



Deliverable Acceptance Sheet

A separate Acceptance Sheet is to be completed for each deliverable. Upon completion, please submit to Vendor Management

Deliverable Description			
SOW Number	SOW 8		
Program Milestone	System Testing and System Integration Testing		
Deliverable ID			
Deliverable Composition	System Test Completion report, (draft at 27/4/09)		
Deliverable Lead	Mark Dymock		
Purpose			
Date of Deliverable	27/4/2009	Date due to IBM:	1/5/2009
Dependent Deliverables			
Prerequisite Deliverables			
Linked to Payment Milestone	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Milestone Date:
Acceptance Details			
Created:	Date:		
Acceptance Lead: Lynelle Adams	Date: 27/03/2009		
ACCEPTED (refer to 'Comments' Section) Y Subject to updates as listed in comments section – note that changes are editorial and not material to test completion.	NOT ACCEPTED (refer to 'Comments' Section) <input type="checkbox"/>		
Acceptance Lead Signature:	27/03/09		
Acceptance Board			
Acceptance Panel (List Board Members)	Area of Acceptance (e.g. Technical, Quality, Audit, Resourcing etc)	Date	
Damon Atzeni	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Jack van der Zwan	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Janette Jones	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Jo Boland	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Leanne Bulmer	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Roslyn Ricoine	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Brian Frederick	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Michael McMahon	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Hans van den Bergh	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	
Scott Asmus	Scope, Technical, Quality	1 May 2009	

Comments

Comments / Issues / Defects (add notes or attach document. If not accepted, please provide list of defects and issues).

This should be updated to reflect the defect status at final publication – in section 2.1 and . As at 5 May there were 24 open defects.

See Attached list for specific items to resolve.

Item	Page / Section Ref	Comment
1.	3 (general)	Update comments to reflect outstanding severity 3 defects in specific test sections.
2.	3.1.2	Note that CorpTech Payroll Bureaus as responsible for external Application test phase (for bank file, payslip printing and deduction disbursements).
3.	3.1.2.	Suggest that Corptech Service Management conditional acceptance of testing of the EFT file be noted with reference to residual issues in appendix B.
4.	3.5	<p>Suggest comments on how the QHIC requirements Traceability Matrix links to the test cases and defects in Quality Centre, so that it is clear what level of traceability there is from the matrix to execution.</p> <p>Suggest also not to the effect that evidence of these links were raised as an issue in the audit report (by KJ Ross & Associates) on April 23, and the issues has been reviewed and resolved. That is, we believe that IBM have been able to demonstrate satisfactory links between execution results and the Requirement Traceability Matrix and believe that on evidence provide that test execution has matched the requirements matrix.</p>
5.	Appendix B – Residual Issues.	<p>See comments from Michael McMahon, CorpTech Service Management regarding outstanding items for testing of EFT file.</p> <p>There was an updated EFT file provided to me yesterday. The previous issue with spurious characters was not witnessed, however two further issues that had been reported in previously reviewed files re-occurred:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The APCA id was incorrect for a Final Pay Run file. The APCA id was that of the adhoc runs. 2. The file did not contain a type 13 balancing transaction. <p>I have received no further payment summary print files or pay advice print files for review.</p>