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1. Deliverable Review Summary and Recommendations

Figure 1. Deliverable Review Summary

| **Deliverable Name / Version:** | **Deliverable Expectation Documents / Version 1** |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Owner** | Corina Gasner |
| **Document Originator** | CGI |
| **Work Package ID** |  |
| **Date Submitted to Gartner** |  |
| **Comments Requested By** | Vijay Desai, Sr. Project Manager |
| **Item reviewed against** | Industry and Gartner Best Practices |
| **Review Type** | DDI Quality Assurance |
| **Reviewers** | Leitch – Chartrand – Chahil - McKinnon |

Figure 2. Deliverable Recommendations

| **Accept / Reject** | **Return for rework** |
| --- | --- |
| **Reason for Reject** | **Incomplete – additional refinement needed** |

Deliverable Review Details

Figure 3. Deliverable Review Details

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **DED# / Section** | **Findings** | **Recommendations** | **Priority (H/M/L)** | **CGI Comments** |
| 1 | All | The DEDs do not include references to the industry standards that deliverables align with | Include references and language to the standards used to structure the deliverables, as per the CPMF | H | *The deliverables were structured based off of the CGI / State of Hawaii statement of work. There were no additional standards applied to determine how to structure the deliverables.* |
| 2 | All | The DED itself needs a section on “Revision History” – this would include the version of the DED and the date submitted | Recommend addition of section | L | *Revision history section added at end.* |
| 3 | All | Every deliverable document needs to identify the “Deliverable Owner”– there is no indication of this content in these DEDs | Recommend addition of section | L | *Added the deliverable owner in the top section of the document.* |
| 4 | All | Every deliverable document needs to identify the “Proposal/Contract Reference” that refers to the document that defines the deliverable that this is a DED for – there is no indication of this content in these DEDs | Recommend addition of section | H | *In Section 1 of each DED, added a Proposal/Contract Reference****.*** |
| 5 | All | Every deliverable document needs a section on “Revision History” – there is no indication of this content in these DEDs | Recommend addition of section | L | *A revision history section is appended to the end of each DED.* |
| 6 | All | The section called “Development and Review Plan” should be better described as “Development and Review Schedule and Approval Distribution List” | Recommend addition of section | L | *Changed the section title to “Approver, Reviewers, and Work Plan”* |
| 7 | All | In the Acceptance Criteria section the DED should indicate the conditions for 3 possible outcomes:   * Acceptable: The deliverable document is in full compliance with the approved DED. Where all content described in the DED is included and the design described fully satisfies the requirements described within the agreed architecture principles and in compliance with all SOV standards. * Rework Required: The deliverable document is substantially in compliance with the approved DED. However, there are omissions or errors that need to be corrected before the document can be approved. * Unacceptable: The document is not in compliance with the approved DED and there are significant omissions in content and or errors that need to be addressed before the document can be fully reviewed. | | M | *CGI’s Review Record document that accompanies each deliverable already outlines the process for approving or rejecting the deliverable, based upon the acceptance criteria. In order to avoid redundancy, CGI did not describe that process within the DED itself.* |
| 8 | D-03  D-04  D-05  D-06 | Refers to “requirements documents” where these are all “design documents” | Recommend refinement of section | L | *In the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement, the wording used in the acceptance criteria describes the “Interface Design Documents” as “interface requirements documents;” the same reference was used here for consistency.* |
| 9 | D-03  D-04  D-05  D-06 | Comments that apply to Interface Design Deliverable Documents:  In each of these DEDs the section on Content includes an overview of what must be included for a sub-set of interfaces addressed by the DED. This overview covers business requirements, data flow design and technical requirements. | As “design” documents these deliverables must include a description of the design of the interface and logically in the following order:   * Business Requirements * Technical Requirements * Data Flow and Technical Design of the Interface | M | *Changed the order of the sections as suggested.* |
| 10 | D-07,  D-08,  D-09,  D-10,  D-11,  D-12,  D-13 | Comments that apply to Test Results Deliverable Documents:  In each of these DEDs the section on Content includes a specification of the tests that will be conducted. One aspect of this is “Test Setup” – this should be expanded to ensure the inclusion of:   * A description of the test environment * The test data * The ability to cycle the tests that will be required to efficiently conduct and repeat the tests | Recommend addition of section | M | *Test Setup section added as suggested.* |
| 11 | D-15 | The Acceptance Criteria references “The RSD provides a complete description of the behavior of the system to be implemented” but does not describe the definition of “complete” nor how that will be ensured or measured. | Provide measurable criteria that addresses “complete”ness of the RSD | M | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 12 | D-15 | The Acceptance Criteria states that the deliverable will “leverage the documentation provided by the Federal CALT and CGI artifacts” but does not provide a way to ensure or measure that | Provide criteria that addresses measuring “leverage” of artifacts in the RSD | M | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 13 | D-15  1.0 | The Deliverable Description indicates that the RSD will provide a summary of the business requirements for the Exchange project, yet it neglects to mention where non-functional requirements are documented. | Recommend referencing where non-functional requirements (e.g., performance, quality, design constraints, etc.) are captured. | L | *The RSD is not technical in nature, but rather documents where business requirements are addressed in the system.* |
| 14 | D-15  2.0 | The content of the RSD is very high-level and does not include some key sections as follows:   * Overview – purpose, revision or release number, scope, intended audience, acronyms and references such as: standards, RTM, use case documents, vision documents, workflows, etc. * Requirements Specifications –, design and implementation constraints (federal or state policies, timing requirements, design conventions, etc.) * Assumptions and dependencies – assumptions that could affect the business requirements stated in the RSD | Recommend adding sections outlined in the findings | M | *Updated RSD to incorporate the concept of purpose and scope, and to denote that applicable assumptions will be in the abstract.*  *Revision history is part of the deliverable template for the project. Acronyms will be spelled out in the first instance and abbreviated thereafter. There is also a published acronym list on Ensemble.*  *The focus of this deliverable is identification where these requirements are met in the system. Federal & state policies are input to the development of the requirements and design considerations are elements of the System Design Document.* |
| 15 | D-15  4 | The RSD does not mention the need to provide links between the business requirements included in the deliverable and the business process flows | Recommend adding link as per finding | M | *The RSD does not address these linkages – this work is a separate effort that the SOV is undertaking.* |
| 15a | D-17 | n/a | In Acceptance Criteria, the following change is made.   * The business rules will **provide developers the information required to encode policy into the**~~be coded in the~~ Oracle Policy Automation tool (OPA). | M | *CGI has edited this acceptance criterion to better interpret the meaning of the deliverable, as a prerequisite to development work where rules will be encoded.* |
| 16 | D-18 | Add the following additional topics in the system design document:   * Assumptions/Constraints/Risks * Operational Scenarios * System Integrity Controls * Glossary and Acronyms | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *Suggested content has been added.* |
| 17 | D-19 | Add the following additional topics in the database design document:   * Assumptions/Constraints/Risks * Detailed Database Design * Data Objects and Resultant Data Structures * DBMS Files | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *Suggested content has been added.* |
| 18 | D-19 | In Database Administration Section, add the following sub-sections:   * Roles and Responsibilities * System Information  1. Database Management System Configuration 2. Database Support Software 3. Security and Privacy  * Performance Monitoring And Database Efficiency  1. Operational Implications 2. Data Transfer Requirements 3. Data Formats  * Glossary and Acronyms | Recommend adding topics as per finding | M | *Suggested content has been added.* |
| 19 | D-20 | Add the following additional topics in the Data Management Plan:   * Assumptions/Constraints/Risks * Data and Metadata Format Standards * Accesses and Sharing * Re-Use, Re-Distribution and the Production of Derivatives * Archiving Data and Samples * Master Data Management | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *Most of these items have been added to the deliverable document already issued to the SOV on 4/3/2013. The remaining items can be reviewed for inclusion during the deliverable review process.* |
| 20 | D-21 | Add the following additional topic and sub-topics in the Interface Control Document:   * General Interface Requirements * Interface Overview * Design Strategies * Business Rules * HIX HIPPA 834 Interface Overview | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *General Interface Requirements is added.*  *Interface Overview is covered under the Service Overview section. Design Strategies and*  *Business Rules topics are both covered under the Detail Interface Requirements section. The HIX HIPAA 834 Interface information is covered within various sections of the ICD.* |
| 21 | D-22 | The sentence “The SOV will provide adequate and appropriately skilled staff to serve in the role as Trainers.” Is not appropriate as a descriptor for the TtT curriculum | Recommend refinement of section | M | *Added further clarification in table of contents item #1.* |
| 22 | D-22 | The audience for this deliverable is unclear | Clarify the intended users that these materials are targeted to. | L | *Table of contents section was expanded to address.* |
| 23 | D-22 | It is unclear how the deliverable will “…leverage other CGI HIX engagements to bring together Training Materials, Manuals and lessons learned” | Recommend refinement of section | L | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement; added some clarification regarding leveraging other engagements.* |
| 24 | D-22 2 | The content items are missing the following components–   * Subject areas for the various training material * Reference to policy manuals as applicable | Recommend adding subject areas covered in the training material, such as – end-user training, maintenance and support training, etc; and reference to policy manuals as applicable | M | *Table of contents section was expanded.* |
| 25 | D-23  2 | There are no descriptions for the following Content Items –  1.8 Key System capacity management considerations  1.9 Key security management functionality  1.10 Contact information for receiving support  1.13 File Descriptions  1.14 System and System environment configuration baseline  2.0 Commercial off the Shelf software user manuals | Recommend adding descriptions as per finding | M | *Descriptions have been added.* |
| 26 | D-23 | Deliverables address manuals tailored to a State user, or partner that is trained – it does not address untrained users (e.g. residents) | Clarify the intended users that user manuals are targeted to. Ensured that all targeted users have appropriate manuals referenced. | M | *Intended audience is addressed in the Description section.* |
| 27 | D-23 | It is unclear how the manuals will include “Computer-based or other media” | Clarify the Acceptance Criteria | L | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 28 | D-24 | Add the following additional topic and sub-topics in the System Security Plan:   * System Identification * System Name * Responsible Organization * Designated Contacts * Assignment of Security Responsibility * System Operational Status * Description of Business Process * Description of Operational/System Environment * System Interconnections * System Security Level * E-Authentication Level * Applicable Laws and Regulations * Rules of Behavior * Review of Security Controls * Risk Assessment and Risk Management * Planning for Security in System Development Lifecycle | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *Additional topics are added to the table of contents section.* |
| 29 | D-24 | Under Security Controls Details and Comments, address:   * Access Control Family * Awareness and Training Family * Audit and Accountability Family * Certification, Accreditation, and Security Assessment Family * Configuration Management Family * Contingency Planning Family * Identification and Authentication Family * Incident Response Family * Maintenance Family * Media Protection Family * Physical and Environmental Protection Family * Personnel Security Family * Risk Assessment Family * Systems and Services Acquisition Family * Systems and Communications Protection Family * System and Information Integrity Family * E-Authentication Family | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *Additional topics are added to the table of contents section.* |
| 30 | D-25 | Add the following additional topic and sub-topics in the System Security Plan:   * System Identification * System Name * Responsible Organization * Designated Contacts * Assignment of Security Responsibility * System Operational Status * Description of Business Process * Description of Operational/System Environment * System Interconnections * System Security Level * E-Authentication Level * Risks and Safeguards * Business Risks and Safeguards * System Risks and Safeguards | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *Additional topics are added to the table of contents section.* |
| 31 | D-26  1 | There is no mention of the implementation strategy for the Exchange solution, including its benefits. | Recommend adding the implementation strategy and associated benefits in the Overview | H | *Added overall strategy and benefits to the Overview section.* |
| 32 | D-26  5.1.2.3 | The Implementation procedures section does not mention the integration activities that will be performed after the implementation and the verification procedures that will be required prior to acceptance of the site | Recommend adding integration and verification activities to the plan | H | *This topic is covered in section 5.1.3 Site Implementation Verification.* |
| 33 | D-26  4 | There is no reference to all supporting activities that must be completed before site acceptance, such as training and manuals | Recommend addition to acceptance criteria | L | *Items such as training and manuals needed before site acceptance will be covered in Section 4 Implementation Support. There is also an Operational Readiness Review, as noted in Section 5.1.3 Site Implementation Verification.* |
| 34 | D-26 | Who is the “Supplier” as referenced? | Recommend refinement of section | L | *Changed to “CGI.”* |
| 35 | D-26 | Description given is not specific to HIX or Vermont. State should ensure that this meets their specific needs | Recommend refinement of section | L | *Clarified with reference in the Description section to State of Vermont’s Health Benefit Exchange.* |
| 36 | D-27  2 | There is no mention of the audience of the Plan | Recommend addition to Section 2 | L | *Added audience to Section 1 Description.* |
| 37 | D-27 | Acceptance Criteria are vague | Recommend refinement of section | M | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 38 | D-28 | At a minimum, address the following topics in the Interconnection Security Agreement:   * Purpose * CMS Background * Non-CMS Organization Background * Scope * Authority * Statement Of Requirements * Network Descriptions * Security Responsibilities * Personnel/User Security * Policies * Network Security * Incident Prevention, Detection, And Response * Modifications * Compliance * Cost Considerations * Timeline * Order Of Precedence * Confidentiality * Survival * Records * Assignment * Severability * Warranty * Limitation Of Liability * Force Majeure * Signatures | Recommend adding topics as per finding | H | *As the CMS template for this document is released, the mandated content will be determined. The suggested review comments will be taken into consideration and merged in with the template content wherever feasible.* |
| 39 | D-29 | In this DED the section on Content includes a section for each type of testing (Integration, System (End to End), Stress – Performance and User Acceptance Test (UAT). | In addition to the results described in the current version of the DED each section should also specify that the report should include a description of the test objectives and an overview of the test approach used. | H | *Change made as suggested.* |
| 40 | D-30 | “All deliverables have been approved by SOV and submitted to CMS” is not specific. CGI likely means “deliverables 26-29 have been approved…” | Clarify meaning and reword | L | *Clarified the wording to refer to deliverables 26-29 specifically.* |
| 41 | D-30 | “Post-production readiness plan” is not meaningful or measurable | Refine | L | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 42 | D-30 | There is no reference in the acceptance criteria to a review, remediation and acceptance of Content items 3 “Identified Problem Report” and 4 “Operational Readiness Review Results” | Provide acceptance criteria that ensures review and acceptance of these content items | H | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 43 | D-30 | Cannot find the reference in the PMP to “The SOV and CGI will develop the final go- live criteria as set forth in the PMP” | Clarify | M | *The go-live criteria will be analyzed and added via a revision to the PMP by a date TBD in August 2013.* |
| 44 | D-30 | There is little consideration for the overall use cases, workflows and requirements in the acceptance criteria under Testing Deliverables -> Software -> Unit Testing | Refine Acceptance Criteria | H | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
| 45 | D-30  2.3 | Missing description of Deliverable D-28 | Add to section 2.3 | L | *Added description.* |
| 46 | D-32 | The Acceptance Criteria is a copy of the description of the deliverable. It should provide a measurable way to ensure success of the deliverable | Provide criteria that are measurable | H | *CGI is using the acceptance criteria language that is provided in the State of Vermont / CGI master services agreement.* |
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