



Title: SRDP-CoDR Response	Author: Kern	Date: June 28, 2018
NRAO Doc. #: 530-SRDP-034-MGMT		Version: 1.0

SRDP Conceptual Design Review Project Response

PREPARED BY	ORGANIZATION	DATE
Jeff Kern	NRAO	June 28, 2018

Change Record

VERSION	DATE	REASON
1.0	June 28, 2018	Initial Version

I OVERVIEW

This document serves as the official response to the Science Ready Data Products Conceptual Design Review Committee Report. We thank the committee for their thorough and thoughtful review of the project. We accept the committee's recommendations and have incorporated them into the project organization and planning. In Section 2 response is provided to those recommendations the committee explicitly called out in the report.

Responses to individual RIDs and final disposition are available through the Jira instance used for the review. In summary, we have addressed all of the RIDs submitted by the committee as agreed at the review meeting, with the exception of those pertaining to the modification of the Proposal Submission Tool (PST) or Observation Preparation Tool (OPT). The document set on the review wiki page (<https://safe.nrao.edu/wiki/bin/view/SRDP/ConceptualDesignReview>) has been updated with the latest versions of all documents. These versions include corrections, clarifications, and suggestions in response to the committee's recommendations and observations (as well as those from the Stakeholder Requirements Review).

RIDs concerning the PST or OPT have been left open and will be carried into the conceptual and requirements discussions for those tools. The process for this will run in parallel to the SRDP project. The initial kick off meeting is scheduled for June 29, 2018.

2 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee highlighted eight recommendation, reproduced below. The recommendation is shown in blue, with the project response below.

1. Provide a two-page summary document providing context for external readers. This document should emphasize the Observatory's commitment, describe the objectives, and explain how the project will exploit existing capabilities, infrastructure and processes. A list of these items can be provided in an Appendix.

We have rewritten the Project Scope Statement (530-SRDP-032-MGMT) to provide this context. This will be the suggested starting point for future external readers.

2. On completion of Rolling Wave I, hold a CDR with external reviewers.

We will plan to hold a CDR on completion of Rolling Wave I and sufficient time with the capabilities deployed and in operations to effectively review that portion of the project as well.

3. Treat Rolling Wave I as a pilot project to understand the management systems, interfaces and revise as needed.

Following your suggestion, we have re-scheduled the first wave to run for 18 months, including a pilot operations period. This allows a dry-run of all interfaces and management systems prior to the initial deployment. Corrections from this pilot process will be incorporated into the standard procedures.

4. Identify risks on the rolling wave horizons.

We had not considered this, and think it is an excellent suggestion. A wave specific risk register will be developed and maintained.

5. Formally define lines of authority to resolve issues between groups

We have added a section to the Project Management Plan (530-SRDP-003-MGMT) in the Risk and Issue Management section to define decision making authority and the escalation path for issues between departments.

6. Provide project level MVP and BoE.

We have developed both a project level MVP (in the Stakeholder Requirements Document: 530-SRDP-015-MGMT) and a BoE (in the Cost Management Plan: 530-SRDP-026-MGMT). The cost management plan has been significantly reworked to incorporate the BoE. I am pleased to report that the overall envelope was not significantly modified in this process.

7. Improve the usability of the weblog.

We will form a focus group, led by the project scientist, to improve the weblog usability for external users. To set expectations, this will not be included as part of the first wave of implementation but will be included in the second or third.

8. Engage user community. We suggest the following example activities: end-user participation in evaluation and testing; community workshops, presentations and workshops at AAS meetings.

This is an important part of the Project Scientist and Project Director role. We will continue to seek opportunities as you suggest to engage of the community.