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**Review History:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review #** | **Date** | **Review Name** |
| 1 | 02-Feb-2016 | Summary Report 1 |
| 2 | 26-Apr-2016 | Draft CAPA |
| 3 | 09-Jun-2016 | Management Response |
| 4 | 13-Jun-2016 | Draft CAPA peer review |
| 5 | 15-Jun-2016 | Final CAPA 1.0 |
| 6 | 17-Jun-2016 | Final CAPA 1.1 |

**Project Information:**

Customer Name: Sazka Lottery

Batch Name: CZH CY15 2nd Draw on Daily Keno

SAP ID: CZH23237

Location: Czech

Go Live date: 12-Apr-2016

**Project Stakeholders:**

Regional Lead: Jaroslaw Dabrowski

Program Manager: Anna Bryc

Software Project Manager: Malgorzata Loniewska

Compliance Manager: Karen Robertson

Standards Compliance Lead: Adam Bek

**Related Documents:**

None

## Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations:

* BI – Business Intelligence
* CML – Configuration Management Lead
* CR – Change Request
* PAF – Project Approval Form
* PRR – Product Release Request
* QA – Quality Assurance
* RDL – Regional Lead
* SDD – Software Design Description
* SPM – Software Project Manager
* SRS – Software Requirements Specification

**Project Schedule:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Name** | **Start** | **Finish** |
| SRS creation | November 10, 2015 | January 20, 2016 |
| SRS Signoff | January 25, 2016 | January 25, 2016 |
| Design / Development Support | November 18, 2015 | February 16, 2016 |
| Design / Development Complete |  | February 12, 2016 |
| Integration | February 12, 2016 | March 11, 2016 |
| Integration Complete |  | March 11, 2016 |
| System Test | March 14, 2016 | April 1, 2016 |
| System Test Complete |  | April 1, 2016 |
| CAT | April 4, 2016 | April 8, 2016 |
| Pre-Installation | April 8, 2016 | April 12, 2016 |
| **Go Live** | **April 12, 2016** | **April 12, 2016** |
| Post Live Support | April 13, 2016 | May 2, 2016 |

**Scope:**

This review is for the CZH CY15 2nd Draw on Daily Keno. The detail findings below are a result of the two summary review and the final findings report.

The purpose of the CAPA report is to provide management with appropriate visibility into the processes being used by the software project(s) and of the products being built. This report will provide insight into any process improvements, trend analysis or other project issues that come up.  A Management response is required by the project for the findings listed below. Any discrepancies can be reported back to the STC Lead. Corrective Action or Preventative Action will then be given based on the responses and the findings.

*Sample of required management response below:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Finding:** | **Detail:** |
| **Management Response:** |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**  *This will be completed by STC once management responses are completed* |

Summary of Findings/Weaknesses:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Finding:**  Configuration Management | **Detail:**   * No evidence of CM Development, Integration, SQA, CAT and Go Live Baseline. |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * I have joined the project when it was already in development stage and there was no settlements done to above baselines. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * Configuration Management require identification SW Baselines at planned milestone events * Baseline must be noted in Software Baseline Identifier document or in milestone Mtg. Minutes * Corrective Action: Software Baseline Identifier must be updated by PC * Preventive Action: Reviewed Configuration Management requirement for the Software Baseline Identifier with the Project Manager (PM) to prevent recurrence. |
| **Finding:**  Project Planning | **Detail:**   * No evidence of Kickoff Mtg * No evidence of CCB |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * When I had joined the project was told not to step back with WPs’ updates (MA) * And this is the reason the CCB was not defined. Whole team was involved in CR review. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * A kick-off meeting is required for all batches   A defined CCB is required for all batches and can be defined or redefined as the project progresses. |
| **Finding:**  Product Integration | **Detail:**   * No evidence of CAT PRR * No evidence of Production PRR |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * Due to go live date acceleration we were in the development stage until the installation date; were not ready for any of above reviews. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**  Preventive Action: PM should be re-train in PRR requirements and provide a confirmation of this activity.  Product Release Request (PRR) is a not a review. It is a process describing how the project releases software externally. |
| **Finding:**  Project Monitoring and Control | **Detail:**   * No evidence of Lessons Learned conducted * No evidence of Development, Integration, SQA,CAT and Go Live milestone readiness * Project did not use mandated Weekly Mtg. doesn't use mandated template. Weekly project staff mtg. was not discussed: no Risks, no Peer Review status, no information referring to Work Products status, Lack of Project Schedule review |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * LL scheduled late this week due to lack of key people presence. * As we were in the development phase almost until the production installation there were no milestones in this project. * It was Program Mgr.’s decision to keep all projects’ weekly MoMs in one sheet as all of them influence each other and customer changes their mind frequently. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * IDM section 5.3.4 Lesson learned requires the use of the template. * In case of changing milestones Project require to Complete the Tailoring Request * Completed Meeting Minutes are required and failure to comply can be considered a finding. |
| **Finding:**  Technical Solution | **Detail:**   * No evidence of SDD Host * Project doesn't use mandated SDDs * No evidence of Critical Code included in SDD * No evidence of UTR documented in RNs Gware Host and PC |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * Host engineers shortage didn’t allow to create the SDD * ☹ * Almost whole code was critical, so Host engineers were in permanent contact for its discussion * Changes were that small that SDD even don’t exist for both Host and PC GWARE products. | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**   * SDDs are required for critical code |
| **Finding:**  Verification | **Detail:**   * No evidence of SRS Peer Review * No evidence of SDD Host and Terminal Peer Review * No evidence of test procedures peer review * No evidence of release notes Host and Terminal peer review * No evidence of SDD Terminal Peer Review * Peer review tracker report not completed |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | * Re 3 first bullets: When I had joined the project was told not to step back with WPs’ updates (MA) * Peer reviews done, but not documented due to serious delay to the project schedule * The only serious SDD doesn’t exists, and we don’t know if LSH engineer will do it before he lives GTECH. * Will try to complete this when have time | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**  AB: Corrective Action: Peer Review Management System (PRMS) must be updated to include defect activity.  Preventive Action: Review Peer Review measurement requirements with Project Team |

**Detail of Findings:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Process Area | Specific Goal | Specific Practice | Description | Rating | Status |
| CM | SG3 | 3.2 | No evidence of CM Development, Integration, SQA, CAT and Go Live Baseline. | NI | CAPA Report |
| IPM | GP | 3.2 | No evidence of approval for SDD Terminal | LI | Resolved |
| IPM | GP | 3.2 | No approval of RN Gware Host and PC | LI | Resolved |
| PI | SG3 | 3.1 | No evidence of CAT and Production PRR | NI | CAPA Report |
| PMC | SG1 | 1.6 | Weekly Mtg. doesn't use mandated template. Weekly project staff mtg. was not discussed: no Risks, no Peer Review status, no information referring to Work Products status, Lack of Project Schedule review | LI | CAPA Report |
| PMC | SG2 | 2.1 | No evidence of Lessons Learned conducted | NI | CAPA Report |
| PMC | SG1 | 1.6 | No evidence of Development, Integration, SQA,CAT and GoLive readiness | NI | CAPA Report |
| PP | SG1 | 1.4 | No evidence of Kickoff Mtg. | NI | CAPA Report |
| PP | SG1 | 1.4 | No evidence of CCB was defined in accordance with the GTL Change Control Process and SPP (Service Project Plan). | NI | CAPA Report |
| TS | SG2 | 2.1 | No evidence of SDD Host. | NI | CAPA Report |
| TS | SG3 | 3.1 | No evidence of RN Host and Terminal | NI | CAPA Report |
| TS | SG3 | 3.1 | Project doesn't use mandated form of SDDs | NI | CAPA Report |
| TS | SG3 | 3.1 | No evidence of Critical Code included in SDD. | NI | CAPA Report |
| TS | GP | 3.2 | No evidence of Install plan | LI | Resolved |
| TS | GP | 3.2 | No evidence of UTR documented in RNs Gware Host and PC | NI | CAPA Report |
| VAL | GP | 3.2 | No evidence of QA summary report | LI | Resolved |
| VAL | GP | 3.2 | No evidence of Final site/CAT report | LI | Resolved |
| VER | SG2 | 2.2 | No evidence of SRS Peer Review | NI | CAPA Report |
| VER | SG2 | 2.2 | No evidence of SDD Host and Terminal Peer Review | NI | CAPA Report |
| VER | SG2 | 2.2 | No evidence of test procedures peer review | NI | CAPA Report |
| VER | SG2 | 2.2 | No evidence of release notes Host and Terminal peer review | NI | CAPA Report |
| VER | SG2 | 2.2 | No evidence of SDD Terminal Peer Review | NI | CAPA Report |
| VER | SG2 | 2.2 | Peer review tracker report not completed | NI | CAPA Report |

**Appendix**

**CMMI Process Areas and Definitions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Process Area** | **Definition** |
| Requirements Development (RD) | RD emphasizes the establishment of customer, product and product component requirements. |
| Requirements Management (REQM) | REQM adds the management of requirements to provide a well-controlled foundation on which the product is built. |
| Project Planning (PP) | PP aids project managers in planning project activities |
| Project Monitoring and Control (PMC) | PMC emphasizes managing project performance according to the plan. |
| Risk Management (RSKM) | RSKM enables projects to proactively identify and reduce risks that may jeopardize achieving project objectives. |
| Configuration Management (CM) | CM emphasizes configuration management and change control processes for designated work products. |
| Process and Product Quality Assurance (PPQA) | PPQA evaluates the quality of processes and work products. |
| Measurement and Analysis (MA) | MA addresses the information needs of the organization and projects with a measurement system. |
| Decision Analysis and Resolution (DAR) | DAR supports making major decisions using a formal decision process. |
| Technical Solution (TS) | TS focuses on designing and building the solutions. |
| Product Integration (PI) | PI addresses integrating the solutions and delivering the products. |
| Verification (VER) | VER emphasizes ensuring the solutions satisfy the requirements. |
| Validation (VAL) | VAL emphasizes ensuring the solutions satisfy the need. |

**Legends for the ratings:**

**LI** – Largely Implemented

**PI** – Partially Implemented

**NI** – Not Implemented

|  |
| --- |
| **Abbreviations(ratings)** |
| LI-Largely Implemented |
| PI-Partially Implemented |
| NI-Not implemented |