

## Meeting Minutes

## Project Directorate Meeting

<b>Chairperson:</b>	Terry Burns	<b>Date:</b>	22 December 2008	<b>Time:</b>	2.00 pm
<b>Venue:</b>	QHEST, Level 24, 307 Queen Street	<b>Minute Taker:</b>	Lianne Allison		
<b>Present:</b>	Terry Burns, Tony Price, Amanda Doughty, Pierre Pienaar, Janette Jones, Bob Cramp, Paul Hickey, Nicola Stubbings, Craig Edmonds				
<b>Apologies:</b>	Steve Mitchell, Shaurin Shah				
<b>Tabled Documents:</b>	QHIC Project Steering Committee Report				

### 1.0 PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS

Date Arising	Item #	Business Arising	Status	By Whom	When

### 2.0 MEETING ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

Item #	Action/ Decision	By Whom	When
	<p><u>PPV Results</u></p> <p>Paul Hickey has raised a CR on Infrastructure – revised business volumetrics</p> <p>Pay Sunday – Amanda, Janette and Pine are comfortable with the run time measured. Pay Monday results were down due to an additional Saturday payrun. Splitting of leave accrual in the Saturday payrun needs to be looked at. There will be a workshop session this week to look at the retro's etc on the Saturday payrun. Detail has not yet been worked out. Amanda stated there is a lot more documentation behind this. Janette accepted the results of what has been measured. Amanda and Janette are both comfortable with the results</p> <p>CorpTech have some concerns around the Pay Monday results. Bob is concerned there are components missing and would like to see further documentation. He commented that as part of PPV it was noted that times of 6.5 hours did not include manual processes i.e. workarounds for each payrun. The time does not represent a realistic view for the whole payrun. There is no contingency if the payrun takes longer than 6 hours for impacts such as EBs etc.</p>		

Item #	Action/ Decision	By Whom	When
	<p>Janette stated that the gate was a technical checkpoint to test run time only. It was not meant to preclude or replace UAT or End to End testing processes. It was a checkpoint to challenge the time the system would take to run only.</p> <p>Amanda has written a briefing note documenting the process of working with IBM on the Saturday payrun. It will provide clarity to the Steering Committee tomorrow. IBM must make a commitment to continue to try to get the time down through testing – not just settle for the 6.5 hour period.</p> <p>Tony commented it was a promising result however the gate hasn't been met contractually. It needs to be decided if the Project goes ahead. There needs to be a continuation of this work to finalise business processes etc before we enter UAT.</p> <p>Terry stated it was not about the pass/fail on 6 hours. Can we build a successful payroll system? Queensland Health is happy and confident that we can. We need to better define what steps need to be done to clarify contractually before we go into UAT. Do we have a stabilised position? Do we have clean entry into UAT? The purpose of the gate is for QH confidence. We need to formalise entry and exit requirements leading into UAT. Service Management needs to have their acceptance criteria sured up with IBM regarding SOW8 and SOW9.</p> <p>Bob questioned whether Payrun Saturday is the only option. There is no evidence of robust testing seen so far and it may not be the best solution. There is a bundle of work that needs to be done to flesh out the new approach. Tony needs this clarified before UAT begins on 12 January.</p> <p>There are three 3 options for decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Results are acceptable and the gate is passed</li> <li>2) Gate should be extended</li> <li>3) Reject and close the project</li> </ol> <p><b>Action:</b> Unanimous decision was made to move forward past the Gate. Serious discussion was had around the amount of work to be done prior and throughout the project lifecycle. The decision was made to accept the gate as passed with the above qualifications.</p> <p>UAT may have to wait – there is 2 weeks contingency in the current schedule. Defined architecture and business processes are to be documented. There needs to be a roadmap of how the whole system works in a 14 day cycle. Janette does not agree this is the best way to proceed – she believes it is exit criteria. Tony firmly believes we need this prior to entry of UAT.</p>	<p>Project Directorate members</p>	
001	<p><u>Scope CRs</u></p> <p>IBM received the requirements for the HR/Fi CR at 11 am. There are now 2 specific issues. QHEST has a requirement document which went to IBM and needs approval from Finance Branch. We need to ascertain the impact on schedule from IBM. It could impact the schedule for HR/FI. Pine to put the issues in a document and distribute this afternoon\</p> <p>CR 175 and 176 are still to go to the Steering Committee tomorrow. There are workarounds for extraction and wage types. Held up in SDA again and this needs to be sorted out rapidly. Tony and Terry meeting with CorpTech after this meeting.</p> <p>CPU sizing may change and this will require a new Change Request. There could be an increase4 from 7 to</p>	<p>Pierre Pienaar</p>	<p>23 December 2008</p>

Item #	Action/ Decision	By Whom	When
	8. The CR has been registered but not as yet ratified. The CR is for production – revised business volumetrics 4 to 8. CR 168 has gone in.		

### 3.0 NEXT MEETING

Item #	DATE	Time	Location
	6 January 2008	3.00pm	QHEST, Level 24, 307 Queen Street