

1. Justify the notion that the results were “gratifying”

The results were gratifying. Although there were a mess up in software quality assurance like late than schedule, many failures by different companies, the final product is “once in operation, was a great success...etc ”.

At first, the mess up occurs because health soft is lack of professional skills and organizations. I can't believe a company who claimed they specialized in hospital software must subcontract a software to a lot of companies. It rather than a gateway company that hiring other software companies but not a software development company. I think the HealthSoft should ask for milestones and checkpoints. However, since the final product works, everything is under the original contract, the result is gratifying.

At second, the RedAid itself has problem. According to article, the development company meets some cooperation problems during testing, I believe this is RedAid's fault, it's a lack of communication and management.

In conclusion, although the entire event ended up with court claims, and trials lasts for years, the final product was working and success, so the results was gratifying .

2. Was the HealthSoft method of choosing subcontractors satisfactory?

Not satisfactory at all. The HealthSoft should not choose a company that only advantage at lower price. The Healthsoft should do adequate background research on its subcontractors, as well as apply correct rules to prevent secret subcontracting like CapeCode did.

3. Was the method of purchasing COTS software appropriate?

Purchasing COTS software itself is appropriate when the modules or COST software's role is not related to secret information such as payment and can reduce cost of self-built. However, in this case, healthsoft purchase Medal 5E to satisfy patient credit and monthly accounting requirements. This method is very unsafe, also since the 5E is in laboratory manner thus the quality of Medal 5E is not secured, thus the method healthsoft used was not appropriate.

However, healthsoft should hiring a company to develop credit and monthly accounting functions, or develop it by themselves to ensure the security and quality. At least, they should ask lion security company to preform security check on this module.

4. Was the method of controlling the implementation of the customer's contribution to the project adequate?

It is not adequate. The RedAid's lack of corporation reflected the weakness of management of customer's' contribution.

It is quite common for a customer to perform parts of the project: to apply the customers' special expertise, respond to commercial or other security needs, keep internal development staff occupied, prevent future maintenance problems and so forth. This situation does have drawbacks in terms of the customer-supplier relationship necessary for successful performance of a project, but they are outweighed by the inputs the customer makes.

HealthSoft should include the customer contribution in the contract to ensure RedAid's cooperation during development.

5. Was HealthSoft's control over its external participants adequate?

Not adequate. Healthsoft doesn't require milestone or checklist for its subcontractors, also the meeting is not enough.

I think Healthsoft should ask for milestone and assign checklist for its subcontractors, also make meeting weekly to check progress. The RedAid is also responsible for ask healthsoft to provide milestone and checklist. In the meantime, HealthSoft should manage the cooperation from RedAid to ensure development.