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**Review History**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review #** | **Date** | **Review Name** |
| 1 | 22-Jan-2016 | Summary Review 1 |
| 2 | 29-Mar-2016 | Summary Review 2 |
| 3 | 19-May-2016 | Summary Review 3 |
| 4 | 13-June-2016 | Draft CAPA |
| 5 | 27-June-2016 | Final CAPA |
| 6 | 28-June-2016 | Finding removed; SPM provided additional info   * No evidence SPM approved of Summary System Test Report |

**Project Information:**

Customer Name: California State Lottery

SAP ID: CA22662

GO Live: 06/12/16

Location: ATC

**Project Stakeholders:**

Regional Lead: Andy Haley

Program Manager: Jay Lance

Project Manager: Jenne Langford

Software Project Manager: Amy Price

Compliance Manager: Karen Robertson

Standards Compliance Lead: Luis Mario Cancino Garcia

**Related Documents:**

* None

## Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations:

* BI – Business Intelligence
* CML – Configuration Management Lead
* CR – Change Request
* PRR – Product Release Request
* RDL – Regional Lead
* SDD – Software Design Description
* SRS – Software Requirements Specification
* CAPA – Correct Action/Preventive Action Report

**Project Schedule:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Phases** | **START** | **FINISH** | **DURATION** |
| Scope Development | Mon 11/09/15 | Fri 11/20/15 | 10 days |
| Scope Review and Sign-off | Mon 11/23/15 | Fri 12/04/15 | 10 days |
| SRS and BRD Development complete | Mon 12/07/15 | Fri 1/1/16 | 20 days |
| IGT SRS finalization | Mon 1/4/16 | Fri 01/08/16 | 5 days |
| IGT SRS Review | Mon 1/11/16 | Fri 01/15/16 | 5 days |
| SRS Final Review and Sign-off | Mon 01/18/16 | Fri 01/22/16 | 5 days |
| Software Design | Mon 01/18/16 | Fri 01/29/16 | 10 days |
| Software Development | Mon 02/01/16 | Tue 03/15/16 | 32 days |
| Integration | Wed 03/16/16 | Fri 03/18/16 | 3 days |
| SQA | Mon 03/21/16 | Fri 04/22/16 | 25 days |
| CAT | Mon 04/25/16 | Fri 06/03/16 | 30 days |
| Install Preparation/Testing | Mon 06/06/16 | Fri 06/10/16 | 5 days |
| Live |  | **Sun 06/12/16** |  |

**Scope:**

This review is for the CY1601 Mt Whitney. 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:**  Technical Solution | **Detail:**   * Release Notes were not approved and released to QA prior to the start of QA phase |
| **Management Response:**   |  | | --- | | [Jenne 6/27/16) Accept this finding. Release Notes were not approved prior to start of QA  My comments below were based on the initial finding detail from StC of: “No evidence Release Notes were approved and released to QA for use during testing”  All Release were approved – see approvals in Clarity here:  [CA 1601 Software - Release Notes Folder](http://clarity.gtk.gtech.com/niku/nu#action:dms.ProjectsfileManager&folderId=6234877&returnAction=dms.ProjectsFileManager&cancelAction=dms.ProjectsFileManager&actionItemId=&id=5272582&type=Projects&taskID=&fromPage=&rootFolderId=&)  The detail of this finding is not specific enough. The standard process was followed; no different to any other project. Has this process changed? | |
| **Corrective Action/Preventative Action**  Approved RNs must be provided to the test group at the start of testing in accordance with process requirements.  **Notes**   * Release Notes were approved in April and May * Mt. Whitney QA Readiness Review conducted 3-18-2016 Criteria   c) Have all Release Notes been delivered => *In progress*  **Process Requirements**   * QA plan section 8 Deliverables * Requires the Release Notes to be approved and released to test at the start of QA testing. No evidence the project complied with this requirement. * GP014 Release Notes Guidelines Rev 2.6 (*1-May-2013*) section 1.1 Purpose * To facilitate the “hand-off” of software to the Test Group. |
| **Observation**  Project Monitoring and Control | **Observation**   * PSR 3.26.2016 - Does not report any issues with Integration, QA planning, and Execution * No risks/decisions related to incomplete SDD and RNs * No risk/decisions related to incomplete development * Project proceeding to integration with incomplete development   **Note:**  ***Integration* Readiness review** - 3.15.16  a) Has all Development been completed? => *No, got replies from engineers on the percentage they are completed. Less at 50%, Daniel 100%, Arsen 75% that is all that has been heard from so far. Overall percentage completed, 60%* |
| **Observation**  Verification | **Observation**-- in this case not required.   * Project should have considered a peer review *Re-Inspection* in lieu of *Acceptance* of the draft SRS submittal. * Software Requirements Specification (SRS) PRMS Entry * High Defects – 7 * Medium Defects – 35 * Low Defects – 22 * Informational Defect – 13   Total Defects 77   * 18 Change Requests (CRs) related to requirements |

**Detail of Findings:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Process Area** | **Goal** | **Practice** | **Description** | **Rating** |
| TS | SG3 | 3.1 | Release Notes were not approved and released to QA prior to the start of QA phase | LI |
| PMC | Obv | Obv | PSR 3.26.2016 - Does not report any issues with Integration, QA planning, and Execution | Obv |
| VER | Obv | Obv | Project should have considered a peer review *Re-Inspection* in lieu of *Acceptance* of the draft SRS submittal. | Obv |

**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 |
| OBV-Observation |