the Project Office Manager works with the Chair to schedule an appropriate meeting". As part of the revised Global PSSRP Project Charter, a process for placing issues on the ESC agenda should be codified.

Recommendation: The QA Consultants strongly urge the ESC to meet, as soon as practical, for a facilitated review of the committee's reach, authority, and power. The meeting should address the following subjects: a) Determining whether the seven responsibilities (Design approvals, Go-live approvals, Scope changes, Conflict or significant interaction between projects, Budget recommendations to Council, Resource needs, and Policy issues) defined in the Olympic Performance report are valid and represent the breadth of topics subject to ESC controls, b) Identifying additional responsibilities, and c) Documenting specific thresholds within each defined category that warrant ESC review, approval or other formal action (by vote).

Additionally, the Olympic Performance report recommended that an agenda and accompanying decision package be distributed to the ESC members one week prior to the quarterly meetings. The Olympic Performance report suggested that these decision packages would be prepared by the POM. However, during the September ESC Meeting, no such packages were created or delivered prior to the meeting date. The level of effort necessary to prepare such a decision package will vary, based on the complexity of the issue. Similarly, the POM's availability to prepare agenda packages will also vary (based on the constantly shifting workload). The QA Consultants recommend that the POM identify alternative human resources to prepare the quarterly ESC agenda and decision packages. Indeed, several ESC members felt that one week was insufficient time to adequately prepare for debating and rendering important decisions, requesting a month of lead-time instead. Recognizing that the people who comprise the ESC have diverse backgrounds (and exposure to public safety technology), the QA Consultants recommend that the agenda packages be created and distributed one month prior to the scheduled meeting (for non-exigent matters, which will have to be brought forth by the POM, as an exception). The conservative lead time will ensure that all ESC members have adequate time to prepare for the meetings.

3.0.1.4 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Operational: During the period, the PSSRP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) became fully operational. The TAC is co-sponsored by Mark Greinke and Lisa Turley. Weekly meetings, facilitated by the Interim Technical Lead (Robin Hamblet) in concert with the POM, have proven valuable in achieving early CAD Next technical tasks.

Although the TAC is not a CAD-specific committee, the coalition of experts on the core team worked principally on CAD and BOEC-related subjects during the period. One notable exception is the substantial degree of work undertaken during the period with PPB regarding the future RMS infrastructure. The TAC's network group worked with the RegJIN Project Manager on defining fundamental network topology elements. Mr. Hamblet has directed TAC resources to work closely with the RegJIN Project Manager (Jerry Schlesinger) on planning for interstate connectivity with ACCESS (Washington State's law enforcement telecommunications system).

The TAC's purpose is to ensure that all the required technology infrastructure and middleware required for PSSRP is implemented on schedule, within budget and meets or exceeds all performance, scalability and reliability requirements. The TAC serves as the technical coordination and planning entity, bringing

together a weekly group of technical experts (in Infrastructure, Network, Hardware, Software, Database and Security) with BTS Project Managers (including PSSRP project staff), BOEC stakeholders (Bureau Business Owners, and operational experts), and Versaterm (the CAD vendor). The frequent meetings provide a high degree of coordination between BOEC, BTS, and Versaterm.

During the period, the TAC completed a number of CAD Next technical elements. Of most significant importance, the TAC created a network design for accommodating the Versadex CAD in the BOEC environment. Other key accomplishments for the period included the identification and acquisition of requisite hardware (much of which is tracking ahead of schedule), and the training of select BTS personnel in managing failover instances. While this QA report was being published, the TAC was coordinating the configuration of the Versadex servers (part of the second Versaterm implementation session).

3.0.2 CAD Next Observations and Recommendations

3.0.2.1 Phase III Meeting Cost, Time, Quality Metrics: Although easily overlooked amidst the granular and technical aspects of the initiative, it is important to note that the CAD Next Phase III key performance metrics (time, cost, quality) are all within predicted ranges. In other words, after three months of installation activities, the CAD Next project is on time, within budget, and meeting or exceeding the business and technical user's expectations.

Implementation Session #2 Successfully Completed: The second (of three) major onsite CAD configuration sessions occurred during the week of October 26. During this period, Versaterm illustrated the configuration options available in the Versadex CAD system by providing onsite product demonstrations and instruction. At this point in the implementation process, the BOEC employees are working closely with ieSolutions to configure the CAD so that it reflects the unique Portland environment (as opposed to being a generic or blank CAD system). Based on interviews with project management and business owners, the session was well-coordinated and achieved the stated goals and objectives.

Additionally, Versaterm provided instruction related to creating address records and other important geographic information systems (GIS) attributes. Preparing an accurate and usable GIS base map is a crucial element to any successful CAD project, yet many similar initiatives (nationwide) are plagued by a lack of training and inadequate human resources (necessary to tailor the

agency's base map to the vendor's unique software requirements). The CAD project management team is aware of the complexity and issues associated with creating and maintaining the Versadex GIS resources.

3.0.2.2 CAD Next Project Charter Updated: In September, the QA
Consultants reported that each CAD Project Manager would have
a more clearly defined role in the next release of the CAD Project
Charter. The Charter has been updated with the following roles:

PSSRP Project The PSSRP project manager is Manager responsible for the daily activity to (City Employee) achieve schedule adherence, budget tracking and overall project team coordination. **BOEC Project** The BOEC project manager is Manager responsible for maintenance of the (Integrator) project schedule and the deliverables from BOEC Operations regarding system configuration settings, code tables, etc.

Recommendation: The two Project Manager descriptions read similarly on paper, yet in practice; are substantially different. Fundamentally, it appears that the PSSRP Project Manager holds traditional project management accountability for the project's cost, scope, time and quality performance while the BOEC Project Manager is accountable for coordinating and providing the PSSRP Project Manager (and Versaterm) with key operational deliverables. The roles and responsibilities should be further defined within the charter.

3.0.3 RegJIN⁶ Observations and Recommendations

3.0.3.1 RegJIN RFP Content Finalized: During the period, the PPB finalized their request for proposal (RFP) content and transferred the file to the Bureau of Purchases (BoP) and Legal for review in advance of releasing the procurement document to the vendor community. Internally, the RegJIN project plan shows a one month review period (for BoP and Legal).

Recommendation: The one month review estimate (for BoP and Legal) is likely insufficient. While representatives from both BoP and Legal have participated in various aspects of the RFP development process, they have not fully vetted the material to

⁶ The PPB has adopted the name "RegJIN" for the purposes of this project (formerly referred to as RegJIN)

date. As that process begins in early November, it is likely that additional time will be required to complete the review and return the document to PPB. After reviewing the file, the QA Consultants believe the review period will likely require a minimum of 60 days to accomplish (three of the next nine weeks include national holidays, and are traditionally a very difficult time for scheduling resources).

3.0.3.2 Budget Refinement Underway: The RegJIN Project Manager is working on a final budget estimate during the coming period (both initial and recurring). With the scope finalized, the Project Manager can now develop a finalized RegJIN budget range. The Project Manager has extensive experience in vendor price modeling, as well as three cost forecasts from vendors who submitted RFI responses.

As discussed during the prior period, the budget is critical for both internal resource allocations as well as for defining the cost (if any) for participating, external agencies. The current PPDS client base is very large, with 35 subscriber agencies responsible for modest fees (to offset some of the time spent on system maintenance and enhancements). It is likely that additional agencies will request participation in RegJIN, given that some nearby agencies: a) currently possess aging law enforcement technology systems (that will need to be replaced in the nearterm), and; b) currently use software products supplied by companies that are financially unstable (due to recessed sector activity). In light of the recession, and with the promise of interoperability, the RegJIN initiative represents a very attractive solution to those agencies in need. Therefore, a detailed project budget is absolutely essential in order for the PPB and ESC to discuss cost recovery options with subscriber agencies.

Recommendation: The QA Consultants recommend that a final RegJIN budget range (for both initial and recurring costs) be prepared in time for the ESC to review it during their December quarterly meeting. Moreover, the agenda should include a discussion regarding cost recovery alternatives, based on the number of subscribing agencies.

3.0.3.3 RegJIN Project Advisory Committee (PAC): The RegJIN PAC met on October 22. The RegJIN Project Manager created and distributed a survey instrument to each of the 35 agencies, focusing on finalizing the "volumes and statistics" which are used to identify the number of people, computers, and usage statistics for each subscriber agency. In addition, the Project Manager solicited participation from attendees to act as evaluators during the RFP evaluation and selection phase.

3.0.4 Regional Radio Observations and Recommendations

- 3.0.4.1 Planning Consultant (iXP) Work Underway: ixP distributed surveys to the regional partners to solicit detailed information regarding each agency's current environment. Returns have been slower than forecasted, which will likely cause delays with nearterm tasks that are dependent on the analysis of the survey data. iXP has also scheduled onsite workshops in early November to meet with the regional partners and identify expectations.
- 3.0.4.2 Monitoring 700MHz Activities: The Regional Radio Project Manager has maintained contact with TriMet and the State of Oregon to closely monitor the availability and planned distribution of 700MHz frequencies for public safety. The Project Manager will also attend future 700MHz planning sessions.
- **3.0.4.3 Portland Stability Plan:** Following a review by internal stakeholders on October 23, the Portland Stability Plan should be finalized, and presented to the ESC during the December meeting for adoption.
- 3.0.4.4 Controller Replacement Analysis Update: During the period,
 Portland received a cost proposal from Motorola for replacing the
 controllers and providing necessary encryption. This information
 is useful in the city's efforts to explore local alternatives and to
 evaluate the extent of any impact on the regional efforts.

4.0 Prior Recommendations

4.0.1 Prior Recommendation Status

The following chart depicts a record of previous QA recommendations, describing any actions taken by the project team. The chart is updated on a monthly basis. Unaddressed recommendations appear with red font.

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.1	The PSSRP requires horizontal vision. Currently, the core projects are operating nearly in a vacuum from one another. Very soon, the organization will begin to suffer from this lack of vision as installation tasks associated with integrating CAD and RMS become apparent and costly. We recommend a comprehensive analysis be undertaken immediately, to identify, triage, and solve, the challenges associated with the present stove-piped approach to the core PSSRP initiatives.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.8 (vi, viii)
Baseline 5.0.1.1	We strongly recommend that the PSSRP Project Charter be rewritten to reflect contemporary scope, budget, timeline, values, objectives, reporting structures, risks and more. It no longer accurately reflects the nature of the initiative.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.4 6/09: (Recommendation ReActivated). 8/09: Recommendation prioritized. 9/09: Global PSSRP, CAD, RegJIN, and Radio Project Charters are in draft form.

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.1	With regard to ieSolutions, we credit the organization with aiding BOEC in their successful CAD vendor selection. However, ieSolutions' lack of prior public safety technology installation experience appears to be in conflict with the degree to which they can, legitimately, be defined as the sole source for integration services (even with their knowledge of the Portland environment, which can be learned). Moreover, the public safety technology consulting marketplace includes many experienced integrators, who have previously assisted police and fire agencies with complex CAD installations (including some that have recently installed Versaterm technology). In light of the observations regarding the subject (See Subsection 1.0.3.2. of the Baseline Assessment), we are highly confident that one or more consulting firms will protest an additional sole source contract for ieSolutions. Therefore, to avoid a bid protest, and the resultant delays, we recommend the City immediately prepare and release a request for proposal (RFP) for professional services to assist with installing the Versadex CAD.	Declined 12/08: 3.0.1.3
Baseline 5.0.1.2	A careful examination of the benefits, risks, and costs of a shared PSSRP CAD/RMS/Mobile solution (across police, fire and EMS), with a comprehensive message switching component should be undertaken immediately (during the 60 day CAD contract suspension). Having worked with Versaterm for over four years (in a full time plus capacity), our QA team is highly knowledgeable about the technical, and functional, relationship between the Versadex CAD and the Versaterm RMS, and the Versaterm AFR product [Mobile Report Entry (MRE)]. Of the 40+ CAD/RMS vendors in the industry, Versaterm is certainly in the top percentile of vendors whose suite of products are very, very tightly integrated (unlike some products wherein the CAD and RMS are merely interfaced). In many instances, root CAD functionality can only be actualized through the acquisition of a complementary RMS/MRE feature set. These are merely examples of the barriers which would exist should the City continue down the path of isolating CAD from the RMS and Mobile technologies.	Adopted 12/08: This concept has been adopted and is reflected in the draft project reorganization structure (which includes horizontal business and technical personnel).
Baseline 5.0.1.2	The City should develop language to protect the City's financial interest, should it ever decide to select Versaterm as the RMS/AFR provider and make it a part of the current Versaterm CAD agreement. This is a very common practice in the industry, as police and fire agencies frequently must pay for project elements over a span of years (particularly when projects are funded by grants).	Adopted 12/08: 3.0.2.5 7/09: Not Executed (no such language was incorporated into the final agreement with Versaterm).
Baseline 5.0.1.2	The City must undertake a comprehensive review of the current Versaterm pricing, which appears to be much higher than other recent Versadex CAD costs. Per the POM, BOP is researching this matter as of the date of report publication.	Adopted 12/08: 3.0.2.4

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.3	In light of our previous recommendations to evaluate RegJIN relative to the balance of the PSSRP initiatives, releasing the RFP at this point would be counterproductive. Additionally, the RFP is still in draft form and requires a careful functional review (to be certain that the requirements accurately reflect both PPB as well as the 18 subscriber agencies), prior to being released to the vendor community.	Adopted 12/08: 3.0.3.1 The RFP is in draft form and has not been released.
Baseline 5.0.1.3 Reactivated: 2/09 3.0.3.3	On balance, most RMS initiatives eclipse the complexity, scope, range and cost of CAD initiatives. Yet, since 2006; while much attention and resources were devoted to the CAD Next project, far less has been assigned to RegJIN. The current Project Manager is assigned multiple law enforcement initiatives and has an unconventional reporting chain of command that lends itself to a lack of accountability. In our estimation, there are no current employees with previous experience with effectively orchestrating a successful RMS initiative that is used by 19 law enforcement agencies, and relied upon by 25 external entities for data exchange. And, given the embedded governmental problems associated with hiring Project Managers, we have no confidence in the City's ability to find a qualified Project Manager for this complex and mission critical endeavor. Even if the selection process could be fast-tracked, it is still extremely unlikely that a qualified and experienced RMS professional would accept the City's present salary offering for this assignment. The ESC should, immediately, authorize the retention of external, professional services to undertake the recommendations outlined in this QA report and place the RegJIN initiative on a stable course.	Initially Declined 12/08: 3.0.3.8 (v) Rather than retaining a consultant, the city is attempting to retain a full time employee. Accepted 5/09: A full time Project Manager started on May 28, 2009.
Baseline 5.0.1.3 Restated 3/09 3.0.3.3	The RegJIN project needs a Project Charter that reflects (at the absolute minimum) a basic and accurate budget, detailed timeline, and comprehensive scope statement.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.3.5 6/09: Recommendation was reactivated as part of the governance reform. 9/09: A draft Project Charter has been developed.

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.3	The RegJIN technology is in such widespread use, yet there is relatively little involvement on behalf of the participating agencies. Many agencies have no representation at all. And, others appear on forms and websites by name only (they have not actively participated in the initiative). Consortia RMS projects are difficult to manage, and require constant effort. In the current environment, most agencies have lost interest (after all, this has been underway for two years without significant activity), while some are considering how to acquire their own RMS technologies. The RegJIN effort must be centered on a collaborative platform that takes into account the project's assumptions, constraints and barriers. Accepting a lack of communication, or collaboration, is not acceptable.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.3.2
Baseline 5.0.1.4	The initiative requires a Regional Project Charter replete with system definition, development, and implementation before getting to the point of retaining an OE (in fact, such retention should be a component of the Project's Charter). And, ownership must pass to all stakeholders in proportion to their commitment in the regional project.	Concept Attempted 12/08: 3.0.4.5
Baseline 5.0.1.4	The project is in clear need of an Owner's Engineer (OE) with the requisite skills and experience necessary to lead a large scale, regional radio initiative. Priority attention should be given to the development, and approval, of this RFP (which is presently only in conceptual format).	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.4.4 Enacted 6/09
Baseline 5.0.1.5	With regard to any core PSSRP initiative, the ESC should assign control of that resource to the POM (whether it be contractor or full time employee).	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.8 Enacted 6/09
Baseline 5.0.1.6	The PSSRP requires the backing of a senior Executive Sponsor (perhaps an elected official) who holds the authority to recognize the PSSRP initiative as a mission critical, high priority, endeavor. The ESC should identify such a person, who would act as the project's advocate whenever necessary, to place focus and prioritization on project tasks.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.3 Enacted 6/09
Baseline 5.0.1.6	To the degree that it is feasible, the ESC should determine the best method for raising the salaries for the core PSSRP Project Managers, as well as the POM to an amount more in line with contemporary market demand. Naturally, this would require additional financial resources to be allocated into the budget. However, failing to make change in this area will cost far more in lost project momentum, and potentially a failed project state.	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.5 Enacted 1/09 Employees Hired 6-8/09

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Baseline 5.0.1.7	The City retain a public safety technology business process analysis consultant immediately. With the CAD installation set to begin in less than 90 days, we suggest that the consultant be retained through a sole source contract, as an exigent circumstance requirement. The scope of services would document the baseline business processes that are, or could be, impacted by technology. This methodology would provide a structured approach for developing a baseline business process "snapshot" of the current environments to confirm or reject various assumptions about the business environments (not to conduct detailed business process mapping).	Concept Adopted 12/08: 3.0.1.8 (viii) Enacted 4/09
12/08 3.0.1.7	When the Versaterm contract is signed, and the RegJIN RFP is released, the POM should document the known intersections, and prepare a migration plan accordingly.	10/09 Update: Underway.
1/09 3.0.2.1 (1)	The ESC should direct the CAD Next project team to prepare four implementation schedules, assuming the Versaterm agreement is ratified in March, April, May or June. Although it is unlikely that the agreement will be delayed until May or June, it is important to prepare a contingency plan that is proactive, and takes into account the potential implementation problems associated with starting the project during the early summer months. The four permutations should be presented to the ESC upon completion.	Concept Adopted 1/09 by ESC. 10/09 Update: See 5/09 3.0.2.2 (below).
1/09 3.0.2.1 (2)	Assuming that a post-March contract execution would negatively impact BOEC's ability to implement the Versaterm products in 2009, the ESC should identify methods for prioritizing the technical, business and legal resources necessary to finalize the Versaterm agreement in a 45-60 day period.	This recommendation was rendered inactive based on the preceding actions.
2/09 3.0.1.3	The QA consultants recommend a facilitated discussion with the current ESC to review "national standards" and examples of similar project governance structures from large municipal public safety technology engagements. As part of the dialogue, the ESC should collaboratively harness the available resources of its members, and proactively assign themselves to specific responsibilities beyond the role of project oversight.	Adopted 7/09 by ESC: The project's key stakeholders adopted the Olympic Performance report recommendations.
2/09 3.0.2.1	(a) BOEC should consider extending the forecast contract completion date to allow for a 6-8 week process. (b) The City should consider creating a written contract development plan. (c) The ESC should give consideration to videotaping (or audio taping) the contract development session (as many large public safety agencies have adopted this practice in recent years).	(a) N/A (b) Not written, but strategized. (c) Not enacted.
2/09 3.0.3.2	PPB should confirm that each Partner Agency has a clear expectation of what the new RegJIN RMS will offer in terms of modules and features.	Adopted 3/09

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
3/09 3.0.2.1	The City (should) set a "date certain" for contract finalization of April 3 (two full weeks prior to the actual deadline), with weekly contract checkpoint meetings (to reinforce urgency, and prevent procrastination). The City should immediately communicate to Versaterm the consequences of failing to reach an agreement in time.	Recommendation rendered inactive when agreement was not reached after April 3.
3/09 3.0.3.3 (Predecessor: Baseline 5.0.1.3)	Developing the RegJIN replacement project budget is an urgent, critical recommendation that should be undertaken immediately. The QA consultants have a very low level of confidence in the current ROM forecast.	Concept adopted: 4/09 by ESC. Draft RegJIN Project Charter submitted, 9/09.
4/09 3.0.1.2 4/09 3.0.2.2	The May ESC Meeting should be held, regardless of the status of the ESC reform efforts. Recognizing that the Versaterm agreement was not ratified by the April 20 deadline, BOEC should recalibrate the Phase III timeline (and associated planning materials) to reflect the early Fall/2009 start date described by Director Turley. Additionally, the ESC should direct the POM to craft a contract finalization schedule which reflects a Summer/2009 completion date (with elected official approval at least one month prior to the project kickoff).	Adopted 4/09 The Phase III implementation timeline continues to reflect a Spring, 2011 completion date.
5/09 3.0.2.2 [predecessor: 1/09 - 3.0.2.1(1)]	The ESC should review the merits, limitations, risks and issues associated with the Phase III timeline compression and evaluate whether the various implementation alternatives may impact the remaining PSSRP initiatives.	The issue was raised during the May ESC Meeting. However, no action was taken. ESC members continue to express an interest in gaining a comprehensive understanding of the implementation timeline, costs and associated risks.
6/09 3.0.1.2	Following the June ESC meeting, the POM should revise the PSSRP Project Charter to align with the many structural changes associated with the final governance reform.	Adopted 7/09 by ESC.
6/09 3.0.2.3	Following the June ESC meeting, ieSolutions should revise the Phase III Project Charter to align with the many structural changes associated with the final governance reform. Additionally, the Project Charter should include (at a minimum) the project's budget, timeline, methodology and risks.	9/09: The CAD Next Phase III Project Charter has been updated.
6/09 3.0.3.1 (predecessor: 6/09 - 3.0.1.2)	Following the June ESC meeting, PPB should revise the RegJIN Project Charter to align with the many structural changes associated with the final governance reform. Additionally, the Project Charter should include (at a minimum) the project's budget, timeline, methodology and risks.	9/09: See 8/09 3.0.1.3 (below).

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
7/09 3.0.1.3	The RegJIN RFP is currently undergoing a final re-scoping exercise. Once the RFP content has been finalized (in terms of functional and technical requirements), the project team should prepare a revised project budget to confirm whether the \$4M placeholder is sufficient. Concurrently, the project team should evaluate all PSSRP expenses in an effort to ensure affordability of the core technologies (specifically; ensuring that the project will yield the stated goals and objectives).	
8/09 3.0.1.1	As the ESC adapts to the new governance model, many questions that pertain the ESC's authority and reach must be addressed (i.e., should change orders of a pre-defined order of magnitude warrant a mandatory ESC review and/or approval?). The earlier these types of issues are discussed and codified, the better. When "rules", or "decision making parameters" are formed late in an initiative, they carry significantly less authority and appear unfairly tailored toward a particular purpose. Most governance models include such parameters in the Project Charter, and we recommend that the current PSSRP Project Charter redraft effort include a section on ESC issue management to define what global, and project-specific, issues warrant a review and/or action by the ESC	
8/09 3.0.1.3 (predecessor: 6/09 - 3.0.3.1)	By October, 2009, revised Project Charters should be in place for each core project. The ESC should provide the POM with any requested human or financial resources necessary to accomplish this task.	
8/09 3.0.3.4	As part of the RegJIN Project Charter update, PPB must also refresh the budget forecast based on the content of the final RFP.	
9/09 3.0.1.1	Typically, public safety projects require monthly Steering Committee meetings to encourage communication and issue resolution. Although the information has been distributed to the ESC members by the POM monthly, there is no substitution for the interaction and spontaneous dialogue which occurs during physical meetings. Less-than-monthly meetings offer convenience, but in exchange; introduce the risk of allowing minor issues to cascade until such time as they may be discussed in person. Therefore, the QA consultants recommend a more frequent ESC meeting interval (preferably monthly). If a physical meeting is too difficult, as a second alternative; the POM could explore the use of videoconferencing during non-meeting months (this has shown to be very effective in other large-scale public safety initiatives wherein the bureau's sponsors find monthly meetings difficult to maintain)	

Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
Until the budget forecasts are finalized, the ESC should take the most conservative approach	
, ,	
1 1	
The Olympic Performance report provided much-needed reform, but was not intended to	
substitute for a global PSSRP Project Charter (Project Plan) and should not be relied upon for	
such purposes. In addition to the recommendations from the prior period on this subject,	
the QA consultants also recommend that the POM construct a revised issue management	
process that is efficient and thorough. Decisions which may impact the POM should be	
assigned to a neutral, third party, for analysis with recommendations left to the ESC.	
•	
· ·	
to the state of th	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Until the budget forecasts are finalized, the ESC should take the most conservative approach toward exploring alternatives for closing potential funding gaps. One such alternative is described in Section 3.0.3.3, wherein PPB would evaluate cost recovery models for multiagency records management systems. The QA consultants recommend that similar evaluations occur for all core projects wherein the provision of information technology is extended to non City of Portland public safety agencies. The Olympic Performance report provided much-needed reform, but was not intended to substitute for a global PSSRP Project Charter (Project Plan) and should not be relied upon for such purposes. In addition to the recommendations from the prior period on this subject, the QA consultants also recommend that the POM construct a revised issue management process that is efficient and thorough. Decisions which may impact the POM should be

Recommendation Location	Recommendation Summary	Action Taken (QA Report, and Subsection)
9/09 3.0.4.3	In light of the national recession, potential regional partners appear hesitant to concretely commit human and financial resources toward regionalization until such time as either: a) The agency's economists predict economic stability, or b) The agency's existing radio communications infrastructure requires replacement. The QA Consultants recommend the participants undertake a low-cost exploration into the current feasibility of regionalization through the use of a survey instrument and accompanying summary of findings. The recommendation is intended to provide: a) A conduit for agencies to refresh their abilities to commit human and financial resources, b) A "reality check" that contrasts agency positions during inception (2007) with current positions, and c) Provide the City of Portland with information which may be relevant when considering the impact of new controllers on nearby agencies.	10/09 Update: Much of this recommendation is being fulfilled through the current data collection methods undertaken by iXP.