

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@inforeliance.com]

Sent: Friday, December 14, 2007 12:57 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Initial feedback on the QA Plan, Test Plan, and System Design Documents

[REDACTED]

I will be at EOP on Monday afternoon and hope that we can meet to go through your concerns thoroughly and come up with a plan resolve these issues.

Thanks

[REDACTED] PMP

InfoReliance
Director

Marine Corps and Executive Office of the President (EOP) Programs

[REDACTED]@inforeliance.com

[REDACTED] (Office)

[REDACTED] (Mobile)

From: [REDACTED]@oa.eop.gov]

Sent: Friday, December 14, 2007 12:24 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Initial feedback on the QA Plan, Test Plan, and System Design Documents

[REDACTED]

I just want to provide some heads up on the feedback that I'm receiving so far. I expect to have full feedback from everyone by Monday. However, due to the nature of the feedback I wanted to get something to so you can start addressing the issues. What I have received is:

From our IA Director:

Both the QA plan and the Test plan seem to be extremely sparse. I would expect quite a bit more detail in both of these, especially the QA plan. I think the contractor needs to revisit these two documents and write them according to standards. PMO might be able to assist them in finding the right contents for these two documents.

From the SDI Business Analyst:

Quality Assurance Plan

This document is not a QA plan. There are no quality controls specified. The QA plan also does not show what benchmarks or metrics the code is being weighed against or what constitutes a success or failure, or more importantly how the failures are measured and mitigated. The plan also does not reference risks, or other required plans that should have been written to show a full life cycle development effort.

Test Plan

There are no benchmarks or other metrics to compare the tests to. The test plan is written to obtain metrics and not to test the performance of the application to 'acceptable' or 'tolerable' measures.

12/14/2007

HOGR70A-030070

The Test Plan references Use Case Testing. The use cases that are documented in the SRS are not designed or written as testable use cases. There are little to no testable requirements.

System Design Document

Looks good from a system design perspective.

I would only be concerned that there are no documented requirements.

There is no requirements tractability.

There are no unit or system testing requirements, benchmarks.

There is no functionality descriptors

From my own concerns having read the documents:

The test plan makes no reference to our current tool or comparisons against our current tool. In other words, if I run the new tool and CMDFI, do I get the same message counts? I also didn't see the process to determine the number of messages within the PST file and validate that the same number is accounted for in the output. We need to show that we are trying to break the tool and indeed, we do need to try to break it. That is why it is in the lab. Can we test for messages from signed emails, can we test for emails that we know has caused problems in the past with CMDFI? Can we have multiple people use the tool against the same PST file or different PST files to show that the process provides consistent results and the same counts as CMDFI and work when CMDFI fails? As I indicated earlier this week or late last week, we do have a team of people available to assist in testing the tool in the lab.

The test cases were not well explained. Also, no references back to the testing against the requirements that the testing was satisfying.

As with all the documents, there was no matrix at the back of the document indicating what requirements were being addressed.

In my opinion, the documents need to be able to stand on their own, which they can do if they have the requirements matrix in the back and show how the document is addressing the requirements. However, what we have is sparse and I have to agree with the feedback that I'm receiving with others; both verbal and written. I also want to express my disappointment with the QA plan, especially in the process of ensuring that what is being provided is of a quality acceptable by all the individuals named in the document. Has Mr. Thames approved the documents we received? Has Mr. Peters reviewed the documents? What we received does not reflect the review by the QA people or if their approvals were obtained.

I also have to admit my bias, as I'm looking at the documents from IEEE standards for a QA plan, for a test plan, and for a SDD and much of what I expected to see, based on those standards, does not appear to be in the documents. Much of the project documentation at the EOP is variations of IEEE standards. These standards are available at www.ieee.org

■ I wish I could provide better feedback and I do apologize of not being available to receive your call this morning. I was called into a meeting. However, I'm more than willing to discuss the above, because we are all interested in this project being successful.

Sincerely,

■
Acting Chief, Service Delivery Improvement Branch
Information Systems and Technology Directorate
Office of Administration
Executive Office of the President
■ (Office)
■ (Mobile)
■ @oa.eop.gov

12/14/2007

HGR70A-030071