

## **New York Health Benefit Exchange**

### **Detailed Design Review Summary for 9.0 Technology October 26, 2012**

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
9.3.3	<b>IV&amp;V Reports, Quality Management section of the PMP</b>

**Note: The Quality Management Plan, which is referenced within this section, is provided in section 9.4.10**

# **NY Health Insurance Exchange Quality Assurance Review**

**Version 1**

## **QA Deliverable: Quality Management Plan (528500-20120822000) Review**

**Presented to: State of New York**

**Department of Health**

**Office of Health Insurance Programs**

**Division of Systems**



Cognosante  
6263 North Scottsdale Road, Suite 200  
Scottsdale, AZ 85250  
Voice: 480.423.8184 fax: 480.423.8108  
[www.cognosante.com](http://www.cognosante.com)

<b>NY-HX</b>	State of New York Department of Health QA Deliverable – Configuration Management Plan QA Review	August 2012
--------------	--	-------------

## NY-HX Quality Assurance (QA) Review

<b>Review ID:</b>	20120824-QMP-QAR-1
<b>Subject of Review:</b>	CSC NY-HX Quality Management Plan

### I. Background

As the Quality Assurance consultant to the New York Health Insurance Exchange (NY-HX) project, Cognosante is required to review and evaluate specific project deliverables prepared by the NY-HX Systems Integrator, CSC. These reviews occur over the course of the entire project timeline and for all phases of the software development lifecycle (SDLC).

### II. Scope of Review:

The scope of this review covers the release of the CSC Quality Management Plan. This review is required by the Funding Availability Solicitation (FAS) for NY-HX Quality Assurance Services and is specifically defined as a QA deliverable review requirement in Section 15, Exhibit 2: QA Contractor Deliverable Requirements by Project Phase.

### III. Summary of Review Process:

There are two major steps comprising the review process:

1. **Establish Clearly Stated Evaluation Criteria-** Quality checklists, consisting of evaluation criteria, are developed for the specific deliverable to be assessed. These criteria are based on the deliverable requirements established by the NY-HX FAS and by best practices defined within accepted industry standards applicable to the subject matter of the deliverable. The final output from this step is the creation of the Quality Assurance Checklist for the deliverable to be evaluated.
  
2. **Perform Assessment and Evaluation Using Stated Evaluation Criteria-** Upon receipt of the CSC project deliverable, Cognosante evaluates the deliverable content against the evaluation criteria established in Step 1 and records the evaluation in the Quality Evaluation Table shown in Section VII below.

For each criterion in the checklist, a determination is made as to whether the criteria is met using a Y- Yes, N- No, P- Partial, or TBD- To Be Determined rating scale. For criteria evaluations receiving a “No” or “Partial” rating, a risk factor of H- High, M- Medium, or L- Low is assigned. For any criteria receiving a “medium” risk factor rating or above, a critical finding is recorded in Section IV below. When applicable, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is defined for critical findings.



#### IV. Critical Findings:

Per the detailed evaluation provided in Section VII, there were two instances where an evaluation criteria assessment received a “medium” risk factor rating. This is documented below in the Finding table.

<b>IV.1 Finding</b>	For criteria item 4.6, which addresses best practices and the source of the reference, the only references made are to the CSC Knowledge Portal artifacts; no other standards references are made.
<b>IV.2 Finding</b>	For criteria item 5.3, which addresses work products that will be measured and evaluated, section 4.2.2 of the plan states that peer reviews will be done on selected deliverables, but does not specify which deliverables or types of deliverables are subject to peer review.

#### V. Corrective Actions

The corrective actions associated with the critical findings are provided below. It is also assumed that CSC will address the other criteria items receiving “Partial”, “No”, and “TBD” evaluations.

<b>V.1 Corrective Action</b>	For IV.1 finding, include relevant documentation in the plan.
<b>V.2 Corrective Action</b>	For IV.2 finding, include relevant documentation in the plan.

#### VI. Update History

Version	Date	By	Reason
1.0	8-24-12	L. Stella, L. Toole	Initial Evaluation

**VII. Detailed Evaluation Table**

NYS DOH/OHIP/DOS NY-HX - Quality Assurance Deliverable Review Checklist							
	<b>Deliverable:</b>	Quality Management Plan, dated August 22, 2012					
	<b>Assigned to:</b>	L. Stella, Cognosante					
Checklist Number	Standard Criteria	Criteria Met?	Risk Factor	Status	Status Date	Review Team Comments	Contractor Comments/Response
<b>Document Management</b>							
1.1	Unique document identifier	Y					
1.2	Version history (number, date, resource, reasons)	Y					
1.3	Distribution list and distribution history	N	L				
1.4	Effective date(s)	Y					
1.5	Managed by the document management system	Y					
<b>Content Management</b>							
2.1	Table of contents	Y					
2.2	Table of figures	N/A					
2.3	Glossary and acronym definitions	P	L			SHD not defined when used in plan; reference to external list	
2.4	Page numbers	Y					
2.5	Descriptive sections and headings	Y					



NYS DOH/OHIP/DOS NY-HX - Quality Assurance Deliverable Review Checklist							
2.6	Updated links to supporting or referenced documents	Y					
2.7	Detailed change history, if appropriate	Y					
2.8	Headers and footers are appropriate and accurate	Y					
2.9	Managed by the content management system	Y					
<b>Process Management</b>							
3.1	The document is available on schedule	Y					
3.2	The document is available to all stakeholders	Y					
3.3	A RACI approach is used to determine stakeholder involvement	Y					
3.4	Department and/or Cognosante personnel are given the opportunity to seek clarification from the contractor of ambiguous or unclear portions of the document.	Y					
3.5	Clarifications successfully resolve issues of ambiguous or unclear content.	N/A					
3.6	Action items, if necessary, are added to the QA issue log for tracking and resolution.	N/A					
3.7	The document is scheduled for periodic review and updating, if appropriate.	N/A					
<b>Information Architecture</b>							
4.1	The document contains sufficient detail to be effective, useful, and unambiguous.	Y					
4.2	The purpose and intended use of the document are defined	Y					



**NYS DOH/OHIP/DOS NY-HX - Quality Assurance Deliverable Review Checklist**

4.3	The document is appropriate for its intended use	Y					
4.4	The document structure aids accessibility	Y					
4.5	The document effectively uses figures and tables	Y					
4.6	The document explicitly references best practices along with the source of the reference.	P	M			The only reference is to CSC NPS Knowledge Portal artifacts	
<b>Adherence to the FAS and CSC Proposal</b>							
5.1	The Plan sets forth a proactive approach to analyzing and assessing the quality and accuracy of project performance.	Y					
	<b>The following commitments are from the CSC proposal. The Plan should reflect these commitments.</b>						
5.2	Our Quality Management Plan (QMP) will establish plans, processes, procedures, and standards that will add value to the project and satisfy project requirements from the beginning.	Y					
5.3	The QMP will specify the processes and procedures that will be used, as well as the associated work products that will be measured and evaluated.	P	M			Section 4.2.2 Peer reviews are done on 'selected' deliverables but the Plan does not specify which deliverables or type of deliverables are subject to peer review	
5.4	CSC's policies require that we include a project Quality Control Plan (QCP) as part of the QMP. QC personnel will audit work	Y					



**NYS DOH/OHIP/DOS NY-HX - Quality Assurance Deliverable Review Checklist**

	products for adequacy and recommend quality improvement initiatives to the Account Executive for consideration.						
5.5	The Quality Management Plan contains the processes and procedures for implementing a comprehensive Quality Assurance program in the NY-HX project. It focuses on performance monitoring, analysis, and reporting during all phases of the NY-HX project to ensure compliance with all policies and procedures and to promote stakeholder satisfaction.	Y					
	<b>Other Requirements</b>						
	<b>The following requirements are based on the HHS EPLC quality management guide</b>						
6.1	The Plan documents the roles and responsibilities of project staff related to quality management.	Y					
6.2	The Plan documents the tools that will be used to measure project quality and the level of conformance to defined quality standards and metrics.	Y					
6.3	The Plan documents which quality standards are relevant to the NY-HX and how to satisfy them.	Y					
6.4	The Plan identifies the metrics and related processes for which to measure quality standard.	Y					
6.5	The Plan identifies the actions, and the	Y					



**NYS DOH/OHIP/DOS NY-HX - Quality Assurance Deliverable Review Checklist**

	associated metrics to measure them, that provide the confidence that project quality is being met and has been achieved.						
6.6	The Plan identifies those monitoring and controlling actions that will be conducted to control quality throughout the life of the NY-HX and how it will be determined that quality standards comply with the defined project standards.	Y					