**1st Implementation Review Genus Innovation Limited, Date – 18th Aug 2022**

Vaibhav Garg (Chief Technology Manager)

Jalaj Mathur

Shweta (PQA)

**PEG**

**Tools used – Ein Frame**

1. In the PEG plan as per the organizational criteria, PEG skills level required needs to be at proficiency levels 3 however there is skill level gap observed in one of the PEG members against the meeting the desired proficiency level. In order to bridge this gap IDP needs to be prepared for PQA to close skill gap identified for resource plan in the Ein Frame tool.
2. Description needs to be enhanced for task level activity in the EPG plan – this enhancement needs to be done in the tool
3. In the PCB report published by PEG group, schedule variance target across projects is kept at 0 and USL is 20 and LSL is -20. This indicates huge variance between target and specification limits; hence it is recommended to the PEG to be relooked at the target to make it more realistic in comparison to specification limits.
4. Note – needs to retain evidence of closing historical observations observed in the last appraisal
5. The BO and PO plan activity discussion was planned but its evidence was not updated
6. The EPG plan should detail the “Digitalisation” strategy adopted.
7. MOM at EPG level to be available to demonstrate build, buy and reuse analysis post implementation of the tool.
8. Process Improvement tracker to be available with details of impacted process and liknked BO / PO for the process improvements.
9. The EPG audit frequency is different than projects but the details for the same are not documented in EPG plan

**Project -1 (SP - project SP9-GGE295)**

PM – Sobhag Prajapat

St date – 19th July 22

End date – 31st July 22

PQA – Shweta Aggarwal

Current phase – Module testing

1. EST – Evidence of performing size estimation is missing from current estimation template. Project managers were affirmed that they are referring old similar projects data to arrive at the size however the same was not visible in current estimation template.
2. MPM – Schedule variance target is 0% however schedule variance actual % is 114%, which was significantly higher than target, causal analysis was not performed.
3. MPM – Awareness on metrics monitoring needs to be increased.
   1. EVMS Chart is used in “Ein Frame” proj mgmt. tool, which show cased EVM value, which project managers needs to explain while linking the same to org level metrics objectives i.e. EV and SV however project manager was not able to affirm relation between EVMS chart and their project level metrics analysis.
4. RDM – Requirement review checklist being used currently needs to be made more exhaustive as currently it is not elaborate to cover all practices of RDM practice area.
5. CAR – Evidence of CAR was not available.
6. RSK – Opportunities are not yet identified at project level,
   1. Risks description needs to be more elaborative so that when it will add value when it will be submitted back to the org database
7. DAR / PI / V&V – implementation not evidenced
8. PR – Defect logging is incorrectly maintained in the Incident place holder.
9. CM – All Configuration management systems related to the project needs to be documented in CM plan(E-in) is also a configuration management system for which access management needs to be maintained.
10. CM audit is performed by PQA, which is a weakness, it needs to be done someone other than CCB Member, Configuration Manager / Controller and process audit. A) PQA person cannot perform audit for his own work in the folder.

**Project – 2 (SP - project GGS151)**

PM – Chandrashekhar Sharma

St date – 19th July 22

End date – 12th Oct 22

PQA – Shweta Aggarwal

Current phase – Implementation phase

1. RDM – In the functional specification template ‘column for the ‘Source of need’ left blank
2. PR – In the ‘Functional Specification’ document some columns were left blank, however the same was not captured while doing the peer review, (evidence of the same was not observed in the review checklist for functional specification template)
3. RR – In this project multiple review defects were logged as only one single incident in the “Ein Frame” tool. Such practice of logging multiple review defect as one single defect in the tool can give create issue while calculating ‘defect density’.
4. MPM – Awareness on MPM to be improved
5. RSK – Risks contingency plans were not captured in the project, opportunities were not identified
6. DAR – not yet created

**PQA (Shweta Aggarwal)**

1. As per the affirmation received during IR from PQA head, she is training all the PM’s for conducting IR, to mitigate risk of availability of PQA for conducting audits. It is recommended to identify cross functional teams such as SME’s, Support team members e.g. Training group representative etc. to get trained it will help to ensure independence while conducting internal IR’s.
2. Evidence needs to be maintained for seeking approval from PQA for the project specific audit plan.
3. If any practice for Development is not performed, it may result to non-achievement of Implementation Infrastructure practice. EPG to facilitate the same to projects.
4. Data Management checks (MPM3.3) needs to be performed to ensure data consistency and reliability of data collection process.