

2.3b(30) Monthly Status Report

Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), Oregon
Health Authority (OHA), and Enterprise Information Services
(EIS)

For:

Integrated Eligibility (IE) Project
For the Month Ending: December 2019

Version 1.0

Submitted: 02/06/2020

PublicKnowledge
ADVISING GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

1911 SW Campus Drive, #457
Federal Way, WA 98023
www.pubknow.com

Contact: Lynn Cartwright
lcartwright@pubknow.com
(503) 949-4620

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
1.1	Overall Project Summary	1
1.2	New Issues and Risks	2
2	Status	3
2.1	Project Status and Risk Rating	3
2.2	Accomplishments	4
2.3	Milestone and Deliverable Status	4
3	Current Issues and Risks	6
3.1	New Issues and Risks	6
3.2	Ongoing Issues	7
3.3	Ongoing Risks	13
3.4	Accepted Issues and Risks	15
3.5	Resolved Issues and Risks	19
4	Issue and Risk Rating Progression	20
5	Quality Control (QC) Review Summary	23
6	Document Change History	24

1 Executive Summary

Overall Risk ¹	Medium
Scope	Medium
Schedule	High
Budget and Resources	Medium

1.1 Overall Project Summary

The overall risk for the project remains medium.

The project scope is stable. The Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) requested changes to “absent parent information” prior to implementation. The project will determine if these changes can be made before or after pilot.

UAT Cycle 2 is about halfway completed. The project continues to have blocked test cases due to unresolved defects. The SI Contractor delivered the User Acceptance Test (UAT) Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM). It is being reviewed for accuracy and gaps.

Over the last few months, the project approved some design changes. These design changes relate to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Recertification and the redesign of the income screens. The design for SNAP was approved and the code is being tested as part of UAT. The income redesign is using an agile approach for design and development. It is expected that this change will be migrated to the UAT environment by January 20, 2020.

JV Legacy System development may not be completed by mid-January. The JV development was interrupted by an Internal Revenue Service (IRS) change that must be implemented in January 2020. It is unknown when JV development will be complete.

¹ The overall project risk is medium. It is likely that the schedule will slip or the project will experience implementation issues because task timelines are compressed, and possibly task quality diminished, to meet the schedule.

There is no workaround if JV is not completed on time. Existing test cases will test the changes to JV. The schedule risk changed to high as a result.

Office Simulation Phase 2 completed in The Dalles and Hillsboro offices. The State received positive feedback about the system from field staff. To date, the business processes around Virtual Eligibility Center (VEC) operations have not been determined. This could impact the work management processes for the IE System.

1.2 New Issues and Risks

There are no new issues or risks this reporting period.

2 Status

2.1 Project Status and Risk Rating

The State received the initial UAT RTM from the SI contractor and is reviewing it for accuracy and gaps. Early evaluation determined there are approximately 755 requirements that are not traceable to UAT test cases. The focus is addressing all priority 1 requirements. Existing test cases are being evaluated to see if they can be adapted to meet priority 1 requirements. There are plans to create additional test cases as needed. The SIT RTM is not yet approved.

There are about 1330 possible open defects. Some of these defects are still going through the triage process and are likely to be determined invalid. There are approximately 500 defects open from UAT Cycle 1. An approach to address UAT Cycle 1 defects prior to pilot has not been identified. The reporting period's rate of UAT Cycle 2 defects is approximately one defect entered for every two UAT test cases executed. About 525 defects are pending validation per the Power BI Report (01/01/2020).

Approximately 2600 test cases have been executed to date in UAT Cycle 2. Although the overall pass rate is about 85%, the State reports each testing week during Cycle 2 saw a decrease in the pass percentage. The slippage is due to defects not being resolved timely. If the project is having trouble keeping up with defects, and if more difficult test cases that are less likely to pass have not yet been scheduled, the quality of the product may be at risk.

The project continues to test and improve the Data Conversion (DCV) processes. It is expected to see a dip in DCV benefit match rate in the next month due to staggered cost of living adjustment (COLA) updates across systems. The State is not able to update the Legacy system with the COLA adjustments in the test system. This issue will be resolved within the first quarter after implementation.

Office Simulation UAT Part 2 concluded in December. Scenarios were executed at the Hillsboro processing center and APD and SSP offices in The Dalles. Office Simulation UAT added a third week in Salem to specifically test work management and work allocation. All findings were consolidated and are being addressed.

2.2 Accomplishments

- Office Simulation Part 2 completed in The Dalles and Hillsboro.
- Track leads report positive feedback about the applicant portal.

2.3 Milestone and Deliverable Status

The project rebaselined the Integrated Project Schedule (IPS) on January 31, 2019, and those baseline finish dates are reflected in this analysis. Table 1 reflects the status of milestones expected to finish this quarter, according to the IPS dated January 3, 2020.

The IPS shows a “Late” status for the Exit DR Testing Phase – Complete. DR Testing Phase 1 testing was completed in early November. The scope and schedule of Phase 2 DR testing is under review by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC).

Table 1. Status of Milestones Expected to Finish This Quarter

Baseline Finish Date	Status	Milestone	Expected Finish Date
IE Disaster Recovery			
NA	Late	Exit DR Testing Phase - Complete	Fri 11/22/19

Table 2 reflects the status of tasks on the critical path and near critical path. These tasks are expected to finish this quarter per the IPS dated January 3, 2020. The tasks that lie on the critical path cannot be delayed without delaying the project. A near critical path task is a task that, if delayed, could become a critical path task.

If Expected Finish Date is later than Baseline Finish Date, and the Expected Finish Date is in the future for one or more tasks, the deliverable is "At risk." If Expected Finish Date is later than Baseline Finish Date, and the Expected Finish Date is in the past for one or more tasks, the deliverable is "Late." The status of each deliverable uses a roll-up model of the status of the lower level tasks on the critical path and near critical path. For example, if even a single task has an "At risk" status, the associated deliverable status is "At risk." If a task has a baseline end date of "NA", analysis can only be conducted based on the percentage complete vs. target percentage complete.

Table 2. Status of Deliverables with Critical or Near Critical Path Tasks Expected to Finish This Quarter

Baseline Finish Date	Status	Tasks ²	% Complete	Expected Finish Date
IE				
Fri 1/31/20	On Track	Performance and Stress Testing	90%	Fri 1/31/20
Fri 12/20/19	At Risk	Data Conversion Mock Run #7 (PROD)	0%	Mon 3/23/20
Tue 1/7/20	At Risk	SQL Server Upgrade Deliverable	15%	Tue 3/10/20
Business Readiness				
Fri 1/31/20	On Track	Execute UAT Office Simulation Business Testing Scenarios	87%	Fri 1/31/20
Disaster Recovery				
Mon 9/30/19	At Risk	Performance Baseline	68%	Fri 1/24/20
Tue 12/3/19	At Risk	Performance Baseline in Cloud-based Environment DEL Prep [D2.11.4]	98%	Tue 1/7/20

²Tasks in this table represent deliverables or activities on the critical path or near critical path.

3 Current Issues and Risks

Risks and issues are scored as follows:

Table 3 – Issue and Risk Scoring

H	<p>High Rating (H). Issues in this category have a high impact. Issues are already occurring on the project and if not mitigated, will result in a significant change to scope, schedule, budget, or quality.</p> <p>Risks in this category have a risk magnitude score of 25. The risk magnitude is calculated by multiplying the likelihood by impact. This means these risks have a high likelihood (5) of occurring and a high impact (5) should they occur.</p>
M	<p>Medium Rating (M). Issues in the category have a medium impact. Issues are already occurring on the project, and if not mitigated, they will result in moderate changes to scope, schedule, budget, or quality.</p> <p>Risks in this category have a risk magnitude score of 15 or 9. This means that either the likelihood or impact is medium (3), and the other is high (5), or both are medium (3). For example, a risk with a medium likelihood (3) and a high impact (5) would have risk magnitude of 15, resulting in a medium risk rating.</p>
R	<p>Resolved (R). Risks or issues in this category are resolved. This means the risk or issue was successfully mitigated or replaced by a new issue or risk.</p>

3.1 New Issues and Risks

There are no new issues or risks this reporting period.

3.2 Ongoing Issues

Issue 2019-10-001.02 UAT test coverage cannot be verified.	Rating:	H
<p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The systems integration testing (SIT) requirements traceability matrix (RTM) is not yet approved. This was originally to be used as the basis for the UAT RTM. • As of this writing, the State is without a UAT RTM. The State is working with the SI Contractor to develop a manual UAT RTM to map requirements to existing test cases. The was done in lieu of an approved SIT RTM. • UAT Cycle 1 used the SIT RTM to verify that critical functions were tested. The project was aware that there were gaps in test coverage. The project plans to use the UAT RTM to ensure that test coverage will be complete in Cycle 2. • The project has dedicated time to develop gap test cases based on subject matter experts (SMEs) input. The State has written more than half of the gap test cases and is expected to confirm outstanding gaps once the UAT RTM is completed. <p>Consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without a UAT RTM it is difficult for the project to demonstrate that all key requirements have test cases and that they will be executed during user acceptance testing. • If there is missing functionality or unfound defects, the system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ may not work as expected, which will require workarounds and additional training. ○ could cost more to fix after implementation than during testing. • UAT Cycle 2 schedule could be impacted until the final number of test cases are identified out of the UAT RTM. • If the system does not work as expected, Oregonians may not receive the correct benefits. <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Consider the following to mitigate this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the UAT RTM. • Prioritize test cases for execution based on the UAT RTM. • Document a complete list of test cases that must be executed in UAT Cycle 2 to ensure adequate test coverage has been reached. 		

<p>Issue 2019-10-001.02</p> <p>UAT test coverage cannot be verified.</p>	<p>Rating:</p>	<p>H</p>
<p>Update:</p> <p>The State received the initial UAT RTM from the SI Contractor and is reviewing it for accuracy and gaps.</p> <p>Associated Assessment Area(s): Product Content</p> <p>Risk Type: Quality</p>		
<p>Issue 2019-09-001.03</p> <p>Triaging UAT defects requires more staff time than planned.</p>	<p>Rating:</p>	<p>H</p>
<p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIT defects were identified during Cycle 1 of UAT, which added additional defects to the UAT defect management process. • There are about 3,000 identified defects logged in TFS. For each testing week of UAT Cycle 1, an average of 200 defects were identified. • The original time estimated for triage was one hour per day. The duration of triage meetings increased so staff could perform an analysis of the reported defects. • Nearly one-third of recorded defects are invalid defects (either duplicates or not actual defects). • Test cases are not written so that any tester can execute any test case. This leads to personal interpretation of results, which may cause a tester to enter invalid defects. <p>Consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defect triage is taking longer than initially anticipated limiting staff availability for other duties like executing UAT test cases. • Duplicate and non-defect reports increase the time for triage. 		

Issue 2019-09-001.03

Triaging UAT defects requires more staff time than planned.

Rating:

H

Recommendations:

Consider the following to mitigate this issue.

- Evaluate the triage process to identify any additional efficiencies that will help improve the process.
- Create reference guides identifying potential defect trends. Train testers to identify potential duplicates of defects.
- Conduct a random QC check of completed test cases to validate recorded defects and identify any training deficiencies. Share this information with testers.

Update:

This risk is regularly reviewed and there is no reportable change.

Associated Assessment Area(s): Product Content

Risk Type: Project Team

Issue 2019-11-001.01

Project progress is difficult to assess.

Rating:

M

Findings:

- The IPS data is out of date. The State is working to update it with information from the SI Contractor's most recent amendment. The State believes the IPS will be updated by December 6, 2019.
- Resource utilization for project team members cannot be derived from the IPS. Without resource utilization, it is difficult to determine if there are enough resources to complete the work.
- Test completion is defined differently in different places. For example, the Executive Summary report counts a test as executed if it is started and not completed. TFS reports this as a test case in progress.
- The project director reports the project is developing a punch list of items that must be completed before implementation.

Consequences:

- Without reliable data related to tasks and resources, it is difficult to verify project progress and identify new priorities.

Issue 2019-11-001.01 Project progress is difficult to assess.	Rating:	M
Recommendations: Consider the following to mitigate this issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize the punch list of items that must be completed before implementation. Use this punch list as the definitive source of information about progress for stakeholders and the project. Use the punch list to guide project activities and assess progress on the remaining work. • Clearly communicate what the “official” source of information is to all stakeholders. • Create common definitions for terms used to report progress. Have all reports and communications use these definitions. Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TFS data (01/01/2020) shows there are about 100 defects with a closed or rejected status and no corresponding closure date. This may be a result of testers forgetting to close out defects or defects waiting on a CR. • About 210 test cases passed with active or proposed defects during December. • The IPS was updated with all current deliverables. 		
Associated Assessment Area(s): Project Management		
Risk Type: Project Team		

<p>Issue 2019-08-001.02</p> <p>Network issues impacted testing.</p>	<p>Rating:</p>	<p>M</p>
<p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state network had multiple outages and poor response times during August due to firewall issues with F5 appliance. • Network issues limited wave 1 testing of data conversion for UAT, which was to set the benchmark for how long data conversion will take during pilot, wave 1, and wave 2. • Skype was not available for project meetings, which limited attendees to on-site staff only due to network issues. • Some UAT defects were logged as a result of screens timing out due to connectivity issues rather than lack of interface responses. • Project infrastructure changes for pilot sites require network firewall changes. • Network slowdown issues resulted in State IT issuing a moratorium on firewall change ticket processing. Changes will be necessary for several project tasks, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Testing of the new call center system for IE pilot sites. ◦ Setup of the disaster recovery solution in Montana. ◦ Completion of DataPower setup. <p>Consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network issues were reported as defects during testing, which added unnecessary work for the triage teams. • Offsite project resources are not able to keep up to date on project status during meetings. • If network problems continue the expansion of pilot sites, the DataPower Upgrade, and setup of disaster recovery could be impacted. 		
<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Consider the following to mitigate this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an IE Project impact briefing on network outages and performance issues to the Enterprise Information Services (EIS) and the State Chief Information Officer (CIO). • Request EIS share their action plan and implementation schedule to resolve the network issues with the project. • Track the status of the firewall ticket moratorium and advocate EIS prioritizes IE Project firewall changes. • Develop contingency plans for tasks that may be late if the moratorium is not lifted. Share this plan with stakeholders. 		

Issue 2019-08-001.02 Network issues impacted testing.	Rating:	M
Update: This issue is regularly reviewed and there is no reportable change.		
Associated Assessment Area(s): Technology		
Risk Type: Technology		

3.3 Ongoing Risks

Risk 2019-10-002.02

Late system modifications may impact the overall quality of the system.

Rating:

H

Findings:

- A change request (CR) was approved to address an issue with income calculation. A CR was also approved to address SNAP recertification. The changes to SNAP recertification and income calculations are under development and will be implemented prior to pilot. It is anticipated that SNAP redetermination and income changes can be completed with the approved budget and schedule. The development related to these CRs is scheduled to be complete by January 15, 2020.
- The project estimates 1,800 hours of remaining design and development work related to JV in October 2019. This Legacy system enhancement is required for implementation.

Consequences:

- Changes implemented late in UAT could impact the quality of system functionality during pilot because changes may not be fully tested.
- If income changes are not tested prior to pilot, inaccurate benefits could be delivered.

Recommendations:

Consider the following to mitigate this issue.

- Conduct daily standup meetings to track the progress of system modifications. Escalate identified issues to project leadership.
- Be prepared with manual income calculation workarounds in case the modifications cannot be implemented by pilot.

Update:

SNAP recertification changes are being tested in the UAT environment. Income design code changes are in process. The JV development was interrupted by an IRS change that must be implemented in January 2020. It is unknown when JV development will be complete. There is no workaround if JV is not completed on time. Existing test cases will test the changes to JV.

Impact: High; **Likelihood:** High; **Risk Score:** 25

Associated Assessment Area(s): Product Content

Risk Type: Quality

Risk 2019-08-002.04

Data conversion may not be completed in the planned time frame.

Rating:

H

Findings:

- The data conversion design indicates conversion will run within the weekend OIS maintenance window. Test conversion runs have not completed within this scheduled window.
- Pilot benchmarking using production hardware and data is not fully planned. The benchmarking is expected to focus on core conversion, not end-to-end conversion.
- Currently, performance measurements are based on UAT hardware.

Potential Consequences:

- If data conversion is not executed within the maintenance window, the system will not be available to field staff, partner agencies, and the public as planned.
- If conversion is not focused on end-to-end conversion, there may be required functionality gaps that are not tested.

Recommendations:

Consider the following to mitigate this risk.

- Use the remaining mock runs and Cutover Plan development to estimate the best-case, likely, and worst-case target conversion durations for each rollout phase (e.g., pilot, wave1, and wave 2). Inform stakeholders of the range.
- Establish business contingency plans in the event conversion exceeds the planned execution time.

Update:

Benchmarking is complete and the project is analyzing the results. This information will be used to develop the schedule of data conversion for production cutover planning.

Impact: High; **Likelihood:** High; **Risk Score:** 25

Associated Assessment Area(s): Technology

Risk Type: Technology

Risk 2019-01-002.02

Rating:

M

Functional security testing may not validate all roles on all screens.

Findings:

- The scope of role testing in SIT was limited to framework-level testing. There are no current plans to test positive and negative access comprehensively.
- Functional security is planned to be tested during UAT. Functional security test cases cannot be identified in the UAT test suite.

Potential Consequences:

- If role testing does not test positive and negative access for all roles and screens, Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and Personal Health Information (PHI) could be inappropriately exposed.

Recommendations:

Consider the following to mitigate this risk.

- Test positive and negative security for all roles and screens.
- Ensure access requirements are tested during UAT.

Update:

This risk is regularly reviewed and there is no reportable change.

Impact: High; **Likelihood:** Medium; **Risk Score:** 15

Associated Assessment Area(s): Development Process

Risk Type: Quality

3.4 Accepted Issues and Risks

This section contains all accepted issues and risks by the project for the reporting period.

Issue 2018-03-004.04

The IE Project resource management process does not provide leadership the necessary information to determine if tasks are appropriately resourced.

Rating:

H

Findings:

- The Weekly Resource Assignment report is not able to inform leadership of staffing needs. Data is not available to correct the reports.
- The IPS does not identify all work to be completed by the project team.
- The IPS identifies the lead resource but does not always identify all the resources needed to finish the task.
- There are limited resources in certain areas. For example, work on the JR legacy system was delayed due to resource prioritization of a financial audit.
- There is not a defined method to communicate resource needs between the IE and Eligibility Transformation (ET) projects.

Consequences:

- Project staff approves schedule decisions without fully realizing the impacts on the project or State resources.
 - The quality of work may decrease due to the amount of work to be completed in a short amount of time.
 - Leadership cannot make strategic decisions on resource utilization, and they become reactive if additional resource needs are not known until the work is in progress.
 - Team morale suffers due to work overload and confusion.
 - Without an accurate picture of the work and the resources needed, the project is at risk of not meeting its schedule dates or may have reduced work quality.
-

Issue 2018-03-004.04

The IE Project resource management process does not provide leadership the necessary information to determine if tasks are appropriately resourced.

Rating:

H

Recommendations:

Consider the following to help mitigate this issue.

Develop and follow a strategic programmatic approach to resource management. Examples of strategic resource management practices include:

- Verify the schedule consistently contains a level of detail that identifies required work tasks, including deliverables for all involved parties (State and SI Contractor). Identify the most critical work for State staff to meet responsibilities for the remainder of the project.
- Schedule monthly reviews with leadership to discuss late tasks and next month's tasks. Ensure leadership understands the state resource needs to complete these tasks.
- Conduct daily stand-up meetings to triage new work, assign responsibilities for work, and track progress.
- Use the schedule to identify resource conflicts and revise this based on the actual work to be completed and the resources available within the 0-3-month timeframe.
- Document the roles and responsibilities, tools, and processes related to resource management. Train all impacted staff.
- If possible, add staff, redistribute work, redefine roles, move due dates, and develop and train additional staff to assist where shortages exist.

Associated Assessment Area(s): Project Management

Risk Type: Project Management

Issue 2018-07-001.03

A comprehensive view of design is not available for the IE Project.

Rating:

H

Findings:

The design documentation for the IE Project is captured across thousands of individual documents. The SI contractor's approach of incremental design captures the design at an appropriate level of detail, but the resulting documentation package is challenging to trace, consume, and manage.

The State completed the design phase and is now moving into the testing phase without a comprehensive view of the design that shows how the documents are related to one another, and without evidence that all requirements are covered by the design. For example, the current documentation does not address how accessibility and usability requirements are met by the design.

Consequences:

- UAT may be the first opportunity to find design gaps, which is late in the development process.
- Throughout the testing phase(s), missing work processes will require manual workarounds. This will complicate training and organizational change management.
- The State may have change orders during UAT or the M&O phase to address missing functionality.
- Complex design documentation will be difficult to maintain and understand in the future.

Recommendations:

Consider the following practices to mitigate this issue.

Develop and implement the following mitigations:

- Have the SI contractor produce an overview document that explains all linkages and flow of design documentation from the FDD through the design addendums.
 - Request documentation from the SI Contractor showing how all requirements map to design.
 - Have each program create a set of key program-specific scenarios (e.g., intake through payment) that are referenced to design documents. These materials would provide functionally-oriented process flows to inform future test case development.
 - Develop an organizational change management triage group to mitigate any functionality gaps or workarounds identified in UAT.
 - Ensure that the State leads are involved early in the review of Final SIT test cases to identify gaps in the design.
 - Implement a document management approach to manage design documentation from testing through the M&O phase.
-

Issue 2018-07-001.03

A comprehensive view of design is not available for the IE Project.

Rating:

H

Associated Assessment Area(s): Maintenance, Product Content

Risk Type: Quality

3.5 Resolved Issues and Risks

There were no resolved issues or risks this reporting period.

4 Issue and Risk Rating Progression

Table 4 below shows project issues and risks over the last six months by the rating of high, medium, or resolved.

Table 4 – Issue and Risk Ratings Progression

Issue or Risk	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19
Issue 2018-03-004.04 The IE Project resource management process does not provide leadership the necessary information to determine if tasks are appropriately resourced.	H	H	H	H	H	H
Issue 2018-03-005.08 There is no unified testing approach integrating the State's and the System Integrator (SI) Contractor's test strategies.	H	H	H	R		
Issue 2018-07-005.05 Preparation for user acceptance testing (UAT), including test scenario and script development, is behind schedule.	R					
Issue 2018-10-002.01 Strategic decisions are being made without comprehensive information.	R					
Issue 2018-10-005.03 There is not an accurate inventory of the work remaining, making it difficult to assess the accuracy of the project schedule.	M	M	M	M	R	

Issue or Risk	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19
Risk 2018-10-003.01 Testing in the Legacy production logical partition (LPAR) may introduce operational, security, and testing risks.	M	R				
Risk 2018-10-004.01 It is not clear that all Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) requirements have been incorporated into the Integrated ONE System.	M	M	M	M	R	
Risk 2019-01-002.02 Functional security testing may not validate all roles on all screens.	H	H	M	M	M	M
Risk 2019-04-001.02 The State training team's efforts may not be appropriately resourced.	M	M	R			
Risk 2019-07-002.01 Information is not shared timely or consistently across workstreams, which could cause rework and delays.	M	M	M	R		
Issue 2019-08-001.02 Network issues impacted testing.		H	M	M	M	M
Risk 2019-08-002.04 Data conversion may not be completed in the planned timeframe.		H	H	M	H	H

Issue or Risk	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19
Issue 2019-09-001.03 Triaging UAT defects requires more staff time than planned.			H	H	H	H
Risk 2019-09-002.01 Revisiting the decision about site support to field staff could cause re-work and potential delays.			M	M	R	
Risk 2019-09-003.01 Some people readiness responsibilities are not allocated appropriately.			M	R		
Issue 2019-10-001.02 UAT Test Coverage cannot be verified.				H	H	H
Risk 2019-10-002.02 Late system modifications may impact the overall quality of the system.				H	H	H
Issue 2019-11-001.01 Project Progress is difficult to assess.					M	M

5 Quality Control (QC) Review Summary

This section summarizes the results of any quality control review performed during this period.

Table 5 – Quality Control Summary

Item Reviewed	Summary	QC Review Status ³
D2.7.2.3 Implementation Readiness Materials	The SI Contractor submitted the deliverable. PK reviewed the document and provided comments to the state. The state signed a deliverable acceptance form (DAF).	Complete
1.5q Disaster Recovery Playbook	The SI Contractor submitted the deliverable. PK reviewed the document and provided comments to the state. The state signed a DAF.	Complete
DED2.4.10 Performance and Stress Test Results	The SI Contractor submitted the Deliverable Expectation Document (DED). PK reviewed the document and provided comments to the state.	In Progress
DED2.7.2.4 Training Delivery Completion Report	The SI Contractor submitted the DED. PK reviewed the document and provided comments to the state.	In Progress

³ The deliverable status is “In Progress” until PK receives a DAF. For DEDs, they remain “In Progress” until the corresponding deliverable is released.

6 Document Change History

Table 6 – Document Change History

Date	Version	Description	Individual(s)
01/06/2020	v0.1	The document was composed.	L. Cartwright L. Steinle A. Doyle J. Hooper J. Pearson G. Gamette P. Cartland R. Martin R. HK LeBlond S. Govan
01/07/2020	v0.2	The document was reviewed by the project manager and a senior consultant.	L. Cartwright J. Hooper
01/12/2020	v0.3	The document was reviewed by project engagement leadership.	K. Disbrow J. Vachon
01/13/2020	v0.4	The document was finalized.	R. HK LeBlond A. Doyle
01/13/2020	v0.5	The document was submitted.	L. Cartwright
02/04/2020	v0.9	The revised document was submitted.	L. Cartwright
02/06/2020	v1.0	The final document was submitted.	L. Cartwright